



WEB COPY



Cr.O.P.No.31960 of 2025

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED : 25.11.2025

CORAM:

THE HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE A.D.JAGADISH CHANDIRA

CrI.O.P.No.31960 of 2025 and
CrI.M.P.Nos.22109 and 22110 of 2025

R.Kuppuraj

... Petitioner

Vs.

1. The State Rep. by
The Inspector of Police
R-10, M.G.R. Nagar Police Station
Chennai – 600 083
Crime No.233 of 2018

2. Suji

... Respondents

PRAYER : Criminal Original Petition is filed under Section 528 of BNSS, to call for the records in C.C.No.2067 of 2020, in Crime NO.233 of 2018, on the file of the XXIII Metropolitan Magistrate Court, Saidapet and quash the same against the petitioner/Accused-1.

For Petitioner : Ms.C.Renuka

For Respondents : Mr.K.M.D.Muhilan

Additional Public Prosecutor for R1

ORDER

This Criminal Original Petition has been filed to quash the proceedings in C.C.No.2067 of 2020, in Crime No.233 of 2018, on the file of the learned XXIII Metropolitan Magistrate, Saidapet, against the petitioner/A1.



CrI.O.P.No.31960 of 2025

2. The learned counsel for the petitioner would submit that though this petition has been filed to quash the proceedings in C.C.No.2067 of 2020, he is not pressing the said prayer. He would further submit that the petitioner is a law graduate and on account of pendency of this case, he is unable to enroll himself in the Bar Council and hence, a direction may be issued to the learned trial Judge to complete the trial at the earliest. He would also submit that the first respondent police are purposefully not producing the witnesses.

3. The learned Additional Public Prosecutor appearing for the first respondent Police would submit that L.W.1 has been examined as P.W1 in part and the case is posted to 04.12.2025, for further examination of P.W.1. He would further submit that there are totally 14 witnesses in this case and the first respondent police will co-operate for the speedy disposal of the case.

4. It is pertinent to state that a Constitution Bench of the Supreme Court, in the case of *High Court Bar Association, Allahabad vs. State of Uttar Pradesh* reported in (2024) 6 SCC 267, has held that the constitutional courts, in the ordinary course, should refrain from fixing a time-bound schedule for the disposal of cases pending before any other court. The relevant portion of the said decision for the sake of ready reference is reproduced below:



WEB COPY



CrI.O.P.No.31960 of 2025

"47.3. Constitutional courts, in the ordinary course, should refrain from fixing a time-bound schedule for the disposal of cases pending before any other courts. Constitutional courts may issue directions for the time-bound disposal of cases only in exceptional circumstances. The issue of prioritising the disposal of cases should be best left to the decision of the courts concerned where the cases are pending."
(emphasis supplied by this Court).

5. It has also been held in the aforesaid extracted portion that in exceptional circumstances, constitutional courts may issue directions for time bound disposal of cases. In the present case, considering that the petitioner/A1 who is a law graduate, is unable to get himself enrolled due to the pendency of this case and this being an exceptional circumstance in the opinion of this Court, a direction is issued to the learned trial Judge to complete the trial as expeditiously as possible, preferably within a period of four months from the date of receipt of a copy of this order.



Cr.L.O.P.No.31960 of 2025

6. With the above directions, this criminal Original Petition is disposed of. Consequently, the connected Miscellaneous Petitions are closed.

25.11.2025

ksa-2

Neutral Citation: Yes/No

Note: Issue order copy by 26.12.2025.



CrI.O.P.No.31960 of 2025

WEB COPY

To

1. The XXIII Metropolitan Magistrate,
Saidapet
2. The Inspector of Police
R-10, M.G.R. Nagar Police Station
Chennai – 600 083
3. The Public Prosecutor,
High Court of Madras.



WEB COPY



CrI.O.P.No.31960 of 2025

A.D.JAGADISH CHANDIRA, J.

ksa-2

CrI.O.P.No.31960 of 2025

25.11.2025