

SCHOOL OF LAW

GREATER NOIDA

Mock Trial Society

— Organizes —

ALL INDIA 1ST MOCK TRIAL COMPETITION 2026

(HYBRID MODE)

14TH - 16TH
OCTOBER , 2026
(ONLINE)



3RD AND 4TH
NOVEMBER ,
2026 (OFFLINE)



IILM UNIVERSITY
GREATER NOIDA

ABOUT IILM UNIVERSITY

IILM was established in 1993, under the aegis of the Ram Krishan & Sons Charitable Trust. With more than 28+ years of experience in training future entrepreneurs and managers, it has emerged as one of the distinguished Universities in the Delhi NCR area.

The University has been set up under the Uttar Pradesh Private University (Amendment) Act 2022 with a vision is to be Global Inclusive and Responsible and the focus will be on Computer Science and Engineering, Technology, Innovation and Entrepreneurship. It is located in 16-18 knowledge park II Greater Noida, with a built area of over 26 acres known for its state-of-the-art facilities. Apart from Greater Noida, we also have safe and secure campuses in New Delhi and Gurugram.

ABOUT SCHOOL OF LAW

IILM Law School is a pathway, not just to the legal profession, but for many leadership roles in society. The overall goal of the programs is to educate, train and develop our students, thereby fostering an in- depth understanding of the laws and the legal profession. It imparts practical training to enhance student's personal and professional ability to adapt and grow with the changes in the legal environment, and to excel in their chosen fields. IILM Law School Greater Noida started its journey in 2022 with BALLB program and LLM program. The school has started its first batch of BBALLB and LLB program in August 2025. The school has moved its path towards achieving the expertise in numerous areas like corporate law, alternative dispute resolution, legal writing, intellectual property rights, etc.



ABOUT MOCK TRIAL SOCIETY

The IILM Mock Trial Society was established in 2026 under the aegis of the School of Law, IILM University, Greater Noida. The Society has been founded with the objective of providing law students with a platform to experience and understand the intricacies of Trialroom practice through simulated trial proceedings.

These competitions serve as an essential educational tool, bridging the gap between theoretical legal education and real-world litigation skills. The IILM Mock Trial Society aims to cultivate critical lawyering skills such as legal drafting, advocacy, client counseling, oral arguments, and witness examination. Through these activities, students develop not only their technical knowledge but also confidence, strategic thinking, and professional ethics. The Society will organize regular mock trial competitions, workshops, guest lectures by practicing advocates and judges, and training sessions focused on trial advocacy techniques. It also encourages participation in national and international mock trial competitions, helping students to showcase their talents and build professional networks.

The IILM Mock Trial Society envisions becoming a hub of excellence for trial advocacy training, contributing to the professional development of students and preparing them to meet the demands of the legal profession with skill, integrity, and leadership. Through commitment to academic rigor and practical experience, the Society strives to produce future litigators, judges, and legal professionals who are ready to uphold justice and the rule of law.

ABOUT ALL INDIA 1ST MOCK TRIAL COMPETITION

This event is centered around the theme of male victimisation, aiming to shed light on the often-overlooked struggles faced by men in various legal and social contexts. It seeks to facilitate practical learning and knowledge-building by engaging students with real-world legal issues, particularly the sensitive and under-discussed topic of male victimisation. Through this initiative, the event aspires to raise awareness and encourage critical analysis of gender-neutral laws, while exploring the unique challenges male victims face within the legal system and society at large. Furthermore, it aims to prepare students for diverse professional environments by equipping them with the skills needed to handle gender-sensitive matters with empathy, neutrality, and legal precision.

KEY DATES

Online Mode

Particulars	Date
Release of proposition	19/08/2026
Early bird registration	05/09/2026
Last date of registration	20/09/2026
Last date to seek clarification	30/09/2026
Release of clarification	02/10/2026
Inaugural ceremony	14/10/2026
Researcher test	15/10/2026
Preliminary rounds	15/10/2026
Quarter final rounds	16/10/2026

Offline Mode

Particulars	Date
Semi final rounds	03/11/2026
Final round	04/11/2026
Valedictory ceremony	04/11/2026

* Limited slots remaining; registrations may close early.

COMPETITION RULE BOOK

01 PARTICIPATION AND ELIGIBILITY

- Students pursuing either a 3-year or a 5-year LL.B. degree from any Law School/College/University recognized by the Bar Council of India are eligible to participate. Team members must be bonafide students of the institution they are representing.
- Teams participating in the Competition must be duly authorized by the mock trial society / Faculty-in-charge/ Dean of their respective Institute to participate. (Registration Form is attached with the pdf)
- Once registered (after Final Registrations), a Team will not be permitted to vary their composition in any manner.

No University/institution can send more than two teams for the Competition

- **Language:** The official language for the Competition is English.
 - **Dress Code:**
 - **For Boys-** Black Pants, White Shirt with Black Blazer.
 - **For Girls-** Black Pants, White Shirt with Black Blazer or White Churidar Suits with Black Blazer or White Sari and Black Blazer.
-

02 TEAM COMPOSITION

- The participating team shall comprise of five (5) members i.e. 2 Speakers, 1 Researcher and 2 Witnesses.
 - Each team will have a team code. Teams shall not disclose their identity or that of their institution or city etc. Such disclosures will invite penalties including disqualification. The decision in this regard shall be at the discretion of the Organizing Committee.
 - The Organizing Committee reserves the right to bar any team from participating in the Competition.
-

03 RULES FOR ROLE OF WITNESS

1. ELIGIBILITY

- The teams will bring their own two witnesses which will be cross-examined by their opposite team.
- These two witnesses will be the part of the original team composition of 5 members.
- Witness may or may not be a law pursuing student. However, he or she should be a student of any recognised institute or university.

2. ROLE OF WITNESS

- No. of witnesses from Prosecution & Defences side are mentioned in the Proposition.
- The role to the Witnesses will be allotted for Preliminary rounds on the late evening of 14/10/2026.
- For Quarter final, late evening of 15/10/2026.
- For Semifinal round, late evening of 02/11/2026.
- For final round, one hour before the final round starts.
- Two witnesses shall be allotted their respective counsels 45 mins prior to the round.

3. CRITERIA FOR JUDGING WITNESSES SHALL BE BASED ON;

- Performance
 - Preparation
 - Creativity
 - Body language
 - Confidence
 - Dress code: Witnesses shall wear the dress/costume based on the roll allotted to them, however, no unnecessary makeup or weird costumes shall be allowed.
-

04 COMPETITION STRUCTURE

- The Competition shall be held in Hybrid Mode and shall consist of Preliminary Rounds (Online), Quarter-final Rounds (Online), Semi-Final Rounds (Offline) and Final Round (Offline). The top 8 teams from the preliminary rounds shall qualify to participate in the Quarter Finals. Top 4 teams qualifying the quarter final rounds will proceed to Semi- Finals (Offline). Top 2 teams qualifying the Semi-final rounds will proceed to the Final Round (Offline).
- Each team would be provided with two Witnesses, 45 minutes prior to the Online Rounds i.e. preliminary rounds & quarter rounds.
- Each team would be provided with three Witnesses, 45 minutes prior to the Semi- Final Rounds.
- Each team would be provided with all the Witnesses, 45 minutes prior to the Final Rounds.

