



126

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

**CRM-M No.24348 of 2026
Decided on: 01.05.2026**

Rekha and others

..... Petitioners

Versus

State of Haryana

.....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJESH BHARDWAJ

Present: Mr. Yatharth Singh, Advocate
for the petitioners (through VC).

Mr. K. D. Sachdeva, DAG, Punjab.

RAJESH BHARDWAJ J.

1. Present petition has been filed praying for quashing of FIR No.162, dated 20.03.2026, under Section 285 of IPC (Section 290 of BNS), registered at Police Station Kharkhoda, District Sonipat, Haryana along with all the proceedings arising therefrom.

2. Succinctly, the facts of the case are that FIR in the present case was got registered on the statement of complainant, namely, Jagpal. It was alleged that Rekha Birla and her associates have threatened to kill by shooting the complainant. It was alleged that on 07.04.2023, the complainant saw on the woman's instagram that her son was firing from the gun and when they reached at Saidpur police station, they found that the shots were fired in village Jharjot. Thus, the request was made to take legal action against the accused. As the woman was not socially



acceptable, she poses a threat to social and family security and life and property. On the basis of the complaint, the present FIR was registered. On the registration of the FIR, the investigation commenced. Hence, the petitioners approached this Court praying for quashing of the FIR.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioners has vehemently contended that the petitioners have been falsely prosecuted in the impugned FIR. He has submitted that the allegations made against the petitioners are vague and based merely upon the video. He has submitted that the FIR has been registered only on suspicion. He has submitted that the petitioners have been implicated in the present case by the complainant only on account of old rivalry. He has relied upon the decision passed by Hon'ble the Supreme Court in **'M/s Pepsi Foods Ltd. vs. Special Judicial Magistrate' 1997(4) RCR (Criminal) 761** and has submitted that keeping in view the law settled, the impugned FIR deserves to be quashed qua the petitioners.

4. On the other hand, learned counsel for the State has opposed the submissions made by learned counsel for the petitioners. He has submitted that complicity of the petitioners has been prima facie established during the investigation conducted so far. He has further submitted that there are specific allegations made against the petitioners by the complainant in the present FIR. He, however, on instructions, has apprised the Court that the case is under investigation and the challan under Section 173 Cr.P.C. is yet to be presented, thus, the present petition deserves to be dismissed.

5. This Court has heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the record with the able assistance.



6. The precise arguments raised by learned counsel for the petitioners is that the petitioners have been falsely implicated in the present case. However, it is apparent that the allegations made by the complainant against the petitioners are specific in nature as they constantly threatens him to shoot.

7. Learned counsel for the petitioners has raised various submissions, which are totally a disputed question of facts. From the facts and circumstances of the case, this Court finds that the case requires a thorough investigation to unravel the mystery.

8. As submitted before this Court by learned counsel for the State, the case is under investigation. The submission made regarding the disputed question of facts cannot be answered by this Court under its inherent jurisdiction under Section 582 of BNSS, 2023.

9. Hon'ble the Supreme Court in the case of *Neeharika Infrastructure Pvt. Ltd. vs. State of Maharastra and another, 2021 SCC Online SC 315* has held that the High Court should exercise the power of quashing under Section 482 Cr.P.C. sparingly with great circumspection as it has been observed, in the rarest of rare cases and also criminal proceedings ought not to be scuttled at the initial stage.

10. From the facts and circumstances of the present case, it is apparent that there are disputed questions of fact, which can be adjudicated only after carrying out a thorough investigation and leading evidence. The Court has to be circumspect for invoking its power under Section 528 of BNSS, 2023 for quashing of FIR at threshold.

11. Weighing the facts and circumstances of the case on the anvil of law settled, this Court does not find any ground to entertain the



present petition at this stage. Resultantly, the present petition being devoid of any merit is hereby dismissed.

12. Nothing said herein shall be treated as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

(RAJESH BHARDWAJ)
JUDGE

01.05.2026
rittu

Whether Speaking/Reasoned	:	Yes/No
Whether Reportable	:	Yes/No