$~47

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**

\# **CNR No. DLHC010551762026**

\+ W.P.(CRL) 3570/2026, CRL.M.A. 35845/2026

KAMAL SINGH @ LANGDA .....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Deepanshu Goswami, Advocate.

versus

STATE OF NCT OF DELHI .....Respondent

Through: Mr. Sanjay Lao, Senior Advocate with Mr. Yudhveer Singh Chauhan, Mr. Abhinav Kumar Arya and Mr. Aryan Sachdeva, Advocates for State. SI Sharmila Yadav, PS-Gulabi Bagh.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJEEV NARULA

O R D E R

% 20.11.2026

1. The present writ petition under Article 226 of the Constitution of India seeks directions for expeditious and day-to-day trial in SC No. 317/2023, arising out of FIR No. 285/2022, registered at PS Gulabi Bagh under Sections 328/379/34 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860, pending before the Additional Sessions Judge, Tis Hazari Courts, Delhi.

2. The Petitioner, who has been in judicial custody since 31st October, 2022, submits that his applications for regular bail have been declined primarily on account of his criminal antecedents. He contends that an expeditious conclusion of the trial is necessary to enable him to establish his innocence and secure his release from custody. Accordingly, he seeks directions for conducting the trial on a day-to-day basis.

This is a digitally signed order.
The authenticity of the order can be re-verified from Delhi High Court Order Portal by scanning the QR code shown above.
The Order is downloaded from the DHC Server on 23/11/2026 at 12:10:10

3. There can be no dispute that every Court must endeavour to conclude criminal trials expeditiously, particularly where the accused remains in custody. At the same time, the practical constraints under which Trial Courts function cannot be overlooked. This Court, as well as its Coordinate Benches, routinely receives requests for expeditious disposal and issues appropriate directions in deserving cases. However, directing expedition in every such matter would serve little purpose, as the Trial Courts must necessarily balance competing demands on their judicial time, including other cases involving accused persons in custody.

4. In the present case, Mr. Sanjay Lao, Senior Counsel for the State, points out that charges were framed on 9th March, 2026, and six prosecution witnesses have already been examined. He further submits that the Trial Court is listing the matter at regular intervals, approximately once every month. Thus, it cannot be said that the trial has remained stagnant or that there has been any undue delay in the proceedings since the framing of charges.

5. While the Petitioner's concern regarding the duration of his incarceration is understandable, having regard to the progress of the trial and the practical constraints noted above, this Court finds no sufficient ground to issue directions for conducting the proceedings on a day-to-day basis or for their conclusion within a fixed timeframe.

6. Accordingly, the petition is dismissed, along with the pending application.

SANJEEV NARULA, J

NOVEMBER 20, 2026/*nk*

This is a digitally signed order.
The authenticity of the order can be re-verified from Delhi High Court Order Portal by scanning the QR code shown above.
The Order is downloaded from the DHC Server on 23/11/2026 at 12:10:10