There are no requirement for prior written submissions. However, if the teams wish to submit any of their written submissions they may directly submit it to the judges.

- Teams shall argue cases against each other. For the said purpose, fixture of teams will be decided by draw of lots prior to each round of the competition

05 CLARIFICATIONS

- Clarifications to the Proposition shall be sought by sending an e-mail to mocktrialsociety.gn@iilm.edu on or before **30th September 2026** (11:59 IST)

- Clarification requests sent after this date shall not be entertained. Clarifications will be released on 2nd October 2026 and shall be e- mailed to the participating team at their registered e-mail address.
-

06 TEAM REGISTRATION FEES

Standard Registration - Rs. 4000

Early Bird Registration - Rs. 3500

(For Students outside With Accommodation)

For Registration, Students are required to fill the Google Form or Scan the QR Code and Pay the registration fee

Students have to also **MANDATORILY** fill the physical registration for attached at the end of the PDF. Get it signed and sealed from the University. And then attach in the Google Form.

LINK FOR REGISTRATION

<https://forms.gle/ZNsAKEYS9C3yb3c4A>

SCAN TO REGISTER



IT IS MANDATORY TO FILL THE GOOGLE FORM TO COMPLETE THE REGISTRATION PROCESS.

ORAL ROUNDS PROCEDURES**A) GENERAL PROCEDURE**

The language to be used during the Oral Pleading Rounds shall be restricted to English. The competition shall consist of the following rounds:

Online Rounds:

Preliminary Rounds I & II; and
Quarter - Final Round.

Offline Rounds:

Semi - Final Round; and
Final Round.

Δ During each of the abovementioned rounds, the order in which the teams shall present their arguments is as follows:

- Each Speaker shall have to conduct either of the two examinations, and deliver either the Opening Statement or the Closing Statement in each round.
- The Best Speaker Award shall be determined based on the individual aggregate score of the speakers taken only from the Preliminary Rounds.
- Individual Aggregate Score shall be determined as the sum of the following:
 - a) The score of Speaker in Preliminary Round I; and The score of Speaker in Preliminary Round II.
 - b) Participants may use their own bare acts, printouts and commentaries.
 - c) The decision of the Judges as to the marks allotted to each team shall be final and binding.

B) SPLITTING OF TIME BETWEEN SPEAKERS

- Teams shall notify the Court Masters of the division of time between the 2 Speakers, 10 minutes prior to the commencement of the Rounds.
- If Speaker 1 exceeds his/her reserved time, the additional time taken shall be deducted from the time reserved for Speaker 2 and vice-versa. This rule may not be followed if the additional time is awarded by the Judge's discretion.
- While granting additional time, if the Judges do not specify the additional number of minutes granted, it shall be presumed that such additional time granted is 2 minutes.
- The finality of the decision as to the time structure shall vest with the Judges.

C) PRELIMINARY ROUNDS

- Every team shall argue twice in the Preliminary Rounds, once for the Prosecution and once for the Defences. No two teams shall face each other more than once in the Preliminary Rounds.
- Draw of Lots: The match-up of teams in Preliminary Rounds shall be determined on the basis of the draw of lots. The draw of lots shall take place on 14/10/2026.
- In the Preliminary Round the time slots for each round shall be as follows:
 - a) Therefore, both sides shall get 30 minutes each in the Preliminary Rounds.
 - b) Each speaker shall have to conduct either of the two examinations in each round.
 - c) This rule shall apply to the two rounds comprising the Preliminary Round.
 - d) Number of witnesses allowed to be examined shall be 2 during the Preliminary Rounds.

D) ADVANCED ROUNDS

- The Advanced Rounds shall include the following rounds: Quarter - Final Round; Semi - Final Round; and Final Round.
- In the Quarter - Final, Semi - Final and the Final Rounds, the time slots for each round shall be as follows:
 - a) Therefore, both sides shall get 45 minutes in each of the Advanced Rounds [Quarter - Final, Semi - Final and the Final Rounds].
 - b) Each speaker shall have to conduct either Examination-in-Chief or Cross-Examination of all witnesses in each round.
 - c) It would be necessary to Examine and Cross-Examine all the witnesses including expert witnesses.
 - d) Each Speaker shall deliver either the Opening Statement or the Closing Statement in each round.

DETAILS OF ROUNDS	TIME ALLOCATED
Opening Statement (i.e. submissions on charge) on behalf of Prosecution	5 Minutes
Opening Statement (i.e. submissions on charge) on behalf of Defence.	5 Minutes
Examination(s)-in-Chief on behalf of the Prosecution.	14 Minutes
Cross Examination(s) on behalf of the Defence.	16 Minutes
Examination(s)-in-Chief on behalf of the Defence	14 Minutes
Cross Examination(s) on behalf of the Prosecution	16 Minutes
Closing Statement on behalf of the Prosecution.	10 Minutes
Closing Statement on behalf of the Defence.	10 Minutes
TOTAL	45 Minutes

E) JUDGING IN ORAL: PRELIMINARY ROUNDS [I & II]

1. There shall be two Preliminary Rounds to ensure that each team is given the opportunity to argue from both sides of the Proposition.
2. The fixtures for the Preliminary Rounds shall be determined by draw of lots.
3. The qualification of teams to the Advanced Rounds shall be determined on the basis of the win or loss of the team in each Preliminary Round.
4. The win or loss of a team shall be determined on the basis of aggregate score. The team with a higher aggregate score shall win the round.
5. The aggregate score of a team shall be computed as the total of: Oral Score of Speaker 1 & Oral Score of Speaker 2.
6. Selection process for Quarter - Finals:
 - Teams that win both the Preliminary Rounds shall go to the Quarter-Final Round.
 - If there are more than 8 teams that have won both the Preliminary Rounds, each of them shall be ranked according to their aggregate scores and the top eight teams so ranked shall go to the Quarter - Final Round.

7. If there are less than eight teams having two wins each, the teams having two wins each shall qualify for the Quarter - Final Round. For the remaining places, teams having less than two wins each shall be ranked according to their aggregate scores and the highest teams thus ranked will be sent to the Quarter - Final Round. If teams are tied after ranking the aggregate scores, then the memorial score after charging penalties shall be taken into consideration to proceed in the next round.

8. In case of a tie in aggregate score of both the Preliminary Rounds, it shall be resolved in the following order:

The team with highest memorial score after charging penalties qualifies for Quarter - Finals.

Highest Score of the team under the oral submissions scoring criteria head 'Knowledge of Law & Facts.

F) JUDGING IN ORAL: QUARTER - FINAL ROUNDS

- The eight teams that proceed to the Quarter - Final Rounds, as determined by the Rules above, shall each argue only once for the side allotted by draw of lots. The fixtures for the Quarter - Final Rounds shall be decided through draw of lots.
- Four teams shall qualify for the Semi - Final Rounds on a knock out basis, i.e., the winner of each Quarter - Final Round shall qualify to the Semi - Final Rounds. The knockout shall be decided based on the oral rounds only.
- The maximum time for Arguments per side shall be 45 minutes.

