



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

**CRM-M No.30793 of 2021
Date of decision: 12.05.2026**

Smt. Bimla Kaundal and another

...Petitioners

Versus

State of Haryana and another

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE MANDEEP PANNU

Present :- Ms. Aruna Sachdeva, Advocate
for the petitioners.

Mr. Vaibhav Sharma, AAG, Haryana
for respondent No.1-State.

Mr. Anuj Garg, Advocate
for respondent No.2.

MANDEEP PANNU, J. (Oral)

1. Present petition under Section 482 Cr.P.C. has been filed for quashing of FIR No.165 dated 19.04.2021, registered under Sections 323, 427, 506 and 34 IPC at Police Station Pinjore, District Panchkula, and all consequential proceedings arising therefrom.

2. As per the allegations levelled in the FIR, on 18.04.2021 at about 1.30 p.m., when the complainant party was distributing Prasad during a Bhandara at Kali Mata Mandir, Himshikha, Pinjore, petitioner No.1 Bimla Kaundal along with co-accused Amit Parmar reached there and allegedly started shouting and threatening the complainant party. It was alleged that Bimla Kaundal pulled complainant Anju Rai from her neck and



hair and kicked her on her back and chest, while both the accused also hurled abuses and threatened the complainant party with dire consequences. It was further alleged that when Meena and Asha intervened, they were also manhandled and even Constable Avtar Singh was pushed when he tried to intervene. Allegations were also levelled that the accused persons created ruckus at the spot, broke a mobile phone and extended threats to the complainant party. On the basis of the said allegations, the present FIR came to be registered against the petitioners.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioners has contended that the present FIR is nothing but a counterblast to FIR No.164 dated 19.04.2021 already got registered by the petitioners and other members of the registered society against the complainant party on the very same day regarding the occurrence in question. It has been argued that the petitioners have falsely been implicated due to personal rivalry and disputes relating to the management and affairs of Kali Mata Mandir, Himshikha. Learned counsel further submits that the husband of complainant Anju Rai was posted as ASI in Panchkula and while taking undue advantage of his influence in the police department, the present FIR was got registered against the petitioners. It has also been argued that various complaints had earlier been submitted by the petitioners against the complainant party and other persons regarding illegal activities, hooliganism and mismanagement in the temple affairs, however, no action was taken thereupon. Learned counsel has further contended that petitioner No.1 Bimla belongs to Scheduled Caste community and was repeatedly harassed and humiliated by the complainant party. It has thus been argued that continuation of the



criminal proceedings would amount to abuse of the process of law and the FIR deserves to be quashed.

4. Per contra, learned State counsel, assisted by learned counsel appearing for respondent No.2, has opposed the present petition and argued that the FIR is not liable to be quashed in exercise of inherent jurisdiction under Section 482 Cr.P.C. It has been contended that specific allegations have been levelled against both the petitioners in the FIR regarding assault, criminal intimidation, creating ruckus and causing damage at the spot. Learned State counsel further submits that the disputed questions of fact raised by the petitioners cannot be adjudicated upon in proceedings under Section 482 Cr.P.C. It has further been argued that during trial, almost all the prosecution witnesses have already been examined and only one prosecution witness remains to be examined and the case is at the fag end of trial. Learned counsel submits that specific roles have been attributed to the petitioners and there is sufficient material on record to proceed against them and, therefore, the present petition deserves dismissal.

5. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and have gone through the paper-book.

6. The scope of interference by this Court while exercising inherent jurisdiction under Section 482 Cr.P.C. is well settled. The inherent powers are to be exercised sparingly, carefully and with great caution and only in cases where continuation of criminal proceedings would amount to abuse of the process of law or where the allegations made in the FIR even if taken at their face value do not disclose commission of any offence. At the stage of exercising jurisdiction under Section 482 Cr.P.C., this Court is



not expected to conduct a mini trial or appreciate the disputed questions of fact and evidence.

7. In the present case, a perusal of the FIR would show that specific allegations have been levelled against the petitioners regarding assault upon the complainant party, extending threats and creating ruckus at the spot during the Bhandara being organized at the temple premises. The allegations *prima-facie* disclose commission of cognizable offences and cannot be said to be inherently improbable or absurd so as to warrant quashing of the FIR at this stage.

8. The pleas sought to be raised by the petitioners regarding false implication, temple rivalry, political influence, counterblast version and other surrounding circumstances are essentially disputed questions of fact, which require appreciation of evidence and cannot appropriately be examined in proceedings under Section 482 Cr.P.C. Such pleas are available to the petitioners during trial and may be raised before the learned trial Court at the appropriate stage in accordance with law.

9. This Court also cannot lose sight of the fact that the trial in the present case has substantially progressed and almost all the prosecution witnesses have already been examined and only one prosecution witness remains to be examined. At such an advanced stage of trial, interference under Section 482 Cr.P.C. for quashing of the FIR would not be justified particularly when specific roles have been attributed to the petitioners in the occurrence.

10. In view of the above facts and circumstances, this Court does not find any ground to exercise inherent jurisdiction under Section 482



Cr.P.C. for quashing of FIR No.165 dated 19.04.2021 registered under Sections 323, 427, 506 and 34 IPC at Police Station Pinjore, District Panchkula and all consequential proceedings arising therefrom.

11. Consequently, finding no merit in the present petition, the same is hereby dismissed.

12. However, anything observed hereinabove shall not be construed as an expression on the merits of the case and the petitioners shall be at liberty to raise all the pleas available to them before learned trial Court at the appropriate stage.

13. All pending applications, if any, also stand disposed of.

(MANDEEP PANNU)
JUDGE

12.05.2026
neetu

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