



**IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH**

**CRM-M No.11887 of 2025 (O&M)
Date of Decision: 03.03.2025**

Ramesh Kumar

..... Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

..... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE MAHABIR SINGH SINDHU

Present:- Mr. Rohit Joshi, Advocate for the petitioner.

MAHABIR SINGH SINDHU, J.

Present petition has been filed under Section 528 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 for directing learned trial Court to conclude the case, titled as “**State of Haryana Versus Premnath Gupta etc.**”, bearing No.CHI-977-2022 (P-3) in FIR No.0215 dated 11.05.2016 (P-2), under Sections 120-B, 406, 420, 467, 468 & 471 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860, registered at Police Station City Narnaul, District Mahendergarh in a time bound manner.

2025:PHHC:029960



(2) Allegations are that accused persons forged the documents, relating to land in dispute, which belonged to Government Hospital, Haryana, with an intention to grab the same.

(3) Contends that challan was presented on 06.12.2022; but the trial is being delayed unnecessarily by the prosecution in connivance with the accused party; thus, direction be issued to learned trial Court to conclude the same in a time bound manner. In support of his contention, learned Counsel cited “**Hero Cycles Ltd. Versus State of Punjab**”, CRM-M-62225-2024, decided on 11.12.2024.

(4) Heard learned Counsel for the petitioner and perused the record.

(5) Hon’ble the Supreme Court, in para 47.3 of “**High Court Bar Association, Allahabad Versus State of Uttar Pradesh & Ors.**”, (2024) 6 SCC 267, held as under:-

“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.”

(6) So far as the argument that trial is being delayed unnecessarily in connivance with the accused party is also liable to be rejected for the

2025:PHHC:029960



reason that petitioner is neither accused; nor the *de facto* complainant in this case; rather he is merely a prosecution witness.

(7) In view of the above, this Court is of the considered opinion that present petition is complete misuse of the process of Court; hence, deserves to be dismissed with costs.

(8) However, taking a lenient view, petition is dismissed, but no costs.

Pending application(s), if any, shall also stand disposed off.

3rd March, 2025
Gagan

(MAHABIR SINGH SINDHU)
JUDGE

<i>Whether speaking/reasoned</i>	<i>Yes/No</i>
<i>Whether Reportable</i>	<i>Yes/No</i>