G) JUDGING IN ORAL: SEMI - FINAL ROUNDS

- The four teams that proceed to the Semi - Final Rounds, as determined by the Rule above, shall each argue only once for the side allotted by draw of lots. The fixtures for the Semi - Final Rounds shall be decided through Draw of Lots.
- Two teams shall qualify for the Final Round on a knock out basis, i.e., the winner of each Semi - Final Rounds shall qualify to the Final Round.
- The knockout shall be decided based on the oral rounds only.
- Each side shall get a maximum time of 45 minutes to present their arguments.

H) JUDGING IN ORAL: FINAL ROUNDS

- The two teams that proceed to the Final Round, as determined by the Rules above, shall each argue only once for the side allotted by Draw of Lots.
- The team which wins the Final Round shall be declared as the 'Best Team.'
- The other team shall be declared as the 'Runner Up'.
- The maximum time for arguments per side shall be the same as in the Semi - Finals Rounds.

I) DELAY IN APPEARANCE/PRESENTATION

If a team scheduled to take part in a Round does not appear within 10 minutes of the scheduled time, the other team present shall be allowed to submit 'ex-parte'.

NOTE: Use of any Electronic Gadgets is strictly prohibited during Oral Rounds. Non-compliance with the Rules shall lead to immediate disqualification.

08 MISCELLANEOUS

A) GENERAL ETIQUETTES

- Participants are expected to behave in a dignified manner and not to cause any inconvenience to the Organizers, the Judges of the Competition or any of the other participants.
- The Organizers reserve the right to take appropriate action for any unethical, unprofessional or immoral conduct.
- All interpretations, as well as any waivers, consents or other decisions in the administration of the competition are at the complete discretion of the Organizers.
- Any decision made by the Organizers shall be final and binding on all participating teams.

B) SCOUTING

- Teams shall not be allowed to observe the Oral Rounds of another team unless they have been officially knocked out of the Competition. Scouting is strictly prohibited. Scouting by any team shall entail immediate disqualification.

C) ADHERENCE TO ANONYMITY

- During the Oral Rounds, participating teams shall not state their names or the name of the Institution to which they belong or any personal details and instead must use the Team Code allotted to them.
- Failure to comply with any of the conditions stipulated above shall result in immediate disqualification of the team. The decision of the Organizing Committee in this regard would be final.

D) ONLINE PLATFORM RULES

The participants must ensure that they have a stable internet connection with good video and audio facilities. They must use laptops or PC for the oral rounds.

The participants shall be permitted to use the screen share feature for making their submissions.

Participants are required to use the latest version of Google Chrome or Firefox.

At the time when one participant is speaking, others are expected to keep their microphones on mute.

E) ACCOMODATION AND MEALS (OFFLINE MODE)

Accommodation shall be provided by MOCK TRIAL SOCIETY to the teams qualifying for the Offline Rounds [Semi-Final and Final Rounds].

Respective teams who wish to arrive or leave a day before or after the event ends respectively, need to submit a regular accommodation amount for adjustment.

Note: Drinking and Smoking is strictly prohibited. Non-compliance of this rule shall lead to disqualification and a strict action.

AWARDS & CERTIFICATES

A) GENERAL DETAILS

- All the Certificates of merit and participation shall be provided to the qualifying teams and participating teams respectively, in accordance within the mode [either Online or Offline] in which the same is secured by the respective teams.
- On the occasion of a final qualification in Online Rounds, the teams shall be awarded with E-certificates only [Inclusive of Participation & Merit Certificates]; however, on the occasion of final qualification in Offline Rounds, the teams shall be awarded with Certificates in Hard Copy only [Inclusive of Participation & Merit Certificates].
- Awards & Certifications which are single candidature specific; [i.e., 'Best Counsel', & 'Best Witness'] shall be provided in Electronic Form only, except if the respective Winner is qualified in either of the Offline Rounds.
- All the Awards shall be announced during the Valedictory Ceremony, to be conducted on 20th September 2026.
- Note: Cash Awards shall be provided post acquiring the details of Winners; [i.e. Institution ID Card, Bank Account, etc.]; and the subsequent submission of the due documents as required by the committee. The same shall be processed post the due process is followed by the organisers.

B) ONLINE ROUNDS

- E-certificates of Merit and Participation shall be given to all the teams qualifying for Quarter - Finals; and the participating teams respectively. E-certificates of merit and E-certificates of Participation shall be E- mailed to the registered E-mail Addresses of the first contact person of all the respective teams post it is announced in Valedictory Ceremony.

C) OFFLINE ROUNDS

- Certificates [Hard - Copy] of Merit shall be given to all the teams qualifying for Semi - Final and Final Rounds; and the participating teams present in the Offline Rounds respectively.
- Certificates [Hard - Copy] shall be awarded only to the participants present during the Valedictory Ceremony and under no circumstances to the absentees. In the event of failure to collect the respective certificates, no E-certificates or an acknowledgement E-mail of Participation shall be sent by the host college.

AWARDS & CERTIFICATES



“
WINNING TEAM
”

51000/-



“
RUNNER UP TEAM
”

31000/-



“
BEST COUNSEL
”

5100/-



“
BEST WITNESS
”

5100/-



“
BEST RESEARCHER
”

5100/-



THE PROPOSITION

**IN THE COURT OF THE JUDICIAL MAGISTRATE FIRST CLASS AT
INDRAPUR, STATE OF MANDHYA**

STATE OF MANDHYA

V.

NAINA SHARMA & RAGHAV SHARMA

BRIEF FACTS

1. The State of Mandhya is a fictional State within the Union of India. All persons, places, institutions, police stations, hospitals and other entities mentioned in this proposition are fictional. The laws of India applicable on the dates stated in the proposition shall govern the proceedings.

2. Dev Malhotra, aged thirty-four years, is employed as a project manager with a private infrastructure company in Indrapur. Naina Sharma, aged thirty-two years, is an interior designer. They met in 2022 and married on 18 August 2024. After their marriage, they began residing at Flat No. 804, Lakeview Residency, Indrapur. Raghav Sharma, aged thirty-six years, is Naina's elder brother and resides approximately fifteen kilometres from Lakeview Residency.

3. During the first few months of the marriage, Dev and Naina continued their respective occupations and maintained a separate household. By November 2024, disagreements between them had become frequent. The reasons for the deterioration of the relationship are disputed. Dev states that Naina became increasingly controlling about his finances, friendships and movements and frequently demanded access to his phone. Naina disputes this and states that Dev had become secretive about his finances, frequently returned home late and reacted aggressively whenever she questioned his conduct.

4. On 18 November 2024, Dev and Naina had an argument concerning a payment made from their joint bank account. The joint-account extract later collected during investigation records an electronic debit of ₹48,500 on 18 November 2024. The entry contains a transaction reference but does not identify which account-holder initiated it or the purpose for which it was made. Dev states that Naina slapped him and pushed him against a wall before scratching the left side of his neck. Naina denies intentionally striking him and states that Dev attempted to leave while the argument was continuing, during which she held his arm and the injuries occurred. Dev attended CityCare Hospital later that evening. The medical record noted a superficial scalp injury, three linear abrasions over the anterior neck and tenderness over the left shoulder. No fracture was detected. On the following day, Dev submitted a written complaint at Lakeview Police Station and enclosed the medical record. The complaint was entered in the station record, but no First Information Report was registered.

