



CRM-M-3891-2025 & ORS. -1-

212 – 3 cases

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

Date of Decision:- 24.02.2025

(1) CRM-M-3891-2025

MANPREET KAUR @ PREETI	Petitioner
Vs.	
STATE OF PUNJAB	...Respondent

(2) CRM-M-6577-2025

DAVINDER KAUR	Petitioner
Vs.	
STATE OF PUNJAB	...Respondent

(3) CRM-M-7217-2025

KAMALJIT KAUR	Petitioner
Vs.	
STATE OF PUNJAB	...Respondent

CORAM:-HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE AMARJOT BHATTI

Present:- Mr. Ravi Chadda, Advocate for petitioner (s)
in CRM-M-3891-2025 and CRM-M-7217-2025.

Mr. Yajur Sharma, Advocate for petitioner
in CRM-M-6577-2025.

Mr. Gautam Thapar, AAG, Punjab.

Mr. Mitul Singh Rana, Advocate for the complainant in all
cases.

**CRM-M-3891-2025 & ORS. -2-****AMARJOT BHATTI, J. (Oral)**

1. Petitioners – Manpreet Kaur @ Preeti [in CRM-M-3891-2025], Davinder Kaur [in CRM-M-6577-2025) and petitioner –Kamaljit Kaur [in CRM-M-7217-2025] have filed instant petitions under Section 482 of Cr.P.C. for grant of anticipatory bail in FIR No.300 dated 27.12.2024 under Sections 67 (A) of the Information Technology Act, 2000 read with Section 77 of BNS, 2023 (corresponding to Section 354 (C) of IPC and Section 61 (2) of BNS, 2023 (corresponding to Section 120-B IPC) registered at Police Station Tanda, Hoshiarpur, Punjab (Annexure P-1). These petitions are taken up together for hearing and decision being arisen out of the same FIR, at request and with consent of learned counsel for the parties.

2. As per facts of case, prosecutrix gave her statement that she got married with Kaka Singh in the year 2009 and out of this wedlock she was having a daughter. In 2010, Kaka Singh went to Italy and did not return back. Thereafter, her parental family and in-laws family arranged her marriage with Sukhwinder Singh son of Baldev Singh in the year 2015. She started residing with Sukhwinder Singh along with her daughter at village Bains Awana. In 2019, Sukhwinder Singh went to USA and could not return back being non-permanent resident of USA. In the year 2019 Manpreet Kaur wife of Gurmeet Singh was working as maid in her house and he managed to prepare one obscene video while she was sharing intimate moment with her husband. When she came to know about said video, she made inquiry who replied that said video has been deleted. Later-on said Manpreet Kaur was turned out of job. In the year 2024 Panchayat elections Amrik Singh, Balwinder Singh @ Nikka and Manpreet Kaur approached her to contest

**CRM-M-3891-2025 & ORS. -3-**

election from their party, but she refused. Manpreet Kaur in connivance with Amrik Singh, Balwinder Singh @ Nikka, Pawanpreet Singh and Bholi wife of Gurmukh and some unidentified persons made said obscene video prepared in the year 2019 viral and by circulating her video outraged her modesty. With these allegations, present FIR has been registered.

3. Learned counsel for petitioner – Manpreet Kaur @ Preeti [CRM-M-3891-2025] denied the allegations. It is pointed out that alleged incident is of the year 2019 and the FIR is lodged in December, 2024. Present FIR has been lodged to settle her political rivalry with her political opponents. Petitioner is a poor lady earning her livelihood by doing menial job. Without considering aforesaid facts, her bail application was declined by the trial Court vide order dated 14.01.2025 (Annexure P-3) whereas anticipatory bail of co-accused Balwinder Singh @ Nikka, Amrik Singh, Pawanpreet Singh @ Lalli and Bholi was allowed vide order dated 14.01.2025 (Annexure P-2). Present petitioner is also ready to abide by the terms and conditions of bail order imposed by this Court.

4. Learned counsel representing petitioner Davinder Kaur [CRM-M-6577-2025] argued that she is falsely implicated in this case. Initially she was not named in the FIR. She was nominated vide G.D. No.28 dated 13.01.2025. There is long delay in lodging the FIR pertaining to the alleged occurrence of 2019. It is further pointed out that other co-accused namely Balwinder Singh @ Nikka, Amrik Singh, Pawanpreet Singh @ Lalli and Bholi named in the FIR are granted anticipatory bail vide order dated 14.01.2025 (Annexure P-4) whereas anticipatory bail of present petitioner along with Kamaljit Kaur was declined vide order dated 31.01.2025. In-fact,

**CRM-M-3891-2025 & ORS. -4-**

there was money transactions between complainant and present petitioner regarding which legal notice was served upon complainant dated 31.01.2025 (Annexure P-3) pertaining to cheque of Rs.5 lakhs. In order to avoid her liability she is falsely named by the complainant.

5. Learned counsel representing Kamaljit Kaur [CRM-M-7217-2025] argued that anticipatory bail application of present petitioner was declined by the trial Court vide order dated 31.01.2025 (Annexure P-3) by making reference of compromise dated 07.06.2024. Petitioner Kamaljit Kaur is the sister of complainant and they are not on good terms. In order to settle score, she is falsely named by the complainant subsequently. She is ready to abide by the terms of bail order. Therefore, her anticipatory bail may be allowed.

6. Status report is filed in all cases separately. Learned counsel representing State argued that there are specific serious allegations against petitioners, referred above. Mobile phones used by the petitioners are yet to be recovered. There are allegations that Manpreet Kaur @ Preeti had prepared objectionable video and she along with other co-accused circulated the same. Therefore, custodial interrogation of petitioners is required.

7. I have considered the arguments and have gone through the record carefully. So far as role attributed to Manpreet @ Preeti in CRM-M-3891-2025 is concerned, main allegations are against her who had prepared objectionable video in the year 2019. She had given assurance that video was deleted but the said objectionable video was circulated during panchayat election of 2024 in order to outrage the modesty of complainant. She is yet to join the investigation and said mobile phone is yet to be recovered which



CRM-M-3891-2025 & ORS. -5-

is a material piece of evidence. Considering the specific allegations, I do not find a fit case for grant of anticipatory bail to petitioner Manpreet Kaur @ Preeti [CRM-M-3891-2025] and the same is accordingly declined.

So far as, Davinder Kaur and Kamaljit Kaur are concerned their role is similar to the other accused Amrik Singh and others who are granted anticipatory bail vide order dated 14.01.2025. Specific role attributed to them is to be enquired during the course of investigation. Both Davinder Kaur and Kamaljit Kaur are ready to join the investigation, therefore, without commenting on the merits of the case, anticipatory bail applications filed by petitioner Davinder Kaur [CRM-M-6577-2025] and petitioner – Kamaljit Kaur [CRM-M-7217-2025] are allowed. They be not arrested. In case of their arrest, they be released on bail to the satisfaction of Arresting/Investigating Officer concerned, subject to condition that petitioners will join investigation as and when required. They will not tamper with or interfere with investigation and will not leave country without prior permission as provided under Section 482 (2) of BNSS, 2023.

8. Pending miscellaneous application(s), if any, stand disposed of accordingly.

9. Photocopy of the order be placed on the files of above-mentioned connected cases.

24.02.2025

snd

(AMARJOT BHATTI)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned: Yes/No.

Whether reportable: Yes/No