



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

121

CRM-M-68636-2025

Date of Decision: 08.04.2026

NISHAN SINGH AND ANOTHER

....Petitioners

VERSUS

STATE OF PUNJAB AND OTHERS

....Respondents(s)

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ALOK JAIN

Present: Mr. Gurpyar Singh, Advocate for the petitioners.

Mr. Amandeep Singh Samra, AAG, Punjab.

ALOK JAIN, J. (Oral)

1. The present petition has been filed seeking quashing of FIR No.40 dated 12.12.2024 under Section 498-A, 406 of IPC registered at Police Station Women, Ferozepur and all other subsequent proceedings arising therefrom.

2. In furtherance to the order dated 17.02.2026, learned State counsel has filed reply by way of affidavit of Rajbir Singh, PPS, Deputy Superintendent of Police, Sub-Division, Gurusahai, District Ferozepur who had initially investigated the matter, which is taken on record.

3. The perusal of the above said reply clearly demonstrate that there was no evidence with regard to the date of giving of Rs.6,00,000/- by the complainant to the accused party. It has also been candidly admitted in the reply that relation of husband and wife became strained in Australia and a proceeding was also pending between them at Australia. However, admittedly, now both the husband and wife are living together in Australia. It



is further mentioned in the reply that a cancellation report has been prepared and the same shall be filed by the Authorities. Para no.20 of the reply in this regard be read as under:-

“That it is further submitted that the petitioners have already been declared as innocent in this case and as such they have no right to maintain the present petition. The present petition has become infructuous”.

4. Learned State counsel fairly submits that as the inquiry conducted by concerned Deputy Superintendent of Police has been set-aside. Therefore, cancellation report has been prepared which shall be submitted within one month from today.

5. At this stage in light of the fact and statement made by learned State counsel that the Authorities shall file a final report seeking cancellation of the FIR within one month from today, learned counsel for the petitioners does not press the present petition, at this Stage.

6. However, it is clarified herein that if the needful has not been done within one month, the concerned official shall remain accountable for his conduct.

7. Further, it is open to the concerned Senior Superintendent of Police to take appropriate action against the concerned DSP who had conducted the shabby investigation and unnecessarily entangled the petitioners into the litigation. Had the concerned Deputy Superintendent of Police performed his duty diligently with some basic common sense, the unnecessary litigation would not have been erupted. Such callous attitude from the officer of rank of DSP is highly condemned by this Court.



8. Let copy of this order be also sent to the concerned Deputy General of Police to consider the need of regular and mandatory orientation courses for the investigating officers or such other concerned officers in every three months to six months, so as to ensure that the officers can perform their duty efficiently. Further the cases dealt by the official should be monitored and must be assessed and be reflected in their ACRs also.
9. Accordingly, the present petition is disposed of in above terms.

08.04.2026
Deepak Patwal

(ALOK JAIN)
JUDGE

- | | | |
|----|---------------------------|--------|
| 1. | Whether speaking/reasoned | Yes/No |
| 2. | Whether reportable | Yes/No |