5. Inspector Vikram Rana, who was on duty when the complaint was received, states that Dev and Naina had given materially different accounts and that Dev had indicated that he did not wish to end the marriage. According to Rana, he advised the parties to attend counselling. Dev states that Rana told him that matrimonial quarrels should not be converted into criminal cases and asked whether he wanted to “send his wife to jail”. There is no recording of the conversation.

6. On 2 December 2024, the parties attended a counselling session at the Indrapur Family Assistance Centre. Rhea Thomas, the counsellor, recorded that both parties complained of aggressive conduct by the other. Dev stated that he was apprehensive about arguments at home and did not know whether approaching the police had made the situation worse. Naina stated that Dev treated every disagreement as a criminal matter and that she did not want the police involved in their marriage. Rhea did not express an opinion as to which party was responsible for the physical incidents alleged by them.

7. On 14 January 2025, another argument took place at the residence. Dev states that Naina stood near the main door and prevented him from leaving and subsequently struck him on the head with a metal table lamp. He further states that, when he attempted to leave the apartment later, Naina closed the bedroom door from outside and retained the key for approximately forty minutes. Naina states that Dev had become aggressive and that she moved away from him. According to her, the lamp was knocked down when Dev attempted to move past her. She admits closing the bedroom door but states that she did so because Dev was shouting and that she intended to give both of them time to calm down.

8. Dev was examined at CityCare Hospital later that night. The medical record noted a 3.1 cm scalp laceration, swelling over the left forearm and bruising over the right shoulder. The doctor did not express an opinion identifying the person responsible for the injuries. On 15 January 2025, Dev submitted another written complaint at Lakeview Police Station referring to the incident and alleging that he had been prevented from leaving the bedroom. The complaint was entered in the station record. No First Information Report was registered.

9. Inspector Rana states that the second complaint appeared to arise from a continuing matrimonial dispute in which both spouses were making allegations against each other. He states that Dev and Naina continued to reside together and that he considered counselling appropriate. Dev states that Rana told him that the police could not “keep registering cases every time a husband and wife fight”. The station record contains no written assessment explaining why the second complaint was not registered as an FIR.

10. On 3 February 2025, Dev sent an email to the Deputy Commissioner of Police, Indrapur, attaching copies of his two complaints, medical records and photographs of his injuries. The email was received at approximately 4:17 p.m. and forwarded to Lakeview Police Station at approximately 5:03 p.m. Inspector Rana acknowledges receiving it. He states that he spoke to Dev by telephone on 5th February and informed him that the matter would be examined. Dev states that Rana did not discuss the substance of the complaints with him. No further action concerning the earlier complaints is recorded before 20 February 2025.

11. On 20 February 2025, Dev and Naina exchanged a series of WhatsApp messages concerning the earlier complaints. Dev wrote that he was documenting what was happening and would approach the police again if there was another incident. Naina replied that Dev provoked arguments and preserved only the portions that suited him. Among the messages subsequently recovered were: “After the way you behaved, if you go to the police again, you will regret it.” and “You know who they will believe.” Naina does not dispute that the messages were sent from the WhatsApp account associated with her, but disputes the meaning attributed to them. The complete conversation was recovered from the devices. The forensic report records the recovery and does not express an opinion on the intention of either sender.

12. On 12 March 2025, Raghav visited Dev and Naina at their residence after Naina telephoned him following an argument. Dev states that Raghav spoke to him about the earlier complaints and told him that nobody would take a husband's complaint seriously. Raghav denies making the statement and says that Naina had called him because she was concerned about another argument with Dev. According to Raghav, he attempted to persuade both parties not to involve the police and left after approximately forty minutes. CCTV footage from the building lobby establishes Raghav's arrival and departure but does not record the conversation inside the apartment. No police complaint was made concerning the visit.

13. On 28 March 2025, Dev returned to Lakeview Residency at approximately 9:50 p.m. Naina was already at the apartment. Device call-log metadata later recovered during investigation records an outgoing call from the handset associated with Naina to Raghav at approximately 9:57 p.m.; the content of that call was not recorded. Raghav entered the building at approximately 10:18 p.m. What happened inside the apartment thereafter is disputed. Dev states that Naina questioned him about his continued communication with the police, took his mobile phone and struck him with a wooden decorative object. He states that he fell towards the kitchen counter and attempted to leave, but Naina stood near the doorway and prevented him from doing so. According to Dev, Raghav entered shortly thereafter and remained near the doorway, preventing him from leaving while Naina continued the assault.

14. Naina disputes Dev's account. She states that Dev began shouting at her and pushed her when she attempted to move away. According to her, the wooden object was knocked down during the ensuing struggle and Dev fell against the kitchen counter. She states that she telephoned Raghav because the argument was escalating and that he arrived after the physical struggle had begun and attempted to separate them. Raghav states that he came after receiving Naina's call, entered after hearing an argument, and found both Dev and Naina shouting. He says that he attempted to separate them and denies preventing Dev from leaving.

15. At approximately 10:41 p.m., an emergency call was made from the apartment. The call lasted approximately forty-seven seconds. The caller stated that his wife had hit him and that he was bleeding. A second adult male voice is audible briefly in the background saying words which the transcript renders as "enough ... leave it", though the recording does not identify the speaker or establish to whom the words were addressed. Police personnel reached Flat No. 804 at approximately 10:57 p.m. Dev was found in the kitchen area with blood on his shirt. Naina and Raghav were present in the apartment. A wooden decorative object was found on the floor near the kitchen counter, photographed and seized. Dev was taken to CityCare Hospital.

16. Dev was examined at approximately 11:35 p.m. The medical examination recorded a scalp laceration, bruising over the right shoulder, multiple superficial abrasions and tenderness over the left side of the chest. A CT scan subsequently revealed a fracture of the seventh rib. The final medical opinion stated that the injuries were compatible with blunt-force trauma and that the rib fracture could result either from direct blunt impact or from impact against a hard fixed surface. The medical evidence does not distinguish between those mechanisms and does not identify the person who caused the injuries. Naina was separately taken to CityCare Hospital by the police personnel present at the scene at approximately 11:40 p.m. Naina was also examined. Her medical record noted a superficial abrasion over the right wrist and bruising over her left forearm. She states that these injuries were caused during her struggle with Dev. Dev denies assaulting her.

17. The wooden object was sent for forensic examination. No usable fingerprint capable of identifying the person who handled it at the relevant time was recovered. A small bloodstain on one surface yielded a DNA profile corresponding to Dev Malhotra. The forensic examiner could not determine when or in what circumstances the blood came to be deposited on the object. The police also obtained the mobile device used by Dev and the device associated with Naina's WhatsApp account. The relevant WhatsApp conversation and call-log metadata were extracted from the devices and accompanied by the certificate relied upon by the prosecution for their admission.

