



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

248

CRM-M-20438-2023 (O&M).

Date of Decision: 13.05.2026.

Sunita Rani and others

....Petitioners.

VERSUS

State of Punjab and another

....Respondents.

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY VASHISTH

Present: None for the petitioners.

Mr. Manjinder Singh Bhullar, Deputy Advocate General, Punjab.

None for respondent No.2.

SANJAY VASHISTH, J. (Oral)

Petitioners (1) Sunita Rani, (2) Jagwinder Singh @ Jaswinder Singh, (3) Gurmit Ram, and (4) Meenu Singh, have filed the instant petition under Section 482 Cr.P.C. for quashing of FIR No.194 dated 14.08.2022 under Sections 306, 506 IPC, registered at Police Station City Muktsar, District Sri Muktsar Sahib, with all consequential proceedings arising therefrom, on the basis of compromise dated 24.02.2023 (Annexure P-2).

2. On 25.04.2023 while issuing notice to the respondents, following was recorded:-

“The petitioners have filed the present petition under Section 482 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973 for quashing of FIR No.194 dated 14.08.2022 registered under Sections 306 and 506 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 at Police Station City Muktsar, District Sri Muktsar Sahib and all

consequential proceedings arising therefrom on the basis of compromise dated 24.02.2023 arrived between the parties.

Notice of motion.

On the asking of the Court, Mr. Jaspal Singh Guru, Asstt. A.G., Punjab, who is present in the Court, has accepted notice on behalf of respondent No.1-State.

At this stage, Mr. Mayank Goyal, Advocate has appeared and accepted notice on behalf of respondent No.2 and filed his power of attorney in the Court which is taken on record.

Learned Counsel for respondent No.2 admits the factum of compromise.

However, learned State counsel raised objection that FIR registered under under Section 306 cannot be allowed to be quashed on the basis of compromise and seeks time to file status report.

Adjourned to 11.07.2023.”

3. Thereafter, since 28.01.2025, the petition is being adjourned to enable the petitioners to cite some law on the objection raised by learned State counsel. Still the petition is kept pending by adjourning many a times. Today none is present to represent the petitioners. Moreover, in view of the observations made by the Hon'ble Division Bench of this Court in **Rakesh Das v. State of Haryana and another** [CRM-M-48043-2023 (O&M)] (Decided on : 12.11.2024) : Law Finder Doc Id # 2663704, the present petition is not maintainable and the same is dismissed on the said count.

Pending misc. application(s), if any, also stand(s) disposed of.

(SANJAY VASHISTH)
JUDGE

13.05.2026

jitender

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