

CRM-M-36275-2026

CNR No: PHHC011002492026

MADHU PURNIMA KISHWAR

VS

UNION TERRITORY, CHANDIGARH AND ANR

Present: Mr. Kapil Sibal, Senior Advocate with
Mr. S.S. Narula, Senior Advocate with
Mr. Sidharth Grover, Advocate
Ms. Sumedha, Advocate
Ms. Vedika Dave, Advocate
Mr. Vabhav Jain, Advocate and
Mr. Anmol, Advocate
for the petitioner (through hybrid mode).

Mr. Manish Bansal, P.P. U.T., Chandigarh
Mr. Shubham Mangla, Addl. P.P. U.T., Chandigarh
Ms. Diksha Sharma, Advocate and
Mr. Arjun Garg, Advocate
for respondent No.1-U.T., Chandigarh.

-. -

The instant petition has been instituted under Section 528 of the BNSS for quashing of FIR No. 44 dated 19.04.2026 registered under Sections 196, 318, 336(1), 336(3), 336(4), 340, 353, 356 of the BNS and Sections 66(C), 66(D) and 67 of the Information Technology Act, 2000, at Police Station, Sector 26, Chandigarh along all subsequent proceedings arising therefrom.

2. On a complaint submitted by one Satinder Singh, Advocate, the FIR in question was registered with the allegation that a video clip was being circulated by various social media users with misleading claims of the Prime Minister of the country receiving face massage by a woman.

3. Learned Senior counsel has referred to the said posts. It has been submitted that a post was initially circulated

by some users of Twitter in the name of @MehakArora1541 and the petitioner only responded to that tweet without naming anyone and without saying anything about the Constitutional authority. Learned Senior counsel submits that after this, there was a tweet by one Zubair Mohammed stating that the tweet of the petitioner had implied that it is of the Prime Minister.

3.1 Learned Senior Counsel submits that immediately a response was given by the petitioner to the said tweet stating that the person in the video is not likely to be the Prime Minister. Reference has been made to the said tweet. It has been submitted that subsequently, many other people re-tweeted the video clip and many people also came in support of the petitioner stating that the petitioner had never stated anything about the Prime Minister.

3.2 Learned Senior counsel submits that even if for the sake of arguments, all allegations in the FIR are believed to be correct, no offence is made out. Learned Senior counsel has referred to each of the Sections in the FIR individually and has submitted that no offence is made out and, therefore, the FIR is liable to be quashed. It has also been submitted that at best, it is a case of defamation, which is not a cognizable offence.

4. Learned Public Prosecutor, U.T., Chandigarh, who is on an advance notice, submits that the anticipatory bail petition of the petitioner was rejected by a Coordinate Bench of this Court vide order dated 29.05.2026. A copy of the said order has also been produced in Court. He also submits that the case is

still at the stage of investigation and, therefore, the present petition is liable to be dismissed.

5. Before proceeding further, this Court deems it appropriate to require the U.T., Chandigarh to file an affidavit as regards the assertions made in the petition. Parties would also be required to inform the Court as to how, in view of the judgment of a Coordinate Bench in the case of **Kuldeep Singh Vs. State of Punjab and others (CRM-M-12541-2026 decided on 06.05.2026)**, the present petition for quashing of the FIR would be maintainable/entertainable once the anticipatory bail petition filed by the petitioner has been dismissed.

6. List on 25.08.2026.

7. To be taken up in the urgents.

[VIKRAM AGGARWAL]
JUDGE

11.08.2026
ds