



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

CWP-PIL-278-2025 (O&M)
Date of decision: 20th April, 2026

Kanwar Pahul Singh

... Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab & others

... Respondents

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SHEEL NAGU, CHIEF JUSTICE
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJIV BERRY**

Present: Petitioner in person.

Mr. Salil Sabhlok, Sr. Dy. Advocate General Punjab
(thr. Video Conferencing)

Mr. Dheeraj Jain, Senior Advocate (arguing counsel)
(thr. Video Conferencing)

with Ms. Gurneet Sagu, Advocate for respondent No.6.

SHEEL NAGU, CHIEF JUSTICE

CM-205-CWPIL-2026

In view of the averments made in the application and in the interest of justice, CM-205-CWPIL-2026 is allowed and replication/rejoinder filed by the petitioner is taken on record.

CWP-PIL-278-2025 (O&M)

1. This petition has been filed raising alleged public cause of faulty implementation of Sections 3 and 4 of The Indecent Representation of Women (Prohibition) Act, 1986 (for brevity, 'the 1986 Act') in the State of Punjab and for a writ of prohibition for stopping publication, production and uploading of obscene/indecent/vulgar photograph/film/slide/reels or representation of videos in any form which contains indecent representation of women or contains indecent/vulgar/obscene language/words on any

social media platform, which is alleged to be a cognizable offence u/s 6 of the 1986 Act, Section 294-295 BNS, Sections 67, 67-A & 67-B of IT Act 2000 and Section 14 of POCSO Act 2012. A further direction has been sought to take all measures for ensuring publicity u/s 19 and 20 of POCSO Act 2012 among all members of the general public and for ensuring implementation of Section 44 of POCSO Act 2012 and to take punitive steps against persons operating such sites in violation of Sections 3 and 4 of the 1986 Act, and finally to implement Sections 107 & 115 BNSS in the entire State of Punjab. A last direction has been sought for deciding representation dated 17.06.2025 (Annexure P-7) made by the petitioner.

2. Before this Court enters upon the realm of jurisdiction, it would be appropriate that the representation made by the petitioner vide Annexure P-7 is decided by the competent authority.

3. In view of the above, this Court refraining to interfere on merits of the case, directs respondents No.1, 2, 3 and 4 to decide representation (Annexure P-7) of the petitioner as expeditiously as possible, preferably within a period of 4 weeks from the date of receipt of a certified copy of this order, by passing a speaking order and communicating the same to the petitioner.

4. The petition stands disposed of accordingly.

5. Pending application(s), if any, also stand disposed of.

(SHEEL NAGU)
CHIEF JUSTICE

(SANJIV BERRY)
JUDGE

April 20, 2026

rps

Whether speaking/reasoned
Whether reportable

Yes/No
Yes/No