



CRM-M-23396-2025

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

140

CRM-M-23396-2025
Decided on :12.01.2026

Rajesh Kumar alias Akash Sidhu

.....Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab and another

.....Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY VASHISTH

Present: Mr. Rakesh Kumar, Advocate for
Mr. Mandeep Singh, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Vinay Malhotra, DAG Punjab

SANJAY VASHISTH, J. (ORAL)

1. The present petition under Section 528 of BNSS has been filed for quashing of FIR No.77 dated 11.02.2025 under Sections 318(4), 316(2), 336(2), 336(3), 340(2), 61(2), BNS and under Section 24 of the Immigration Act, registered at Police Station Zirakpur, District SAS Nagar (Annexure P-1), and all subsequent proceedings arising therefrom

2. On 02.05.2025, the following order was passed :-

“The present petition under Section 528 of BNSS has been filed for quashing of FIR No.77 dated 11.02.2025 under Sections 318(4), 316(2), 336(2), 336(3), 340(2), 61(2), BNS and under Section 24 of the Immigration Act, registered at Police Station Zirakpur, District SAS Nagar (Annexure P-1), and all subsequent proceedings arising therefrom.

Counsel states that though there are other accused also, yet complainant/respondent No.2 has clearly mentioned in the



CRM-M-23396-2025

compromise deed that the present compromise be considered as full and final settlement viz-a-viz the other co-accused also. However, therebeing no one present to represent the private respondent No.2/complainant party, petition is adjourned to 13.05.2025.”

3. On the next date of hearing i.e. 13.05.2025, proceedings were deferred for 12.08.2025 because petitioner was unable to secure presence of the private respondents before this Court to confirm the factum of compromise. On 12.08.2025, none appeared to represent the petitioner, however, in the interest of justice, proceedings were deferred to 15.10.2025. On 15.10.2025, there was a change of counsel and Mr. Mandeep Singh, Advocate filed Vakalatnama on that date and sought adjournment to address arguments. On 16.12.2025, none appeared because lawyers were observing strike on that date.

4. Today, when the matter was taken up and the factum of there being total three accused, whereas the petition is being filed by one of them, learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner prays for grant of adjournment as the arguing counsel Mr. Mandeep Singh, Advocate is not present in the Court, being not well.

5. I find no substantial reason to keep the petition pending, more for the reason that as per judgment passed by Hon'ble Division Bench of this Court in CRM-M-48043-2023 titled as ***Rakesh Das vs. State of Haryana and another*** decided on 12.11.2024, partial quashing petition based on compromise is not maintainable.

The petition is, accordingly, dismissed.

12.01.2026
reena

(SANJAY VASHISTH)
JUDGE

Whether Speaking/Reasoned:
Whether Reportable:

YES/NO
~~YES~~/NO