

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA  
AT CHANDIGARH

Reserved on: 13.02.2026  
Pronounced on:25.02.2026.  
Uploaded on: 26.02.2026.

(1) CRM-M-41634 of 2019 (O&M) 2026:PHHC:031516



Sukhwinder Kaur and another

..Petitioners

Versus

State of Haryana and others

..Respondents

(2) CRM-M-11461 of 2022 (O&M) 2026:PHHC:031516



Kanwarjot Singh @ Prince and another

..Petitioners

Versus

State of Haryana and another

..Respondents

**CORAM: HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE SHALINI SINGH NAGPAL**

**Present:** Mr. Aman Pal, Senior Advocate with  
Mr. Rishabh Chaudhary, Advocate,  
Mr. Rajender Kumar, Advocate,  
Mr. Sankalp Dhanda, Advocate and  
Mr. Partham Bali, Advocate for the petitioners  
in CRM-M-41634 of 2019.

Mr. Keshav Pratap Singh, Advocate  
Mr. Bharat Singh, Advocate and  
Mr. Tarun Hooda, Advocate  
for the petitioners in CRM-M-11461 of 2022.

Ms. Kanica Sachdeva, DAG Haryana.

Mr. Ashit Malik, Advocate for respondents No. 2 and 3.

**SHALINI SINGH NAGPAL, JUDGE**

This common order determines two petitions detailed above,  
both arising out of FIR No. 0439 dated 06.08.2019 under Sections 406, 498-

A and 506 IPC, Police Station Pehowa, District Kurukshetra. Petitioners are accused in the FIR. Prayer in both petitions is for quashing of FIR No. 0439 dated 06.08.2019 under Sections 406, 498-A and 506 IPC, Police Station Pehowa, District Kurukshetra along with all subsequent proceedings arising thereto.

FIR was registered on complaint of Karnail Kaur, wife of Charanjit Singh who stated that her husband lived abroad and she had only one child, namely, Prabhjot Kaur. Prabhjot Kaur and Jasmine Cheema d/o Sampuran Singh studied together. Jasmine Cheema and her mother Sukhwinder Kaur were on visiting terms with them. They owned 10 acres land in Village Garhi Singha (Dera Ratanpura). Out of greed, Sukhwinder Kaur, Jasmine Kaur and Sampuran Singh repeatedly visited her house and asked for the hand of Prabhjot Kaur in marriage for their son Kanwarjot Singh. They pressurized her to agree. As the day of marriage approached, Sampuran Singh and Sukhwinder Kaur demanded engagement ceremony which was never agreed earlier and raised demand for gold ornaments, car, cash etc. for themselves, their relatives and their son. Marriage of her daughter was performed on 03.02.2014 at Shanti Farm Marriage Palace, Pehowa. Sufficient gold and silver ornaments, costly articles, clothes, cash was given as per demands besides, *Endeavor* Car to her son-in-law as per his demand. All these articles were in the custody of Sampuran Singh and Sukhwinder Kaur. After marriage, on every big and small function, accused took ₹10,000/- or ₹20,000/- or more from her through her daughter and costly articles like AC, Refrigerator and Washing Machine. They also grabbed money from her on the pretext of birthday or anniversary functions in their house. On 21.02.2014, Kanwarjot Singh pressurized her daughter to

bring ₹10,000/- from her for marriage anniversary of his parents which she had given. On the day of anniversary again, she was pressurized through Prabhjot Kaur for giving costly phones and gifts to his parents. On 11.02.2015, on *Lohri* festival, Kanwarjot Singh pressurized her daughter for money and costly branded clothes whereupon she had given sweets etc. besides ₹5,000/- cash. Kanwarjot Singh and his family members used to ask for money and costly items from her husband, who was living abroad, by pressurizing her daughter Prabhjot Kaur and when she refused, they abused her. On 18.09.2013, during birthday of Kanwarjot Singh, her husband sent ₹50,000/-; on 19.08.2014 on the birthday of Jasmine Cheema, he sent ₹50,000/- and on 18.09.2014, on the birthday of her daughter Prabhjot Kaur, he sent ₹35,000/- from America on demand of Kanwarjot Singh and his family.

