

2026:PHHC:070823



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

259

**CRM-M-14344-2025
Date of Decision: 06.05.2026.**

Ramanpreet Singh and others

....Petitioners.

VERSUS

State of Punjab and another

....Respondents.

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY VASHISTH

Present: Mr. Arjun Kapur, Advocate for
Mr. Abhinav Singla, Advocate for the petitioners.

Mr. Vinay Malhotra, DAG, Punjab.

SANJAY VASHISTH, J. (Oral)

Petitioners-Ramanpreet Singh, Avtar Singh, Achin Maini and Anil Kumar, have filed the aforementioned two petitions under Section 528 of BNSS, 2023, for quashing of FIR No.59 dated 29.03.2022 under Sections 323, 341, 342, 348, 148, 149 and 506 IPC (Section 3 of the Scheduled Castes and the Scheduled Tribes (Prevention of Atrocities) Act, and Sections 25, 27, 54, 59 of Arms Act added later on), registered at Police Station Tanda, District Hoshiarpur, with all consequential proceedings arising therefrom on the basis of compromise dated 09.03.2025 (Annexure P-2) alleged executed between the petitioners and respondent No.2.

2. Present petition was instituted in March, 2025 and direction to get the statements recorded was issued by Co-ordinate Bench of this Court on 17.03.2025 i.e. more than a year back.

3. On 30.04.2025, on request of counsel for the parties, for affording another opportunity to get the statements recorded, one more opportunity was granted by the Court to get the statements recorded.

4. On 28.07.2025, none appeared to represent the petitioner nor there was any representation on behalf of respondent No.2. As per report dated 24.04.2025 forwarded by the Court of Judicial Magistrate Ist Class, Dasuya, complainant-Sugriv Singh and petitioner-Anil Kumar did not appear for making their statements in regard to the compromise. Even accused Avtar Singh and Achin Main (petitioners No.2 and 3) had been declared as proclaimed persons, vide order dated 18.03.2025.

5. Again on 29.05.2025, another report is forwarded to this Court. However, again none of the parties appeared on 13.05.2025 also for recording their statements qua compromise in compliance of direction issued by this Court.

6. In view of the aforementioned position, this Court reaches to the conclusion that, in fact, there does not appear to be any final settlement amongst all the accused and the complainant. Therefore, the petition is unwarranted and accordingly the same is **dismissed**.

Pending application(s), if any, also stands disposed of accordingly.

(SANJAY VASHISTH)
JUDGE

06.05.2026
jitender

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