



101

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

**CRM-M-27206-2026
DECIDED ON: 20.05.2026**

RANJIT SINGH @RANJIT SINGH BHATIA
.....PETITIONER

VERSUS

STATE OF PUNJAB
.....RESPONDENT

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY VASHISTH.

Present: Mr. Angad Parmar, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

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.19, dated 22.04.2026, under Sections 79 of BNS (erstwhile section 509 of IPC) and section 67 of Information and Technology Act, registered at Police Station Cyber Crime, District Jalandhar.

2. Allegations as well as findings, as recorded in paragraph No.4 of the impugned order dated 08.05.2026, passed by the Court of learned Additional Sessions Judge, Jalandhar (Annexure P-4), are reproduced here under:-

“As per police record, the complainant, a lady, had moved complaint with local Commissioner of Police on 20.04.2026 inter alia stating that she is the President of Human Rights Council (India) and on her Facebook page the accused had posted vulgar and sexually explicit and derogatory contents on public platform causing her severe mental harassment, intimidation and damage to her reputation. These contents of posts of applicant/accused are offensive and insulting the dignity of complainant as a lady. The matter was gone through and FIR was lodged against applicant/accused on 22.04.2026. Notice to him was

issued for appearance. Instead he rushed to the Court for anticipatory bail. Police record shows that Investigating Agency has collected material evidence against this applicant/accused which includes copies of Facebook comments allegedly posted on the Facebook page of complainant by this applicant which are so vulgar and gross that mentioning thereof in this order appears unpleasant and difficult. Then, there are photographs of applicant/accused and details of IP addresses he allegedly had used to put these comments on social platform. Keeping in view the nature of offence and requirement of custodial interrogation of applicant by Investigating Agency to recover the device used to commit the referred offence, I find that this application has to be dismissed. Same is dismissed for the reason.”

3. Counsel for the petitioner submits that neither FIR clarifies, nor learned Sessions Court, while dealing with the application, has discussed the specific derogatory, abusive, or filthy words allegedly published by the petitioner on the Facebook account. He further submits that petitioner is ready to join the investigation, provided he is protected from arrest by this Court.

4. It is further submitted that the allegations are primarily bailable in nature. Therefore, counsel for the petitioner seeks permission to withdraw the present petition, so as to enable the petitioner to surrender before the Court concerned, and thereafter, file an appropriate application for regular bail.

5. In view of the statement made by learned counsel for the petitioner, present petition is dismissed as withdrawn, with the liberty as sought and recorded here above.

(SANJAY VASHISTH)
JUDGE

20.05.2026

Lavisha

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