Respondent No.2 further alleged that accused raised demands of cash and gifts every *Diwali* and the demands were fulfilled. In the meanwhile, they started pressurizing Prabhjot Kaur for transfer of land of her share from her father, in the name of Kanwarjot Singh and tortured her on this account. Thereafter, Prabhjot Kaur was pressurized to clear IELTS to go abroad which she did and on 14.04.2017, her daughter went to Canada on student visa where she was residing alone. She helped with her money to send her abroad. Kanwarjot Singh had given ₹6,00,000/- to an agent to go abroad, for which he had taken a sum of ₹2,00,000/- from her by exerting pressure. He also borrowed money from her when the Agent vanished but did not return the money. Accused were habitual of raising demands. Her daughter's mother-in-law and sister-in-law Jasmine Cheema made phone calls to her and made demands. On refusal, her son-in-law and father-in-law

abused her daughter in filthy language. In this manner, Kanwarjot Singh and his family members mentally and financially harassed her and her daughter. Kanwarjot Singh sold the *Endeavor* Car given to him in the marriage and grabbed the sale consideration. On demand of accused, she had given ₹1,00,000/- on 06.04.2017 by taking loan from Naresh Vadhwa. On 13.03.2016, she had given ₹50,000/- to them which she took from Sanjna Manchanda on loan. In the month of January, 2017, she transferred ₹2,00,000/- from her bank account to the account of Kanwarjot Singh. Whenever she received lease money of her land, Kanwarjot Singh and his family used to take ₹40,000/- or ₹50,000/- on different pretexts, which they never returned. During this period, by making repeated phone calls they started pressurizing her daughter for sending Canadian work permit for Kanwarjot Singh.

In January, 2018, her daughter applied for work permit in the name of her husband and in the intervening night of 23/24.07.2018, Kanwarjot Singh went abroad without informing her and her daughter but did not join her daughter. He was intentionally residing separately from Prabhjot Kaur nursing grudge that she had not taken her share from the land of her father. Whenever Prabhjot Kaur asked him to join her, he insisted that she get the property transferred in his name. Kanwarjot Singh and Sampuran Singh abused her daughter on telephone and mentally pressurized her. When complainant spoke with Sampuran Singh and Sukhwinder Kaur, they abused her and exerted pressure for transferring land in the name of their son- Kanwarjot Singh, threatening to make her life worse and to defame her in the society. Sampuran Singh also threatened to get her kidnapped by using his contacts with criminals in Uttar Pradesh and Bihar. He threatened that his

son could murder her daughter in Canada if she did not get the land transferred in his name. She remained under great mental stress due to the harassment. Now, they were threatening to go abroad. She apprehended threat to her life at the hands of Kanwarjot Singh and his family members and prayed for registration of FIR.

Mr. Aman Pal, Senior Advocate with Mr. Rishabh Chaudhary, Advocate, Mr. Rajender Kumar, Advocate, Mr. Sankalp Dhanda, Advocate and Mr. Partham Bali, Advocate for the petitioners (in CRM-M-41634 of 2019) and Mr. Keshav Pratap Singh, Advocate with Mr. Bharat Singh, Advocate and Mr. Tarun Hooda, Advocate for the petitioners (in CRM-M-11461 of 2022) submit that petitioners were the husband, parents-in-law and sister-in-law of respondent No.3. The marriage of petitioner Kanwarjot Singh @ Prince was solemnised with respondent No.3 on 03.02.2014 at Pehowa. The marriage was simple and no dowry was given or taken other than customary gifts. There was no issue born out of the wedlock. It was submitted that Kanwarjot Singh @ Prince and respondent No.3 Parbhjot Kaur were both permanently settled in Canada. Earlier complaint dated 16.05.2019 moved by respondent No.2 was found false on investigation and filed. Later on, fresh complaint was moved with legal advise and respondent No.2 got the FIR registered against the petitioners on cooked up, false and concocted story.

Learned counsels submit that it was petitioner-Sampuran Singh who had borne all expenses of sending respondent No.3 abroad after taking loan on his property. Respondent No.3 left for Canada in the year 2017 followed by petitioner-Kanwarjot Singh who reached Canada in July 2018. There were strained relations between the couple, who had since been

divorced by the Court of competent jurisdiction at Canada. No complaint was ever made by respondent No.3 either in India or in Canada alleging cruelty or demand for dowry or harassment in connection therewith. The complaint was outrightly false and was only intended to harass the petitioners and exert pressure on them by involving all the members of the family. Vague and general allegations, without any specific instances were levelled in the complaint. The Court had inherent powers to quash the criminal proceedings manifestly attended with *malafide* and maliciously instituted with ulterior motive with a view to spite the petitioners.

