



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

(221)

CRM-M-30008-2025 (O&M)
Date of Decision: 16.09.2025

MANDEEP SINGH

.....Petitioner

Versus

STATE OF PUNJAB

.....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE KIRTI SINGH

Present: Mr. Amit Arora, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Ms. Aakanksha Gupta, AAG, Punjab.

KIRTI SINGH, J. (ORAL)**CRM-35294-2025**

Allowed as prayed for subject to all just exceptions. Annexure
P-3 is taken on record.

Main case

1. The jurisdiction of this Court under Section 483 BNSS has been invoked for grant of regular bail to the petitioner in case FIR No.23 dated 22.02.2024, under Sections 354-A, 354-D, 509 and 506 of IPC and Sections 67 and 67(A) of Information Technology Act, 2000, registered at Police Station City Patti, District Tarn Taran.

2. The translated version of the FIR is reproduced below:-

“Statement of xxxx wife of Gurmeet Singh son of Jagtar Singh, resident of Pandita Wali Gali, Ward No.07, Patti, aged about 34 years, Mobile No.78375-xxxxx. It is stated that I am resident of above mentioned address and used to do household work. My



marriage was got solemnized about 12 years ago with Gurmeet Singh above said. I am having two children one daughter xxxx, aged about 11 years and son Manmeet Singh aged about 09 years. My husband has gone to Dubai from last about 10 years and now also after spending his holidays have gone back to Dubai in the month of September 2023. I am living in the house along with my father-in-law Jagtar Singh and mother-in-law Sukhwinder Kaur. In the year 2020, during the lock-down my husband was present in the house and at that time Mandeep Singh son of Surjit Singh, resident of near Rabia Boutique, Ward No.07, Patti got friendship with my husband and Mandeep Singh used to come to our house very often. After my husband went abroad thereafter, Mandeep Singh above started keeping bad eye upon me. In the month of March 2023, I fell prey to the talks of Mandeep Singh and he started making physical relationship with me and he used to come to my house after finding the opportunity and kept on making physical relationship with me. I did not wanted to indulged in the same but during this period Mandeep Singh recorded the screen video call with me and after showing me the video started blackmailing me and stated that either make illicit relationship with me in the same manner otherwise he will got viral the photographs of the video call with me and thus, given threat to me of getting viral my video and photographs. He many times followed me in order to pressurize me and also kept on making false gestures in the market and after showing me the recording of the video call kept on making physical relationship with me and is causing harassment to me because of which reason I got disturbed. That I wanted to tell the same to my husband but due to the fear she could not tell anything to him because due to the said reason her entire matrimonial life could be finished as such she kept on tolerating the same. On dated 11.02.2023, Amandeep Kaur wife of Harpal Singh who is residing in Canada and the sister-in-law disclosed to me by calling me on phone that your nude video with one boy has been got viral and she also sent the screenshot of the same to me and because of which reason I got disturbed. That I due to the fear of getting this video viral have not disclosed anything to anyone but now that I came to know that Mandeep Singh above said has got viral my video and due to the said reason the damaged has been caused to my reputation as such the strict legal action may kindly be taken against the Mandeep Singh and justice be got done with me. Statement has been got recorded which has been read over and same is admitted to be true. Sd/- deponent xxxxxx, attested Ranjit Singh, SHO, Police Station City Patti, dated 22.02.2024.”



3. Learned counsel for the petitioner *inter alia* submits that the petitioner has been falsely implicated at the instance of the complainant-prosecutrix. It is contended that the allegations pertain to the year 2023, however it was only in February, 2024 that the instant FIR was got lodged. Furthermore, the allegations levelled are also sweeping, and lack specifications. Rather, it is a case where the petitioner had lent a friendly loan to the husband of the prosecutrix, and when repayment of the same was sought, the instant FIR was got lodged against the petitioner. Now the parties have amicably resolved their disputes, factum of which can be affirmed from the affidavit of the prosecutrix (Annexure P-3) and even a quashing petition on the basis of the said compromise has also been filed before this Hon'ble Court (CRM-M-48949-2025), wherein the parties have been directed to record their respective statements before the learned trial Court. The petitioner has already undergone an actual custody of 7 months and has clean antecedents.

4. *Per contra*, learned State counsel has vehemently opposed the submissions made by the learned counsel for the petitioner. She states that the petitioner was actively involved in the commission of the offence. She has filed custody certificate in Court today and the same is taken on record. As per custody certificate, the petitioner has undergone an actual custody of 7 months. Investigation is complete. The final report under Section 173 Cr.P.C. was presented before the concerned Court. The trial of the case has not made much progress, as the charges have yet not been framed. She submits that in view of the serious allegations against the petitioner, he is not entitled to the concession of regular bail.

5. Heard the rival submissions made by learned counsel for the parties.



6. Investigation in the present case is complete, and challan stands presented before the learned trial Court. A separate petition seeking quashing of the FIR on the basis of compromise arrived at between the parties is pending adjudication. The petitioner has already undergone actual custody of 7 months, and there is no other criminal case registered against him. No useful purpose shall be served by further detention of the accused-petitioner. Keeping the petitioner in further detention without the prospect of the trial being concluded in the near future, would be violative of his rights under Article 21 of the Constitution of India including the right to speedy trial, and is against the principle “Bail is a rule, jail is an exception” as elucidated in the judgment of Apex Court in ***“Dataram Singh vs. State of Uttar Pradesh and another”, (2018) 3 SCC 22.***

7. Without commenting anything on the merits of the case, lest it may prejudice the trial, the present petition is allowed and the petitioner is ordered to be released on regular bail on his furnishing adequate bail/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the concerned learned trial Court/Duty Magistrate. The petitioner shall also abide by the following conditions:-

- (i) The petitioner will not tamper with the evidence during the trial.
- (ii) The petitioner will not pressurize/intimidate the prosecution witness(s).
- (iii) The petitioner will appear before the trial Court on the date fixed, unless personal presence is exempted.
- (iv) The petitioner shall not commit an offence similar to the offence of which he is accused of, or for commission of which he is suspected.
- (v) The petitioner shall not directly or indirectly make any



inducement, threat or promise to any person acquainted with the facts of the case so as to dissuade him from disclosing such facts to the Court or to any police officer or tamper with the evidence.

8. In case of breach of any of the above conditions, the prosecution shall be at liberty to move an application for cancellation of bail before this Court.
9. However, nothing stated above shall be construed as a final expression of opinion on the merits of the case and the trial Court would proceed independently of the observations made in the present case which are only for the purpose of adjudicating the present bail petition.
10. Pending miscellaneous application(s), if any, also stands disposed of.

(KIRTI SINGH)
JUDGE

September 16, 2025
Ithlesh

Whether speaking/reasoned	:	Yes/No
Whether reportable	:	Yes/No