



CRM-M-69388-2025 (O&M)

1

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH
(102)

CRM-M-69388-2025 (O&M)

Date of Decision:- 24.12.2025

Manpreet Singh Gill

.....Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab and another

.....Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ALOK JAIN

Present: Ms. Sapna Seth, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Japjot Singh, AAG, Punjab.

Ms. Anjali Bansal, Advocate
for respondent No. 2.

ALOK JAIN, J. (Oral)**CRM-52941-2025 &**
CRM-51544-2025

The present applications have been filed for placing on record certain transcripts of alleged conversations between the petitioner and the complainant.

However, the said transcripts are vague in nature and do not disclose the date and time of the conversations. Accordingly, while leaving it open to the petitioner to prove the same in accordance with law at the appropriate stage of trial, no reliance can be placed upon the said transcripts at this stage.

**CRM-M-69388-2025**

1. The present petition has been filed praying for the grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner in FIR No.124 dated 11.11.2025, registered under Sections 64 and 351(2) of the BNS, 2023 and Section 25 of the Arms Act at Police Station Mehna, District Moga.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner has vehemently argued that the petitioner and the complainant were in a consensual relationship and the complainant was aware from the very inception that the petitioner is a married man. It is further submitted that the complainant herself is a married woman and has two children. Learned counsel contends that the petitioner cannot be held solely responsible for a consensual relationship outside marriage, particularly when there was no objection from the complainant at any stage. Learned counsel further submits that the dispute arose only when the complainant allegedly demanded a sum of ₹50,00,000/- and started blackmailing the petitioner. Upon the petitioner's refusal to accede to the said demand, the present FIR was lodged.

3. It is further submitted that, in order to entangle the petitioner, the complainant herself used an international mobile number and sent certain videos depicting intimacy between the petitioner and the complainant not only to her own daughter but to the other family members of the petitioner as well. It is also submitted that these videos were sent much prior to the lodging of the present FIR, however, there is no mention thereof in the FIR.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner at this stage, disclosed that the petitioner is facing trial in another case and on account of the present FIR, the petitioner is unable to attend the proceedings therein, which may



adversely affect the said trial, as the petitioner is likely to be declared a proclaimed person. It is submitted that the petitioner is ready and willing to join the investigation and, accordingly, a prayer has been made for grant of the concession of anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

5. Ms. Anjali Bansal, Advocate has put in appearance and filed her fresh Power of Attorney with “No Objection” from the previous counsel on behalf of respondent No. 2/complainant in Court today, which is taken on record, subject to all just exceptions.

6. Learned State counsel, assisted by learned counsel for the complainant, have vehemently opposed the petition and, on instructions from the Investigating Officer, submits that the petitioner had sent explicit and objectionable videos to the children of the complainant, which demonstrates the *mens rea* as well as the act of blackmailing allegedly carried out by the petitioner.

7. This Court, vide order dated 10.12.2025, had directed the complainant to hand over the mobile phones of herself and her children on which the alleged messages and videos were received. As per the report submitted by the Investigating Officer, it was found that one objectionable video, having a duration of 01 minute and 46 seconds, was received on mobile number 70472-30007 on 02.11.2025 from mobile number +44-79283-2808. It is further reported that in the aforesaid video, no face is visible, however, it is also reported that text messages from WhatsApp on same number were received from mobile number 92891-25051 on 24.10.2025, which shows that the petitioner had sent the messages. The entire act needs thorough investigation.



8. Learned counsel for the complainant submits that there was no demand of ₹50 lakhs made by the complainant to settle the matter and that the same is a false defence raised by the petitioner. It is further submitted that the complainant is ready to face all consequences, in case, she is unable to substantiate her allegations. It is also submitted that the transcripts and documents relied upon by the petitioner are conversations between the relatives or known persons of the petitioner himself and therefore, cannot be relied upon to test the veracity of the allegations made by the complainant.

9. Learned State counsel, assisted by learned counsel for the complainant, has raised an objection that in paragraph 27 of the petition it has been wrongly stated that the petitioner has never indulged in any similar offence and has no previous criminal history anywhere in India, nor is any criminal case pending or decided against him.