It was further argued that after passing of the divorce decree, on 23.03.2020 respondent No.3 had remarried and was settled in matrimony with another person while petitioners were facing the ignominy of criminal proceedings. In the divorce case, the allegations of cruelty, harassment for dowry and beatings etc. were missing indicating that the FIR was false and cooked up. Relying upon decisions of Hon'ble Supreme Court in *Nitin Ahluwalia Versus State of Punjab and another 2025 online SC 2013*, *Achin Gupta versus State of Haryana and another 2024 SCC online SC 759* *Dara Lakshmi Narayana and others Versus State of Telangana and another 2024 SCC online SC 3682*, of this Court in *S. Kawaljit Singh and another Versus State of Punjab and another 2026 NCPHHC 10582*, *Simrandeep Singh Sidhu Versus State of Punjab and others 2026(1)RCR(Criminal) 250* and *Davinder Pal and another Versus State of U.T. Chandigarh and others 2024 NCPHHC 47717*, it was urged that the FIR was nothing but an abuse of the process of Court and deserves to be quashed.

Learned State counsel has refuted the submissions drawing attention of the Court to the contents of the FIR. It has been claimed on the strength of attribution therein, that specific allegations were levelled against all the petitioners by giving minute details of each incident with relevant dates and a clear case for commission of offences under Sections 406, 498-A and 506 IPC was made out. It was conceded that respondent No.2 previously moved an application to C.M. Window, Haryana and the same was filed by Deputy Superintendent of Police, Kurukshetra. Petitioners-Kanwarjot Singh and Jasmine Cheema could not be arrested as they were residing abroad. Police has issued lookout circular against them. It was thus prayed that the petitions be dismissed.

Learned counsel for respondents No. 2 and 3 also submit that allegations against the petitioners in the FIR were specific and *prima-facie* disclosed commission of offences under Sections 406, 498-A and 506 IPC. Though the factum of the inquiry before registration of FIR and the marital status of the parties was not disputed, it was urged that finding sufficient material against the petitioners, investigating agency had presented challan and charges too were framed, therefore, the petitioners ought to face trial and it was not a fit case to quash at the threshold.

In *State of Haryana and Others Vs. Chaudhary Bhajan Lal and Others, 1992 AIR 604*, after considering all the earlier precedents, Hon'ble Supreme Court laid down principles which the High Courts must consider while exercising jurisdiction under Section 482 Cr.P.C. for quashing the proceedings. It gave the following categories of cases by way of illustration wherein such power could be exercised either to prevent abuse of the process of the Court or otherwise to secure the ends of justice:

“(1)where the allegations made in the first information report or the complaint, even if they are taken at their face value and accepted in their entirety do not *prima facie* constitute any offence make out a case against the accused.

(2) Where the allegations in the first information report and other materials, if any, accompanying the FIR do not disclose a cognizable offence, justifying an investigation by police officers under Section 156(1) of the Code except under an order of a Magistrate within the purview of Section 155(2) of the Code.

(3) Where the uncontroverted allegations made in the FIR or complaint and the evidence collected in support of the same do not disclose the commission of any offence and make out a case against the accused.

(4) Where, the allegations in the FIR do not constitute a cognizable offence but constitute only a non-cognizable offence, no investigation is permitted by a police officer without an order of a Magistrate as contemplated under Section 155(2) of the Code.

(5) Where the allegations made in the FIR or complaint are so absurd and inherently improbable on the basis of which no prudent person can ever reach a just conclusion that there is sufficient ground for proceeding against the accused.

(6) Where there is an express legal bar engrafted in any of the provisions of the Code or the concerned Act (under which a criminal proceeding is instituted) to the institution and continuance of the proceedings and/or where there is a specific provision in the Code or the concerned Act, providing efficacious redress for the grievance of the aggrieved party.

(7) Where a criminal proceeding is manifestly attended with mala fide and/or where the proceeding is maliciously instituted with an ulterior motive for wreaking vengeance on the accused and with a view to spite him due to private and personal grudge."