18. The emergency call was obtained from the emergency-response system. The system record notes the time of the call and the responding unit. Arjun Mehta, a friend of Dev, states that Dev telephoned him after the police had arrived and said that he had been assaulted. Arjun was not present at Lakeview Residency during the incident. Priya Menon, who resides in a neighbouring flat on the eighth floor, states that shortly before the emergency response she heard raised voices. She first heard a female voice saying words which sounded like “leave me alone”. Shortly thereafter she heard a male voice saying words which sounded like “open the door” or “let me out”, followed by a thud. She did not see inside Flat No. 804, cannot identify either speaker, and cannot say whether anyone was physically restrained or who caused any injury.

19. On 31 March 2025, three days after the incident, Naina submitted a complaint alleging that Dev had subjected her to cruelty. She alleged that Dev had repeatedly humiliated her, controlled her finances, monitored her communications, threatened to leave her without financial support and had behaved violently during arguments. Naina stated that she had remained silent because she did not wish to involve the police in her marriage. Criminal proceedings were initiated on the basis of her complaint.

20. Dev denied the allegations and stated that Naina's complaint had been made after his earlier complaints against her and was intended to create a counter-record. Naina denied that her complaint was retaliatory. The proceedings arising from her complaint against Dev are pending separately and are not before the Court in the present trial.

21. In May 2025, the Deputy Commissioner of Police directed an inquiry into the handling of Dev's earlier complaints. The inquiry examined the complaints dated 19 November 2024 and 15 January 2025, the corresponding station records, the email sent to the DCP office, the medical records and Inspector Rana's explanation.

22. Inspector Rana stated that the November complaint contained allegations concerning a physical altercation arising from a matrimonial dispute and that Dev and Naina had given conflicting versions. In relation to the January complaint, he stated that he had understood Dev's allegation concerning the bedroom to be part of the dispute between the spouses and did not believe that the information available to him required immediate registration of an FIR.

23. When asked why no written assessment had been recorded, Rana stated that the decision had been taken during the ordinary handling of the station's matrimonial complaints. The inquiry report recorded deficiencies in the handling of the complaints and recommended that Rana's conduct be placed before the competent authority. The inquiry officer did not record a finding that Rana had committed a criminal offence.

24. On 29 March 2025, FIR No. 118/2025 was registered at Lakeview Police Station in relation to the incident of 28 March 2025. The earlier complaints were referred to as part of the background.

25. During investigation, the police collected the earlier complaints, station records, medical records, DCP correspondence, CCTV footage, the relevant security-desk visitor register, electronic communications, the emergency call, scene photographs and the wooden object (size of the wooden object). CCTV footage shows Dev entering the building at approximately 9:49 p.m., Raghav entering at approximately 10:18 p.m., appearing again in the eighth-floor lobby at approximately 10:52 p.m., and leaving through the principal entrance at approximately 11:11 p.m. Police personnel entered the building at approximately 10:55 p.m. and reached the apartment shortly thereafter. The cameras do not capture the interior of Flat No. 804 or the alleged assault. The building security supervisor who supplied the footage did not witness the events inside the flat.

26. Investigation was completed in May 2025. On 18 June 2025, the Investigating Officer submitted the police report before the competent court. Naina Sharma was sent for trial for offences punishable under sections 117(2) and 127(2) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023. Raghav Sharma was sent for trial for offences punishable under sections 117(2) and 127(2), read with section 3(5) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023.

27. The Court took cognizance of the offences and, after supply of the police report and accompanying documents and hearing the parties on charge, framed charges against Naina and Raghav. Both accused pleaded not guilty and claimed trial. The charges are reproduced in Annexure 21. The present proceedings are at the stage of prosecution evidence.

28. The prosecution has commenced its evidence. The documentary, medical, forensic and electronic material referred to in the proposition and paperbook has been tendered subject to proof, admissibility and the permissible use of prior statements.

29. The separate proceedings arising from Naina Sharma's complaint against Dev Malhotra are not before this Court. Nothing in the present record shall be treated as a finding on the truth or falsity of the allegations made in those proceedings.

30. No finding has been made that Dev's allegations against Naina are true, that Naina's allegations against Dev are false, or that Raghav participated in the occurrence. The guilt or otherwise of the accused is to be determined solely on the evidence properly brought before the Court.

ISSUES FOR DETERMINATION

ISSUE I — VOLUNTARILY CAUSING GRIEVOUS HURT

Whether the prosecution has proved beyond reasonable doubt that Naina Sharma voluntarily caused grievous hurt to Dev Malhotra during the incident of 28 March 2025?

ISSUE II — WRONGFUL CONFINEMENT

Whether the prosecution has proved beyond reasonable doubt that Naina Sharma wrongfully confined Dev Malhotra during the incident of 14 January 2025 and/or 28 March 2025?

ISSUE III — COMMON INTENTION AND PARTICIPATION

Whether the prosecution has proved beyond reasonable doubt that Raghav Sharma acted in furtherance of a common intention with Naina Sharma during the incident of 28 March 2025 so as to attract joint liability for the grievous hurt and/or wrongful confinement, if proved?

ISSUE IV — ELECTRONIC AND PRIOR EVIDENCE

Whether the electronic records relied upon in the trial, including the WhatsApp conversation, CCTV footage, call-log metadata and emergency-call recording, satisfy the requirements of the Bharatiya Sakshya Adhiniyam, 2023, and what evidentiary weight may be attached to those records, the prior complaints, and the medical and forensic material when read with the oral evidence

WITNESSES AVAILABLE FOR TRIAL

Prosecution: Dev Malhotra; Arjun Mehta; Rhea Thomas; Inspector Vikram Rana; Sameer Khan, security supervisor/camera custodian; Priya Menon, neighbouring resident; the treating medical officer(s); the emergency-response custodian; the forensic examiner(s); and the Investigating Officer.

Defence: Naina Sharma and Raghav Sharma may enter upon defence in accordance with law and the competition rules. No police statement attributed to either accused is supplied as substantive evidence.

Note: Expert/technical witnesses may be examined at the discretion of the Court and, where applicable under the competition rules, shall not be counted within the prescribed PW/DW limit.

NOTE TO PARTICIPANTS

1. The proposition and annexures together constitute the trial record. Participants shall not introduce facts outside that record; reasonable inferences from proved or admitted material are permissible.
2. No complaint, statement, medical record, forensic opinion or electronic record is self-proving merely because it appears in the paperbook. Its admissibility, permissible use and evidentiary weight remain governed by law.
3. The proceedings arising from Naina Sharma's separate complaint against Dev Malhotra are not before the Court in this trial. Participants shall independently research and apply the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023, the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023, the Bharatiya Sakshya Adhiniyam, 2023 and applicable judicial authorities.

**IN THE COURT OF THE JUDICIAL MAGISTRATE FIRST CLASS
AT INDRAPUR, STATE OF MANDHYA**

STATE OF MANDHYA

v.

NAINA SHARMA & RAGHAV SHARMA

TRIAL RECORD NOTE : The proposition and annexures together constitute the trial record. All documentary, medical, forensic and electronic material remains subject to proof, admissibility and the permissible use of prior statements. Participants may test inconsistencies and omissions through examination and cross-examination but shall not introduce facts outside the record.

