



ends of justice. The present petitioner has failed to show that the delay is attributable to any fault or malafide action by the prosecution or any other party. It is not the case of petitioner that he is in custody and due to delay he is suffering. The trial Court is vested with authority to manage its own docket and regulate the proceedings. The present petition does not make out any compelling ground of delay that amounts to an abuse of process of law or denial of justice. This Court is of the view that direction for the expeditious trial can not be issued in routine manner unless compelling circumstances of manifest injustice or arbitrary delay are established. Ergo this Court finds no merits in the submissions of the petitioner and present petition is dismissed.

(SUBHAS MEHLA)
JUDGE

27.08.2025
monika

- | | | |
|-------------------------------|---|---------|
| 1. Whether speaking/ reasoned | : | Yes /No |
| 2. Whether reportable | : | Yes /No |