Hon'ble Supreme Court, in a recent decision has highlighted that when an accused comes before the Court invoking inherent powers under Section 482 Cr.P.C. or extra ordinary jurisdiction under Section 226 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, to get the criminal proceedings quashed on the ground that such proceedings are manifestly frivolous, vexatious or

instituted with ulterior motive for wreaking vengeance, the Court owes a duty to look into the FIR with care, caution and even more closely. In ***Mohammad Wajid and another Versus State of U.P. and others 2023 INSC 682*** and it was held as under:

*‘ 30.xxxxxxxxWe say so because once the complainant decides to proceed against the accused with an ulterior motive for wreaking personal vengeance, etc., then he would ensure that the FIR/complaint is very well drafted with all the necessary pleadings. The complainant would ensure that the averments made in the FIR/complaint are such that they disclose the necessary ingredients to constitute the alleged offence. Therefore, it will not be just enough for the Court to look into the averments made in the FIR/complaint alone for the purpose of ascertaining whether the necessary ingredients to constitute the alleged offence are disclosed or not. In frivolous or vexatious proceedings, the Court owes a duty to look into many other attending circumstances emerging from the record of the case over and above the averments and, if need be, with due care and circumspection try to read in between the lines. The Court while exercising its jurisdiction under [Section 482](#) of the CrPC or [Article 226](#) of the Constitution need not restrict itself only to the stage of a case but is empowered to take into account the overall circumstances leading to the initiation/registration of the case as well as the materials collected in the course of investigation. Take for instance the case on hand. Multiple FIRs have been registered over a period of time. It is in the background of such circumstances the registration of multiple FIRs assumes importance, thereby attracting the issue of wreaking vengeance out of private or personal grudge as alleged.’*

Thus, it is not enough for this Court to look into the allegations made in the FIR to ascertain whether essential ingredients of offences under

Section 406, 498-A and 506 IPC are made out. It is the duty of the Court to consider and assess all attending circumstances emerging from record of the case, with due care and circumspection, to try and lift the veil in order to do complete justice between the parties. It has to be examined whether the allegations are genuine or whether they are only an aftermath of a matrimonial discard, arising out of incompatibility or such other reason. Though, it is well settled that defence of the accused is not to be considered while considering a quashing petition under Section 482 Cr.P.C., it is equally true that proceedings of the Court should not be permitted to degenerate into weapon of harassment or persecution in a criminal case. The veiled object behind a prosecution and the circumstances on which the foundation of prosecution rests, must be considered by the Court while exercising inherent powers. Thus, the background in which respondent No.2 filed the FIR becomes very relevant.

Two documents of much significance which have not been disputed by respondent/State are Annexure P-2 and Annexure P-3, (in CRM-M-41634 of 2019). Prior to registration of the subject FIR, respondent No.2 filed a complaint against the petitioners alleging that in the marriage of her daughter on 03.02.2014, she had given gold, silver ornaments and *Ford Endeavor* car. She also levelled allegations of demand of cash by the petitioners and harassment of her daughter when she refused to satisfy the demands, pressure exerted on her daughter to go abroad, Rs. 2 lacs given by her to Kanwarjot Singh for the purpose and conduct of Kanwarjot Singh who relocated to Canada on 24.07.2018 but did not join her daughter. The first complaint is conspicuous by absence of specific allegations of entrustment, criminal misappropriation, cruelty and demand of dowry by the

petitioners. The allegations are therein were generic, ambiguous and omnibus in nature.

Annexure-P3, the action taken report on complaint dated 16.05.2019 of respondent No.2-Karnail Kaur shows that the complaint was inquired into and it was found that after marriage, petitioner-Sampuran Singh and his family treated Parbhjot Kaur like their daughter. She remained with them for three years at Pehowa. During this period, Sampuran Singh and his family never quarrelled or kept grudge against Parbhjot Kaur. Rather, Sampuran Singh spent lacs of rupees to settle her and his son in Canada. It was also found that Sampuran Singh and his family was still ready to keep Parbhjot Kaur with them. The allegations levelled by Karnail Kaur, mother of Parbhjot Kaur in her complaint against Sampuran Singh etc. for taking money and for trying to usurp land of father of Parbhjot Kaur were found false and baseless. It was also found that Sampuran Singh and his family has spent lacs of rupees (approximately Rs.25 lacs) to send Parbhjot Kaur abroad. The allegations of Karnail Kaur that Kanwarjot Singh was pressurising Parbhjot Kaur for transfer of land was also found false. The complaint was filed as the all allegations levelled by Karnail Kaur were found false.