PAPERBOOK OF ANNEXURES

ANNEXURE	DOCUMENT
1	First Information Report
2	Written complaints of Dev Malhotra and joint-account statement extract
3	Station diary extracts
4	Earlier CityCare medical records
5	Counselling record
6	DCP e-mail and forwarding endorsements
7	Complete WhatsApp conversation
8	Cyber forensic extraction report
9	BSA section 63 certificate
10	Emergency call record and transcript

11	Scene photograph index and seizure memo
12	Dev final MLC, radiology and opinion
13	Naina medical record
14	CCTV footage log and security-desk register extract
15	Forensic report on wooden object
16	Statement of Dev Malhotra
17	Witness statements
18	Complaint of Naina Sharma
19	Administrative inquiry report
20	Police report on completion of investigation
21	Order framing charges and charges

ANNEXURE 1
FIRST INFORMATION REPORT
FIR No. 118/2025

(Under section 173 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023)

1. Acts and sections

Act Sections entered at registration

Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 117(2), 127(2), read with 3(5) where applicable

2. Occurrence of offence

Particular Entry

Day / Date Friday, 28.03.2025

Approximate period 21:50 hrs to 22:57 hrs

Information received 29.03.2025, after medical examination

3. Type of information: Written

4. Place of occurrence: Flat No. 804, Lakeview Residency, Indrapur — within the limits of this police station. Distance and direction: not material to the competition record

5. Informant

Dev Malhotra, aged 34 years, project manager, resident of Flat No. 804, Lakeview Residency, Indrapur. Telephone particulars withheld from the competition record

6. Accused persons

- i. Naina Sharma, aged 32 years, interior designer, wife of the informant, resident of Flat No. 804, Lakeview Residency, Indrapur.
- ii. Raghav Sharma, aged 36 years, brother of accused No. 1, resident of Indrapur — under sections 117(2) and 127(2) read with section 3(5) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023.

7. Reasons for delay in reporting

The informant was removed to CityCare Hospital from the place of occurrence on the night of 28.03.2025 and was examined there. His written information was received at the police station thereafter.

8. Particulars of property involved

One wooden decorative object taken into possession from the place of occurrence. Particulars as per the seizure memo.

9. Contents of the First Information Report

That the informant resides at Flat No. 804, Lakeview Residency, Indrapur with his wife, Smt. Naina Sharma. That on 28.03.2025 the informant returned to Lakeview Residency at about 9:50 p.m. His wife was present in the flat. His wife's brother, Raghav Sharma, came to the flat at about 10:18 p.m. That his wife questioned him about his having continued to contact the police. That she took his mobile phone from him and struck him with a wooden decorative object. That the informant fell towards the kitchen counter. That when he tried to leave the room, his wife stood near the doorway and did not let him go out. That Raghav Sharma came into the room shortly afterwards and stood near the doorway. That Raghav Sharma also did not let the informant leave the room, and his wife continued to assault him. That at about 10:41 p.m. the informant made a call on the emergency response number and stated that he had been assaulted and was bleeding. Police personnel reached the flat at about 10:57 p.m. The informant was found in the kitchen area. He was thereafter taken to CityCare Hospital. That the informant had earlier submitted written complaints at this police station on 19.11.2024 and 15.01.2025 concerning incidents at the same residence, and had also sent an e-mail to the office of the Deputy Commissioner of Police on 03.02.2025. That the informant requests that action be taken in accordance with law.

10. Action taken

The information discloses the commission of cognizable offences under the sections mentioned at item 1. The case has been registered and investigation has been taken up by _____, Sub-Inspector, Lakeview Police Station.

The First Information Report was read over to the informant, who admitted it to be correctly recorded, and a copy was furnished to him free of cost.

Sd/- Informant

Dev Malhotra

Sd/- Officer in charge, Lakeview Police Station

Officer in charge, Lakeview Police Station — particulars not reproduced.

Date and time of despatch to Court: as recorded in the original police record; not separately material to the competition record.

ANNEXURE 2
WRITTEN COMPLAINTS OF DEV MALHOTRA

2 (i) — COMPLAINT DATED 19 NOVEMBER 2024

To,
The Station House Officer,
Lakeview Police Station, Indrapur

Date: 19.11.2024

Subject: Complaint against my wife, Smt. Naina Sharma

Sir,

1. I, Dev Malhotra, aged 34 years, working as a project manager, resident of Flat No. 804, Lakeview Residency, Indrapur, wish to state the following.

2. I was married to Smt. Naina Sharma on 18.08.2024. We reside together at the above address.

3. Yesterday, that is on 18.11.2024, we had an argument at home about a payment that had been made from our joint bank account. During the argument my wife slapped me and pushed me against the wall. When I tried to walk out of the room she scratched the left side of my neck.

4. I went to CityCare Hospital the same evening. I was examined there and my injuries were written down. I am enclosing a copy of the medical paper given to me.

5. I have not told anyone at my office or in my family about this. I am submitting this complaint so that there is a record of what happened, and I request that suitable action be taken.

Yours faithfully,

Sd/-

Dev Malhotra

Telephone particulars withheld from the competition record.

Enclosure: Copy of CityCare Hospital medical record dated 18.11.2024.

2 (ii) — COMPLAINT DATED 15 JANUARY 2025

To,
The Station House Officer,
Lakeview Police Station, Indrapur

Date: 15.01.2025

Subject: Second complaint against my wife, Smt. Naina Sharma
Sir,

1. I had submitted a complaint at this police station on 19.11.2024 about an incident with my wife on 18.11.2024. I am writing again because there has been another incident.

2. Yesterday, 14.01.2025, there was an argument at our flat. My wife stood near the main door and did not let me go out of the flat. She then picked up the metal table lamp and hit me on the head with it.

3. After this I went into the bedroom. When I tried to come out and leave the flat, I found that the bedroom door had been closed from outside. My wife had the key. I was kept inside for about forty minutes and could not come out until she opened the door.

4. I went to CityCare Hospital the same night. I am enclosing a copy of the medical paper.

5. I request that my complaint be taken on record and that action be taken in accordance with law.

Yours faithfully,

Sd/-

Dev Malhotra

Telephone particulars withheld from the competition record.

Enclosure: Copy of CityCare Hospital medical record dated 14.01.2025.

2 (iii) — JOINT ACCOUNT STATEMENT EXTRACT

Account holders: Dev Malhotra and Naina Sharma

Bank and complete account number: not reproduced in the competition record.

DATE	TRANSACTION PARTICULARS	Debit (₹)	Credit (₹)	Running balance (₹)
17.11.2024	Card purchase — reference ending 4412	2,430	—	1,84,760
18.11.2024	Electronic transfer — reference ending 7281	48,500	—	1,36,260
19.11.2024	UPI payment — reference ending 1056	1,280	—	1,34,980

Note: This extract reproduces the relevant entries from the joint-account statement obtained during investigation. The bank record does not identify which joint account-holder initiated the transfer of 18.11.2024 and does not state the purpose of that transfer. (Expert witness needs to be examined)

ANNEXURE 3

CERTIFIED EXTRACTS FROM THE STATION DIARY, LAKEVIEW POLICE STATION

3 (i) — Entry dated 19.11.2024 (Tuesday) — station entry particulars not reproduced.

