



CRM-M-18954-2026 (O&M)

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

272

CRM-M-18954-2026 (O&M)
Date of decision: 07.05.2026

AMANDEEP SINGH

...PETITIONER

VERSUS

STATE OF PUNJAB AND OTHERS

...RESPONDENTS

CORAM: HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE SHALINI SINGH NAGPAL

Present: Mr. Ravi Kumar, Advocate for
Mr. Kulwinder Singh, Advocate for the petitioner.
Mr. Akash Yadav, AAG Punjab.
Mr. Bharat Kumar, Advocate for respondent No.2.

Shalini Singh Nagpal, J. (Oral)

1. Petitioner seeks quashing of FIR No.51 dated 07.07.2025 under Sections 64, 308(2), 351(2), 238 of Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita (B.N.S.), 2023, Sections 66E, 67A of the Information Technology Act, Police Station Jaurkian, District Mansa and all consequential proceedings arising therefrom, on the basis of compromise dated 27.02.2026.

2. Complainant alleged that she was married to Harnek Singh in 2008. About 7 years ago she attended a marriage function in her in-laws family, where she came into contact with Amandeep Singh, who lured her with his talks saying that her husband was involved with another woman and that he could provide proof of the same. On this account, she exchanged her phone number with him and since then, they started communicating regularly. When she asked him about the alleged proof, he used avoid the issue. Subsequently, they also communicated through video call during which Amandeep Singh asked her to show her private parts and the said video calls were recorded by him. When he asked her to repeat the said act, she stopped calling him. Thereafter, he sent the videos and messages to her and threatened her that he would make them viral. He also blackmailed her and demanded money. Out of

fear, she handed over her gold jewellery, ₹3,30,000/- in cash and transferred



CRM-M-18954-2026 (O&M)

₹3,90,000/- through online mode while some amount was transferred to the account of friend of Amandeep Singh. In March, 2025 also, he threatened to make the videos viral and forcibly made physical relations with her. In May, 2025 when she was at her parental home, he again sent photos, videos and screenshots of chats on her mobile phone which were seen by her brother as her phone was in his possession, upon which he called Amandeep Singh and they exchanged heated arguments. Thereafter Amandeep Singh sent audio recordings to her and her husband and threatened to upload the videos on social media. She further alleged that she also submitted an application to DSP Sardulgarh, though certain facts were not disclosed in the said application.

3. On 08.04.2026, this Court directed the parties to appear before learned trial Court/Illaq Magistrate for recording of their statements with regard to compromise dated 27.02.2026.

4. In compliance of the aforesaid order, parties appeared before learned Additional District and Sessions Judge, Fast Track Special Court, Mansa on 20.04.2026. Statement of Investigating Officer Inspector Rupinder Kaur was also recorded on 20.04.2026. Learned Additional District and Sessions Judge, Fast Track Special Court, Mansa has submitted her report recording satisfaction that all the parties have entered into a valid compromise without any influence or coercion. Point-wise report as under has been submitted:

- “(1) As per statements of Investigating Officers, there is only one accused namely Amandeep Singh, son of Avtar Singh, resident of Mian, District Mansa.*
- (2) As per record, said accused Amandeep Singh has appeared and made his statement.*
- (3) As per statements of Investigating Officers, no additional accused has been added in this case.*
- (4) As per police record, accused Amandeep Singh has never been declared as absconder or proclaimed person.*



- (5) *As per statement of Investigating Officers, no offence was added or deleted during investigation.*
- (6) *As per statement of Investigating Officers, investigation is not pending against any accused in this case and no accused has been declared as innocent in this case.*
- (7) *As per statements of the Investigating Officers, the complainant is Harwinder Kaur wife of Sukhdev Singh, resident of village Adamke, who herself is the victim in the present case.*
- (8) *As per record, the sole victim/prosecutrix 'H' has appeared and got recorded her statement recorded regarding compromise, and she was duly identified by the Investigating Officers at the time of recording her statement in the Court.*
- (9) *Investigating Officer Inspector Parminder Kaur No. 165/BTR and Investigating Officer Inspector Rupinder Kaur No. 145/BTR have appeared and recorded their statements.*
- (10) *As per record, the trial is pending for prosecution witnesses.*
- (11) *From the statements of parties, it appears that the compromise effected between them vide compromise deed Annexure A1 is genuine, voluntary and without any coercion or undue influence.*
- (12) *As per police record, no other criminal case or proceedings are pending against the accused Amandeep Singh.”*

5. Learned State counsel and learned counsel for respondent No.2 have not raised any dispute regarding the factum of compromise.

6. Apparently, dispute between prosecutrix and petitioner has been amicably resolved. In ***Madhukar and others Vs. The State of Maharashtra and another'***, 2025 ***LiveLaw (SC)710***, Hon'ble Supreme Court of India, recognizing that offence under 376 of the Indian Penal Code is of a grave and heinous nature, observed that the power of Court under Section 482 Cr.P.C. to secure the ends of justice is not constrained by a rigid formula and must be exercised with reference to the facts of each case. In that case, the complainant expressed desire not to pursue the case on the ground that she was now married, settled in personal life and continuing with the criminal proceedings



CRM-M-18954-2026 (O&M)

would only disturb her peace and stability. Hon'ble Supreme Court observed that the parties had amicably resolved their differences and arrived at mutual understanding and continuation of trial would not serve any meaningful purpose, rather would only prolong distress for all concerned specially the complainant and burden the Court without the likelihood of productive outcome.

7. Complainant is a married lady. She was in a relationship with petitioner for 07 years which later turned sour. Given the marital status of the complainant, it would be in her interest to put a quietus to the whole episode. The parties have resolved their disputes amicably and should be saved from the agony of criminal trial. The continuance of criminal trial would only add to the sufferings of the parties and would be an exercise in futility.

8. Following the principles of law laid down by Hon'ble Supreme Court in *Madhukar and others vs. The State of Maharashtra and another, 2025 LiveLaw (SC)710*, it is a fit case warranting exercise of discretion under Section 528 Bharatiya Nagrik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023.

9. The petition stands allowed. FIR No.51 dated 07.07.2025 under Sections 64, 308(2), 351(2), 238 of Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita (B.N.S.), 2023, Sections 66E, 67A of the Information Technology Act, Police Station Jaurkian, District Mansa and all consequential proceedings arising therefrom, are quashed qua the petitioner, on the basis of compromise dated 27.02.2026.

7. Pending applications, if any, stand disposed of.

(SHALINI SINGH NAGPAL)
JUDGE

07.05.2026

HS.CHAUHAN

Whether Speaking/Reasoned :
Whether Reportable :

Yes/No
Yes/No