Strangely enough, after the enquiry in the complaint was concluded on 05.06.2019, the FIR came to be registered against the petitioners on 06.08.2019. The result of the previous enquiry has not been disclosed in the FIR. Conduct of respondent No.2, as also of the investigating agency is, therefore, is questionable.

Even though the FIR and the charge-sheet disclose commission of a cognizable offence(s), the Court cannot be a helpless spectator and for

doing substantial justice, should read in between the lines, the oblique motive of the complainant and take a pragmatic view of the matter. If the FIR is to be accepted blindly, without lifting the veil, conferment of inherent powers upon the High Court would be rendered otiose. If the complainant on account of matrimonial disputes decide to harass the husband and his family members, the first thing she would ensure is to see that proper allegations are levelled in the First Information Report. Many a times services of professionals are availed for the same. If a complaint is drafted by a legal mind, it would be rather difficult to find deficiencies in the same. This, however, should not render the Court powerless saying that the allegations in the FIR and charge sheet disclose commission of cognizable offence. (vide *Achin Gupta versus State of Haryana and another 2024 SCC online SC 759.*)

The admitted fact that the investigating agency, in the first instance closed the complaint filed by the complainant on similar allegations, strikes at the very edifice of the case and is illustrative of the vindictive motive of implicating the husband and relatives of the husband in the false case of demand of dowry and cruelty.

The growing tendency of misuse of beneficial provisions like Section 498-A IPC by disgruntled wives and their families as a tool for unleashing personal vendetta against the husband his family members is a matter of grave concern. It has time and again been reiterated by Hon'ble Supreme Court that the Courts have to be extremely careful and cautious in dealing with such complaints.

In *Arnesh Kumar Versus State of Bihar (Criminal Appeal No.1277 of 2014, decided onb 2<sup>nd</sup> July, 2014)* Hon'ble Supreme Court held as under:

*“4. There is a phenomenal increase in matrimonial disputes in recent years. The institution of marriage is greatly revered in this country. Section 498-A IPC was introduced with avowed object to combat the menace of harassment to a woman at the hands of her husband and his relatives. The fact that Section 498-A IPC is a cognizable and non-bailable offence has lent it a dubious place of pride amongst the provisions that are used as weapons rather than shield by disgruntled wives. The simplest way to harass is to get the husband and his relatives arrested under this provision. In a quite number of cases, bedridden grandfathers and grandmothers of the husbands, their sisters living abroad for decades are arrested.....”*

Another material feature of the case is that after the marriage was solemnised in India on 03.02.2014, respondent No.3 Parbhjot Kaur left for Canada in April 2017 and was followed by petitioner-Kanwarjot Singh who reached Canada in July 2018. Undisputedly, the matrimonial alliance was in rough weather on account of which the wife-respondent No.3 filed an application for divorce in the Superior Court of Justice, Ontario, Canada on 18.03.2019. The FIR was lodged on 06.08.2019 when both Kanwarjot Singh and Parbhjot Kaur were in Canada and the matrimonial relationship was in turbulence. The divorce was finalised on 31.01.2020. The decree of divorce is on record as Annexure P-7. The divorce was sought on account of break down of marital relationship without any hope for reconciliation between the parties since 17<sup>th</sup> July, 2018. Pertinently, the allegations of demand of dowry, cruelty and harassment in connection with dowry demands are missing in the application for divorce.

In *B.S. Joshi v. State of Haryana (2003) 4 SCC 675 : AIR 2003 SC 1386* it was observed that there is no doubt that the object of introducing Chapter XXA containing Section 498-A in the Penal Code, 1860 was to prevent the torture to a woman by her husband or by relatives of her husband. Section 498-A was added with a view to punish the husband and his relatives who harass or torture the wife to coerce her relatives to satisfy unlawful demands of dowry. But if the proceedings are initiated by the wife under Section 498-A against the husband and his relatives and subsequently she has settled her disputes with her husband and his relatives and the wife and husband agreed for mutual divorce, refusal to exercise inherent powers by the High Court would not be proper as it would prevent woman from settling earlier. Thus for the purpose of securing the ends of justice quashing of FIR becomes necessary, [Section 320 Cr.P.C.](#) would not be a bar to the exercise of power of quashing. It would however be a different matter depending upon the facts and circumstances of each case whether to exercise or not to exercise such a power.

