



**In the High Court for the States of Punjab and Haryana
at Chandigarh**

106

CRM-M-73745-2025 (O&M)
Date of Decision:- 13.02.2026

Waris ... Petitioner
Versus
State of Haryana ... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SUBHAS MEHLA

Present:- Mr. Balraj Gujjar, Advocate for the petitioner.
Mr. Surender Singh Pannu, Addl. A.G., Haryana.

SUBHAS MEHLA, J. (Oral)

CRM-4522-2026

In view of the reasons mentioned in the application, the same is allowed and the hearing of the main petition is preponed from 10.03.2026 and the same is taken on Board today itself.

CRM-M-73745-2025

1. This is the 6th petition filed by the petitioner seeking regular bail in case FIR No.82 dated 18.03.2021 registered under Sections 302 and 34 of IPC, at Police Station Punhana, District Nuh, Haryana.
2. Learned counsel for the petitioner contended that the prosecution evidence was closed one year prior and the case before the trial Court is now fixed for defence evidence, and accused/petitioner does not wish to lead any defence evidence. Thus, learned counsel limited his prayer to the extent that the trial Court may be directed to decide the case within one month.



CRM-M-73745-2025 (O&M) (2)

3. Learned State counsel has not opposed the prayer made by learned counsel for the petitioner.
4. Mr. Nafeesh Ahmed, Advocate has put in appearance on behalf of the complainant and has filed *Vakalatnama*, which is taken on record.
5. Heard.
6. Keeping in view the limited prayer made by learned counsel for the petitioner, the instant petition stands disposed off with a direction to the Trial Court to expedite the conclusion of trial preferably within a period of 1 month from the next date of hearing fixed before it. If the trial Court fails to conclude the trial within the stipulated period, then the petitioner would be at liberty to move an appropriate application seeking grant of bail before the Trial Court. Upon such application being filed, the Trial Court shall release the petitioner on bail subject to his furnishing requisite bonds to its satisfaction by imposing such condition that his presence can be secured during the trial. However, it is made clear that if the delay in the trial is caused on the part of the petitioner/accused, then he shall not be entitled for the aforesaid relief.

13.02.2026
Geeta

(SUBHAS MEHLA)
JUDGE

Whether speaking /reasoned	Yes / No
Whether Reportable	Yes / No