10. Learned State counsel as well as learned counsel for the complainant submit that an FIR under the NDPS Act was pending against the petitioner, in which he was arrested on 06.02.2024 and was released on bail only on 18.11.2024 by the Hon'ble Delhi High Court. It is, therefore, contended that the petitioner has made a false and misleading statement with regard to his antecedents. In fact, learned counsel for the petitioner herself admitted in her argument that petitioner is facing trial in another case.

11. Learned counsel for the petitioner, in response, clarifies that the petitioner was not named in the said FIR and was arrayed as an accused only on the basis of a disclosure statement.

12. *De hors* the aforesaid clarification, the fact remains that the petitioner was an accused as on the date of filing of the present petition.



13. Learned State counsel, assisted by learned counsel for the complainant, has further submitted that it is an admitted position that the petitioner is a citizen of Canada and, therefore, there exists a substantial apprehension of the petitioner absconding from the process of law.

14. *Per contra*, learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the passport of the petitioner is already in the custody of the authorities and, therefore, there is no likelihood of his absconding.

15. Learned State counsel, assisted by learned counsel for the complainant, further submits that the petitioner is attempting to mislead this Court, inasmuch as the FIR was lodged on 11.11.2025 and the subsequent alleged incident dated 18.11.2025 has been grossly misinterpreted. It is submitted that, in fact, on 17.11.2025, the relatives of the petitioner visited the village of the complainant and met the Sarpanch, and exerted pressure upon the complainant to settle the matter. Upon her refusal, further calls were allegedly made, and a message regarding the location of a meeting was sent by the wife of the petitioner to the complainant on her mobile phone at 12:54 A.M. on the intervening night of 17/18.11.2025.

16. Learned counsel for the complainant has clarified that the wife of the petitioner resides in “J” Block of the same society, whereas the real sister of the complainant resides in “K” Block. It is further clarified that the complainant did not visit the house of the petitioner’s wife on the said date; rather, she went to the residence of her sister, where the sister of the petitioner came to meet her. It is also clarified that the second photograph relied upon by the petitioner, annexed as Annexure P-4, depicting the complainant in a



lift, pertains to 21.11.2025, i.e., the date on which the police authorities took the complainant for further proceedings in relation to the FIR.

17. Heard learned counsel for the parties at length and perused the record.

18. At the outset, it is clarified that any document annexed with the present petition shall not, by itself, be treated as *ipso facto* evidence for any of the parties, and the parties shall be at liberty to lead appropriate evidence at the stage of trial. This Court refrains itself from returning any finding on the merits and facts of the case as the same may affect the trial.

19. However, considering the gravity of the allegations, particularly that the petitioner has been accused of not only commission of offence but also by his act of sending obscene videos to the daughter of the complainant and the fact that the petitioner has concealed a material fact with regard to another criminal case pending against him in the pleadings but the counsel for the petitioner has argued that the petitioner be granted the concession of anticipatory bail to defend himself in the earlier criminal case pending against him which demonstrates the *mala fide* of the petitioner; coupled with his own admission that he is a citizen of Canada, giving rise to a reasonable apprehension of his absconding from the process of law and the petitioner is at flight risk, this Court does not find any ground to grant the extraordinary concession of anticipatory bail to the petitioner at this stage. Accordingly, the present petition is dismissed.

20. It is noted that during the course of proceedings, the original mobile phone of the complainant and her daughter had been handed over to



CRM-M-69388-2025 (O&M)

7

the Investigating Officer; however, the same has been returned to learned counsel for the complainant in Court today.

21. Needless to say, the Investigating Officer shall investigate the matter thoroughly in accordance with law, with complete cooperation from the complainant, who shall deposit the old mobile phone to the Investigating Officer. The Investigating Officer shall investigate the matter without any bias and with due diligence.

22. Pending application(s), if any, shall stand disposed of.

(ALOK JAIN)
JUDGE

24.12.2025

Parul

Whether speaking/reasoned:-
Whether Reportable:-

Yes/No
Yes/No