



CRA-S-3841-2025 (O&M) 1

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

101

CRA-S-3841-2025
Decided on: 10.04.2026

JAGJIT SINGH @ JEETA

.....Petitioner

Versus

STATE OF PUNJAB AND ANOTHER

.....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY VASHISTH

Present: Mr. Varun Goyal, Advocate,
for the appellant.

Mr. Neeraj Madaan, Sr. DAG, Punjab.

None for respondent No.2.

SANJAY VASHISTH, J.

1. Appellant Jagjit Singh @ Jeeta, has filed present appeal seeking anticipatory bail in connection with FIR No.44 dated 02.04.2021, registered under Sections 506 and 509 of the IPC, as well as Section 3(1)(r) of the Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes (Prevention of Atrocities) Act, at Police Station Goraya, Jalandhar.

2. On 10.12.2025, following order was passed:-

“i) Appellant Jagjit Singh, also known as Jeeta, has filed present appeal seeking anticipatory bail in connection with FIR No. 44 dated 02.04.2021, registered under Sections 506 and 509 of the IPC, as well as Section 3(1)(r) of the Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes (Prevention of Atrocities) Act, at Police Station Goraya, Jalandhar.

ii) Learned counsel for the appellant submits that, in fact, since August 2014, the appellant has been settled abroad, namely United States of America, and had not returned to India during this period. However, due to certain accusations, while the appellant was already outside the country, the instant FIR was lodged against him on 02.04.2021.



iii) According to the allegations in the FIR, the appellant's Facebook account was used to post offensive and filthy language against the complainant's family members, including the women of the household, along with accusations and threats to kill them. It is further alleged that the appellant continuously insulted the complainant, Tarsem Singh, for about 21 minutes, referring to him as a "bitch Bazigar" while mentioning the names of his family members. A CD containing the publications made by the appellant was prepared and presented for the purpose of registering the instant case.

iv) FIR also mentions that in 2013, Balihar Singh (brother of the appellant) had murdered Ishar Singh (uncle of the complainant), and in that case, the complainant, Tarsem Singh, and his brother, Satwinder Singh, had given evidence, following which the accused, Balihar Singh, was convicted and sentenced to life imprisonment. Allegedly, due to this grudge, the appellant, Jagjit Singh @ Jeeta, went live on Facebook and defamed the complainant, the women of his family, and other panchayat members by making false accusations.

v) Since appellant was already settled in the USA and could not join the proceedings by appearing before the Investigating Officer or the concerned Court, he was declared a proclaimed person/proclaimed offender vide order dated 01.07.2023. Subsequently, a lookout notice was also issued against the appellant on 06.05.2021 (A-2) to facilitate his arrest at the airport.

vi) On becoming aware of the order dated 01.07.2023, appellant filed CRM-M-53070-2025 challenging the same and said petition was allowed vide order dated 22.09.2025 (A-4) by the co-ordinate Bench of this Court. Thus, order dated 01.07.2023, by which appellant was declared a proclaimed offender, was set aside on merits.

When appellant expressed his willingness to return to India and to surrender before trial Court/Ilqa Magistrate concerned, with a view to securing his presence for trial, vide its order dated 22.09.2025, trial Court granted him time of 15 days, i.e., up to 30.09.2025 to do so and also observed that during this period, appellant's arrest shall remain stayed, and he shall not be arrested at the airport upon his arrival from abroad.

Court had also clarified that if appellant fails to surrender before the trial court within the prescribed period, i.e. upto 30.09.2025, protection



regarding his arrest shall stand ipso facto vacated, without any further reference to this Court.

It further observed that upon appellant's surrender before the trial Court, interim protection granted by this Court would cease to operate, and trial Court shall proceed in accordance with law.

v) *Thereupon, the appellant sought clarification from the co-ordinate Bench to ascertain whether he would be able to seek the remedy of anticipatory bail upon his return to India on 29.09.2025. In the order dated 17.11.2025, the Court noticed that, although the appellant had not complied with the directions issued on 22.09.2025, as he did not surrender before the trial Court, however, directed to avail the remedy available to him in accordance with law. Thus, counsel argues that availing chance of legal remedy of seeking anticipatory bail is his statutory right, hence instant appeal.*

Further submits that in fact, he has been falsely implicated in the case, having no knowledge even of the contents allegedly published on his Facebook account.

