



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

Sr. No.113

CRM-M-72560-2025

Date of Decision: 07.03.2026

**AMIT KUMAR****...Petitioner****Versus****STATE OF PUNJAB****....Respondent****CORAM: HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE MANDEEP PANNU**

Present:- Mr. L.S. Lakhan Pal, Advocate  
for the petitioner.

Mr. Sahil Chowdhary, AAG, Punjab.

\*\*\*\*\*

**MANDEEP PANNU, J. (Oral)**

1. This is the first petition filed under Section 482 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 for the grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner in case FIR No. 0029 dated 20.07.2025 registered under Section 67 of the Information Technology Act, 2000 at Police Station Cyber Crime, District Police Commissionerate Amritsar, District Amritsar.

2. Briefly stated, as per the prosecution case, complainant Anjali was previously married to Roshan Lal in the year 1998 and two children were born out of the said wedlock. However, her husband deserted her in the year 2007. About five years prior to the lodging of the complaint, she came into contact with the petitioner, who represented that he was running a travel agency under the name and style of "JMC Travel". The complainant approached the petitioner as she wanted to send her son Rahul Puri abroad. It is alleged that she paid a sum of ₹2,00,000/- in cash to the petitioner and



consequently her son was sent to Dubai in October 2020. Thereafter, the petitioner started visiting the house of the complainant and both of them allegedly developed a relationship with each other. In April 2021, it is alleged that the petitioner performed a marriage with the complainant at a temple in Model Town, Amritsar and asked her not to disclose the said fact to anyone. It is further alleged that the petitioner was already married to one Sonia Sharma, but he assured the complainant that he would obtain divorce from his wife. Subsequently, the complainant came to know that the petitioner was still residing with his wife and when she protested, the petitioner allegedly assaulted her, which resulted in miscarriage. Thereafter, the parties separated but the petitioner allegedly continued to contact the complainant through phone calls and compelled her to develop physical relations with his friends by threatening to make her videos viral on the internet. It is further alleged that the petitioner used to make WhatsApp calls to the complainant and on one occasion made a video call showing himself in a nude condition. Despite the complainant asking him not to make such calls, the petitioner allegedly continued to harass and threaten her. On the basis of these allegations, the present FIR came to be registered.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner has argued that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case and the allegations levelled in the FIR are vague and baseless. It is contended that from the bare reading of the FIR itself, it is apparent that both the complainant and the petitioner were in a consensual relationship and the complainant was fully aware that the petitioner was already married to one Sonia Sharma, yet she continued the



relationship with him. It is further submitted that no specific date, time or year of the alleged occurrence has been mentioned in the FIR and bald allegations have been levelled against the petitioner. It is further argued that the complainant, after the relationship turned sour, started blackmailing the petitioner on the basis of certain videos prepared during their relationship and demanded a sum of ₹8 lakhs or, in the alternative, purchase of a house in her name and upon refusal by the petitioner, the present FIR has been lodged. It is also contended that the petitioner is a peace-loving and law-abiding citizen having good reputation in society and he is ready and willing to join the investigation as and when required by the investigating agency. It is further argued that the petitioner has already approached the Court of learned Additional Sessions Judge, Amritsar seeking anticipatory bail but the same was dismissed vide order dated 21.11.2025.

4. Learned State counsel, on the other hand, has opposed the bail application mainly on the ground that the pen drive containing the above-mentioned screen recording of the WhatsApp call made to the complainant in completely nude condition by the petitioner Amit Kumar has been taken and the same is available with the Investigating Officer. It is further submitted that the petitioner is absconding and is concealing himself in order to avoid his arrest. It is argued that the allegations levelled against the petitioner are serious in nature and his custodial interrogation is required for proper investigation and also for effecting recovery of the mobile phone used in the commission of the crime in the present case. Therefore, the petitioner does not deserve the concession of anticipatory bail.



5. I have heard learned counsel for the petitioner as well as learned State counsel and have carefully gone through the record of the case. The allegations levelled against the petitioner are serious in nature. As per the prosecution case, the petitioner is alleged to have made obscene WhatsApp video calls to the complainant and on one occasion allegedly made a video call while being in a nude condition. It has further come on record that the screen recording of the said WhatsApp call has been preserved in a pen drive and the same is stated to be in the possession of the Investigating Officer. Learned State counsel has further submitted that the petitioner is absconding and is concealing himself in order to avoid his arrest.

6. At this stage, the investigation is still in progress and the custodial interrogation of the petitioner appears to be necessary for the purpose of proper investigation and for effecting recovery of the mobile phone allegedly used in the commission of the crime. The recovery of the said mobile phone assumes significance in the present case as the allegations pertain to the making of obscene video calls and circulation of such content through electronic means. In such circumstances, custodial interrogation of the petitioner would be essential to unearth the true facts and to facilitate effective investigation.

7. Keeping in view the gravity and nature of the allegations levelled against the petitioner, the material collected during investigation and the requirement of custodial interrogation for recovery of the mobile phone used in the alleged offence, this Court does not find it to be a fit case for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner.



8. Consequently, the present petition seeking anticipatory bail filed by the petitioner Amit Kumar stands dismissed. Any observation made hereinabove shall not be construed as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

9. All pending applications, if any, also stand disposed of.

**(MANDEEP PANNU)**  
**JUDGE**

**07.03.2026**

Anu

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