A Co-ordinate Bench of this Court in *Krishna Mangla Versus State of Punjab and another, 2025 (1) RCR (Criminal) 547*, quashed an FIR under Section 498-A IPC lodged by the complainant two years from the date of divorce decree granted by the Family Court in U.K. and ten years from the date of marriage, noticing that despite the allegations of mental and physical abuse from the beginning of marriage, complainant never approached the authorities to seek justice during the entire period of her marriage and found it appropriate to knock at the door of the police, two years after she had parted ways from the accused.

In similar circumstances in *Simrandeep Singh Sidhu Versus State of Punjab and others, 2026 (1)RCR(Criminal) 250*, FIR under Sections 498-A and 406 IPC was quashed by a Co-ordinate Bench observing that the marriage took place on 22.12.2015. Petition for dissolution of marriage was filed in USA on 01.02.2016 and all the disputes had been settled between the husband and wife by reducing the settlement into writing. Thereafter, the marriage was dissolved on 30.07.2019 and seven months after dissolution of marriage, the FIR was lodged by father of the wife without mentioning the factum of dissolution of marriage. It was held in the facts and circumstances of the case that lodging of the FIR, seven months after the dissolution of marriage in U.S.A., was nothing but pure abuse of process of law.

Similarly in *Xxxxxx Versus The State of Uttar Pradesh and another, SLP (Criminal) No. 9218 of 2024, decided on 12.02.2025*, the Apex Court observed that marriage between the appellant and respondent was solemnised on 05.03.2016. The petition for decree of divorce was filed on 17.06.2021. After the divorce petition was filed, respondent No.2 lodged the FIR under Section 498-A, 354, 328, 376, 352, 504, 506 IPC and Sections 3 and 4 of Dowry Prohibition Act, 1961 against the husband, brother-in-law, mother-in-law and father-in-law. The Court ruled as under:

*'19. Considering the ratio laid down by this Court in the aforesaid judgments, and especially in the light of the fact that initially the FIR was lodged alleging rape and no charge-sheet was filed for prosecuting the accused for the offence of rape, and keeping in view of the fact that no protest petition was filed thereafter, this Court is of the considered opinion that the FIR is vexatious and seems to be instituted with an ulterior motive only because the husband preferred a divorce petition on 17.06.2021 i.e. much prior to the filing of the FIR against all the family members.*

*Therefore, this Court is of the opinion that in the peculiar facts and circumstances of the case, the FIR No.733/2021 and the charge-sheet dated 02.02.2022 in the matter deserve to be quashed and are accordingly quashed. The appeal is allowed.'*

In ***Digambar Versus State of Maharashtra, 2024 SCC online SC 3836***, Hon'ble Supreme Court speaking through B.R. Gavai, J. (as the learned Chief Justice of India presently, then was) observed as follows:

*"...it was lodged after the legal notice for Divorce was sent by the complainant therein. It was therefore concluded that the FIR came to be lodged as a retaliatory measure intended to settle score with the husband and his relatives."*

In ***Nitin Ahluwalia's case (supra)***, the wife filed a complaint after the grant of divorce a month later. The Court expressed concern as to why despite having been separated from the husband for almost three years she did not consider filing an application with the police at the relevant time.

In our case, as well, respondent No.3 never moved a complaint against the petitioners while she was in India for three years after her marriage. She did not ever file any complaint against petitioner- Kanwarjot Singh in Canada. She also did not join the investigation of the case to support and corroborate the version of the complainant. Her non-association from the case from the very inception speaks volumes and fortifies the conclusion that the criminal prosecution initiated by her mother respondent No.2 is nothing but a tool of harassment, oppression, intended to wreak vengeance.

Considering all relevant facts and circumstances of the case prior to registration of FIR and thereafter, in the light of judicial precedents

discussed hereinabove, this Court has no hesitation to invoke inherent powers under Section 482 Cr.P.C. to quash the FIR qua the petitioners.

The petitions are allowed. FIR No. 0439 dated 06.08.2019 under Sections 406, 498-A and 506 IPC, Police Station Pehowa, District Kurukshetra and all subsequent proceedings arising therefrom are ordered to be quashed qua the petitioners.

All the pending miscellaneous applications, if any, stand disposed of.

**(SHALINI SINGH NAGPAL)**  
**JUDGE**

**25.02.2026.**

*HS CHAUHAN/reema*

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes

Whether reportable : No