vi) *Referring to the inquiry and investigation conducted following the registration of FIR, learned counsel submits that there is nothing mention regarding any verification of the appellant's Facebook account by the Investigating Officer to make the allegations prima facie believable.*

However, counsel further submits that without delving into these controversies, appellant is willing to appear before the trial Court and participate and join the legal process, provided he is protected from arrest. Accordingly, he expresses his intention to join the proceedings and also to surrender before the learned trial Court concerned.

vii) *Undoubtedly, interim protection order was granted for a specific period, i.e., up to 30.09.2025. From the viewpoint of this Court, such protection was provided to the appellant to secure his presence before the Court so that he could join the process of law.*

viii) *Availing the right to pre-arrest bail is a statutory legal remedy available to every citizen of the country. Denying the appellant an opportunity to exercise this right would place him in a situation of discrimination vis-à-vis other citizens who are entitled to the same statutory remedy. Therefore, this Court has no hesitation in entertaining the plea raised by the appellant through the instant appeal.*



ix) Upon perusal of FIR and material placed on record, it is not clear as to what are the contents recorded in the CD submitted by complainant-respondent No. 2 for the purpose of registration of the case against the appellant.

x) Be that as it may, and taking into consideration the earlier direction regarding his surrender issued by the co-ordinate Bench of this Court, it would be appropriate to grant appellant an opportunity once again to appear in the present case and join the proceedings in accordance with law, and cooperate with the Investigating Agency for the purposes of investigation.

xi) Notice of motion

xii) Mr. Neeraj Madaan, Sr. DAG, appears on behalf of respondent/State. He seeks some time to file reply/Status report.

Respondent No. 2 shall be served through concerned SHO also, informing him of the next date of hearing fixed before this Court.

xiii) List on 02.02.2026.

xiv) In the event, appellant appears before the concerned Court within one week from today, i.e., on or before 18.12.2025, he shall be released on interim bail till the next date of hearing., subject to the furnishing of bail bonds to the satisfaction of the learned trial Court/Illaqa Magistrate/Duty Magistrate concerned. Appellant shall also comply with all the conditions laid down under Section 482(2) of BNSS, 2023 (earlier Section 438(2) Cr.P.C.)

xvi) Let status report be filed, detailing therein the contents of the CD, so as to examine on a prima facie basis whether the allegations are sufficient to constitute an offence under the SC/ST Act.”

3. On the very outset, learned State counsel has filed status report dated 01.02.2026 in the Court today and the same is taken on record. Registry is directed to tag the same at the appropriate place on the file.

4. Referring to paragraph No.13 of the status report, learned State counsel informs that respondent No.2 has been duly informed about the pendency of the present case before this Court. Even, his signatures on the notice issued by the SHO are also there.



However, there is no representation on behalf of respondent No.2/complainant today before this Court.

5. Counsel for the appellant submits that in compliance to the direction issued by this Court vide order dated 10.12.2025, appellant has already appeared before the trial Court on 17.12.2025, and thereupon, he was released on interim bail.

6. On the other hand, in regard to the contents of CD as directed in paragraph (xvi) of the order dated 10.12.2025, while referring to paragraph No.12 of the status report, learned State counsel submits that as per the response given by the Technical Cell, Jalandhar (Rural), letter rogatory has been asked for through Mutual Legal Assistance Treaty, and the said report is still awaited.

7. However, on being asked by the Court, learned State counsel, on instructions from ASI Chaman Lal, submits that CD containing the audio recording of the appellant, allegedly comprising derogatory remarks made on his Facebook account, is in the possession of the prosecution agency.

8. In view of the above, this Court does not find any substantial justification, for subjecting the appellant to custodial interrogation, as no meaningful purpose would be served thereby. Moreover, appellant has already complied with the directions issued by this Court vide order dated 10.12.2025. **Therefore, interim bail order dated 10.12.2025 passed by this Court is hereby made absolute. Accordingly, present petition is allowed.**



However, appellant shall continue to appear before the trial Court concerned as and when required to do so and abide by all the terms and conditions laid down under Section 482(2) of BNSS, 2023.

9. Accordingly, appeal stands disposed of.

(SANJAY VASHISTH)
JUDGE

10.04.2026

Lavisha

Whether Speaking/Reasoned: YES/NO
Whether Reportable: YES/NO