



2026:PHHC:074470

2026:PHHC:074470



CRM-M-9276-2024

-1-

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

126+257

CRM-M-9276-2024 (O & M)

Date of decision: 12.05.2026

Raj Bansal

....Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana and others

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMAN CHAUDHARY

Present : Mr. Parminder Singh, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

Mr. Amrik Narwal, DAG, Haryana.

Mr. Keshav Pratap Singh, Advocate,
for respondents No.2 to 4.

AMAN CHAUDHARY, J. (ORAL)

1. The present petition has been filed for quashing the order dated 20.01.2024, Annexure P-3, vide which evidence of the prosecution was closed.

2. Learned counsel submits that although charges were framed way back in the year 2016, against which the accused had filed a revision, that was dismissed in 2019, whereafter application under Section 319 Cr.P.C., was moved which also stood dismissed on 08.12.2022 and it was only thereafter, that the recording of the prosecution evidence commenced, however, the trial Court without appreciating the aforesaid peculiar facts, proceeded to close evidence, thereby causing serious



CRM-M-9276-2024

prejudice to the prosecution, thus, he prays for grant of effective opportunities to the prosecution to lead its remaining evidence.

3. Learned counsel for respondent Nos.2 to 4 submits that the order impugned in the present petition is legal and valid on account of the fact that the prosecution has already availed ample opportunities to conclude its evidence.

4. Heard.

5. The procedural law is intended to advance the cause of justice and not defeat the same on technicalities. The delay in conclusion of evidence is not entirely attributable to the prosecution, rather is on account of the multiple proceedings which got initiated as soon as the charges were framed in 2016 and continued till 2022. As such, the prosecution could not effectively proceed with recording of evidence during the pendency of aforesaid proceedings.

6. For a just decision of a case, it is essential that all evidence, including examination of prosecution witnesses is recorded, they being material. Moreover, no irreparable prejudice would be caused to the accused-respondent as it would be open for them to conduct cross-examination of aforesaid witnesses to check the veracity of their testimony.

7. In the peculiarity of facts and circumstances narrated hereinabove, the impugned order dated 20.01.2024, Annexure P-3, is hereby set aside and this Court, being persuaded, finds it to be just and appropriate to grant 7 effective opportunities to the prosecution to lead



2026:PHHC:074470

-3-

CRM-M-9276-2024

evidence in support of its case, subject to costs of Rs.20,000/- to be paid by the petitioner to respondents No.2 to 4.

8. The petition stands disposed of in the above terms.

12.05.2026

ashok

(AMAN CHAUDHARY)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes / No
Whether reportable : Yes / No