



ITEM NO.1

COURT NO.2

SECTION II-E

S U P R E M E C O U R T O F I N D I A
RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS

Petition(s) for Special Leave to Appeal (Crl.)
No(s). 271/2026
[Arising out of impugned order dated 19-08-2025
in MCRC No. 21878/2025 passed by the High Court of
Madhya Pradesh Principal Seat at Jabalpur]

HAZI ABDUL RAJJAK

Petitioner(s)

VERSUS

STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH

Respondent(s)

IA No. 304448/2025 - EXEMPTION FROM FILING C/C OF
THE IMPUGNED JUDGMENT

IA No. 88585/2026 - EXEMPTION FROM FILING O.T.

IA No. 42761/2026 - EXEMPTION FROM FILING O.T.

IA No. 4332/2026 - EXEMPTION FROM FILING O.T.

IA No. 311379/2025 - EXEMPTION FROM FILING O.T.

IA No. 304450/2025 - PERMISSION TO FILE ADDITIONAL
DOCUMENTS/FACTS/ANNEXURES

IA No. 4331/2026 - PERMISSION TO FILE ADDITIONAL
DOCUMENTS/FACTS/ANNEXURES

IA No. 311378/2025 - PERMISSION TO FILE ADDITIONAL
DOCUMENTS/FACTS/ANNEXURES

Date : 17-08-2026 This matter was called on for
hearing today.

CORAM :

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VIKRAM NATH

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANDEEP MEHTA

For Petitioner(s) : Mr. Pawan Reley, Adv.

Mr. Anmol Kheta, Adv.

Mr. Sharik Akeel Farooqui, Adv.

Ms. Tanya Srivastava, AOR

For Respondent(s) :Mr. S. V. Raju, A.S.G.
Mr. Sridhar Potaraju, A.A.G.
Mr. Manisha T Karia, A.A.G.
Mr. D. S. Parmar, A.A.G.
Ms. Mrinal Gopal Elker, AOR
Ms. Niharika Singh, Adv.
Ms. Silpi S Swain, Adv.

UPON hearing the counsel the Court made the following
O R D E R

In the order dated 27th July, 2026,
the following order was passed :-

*"On 27.05.2026, this Court
passed the following order:*

*Mr. S.V. Raju, learned
Additional Solicitor General,
appearing for the respondent,
states that in relation to the
supplementary charge-sheet filed
against the accused Mohd. Ayaz, the
prosecution would move an
appropriate application that his
trial may be segregated so that the
conclusion of the present trial is
not delayed. We, therefore, direct
that on such application being*

filed, the Trial Court would pass appropriate order segregating the trial of Mohd. Ayaz from the present trial.

Mr. Raju, further states that as of now only two witnesses who are partially examined and two are left to be examined, other than that all prosecution witnesses have been examined. He also submits that the Trial Court did endeavour to conclude the trial within two months as directed by order dated 25.03.2026, but because of intervening vacation and/or officer being on leave, the next date fixed in the case is 08.06.2026.

He further submits that the remaining witnesses, as noted above, would be examined within a period of two months.

Accordingly, the Trial Court is directed to conclude the trial within a period of two months from today.

It goes without saying that

the prosecution as well as defence shall extend all cooperation in the conclusion of the trial. Let this matter be listed again on 27.07.2026."

Today, a request form (Annexure-I) dated 17.07.2026 has been received from the Trial Court seeking an extension of time on two grounds - (i) that the prosecution has filed an application under Section SLP(Crl.)No.271/2026 2 311 Cr.P.C. (Sec.348 BNSS) for recalling two of its witnesses, and (ii) that the report of the handwriting expert with respect to a co-accused, who is being tried separately, is awaited.

Upon consideration of the above developments, the Court was inclined to grant bail to the petitioner, at which stage, Mr. S.V.Raju, learned Additional Solicitor General, upon instructions, submitted that the prosecution would withdraw its application under Section 311

Cr.P.C. (Sec.348 BNSS). He further submitted that the request for adjournment on the ground of the handwriting expert's report with respect to the co-accused would not be relevant for the trial of the present petitioner. As such, no adjournment would be sought on that ground.

He also stated that the prosecution evidence has been concluded and that the trial is now at the stage of examination of the accused under Section 313 Cr.P.C (Section 351 BNSS).

According to learned counsel for the petitioner, the next date fixed by the Trial Court is 29.07.2026.

We, accordingly, direct the Trial Court to examine the accused under Section 313 Cr.P.C. (Section 351 BNSS) on the said date or on any date within a week thereafter, and thereafter proceed to hear the SLP(Crl.)No.271/2026 3 arguments,

subject to the defence not proposing to examine any witnesses. In any event, the Trial Court shall make and endeavour to conclude the trial within two months.

It goes without saying that both the prosecution arguments, subject to the defence not proposing to examine any witnesses. In any event, the Trial Court shall make and endeavour to conclude the trial within two months.

It goes without saying that both the prosecution and defence shall extend their full cooperation for the conclusion of the trial. List this matter again on 17.08.2026."

Today Mr. S. V. Raju, learned Additional Solicitor General, upon instructions, states that he would like to withdraw from his statement that the prosecution would not be pressing the

application under Section 311 Cr.P.C.
(Section 348 B.N.S.S.).

He also submitted that the other request of the prosecution for relying upon the handwriting expert's report in the trial of the petitioner would be relevant and the same would be brought on record of the Trial Court.

In that view of the matter, we are inclined to grant bail to the petitioner in the present case for the reasons recorded in the aforesaid order of 27th July, 2026.

Accordingly, we direct that the petitioner be released on bail, on such terms and conditions as may be imposed by the Trial Court, in connection with FIR No.257 of 2023 dated 14.05.2023, Police Station Omti, District Jabalpur, Madhya Pradesh.

The undertaking as given by Mr. Raju, learned Additional Solicitor General, in the previous order dated 27th July, 2026 stand withdrawn. The time frame fixed by this Court in previous order shall also stand withdrawn.

It goes without saying that both the prosecution and defence shall extend full cooperation for the conclusion of the trial.

In the event, the Trial Court or the State finds that the petitioner is delaying the conclusion of trial, it will be open for them to apprise this Court of the same for appropriate orders.

The Special Leave Petition and pending applications are disposed of accordingly.

(SONIA BHASIN)
ASSISTANT REGISTRAR-CUM-PS

(RANJANA SHAILEY)
ASSISTANT REGISTRAR

