



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-68813-2025
DECIDED ON: 24.04.2026

PAWANPREET SINGH

.....PETITIONER

VERSUS

STATE OF PUNJAB

.....RESPONDENT

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY VASHISTH.

Present: Mr. Himanshu Puri, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Manjinder Singh Bhullar, DAG, Punjab.

SANJAY VASHISTH, J (ORAL)

1. **Present 2nd petition** has been filed by the petitioner, seeking grant of anticipatory bail, in case, FIR No.267, dated 15.10.2024, under Sections 126(2), 118(1), 118(2), 191(3), 351(2) of BNS, 2023, registered at Police Station City Kapurthala, District Kapurthala.
2. While issuing notice to the respondent, on 25.03.2026, following order was passed:-

“2. On 05.12.2025, following order was passed in the present case:-

“ii) Vide order dated 21.04.2025 (P-2) passed by a Coordinate Bench of this Court, the earlier anticipatory bail petition, i.e., CRM-M-20601-2025, was dismissed as withdrawn after having been argued for some time.

iii) Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that thereafter the circumstances have changed, as parties have amicably resolved the dispute. Consequently, a quashing petition, i.e., CRM-M36842-2025, has also been filed for quashing of the FIR, in which a direction for recording of statements has been issued by the Coordinate Bench of this Court. Said petition is now pending for 08.12.2025.

iv) List on 08.12.2025

v) To be heard alongwith CRM-M-36842-2025.”

3. *Since the prime contention of learned counsel for the petitioner is that the dispute has been resolved*

and the parties are ready to get their statements recorded with regard to the compromise.

4. Notice of motion for 24.04.2026.

5. On advance notice, learned State counsel puts in appearance on behalf of the respondent–State and seeks some time to respond to the submissions addressed by learned counsel for the petitioner, after seeking instructions, and, if necessary, to file a status report.

6. Till the next date of hearing before this Court, arrest of the petitioner shall remain stayed, so as to enable him to get his statement recorded with regard to the factum of compromise having been arrived at between the parties.”

3. Today, on the very outset, counsel for the petitioner informs that at the time of recording of the statements in the compromise petition, i.e. CRM-M-36842-2025, before the Court of learned Magistrate, it was the complainant, who backed out, and therefore, statements could not be recorded and the compromise could not mature.

4. In view of this, counsel for the petitioner seeks withdrawal of the present petition.

5. Accordingly, present petition stands dismissed as withdrawn.

(SANJAY VASHISTH)
JUDGE

24.04.2026

Lavisha

<i>Whether speaking/reasoned</i>	<i>Yes/No</i>
<i>Whether reportable</i>	<i>Yes/No</i>