



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

272

CRM-M-17038-2025

Date of decision : 30.07.2025

Razzak Muhammad and others

....Petitioners

V/S

State of Punjab and another

....Respondents

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE NAMIT KUMAR

Present: None for the petitioners.

Mr. Rahul Jindal, A.A.G., Punjab.

None for respondent No.2.

NAMIT KUMAR, J. (ORAL)

1. The petitioners have filed the instant petition under Section 528 of Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 seeking quashing of FIR No.40 dated 09.04.2024 registered under Sections 498-A, 406 & 34 of Indian Penal Code, 1860 at Police Station Sirhind, District Fatehgarh Sahib (Annexure P-1) and all subsequent proceedings arising therefrom on the basis of compromise dated 11.02.2025 (Annexure P-2) effected between the parties.

2. Vide order dated 28.03.2025, while issuing notice of motion, the parties were directed to appear before the Illaqa Magistrate/Trial Court on 21.04.2025 for recording their statements with regard to the compromise. In pursuance to the said order, report dated 24.07.2025 from learned Additional Chief Judicial Magistrate, Fatehgarh Sahib through learned District and Sessions Judge, Fatehgarh



Sahib has been received, wherein it has been stated as under :-

“xx xx xx xx xx

It is submitted that on 21.04.2025, accused Razak Mohammad, Bajira and Khursheed Mohammad got their presence marked before the Court. Complainant did not put in appearance and power of attorney on her behalf was filed by Sh. S.S. Narain, Advocate. Thereafter, the case was adjourned to 01.05.2025 for recording the statements of the parties.

On 01.05.2025, accused Razak Mohammad undertook to give payment to the complainant before the Family Court in second statement to be recorded in case under Section 13-B of Hindu Marriage Act. Adjournment was again sought for recording the statements of the parties.

On 07.07.2025, complainant Parveen Kaur came present but none was present on behalf of accused. As such, the case was adjourned to 11.07.2025 for recording statements of the parties.

On 11.07.2025, both the parties appeared and sought time for getting their statements recorded. On their request, the matter was adjourned to 18.07.2025. Similarly, on their request, the matter was again adjourned to 21.07.2025.

On 21.07.2025, both complainant Parveen Kaur and accused Razak Mohammad were present and did not suffer any statement regarding compromise. Learned counsel for the complainant stated that till the time accused does not make any statement before the Family Court, complainant is not ready to compromise the matter.

Since the statements of parties qua compromise have not been recorded, the report is being submitted for the kind perusal.”

3. Thereafter, the petitioners have filed application bearing CRM No.27043 of 2015 seeking one more opportunity to appear before the Illaqa Magistrate/Trial Court for recording their statements qua compromise. The said application was allowed by this Court, vide order dated 23.07.2025 and the parties were again directed to appear before



CRM-M-17038-2025

3

the Illaqa Magistrate/Trial Court on 25.07.2025 for recording their statements.

4. In pursuance to the order dated 23.07.2025, report dated 28.07.2025 from learned Additional Chief Judicial Magistrate, Fatehgarh Sahib through learned District and Sessions Judge, Fatehgarh Sahib has been received, wherein it has been stated as under :-

“xx xx xx xx xx

On 28.07.2025, complainant Parveen Kaur and accused persons namely Razak Mohammad, Bajira and Khursheed Mohammad were present but none of them made any statement before the Court. Complainant Parveen Kaur has orally stated that no compromise has been effected between her and accused persons.

Since the statements of parties qua compromise have not been recorded, the report is being submitted for the kind perusal.”

5. There is no representation on behalf of the petitioners as well as respondent No.2. It appears that the parties are not interested to pursue the present petition.

6. In this view of the matter, the present petition is dismissed for non-proseuction.

30.07.2025

kothiyal

(NAMIT KUMAR)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned:

Yes/No

Whether Reportable:

Yes/No