



106

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

**CRM-M-17695-2026
DECIDED ON: 02.04.2026**

MANPREET SINGH**.....PETITIONER**

VERSUS

STATE OF PUNJAB**.....RESPONDENT****CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY VASHISTH.**

Present: Mr. Gaurav Sharma, Advocate,
for the petitioner (through VC mode).

Mr. Neeraj Madaan, Sr. DAG, Punjab.

SANJAY VASHISTH, J (ORAL)

1. Present petition has been filed by the petitioner, seeking grant of anticipatory bail, in case, FIR No.02, dated 03.02.2026, under Sections 67(A) and 66(C) of IT Act, 2000, registered at Police Station Cyber Crime, District Rupnagar.

2. FIR in question has been lodged by the complainant 'X', who is a widow working in a factory in Himachal Pradesh, and mother of two children, one son and one daughter, alleging therein that for the past three days, she came to know that an obscene video, purportedly depicting her, was circulating on the mobile phones of villagers, as a result of which people in the village had begun to look at her in a derogatory manner.

It is further alleged that the said video had been morphed by superimposing her image onto that of another person.

3. During the course of investigation, it transpired that petitioner, who is of the age of 22 years, had accessed internet services by taking a hotspot from mobile number 8219598914 belonging to one Gurtej Singh, and thereafter, transmitted the objectionable video to the Instagram ID of Prince, who is the son of the complainant.

4. Counsel for the petitioner refers to paragraph No.5 of the present petition and submits that video in question was received by the petitioner from a friend, namely Pammu, who resides in the same village and is not an accused in the present case. The only error committed by the petitioner was, in good faith, forwarding the alleged video to son of the complainant, who is a close friend of the petitioner. It is submitted that petitioner had no role in creating, making, or editing the alleged video.

5. This Court observes that allegations against the petitioner are of a serious nature, affecting the dignity and reputation of a woman, and therefore, cannot be taken lightly. However, considering that petitioner merely forwarded the video, which he had received, and had no involvement in its creation, the circumstances surrounding the generation and recording of the video require thorough investigation. Therefore, custodial interrogation of the petitioner appears necessary to unearth the truth.

6. Therefore, finding no substantial ground to extend the concession of anticipatory bail to the petitioner in the present case, **present petition is dismissed.**

(SANJAY VASHISTH)
JUDGE

02.04.2026

Lavisha

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