



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

(102+209)	CRM-M-61775-2025 (O&M) Date of Decision: 20.01.2026
SUKHDEEP SINGH @ SEEPA	Petitioner
Versus	
STATE OF PUNJAB	Respondent
(2)	CRM-M-50918-2025 (O&M)
PARTAP SINGH	Petitioner
Versus	
STATE OF PUNJAB AND OTHERS	Respondents
(3)	CRM-M-51456-2025 (O&M)
JAGDISH SINGH @ JAGDISH DEVIWALA	Petitioner
Versus	
STATE OF PUNJAB	Respondent
(4)	CRM-M-53469-2025 (O&M)
JASVEER SINGH	Petitioner
Versus	
STATE OF PUNJAB	Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE KIRTI SINGH

Present: Mr. Arshdeep Singh Brar, Advocate
for the petitioner (in three cases).

Mr. Sukhdeep Singh, Advocate with
Mr. A.D.S. Sukhija, Advocate
for the petitioner (in CRM-M-50918-2025).



Ms. Aakanksha Gupta, AAG, Punjab.

Mr. Himmat Singh Deol, Advocate
for the complainant (in all cases).

KIRTI SINGH, J. (ORAL)

1. Since the prayer in all the petitions filed under Section 482 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023, is for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner(s) arises from a common FIR i.e. FIR No.80 dated 01.08.2025, under Sections 75, 77, 79, 308(2) and 61(2) of BNS and Sections 66-E and 67 of IT Act, registered at Police Station Smalsar, District Moga, as such, all the petitions are amenable to be disposed of by way of a common judgment.

2. The contents of FIR are reproduced hereinafter.

“One complaint no.1643-PC-4/25 Date 15.07.2025 (PGD-622195) from Jagsir Singh son of Mohinder Singh, and xxxx daughter of Major Singh, residents of Village Mallke, against Jagsir Singh alias Chhota Seera son of Kartar Singh, Partap Singh Dairywala, Jagdish Deviwalla, Sukhdeep Singh alias Seepa son of Harjinder Singh, Jassi son of Harbans Singh, residents of Village Mallke, District Moga was submitted before Hon'ble SSP Moga. Subject: Application for taking legal action against Jagseer Singh alias Chhota Seera son of Kartar Singh, Partap Singh Dairywala, Jagdish Deviwalla, Sukhdeep Singh alias Seepa son of Harjinder Singh, Jassi son of Harbans Singh, residents of Village Mallke, Tehsil Baghapurana, District Moga, for circulating our private videos on the internet. Sir, It is humbly requested that we, Jagsir Singh son of Mohinder Singh and xxxx daughter of Major Singh are residents of Village Mallke, Tehsil Baghapurana, District Moga. Sir, we both are in a live-in relationship and we are in a relationship. The mentioned individuals hacked my phone and misused the data to steal objectionable videos of our physical relationship. Through this video, these individuals first blackmailed us, saying that if we want this video deleted, we should give them Rs. 5 lakh, otherwise, they will put it on the internet and defame us. When we flatly refused to give the money, these individuals, the mentioned Sukhdeep Singh, used his mobile number 95013-xxxxx to post the video of our private relationship



in the village groups such as Panchayat, clubs, and societies, and we were greatly defamed. The mentioned Jagsir Singh alias Chhota Seera had also earlier told xxxxx to have a physical relationship with him, and then he would delete the video. When xxxxx told me this, I told her that he cannot do anything. Because of this, the mentioned xxxx is mentally very disturbed and may end her life, for which the mentioned individuals will be responsible. The mentioned Jagsir Singh alias Chhota Seera had tried to grab my uncle's house in a 420 case and had taken a loan on it, under which a case of 420 is pending against this person. I, Jagseer Singh, son of Mohinder Singh, am handling the legal proceedings for this case. They were pressuring us for a compromise. When we did not compromise in this case, these individuals interfered in my private life and stole this video and defamed us out of enmity. These individuals have openly misused the internet and caused great harm to us. We have a threat to our life and property from these individuals. If there is any harm to our life or property, the mentioned individuals will be responsible. Therefore, please take legal action against the accused. Please ensure the safety of our life, property, and honor. Please give us justice. We will be thankful to you. Yours sincerely, Sd/-Jagseer Singh Sd/- xxx.”

3. Learned counsels for the petitioners submit that the petitioners have been falsely implicated in the present FIR on the statement of the complainant and the victim due to party faction in the village. It is submitted that the video which was alleged to be made viral on social media is of the year 2017, the same was, admittedly recorded in the mobile by complainant himself. The allegation that the petitioners hacked the said phone and circulated the video recorded 8 years ago, is highly improbable. It is submitted that there is in fact no direct evidence that points towards the complicity of the petitioners.

4. *Per contra*, learned State counsel as well as learned counsel for the complainant have vehemently opposed the submissions made by the learned counsel for the petitioner and submit that there are specific and serious allegations against the petitioners. They state that the petitioners



were actively involved in the commission of the offence.

5. Learned State counsel while placing reliance upon the status report dated 12.11.2025 submits that it is the categoric allegation against the petitioner that they hacked the mobile phone of the complainant-Jagsir Singh and stole an intimate video, after which they started blackmailing the complainants by demanding a sum of Rs.5 lakhs for deleting the said video. When the demand of the petitioners was not conceded to then petitioner-Sukhdeep Singh shared the video on social media from his mobile phone. It is also alleged that one co-accused namely Jagsir Singh alias Chota Seera also demanded sexual favour from the complainant. During inquiry the said co-accused appeared before the inquiry officer on 31.07.2025 and admitted the fact that he received the said video, and after that he went to the complainant to show her the video. During the course of investigation, the complainants/ and the victim got recorded their statements under Section 180 BNSS, wherein they supported the case of the prosecution. It is therefore averred that the custodial interrogation of the petitioners is required for recovery of mobile phone, and to determine the exact sequence of events.

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

7. The expansion of internet access has led to a rampant increase cyber crimes, which has posed a serious threat to the social fabric of the society. Therefore, it is incumbent on the authorities to address the same and take prompt action against the offenders.



8. Prima facie, the allegations levelled against the petitioners reveal the commission of grave and serious offences involving a premeditated and unlawful intrusion into the complainant’s mobile phone, followed by the exploitation of her private and intimate material for the purposes of blackmailing and extorting. The said video is also alleged to have been subsequently circulated by the petitioners. The allegations prima facie disclose a conscious abuse of technology, resulting in a profound violation of the complainant’s dignity and privacy.

9. Having regard to the gravity of the offences, the manner in which they are alleged to have been committed, and the likelihood that custodial interrogation is required for recovery of electronic evidence and for unearthing the true extent of the alleged offences, this Court is not inclined to grant the concession of anticipatory bail to the petitioners since grant of such relief at this stage might prejudice a free, fair and effective investigation.

10. Accordingly, all the four petitions stand dismissed.

11. Needless to say that nothing observed hereinabove shall be construed as an expression on the merits of the case.

Pending miscellaneous application(s), if any, also stands disposed of.

(KIRTI SINGH)
JUDGE

January 20, 2026
Ithlesh

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