One Dev Malhotra, project manager, resident of Flat No. 804, Lakeview Residency, attended the police station and submitted a written complaint against his wife, Smt. Naina Sharma. He stated that during an argument at the residence on the previous night she had slapped him, pushed him against a wall and scratched his neck. He produced a copy of a medical paper of CityCare Hospital dated 18.11.2024. Complaint received and taken on record.

Inspector Vikram Rana, on duty, heard the complainant. Smt. Naina Sharma was also heard. Both have given different accounts of the incident. The complainant has stated that he does not wish to end the marriage. Both parties advised to attend counselling.

Sd/- _____, Duty Officer

3 (ii) — Entry dated 15.01.2025 (Wednesday) — station entry particulars not reproduced.

Dev Malhotra attended the police station and submitted a second written complaint against his wife, Smt. Naina Sharma. He has referred to his earlier complaint and has stated that on the night of 14.01.2025 his wife prevented him from leaving the flat, struck him on the head with a metal table lamp, and thereafter closed the bedroom door from outside and kept the key for about forty minutes. He produced a copy of a medical paper of CityCare Hospital dated 14.01.2025. Complaint received and taken on record.

Inspector Vikram Rana informed.

Sd/- _____, Duty Officer

3 (iii) — Certificate

Certified that the entries reproduced above are true extracts from the station diary of Lakeview Police Station, and that these are the only entries appearing in that diary in relation to the complaints of Dev Malhotra between 19.11.2024 and 20.02.2025.

Sd/- [authorised signatory]

Designation: as per original record.

Date: as recorded in the original record.

ANNEXURE 4

CITYCARE HOSPITAL — MEDICAL RECORDS OF DEV MALHOTRA

4 (i) — RECORD DATED 18 NOVEMBER 2024

History as narrated by the patient: Alleged physical altercation at the residence.

On examination:

- (a) Superficial injury over the scalp.
- (b) Three linear abrasions over the anterior aspect of the neck.
- (c) Tenderness over the left shoulder.

Investigations: X-ray. No fracture detected.

Advice: Dressing, analgesics, review if symptoms persist.

Sd/- [authorised signatory]

Medical Officer, CityCare Hospital, Indrapur

Registration particulars: not reproduced.

4 (ii) — RECORD DATED 14 JANUARY 2025

History as narrated by the patient: Alleged assault at the residence.

On examination:

- (a) Laceration over the scalp, 3.1 cm in length.
- (b) Swelling over the left forearm.
- (c) Bruising over the right shoulder.

Advice: Suturing of scalp wound, dressing, analgesics, review after five days.

Note: No opinion is expressed as to the identity of any person in relation to the causation of the above injuries.

Sd/- [authorised signatory]

Medical Officer, CityCare Hospital, Indrapur

Registration particulars: not reproduced.

ANNEXURE 5

INDRAPUR FAMILY ASSISTANCE CENTRE — COUNSELLING RECORD

Record of the session

1. Both parties attended together. Each of them complained of aggressive conduct on the part of the other.
2. Dev Malhotra stated that he was apprehensive about arguments at home. He stated that he did not know whether his having approached the police had made the situation worse. He also stated that he did not think anyone would believe him because he was the husband.
3. Naina Sharma stated that Dev Malhotra was treating every disagreement as a criminal matter. She stated that she did not want the police to be involved in their marriage.
4. No opinion is recorded by the undersigned as to which party was responsible for the physical incidents alleged by them.

Sd/-

Rhea Thomas

Counsellor, Indrapur Family Assistance Centre

ANNEXURE 6

6(i) — E-MAIL TO THE DEPUTY COMMISSIONER OF POLICE, INDRAPUR

From: Dev Malhotra [e-mail address not reproduced]

To: Office of the Deputy Commissioner of Police, Indrapur [official e-mail address not reproduced]

Date: 03.02.2025 (Monday)

Subject: Complaints submitted at Lakeview Police Station — request for consideration

Sir,

1. I am writing about two complaints I submitted at Lakeview Police Station, on 19.11.2024 and 15.01.2025, against my wife, Smt. Naina Sharma. Both complaints concerned incidents at our flat at Lakeview Residency.

2. I am attaching copies of both complaints, the medical records of my examination at CityCare Hospital on each occasion, and photographs of the injuries I sustained.

3. I would be grateful if the matter could be looked into.

Dev Malhotra

Flat No. 804, Lakeview Residency, Indrapur

Telephone particulars withheld from the competition record.

Attachments:

(a) Complaint dated 19.11.2024.

(b) Complaint dated 15.01.2025.

(c) CityCare Hospital medical record dated 18.11.2024.

(d) CityCare Hospital medical record dated 14.01.2025.

(e) Photographs of injuries supplied with the e-mail.

6(ii) — OFFICE ENDORSEMENTS

Office of the Deputy Commissioner of Police, Indrapur

1. Received electronically on 03.02.2025 at 16:17 hrs. Office diary particulars not reproduced.

2. Forwarded electronically to the Station House Officer, Lakeview Police Station, on 03.02.2025 at 17:03 hrs, with attachments, for necessary action and report.

Sd/- [authorised signatory]

For Deputy Commissioner of Police, Indrapur

ANNEXURE 7

EXTRACTED WHATSAPP CONVERSATION DATED 20 FEBRUARY 2025

Extracted from the device produced during investigation. Reproduced in full, in the sequence recorded in the extraction.

Time	Sender	Message
18:42	Dev	I wrote to the DCP because nothing happened after the January complaint.
18:44	Naina	You keep taking private arguments outside and making them sound like crimes.
18:45	Dev	I went to the hospital twice. I asked you not to stop me from leaving.
18:47	Naina	And you never mention how you shout or the marks I get when I try to move away.
18:49	Dev	I did not hit you. I am not going to pretend the complaints did not happen.
18:52	Naina	I closed the bedroom door because you were shouting. You know that.
18:53	Dev	I am documenting this now. If it happens again, there will be a record.

18:54	Naina	You keep pushing until I react and then save the part that suits you.
18:55	Dev	If this happens again I will go to the police again.
18:56	Naina	After the way you behaved, if you go to the police again, you will regret it.
18:57	Dev	Is that supposed to be a threat?
18:58	Naina	You know who they will believe.
19:00	Dev	I am keeping this conversation.
19:02	Naina	Keep it. Just keep the whole conversation, not only the lines that suit you.

No further messages were exchanged between the two accounts on 20.02.2025.

ANNEXURE 8

CYBER FORENSIC EXTRACTION REPORT

8.1 Articles received for examination

(1) Article D-1: one mobile handset produced by Dev Malhotra. Device identifiers are retained in the laboratory case sheet and are not reproduced in the competition record.

(2) Article N-1: one mobile handset associated with the WhatsApp account attributed to Naina Sharma. Device identifiers are retained in the laboratory case sheet and are not reproduced in the competition record.

8.2 Examination conducted.

Both handsets were received in sealed condition. Logical extraction of the WhatsApp application data was carried out on each handset using a validated forensic extraction workstation. The extracted data was written to read-only media and hash values were generated. Call-log metadata on Article N-1 records an outgoing call at approximately 21:57 hrs on 28.03.2025 to the contact/number associated in the device with Raghav Sharma. The recorded duration is less than one minute. The content of the call is not available from the device extraction.

