



- 1-

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA  
AT CHANDIGARH

123

CRM-M-7775-2025  
Date of decision: 07.05.2025

GAGANDEEP SINGH AND ANOTHER

....Petitioners

Versus

STATE OF PUNJAB AND OTHERS

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY VASHISTH

Present : Mr. G.S. Nehra, Advocate for the petitioners.

Mr. Manjinder Singh Bhullar, DAG, Punjab.

**SANJAY VASHISTH. J.(Oral)**

1. Petitioners Gagandeep Singh and Karnail Singh have filed the instant petition for seeking quashing of the FIR No.0056 dated 23.05.2023, under Sections 420 and 120-B of IPC, registered at Fatehgarh Sahib, P.S. Fatehgarh Sahib and all the consequential proceedings arising therefrom, on the basis of compromises dated 27.07.2023 (Annexure P-2 and Annexure P-3).

2. On 13.02.2025, following order was passed:-

*“Prayer in this petition under Section 528 BNSS (earlier 482 Cr.P.C. is for quashing of FIR No.0056 dated 23.05.2023, under Sections 420, 120-B IPC, registered at Police Station Fatehgarh Sahib, District Fatehgarh Sahib, and all consequential proceedings arising therefrom on the basis of compromise dated 27.07.2023 (Annexures P-2 & P-3).*

*Petitioners have made second attempt for seeking quashing of*



- 2-

*the FIR on account of compromise.*

*Admittedly, the earlier quashing petition filed on the basis of compromise was withdrawn by the petitioners because respondent(s)/victim(s) had retracted from the compromise at that time.*

*Even today, petitioners are unable to join hands with the respondents, as no one is here to represent them.*

*On request of counsel for the petitioners, adjourned to 20.03.2025.*

3. On 20.03.2025, following order was passed:-

*“Due to demise in the family of the petitioners, counsel for the petitioners could not get the required instructions, thus, prays for an adjournment.*

*List on 03.04.2025.”*

4. On 03.04.2025, following order was passed:-

*“On the one hand, counsel for the petitioners pleads that the dispute has been resolved with the complainant, but he is unable to procure the representation on behalf of the said respondents.*

*List again on 07.05.2025.”*

5. Today again though petitioner's counsel plead that the compromise still exists but, there is no explanation with the counsel that if the compromise is there in actual, then why the respondents can't appear before this Court for accepting the factum of compromise, relied upon by the petitioners. It is also noticed that instant petition is a second attempt for seeking quashing of the FIR, on account of compromise. It appears that there is no compromise and unnecessarily the provision of law of quashing of the proceedings on the basis of compromise is misused by the petitioners.

6. At this stage, counsel for the petitioners seeks withdrawal of the



present petition.

7. Dismissed as withdrawn.

07.05.2025  
amandeep

(SANJAY VASHISTH)  
JUDGE

|                            |   |        |
|----------------------------|---|--------|
| Whether speaking/reasoned. | : | Yes/No |
| Whether Reportable.        | : | Yes/No |