



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

CRM-M No.13858 of 2025 (O&M)

Date of decision: 30.04.2026

Jagjit Singh and another

...Petitioners

Versus

State of Punjab and another

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE MANDEEP PANNU

Present :- Mr. Jasdev Singh Mehndiratta, Senior Advocate with
Ms. Tanveen Kaur, Advocate
for the petitioners.

Mr. Hardeep Singh Wadhwa, DAG, Punjab
for respondent No.1-State.

Mr. Gaurav Jain, Advocate
for respondent No.2.

MANDEEP PANNU, J. (Oral)

1. The present petition has been filed by the petitioners, namely Jagjit Singh and Amarjit Kaur, who are the parents-in-law of the complainant, for quashing of FIR No.126 dated 28.08.2024 registered under Sections 406, 420 and 120-B IPC at Police Station Pasiana, District Patiala, with all the consequential proceedings arising therefrom.

2. It is submitted by learned counsel for the petitioners that the allegations in the FIR pertain to matrimonial dispute but the complainant is not even married to the son of the petitioners and, therefore, the present FIR is not maintainable, as there exists no relationship of husband and wife between the co-accused, son of the petitioners, and the complainant. It is



further contended that the essential ingredients of Sections 406 and 420 IPC are not made out. It is argued that in a previous complaint filed by the complainant, she had suffered a statement before learned Magistrate wherein she merely stated that she was residing with co-accused Harpreet Singh and no assertion regarding any marriage was made.

3. Per contra, learned counsel for respondent No.2 has submitted that proper ceremonies of the marriage were duly performed and that it is not a case under Section 498-A IPC; rather, the factum of marriage is not determinative for the offences alleged.

4. Heard.

5. The pleas raised by the petitioners cannot be adjudicated in the present proceedings, as this is a petition seeking quashing of the FIR. This Court, while exercising jurisdiction under Section 528 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita (BNSS), cannot conduct a mini-trial or delve into disputed questions of fact.

6. In the present case, the charge is yet to be framed. Therefore, the petitioners are at liberty to raise all the aforesaid pleas before the trial Court at the appropriate stage. Learned Magistrate shall consider the same and pass a reasoned and speaking order at the time of framing of charge.

7. With the aforesaid observations, the present petition stands disposed of.

8. All pending applications, if any, also stand disposed of.

30.04.2026

nctu

(MANDEEP PANNU)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned: Yes/No
Whether Reportable: Yes/No