



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

105

CRM-M-70158-2025

Date of Decision: 13.01.2026

SUKHMANDEEP SINGH @ SUKHMAN MANN @ SUKHVIR
SINGH MANN

....Petitioner

VERSUS

STATE OF PUNJAB AND ANOTHER

....Respondents(s)

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ALOK JAIN

Present : Ms. Meena Bansal, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Japjot Singh, AAG, Punjab.

Mr. Amaninder Singh Sekhon, Advocate for the complainant.

ALOK JAIN, J. (Oral)

1. The present petition has been *inter alia* filed under Section 482 of Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner in case arising out of FIR No.0006 dated 22.08.2025 registered under Sections 77, 75, 351(2), 61(2), 79 of BNS and Section 67 of Information Technology (Amendment) Act, 2008 at Police Station Cyber Crime Faridkot, District Faridkot (during investigation Sections 74 and 78 of BNS, 67-A of Information Technology (Amendment) Act, 2008 and Sections 12 and 15 of POCSO Act, 2012 added later on)

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that petitioner has been wrongly entangled in the present FIR and he has no role to play.

Learned counsel submits that the main accused Arshdeep Singh @Fauji had forwarded the obscene video of daughter of the complainant to one Daljit



Singh and the petitioner has been wrongly entangled in the present FIR. Learned counsel further submits that petitioner has been nominated at the instance of Daljit Singh who harbour personal grudge against the petitioner and hence, he prays the grant of concession of anticipatory bail.

3. *Per contra*, learned State counsel has vehemently opposed the grant of bail to the petitioner on the ground that it was the petitioner who had prepared the video in the first instance. It is further submitted that the main accused, Arshdeep, prepared the video which was copied from the video prepared by the petitioner and circulated the same on social media and various other platforms. He further submits that the petitioner has played a pivotal role in the commission of the offence and that there are specific allegations of conspiracy to blackmail the daughter of the complainant against the petitioner.

4. Heard learned counsel for the parties at length.

5. Considering the seriousness of the allegations and the fact that custodial interrogation of the petitioner is necessary, particularly in view of specific case of the complainant that the video in question was prepared by the petitioner from his own mobile phone, therefore, this Court is not inclined to grant the concession of anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

6. Hence, the present petition stands dismissed.

(ALOK JAIN)
JUDGE

13.01.2026

Deepak Patwal

- | | |
|------------------------------|--------|
| 1. Whether speaking/reasoned | Yes/No |
| 2. Whether reportable | Yes/No |