8.3 Findings

(1) A conversation between the two accounts, dated 20.02.2025, was recovered from both handsets. The messages recovered from each handset correspond in sequence, time and content. The recovered conversation is reproduced at Annexure 7.

(2) Hash value of the extracted conversation file (SHA-256):
c6595efc3c3e10664700718915a42636108aef037235365bf5d1d3b56a18bc01

(3) No indication of deletion, insertion or modification within the recovered conversation was observed on either handset.

8.4 Note

This report records the recovery of the electronic records described above and the technical particulars of that recovery. No opinion is expressed as to the meaning of any message, or as to the intention of the sender of any message, or as to the identity of the person operating either handset at the time any message was sent.

Sd/- [authorised signatory]

Scientific Officer (Cyber)

Forensic Science Laboratory, Indrapur.

ANNEXURE 9

CERTIFICATE UNDER SECTION 63 OF THE BHARATIYA SAKSHYA ADHINIYAM, 2023

In the form of the Schedule to the Adhiniyam

PART A — to be filled by the party

1. I, the authorised custodian producing the electronic record described below, certify as follows.

2. I am lawfully in control of the computer/communication device and of the activities in relation to which the electronic records described below were produced.

3. The electronic records produced are:

Electronic record

Source / description

SHA-256

Electronic record	Source / description	SHA-256
WhatsApp conversation	Forensic export from Articles D-1 and N-1	c6595efc3c3e10664700718915a42636108aef037235365bf5d1d3b56a18bc01
CCTV export	Lakeview Residency DVR export, cameras C-1 and C-2	44350c1bf32aa4b6f862d25b26bdb6ecb7212c9edd7bd9e3c55c4ed6ea470e68
Emergency call	Emergency Response Centre audio export	f6e6a42c13ca7242355d7331a9610eface678004c554971fb367fc2da9bb7239

4. Each of the above records was produced by a computer or communication device which was used regularly to create, store or process information for the purposes of activities regularly carried on over that period by the person having lawful control over its use; information of the kind contained in the records was regularly fed into it in the ordinary course of those activities; throughout the material part of that period it was operating properly, or, if not, such non-operation was not such as to affect the records or the accuracy of their contents; and the information contained in the records reproduces or is derived from information fed into it in the ordinary course of those activities.

5. The manner of production of each record is described in the report accompanying it.

6. I state that the hash values of the electronic/digital records are those set out in the table above.

Hash function used: SHA-256.

Sd/- [authorised signatory]

Date: as recorded in the original record. Place: Indrapur

PART B — to be filled by the expert

I, the examining expert, having examined the electronic records described in Part A and the devices and systems from which they were produced, state that the records have been produced in the manner described, that the hash values recorded in Part A correspond to the records produced, and that no alteration of the records has been detected.

Sd/- [authorised signatory]

Designation: as per original record.

Date: as recorded in the original record. Place: Indrapur

ANNEXURE 10

**EMERGENCY RESPONSE CALL RECORD AND TRANSCRIPT —
28 MARCH 2025**

Part I — Call record

Field	Record
Date	28.03.2025
Call received	22:41 hrs
Duration	47 seconds
Location supplied	Lakeview Residency, Indrapur
Unit dispatched	Patrol unit assigned by control room
Arrival recorded	22:57 hrs

Part II — Transcript

Transcript of the recording of the call. Speech which could not be made out is shown as indistinct.

Operator: Emergency response. Tell me what has happened.

Caller: My wife hit me. I am bleeding. Please send someone.

Operator: Are you inside the residence now?

Caller: Yes. Lakeview Residency, Flat 804. [adult male voice in background: “enough ... leave it”]

Operator: Stay on the line if you can. A unit is being sent.

Caller: Please come quickly. [call ends]

Note: A second adult male voice is audible briefly in the background. The recording does not identify the speaker, establish to whom the words were addressed, or show whether the speaker was intervening in or participating in the incident.

Sd/- [authorised signatory]

For Emergency Response Centre, Indrapur

ANNEXURE 11

SCENE PHOTOGRAPH INDEX AND SEIZURE MEMO

Part I — Index of photographs taken at the place of occurrence

Photo	Subject
P-1	General view of kitchen and adjoining doorway
P-2	Wooden decorative object on floor near kitchen counter before seizure
P-3	Area of kitchen counter and floor
P-4	Blood staining visible on Dev Malhotra's shirt as observed by first responders

Place: Flat No. 804, Lakeview Residency, Indrapur

Date and time: 28.03.2025, after arrival of the responding police unit.

Photographs taken by: member of the responding/investigating police team; identity recorded in the case diary.

Part II — Seizure memo

Prepared at Flat No. 804, Lakeview Residency, Indrapur, during the scene examination commencing on the night of 28.03.2025.

Independent witnesses to the seizure: particulars retained in the police file; not otherwise material to the competition record.

The following article was found and taken into possession from the place of occurrence:

Item 1 — One wooden decorative object, found lying on the floor near the kitchen counter. The object was photographed in situ and marked Article W-1.

The wooden object recovered from the scene was a solid hardwood decorative statuette (a sheesham-wood carved figurine of the type kept on the kitchen counter/sideboard), measuring approximately 34 cm in length, with a body diameter tapering from approximately 7 cm at its thicker (basal) end to approximately 4 cm at its narrower (upper) end, and weighing approximately 950 grams. The base was flat and unpolished; the body was solid, without any hollow cavity, and had a smooth lacquered finish save for the base. No sharp edges were noted, but the basal end presented a relatively hard, flat, and narrow striking surface.

The article was photographed in position before removal, packed, sealed and labelled Article W-1. The specimen seal was retained with the case property record.

The process of taking possession of the article, the preparation of this list and the signing of this list by the witnesses were recorded through audio-video electronic means as required by section 105 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023. The recording has been forwarded to the Court of the Judicial Magistrate First Class, Indrapur, with the case property papers.

A copy of this memo has been furnished to the occupants of the premises.

ANNEXURE 12

CITYCARE HOSPITAL — MEDICO-LEGAL RECORD, RADIOLOGY REPORT AND FINAL MEDICAL OPINION

Part I — Medico-legal record dated 28 March 2025

History as narrated: Alleged assault at the residence on the same night.

On examination:

- (a) Laceration over the scalp.
- (b) Bruising over the right shoulder.
- (c) Multiple superficial abrasions.
- (d) Tenderness over the left side of the chest.

Advice: Suturing of scalp wound. Chest to be evaluated radiologically.

Admission for observation.

Sd/- [authorised signatory]

Medical Officer, CityCare Hospital, Indrapur

Part II — Radiology report

Findings: Fracture of the seventh rib on the left side. No pneumothorax. No haemothorax.

Impression: Fracture of the seventh rib.

Sd/- [authorised signatory]

Consultant Radiologist, CityCare Hospital, Indrapur

Part III — Final medical opinion

With reference to the examination of Dev Malhotra on 28.03.2025 and the subsequent radiological examination, the following opinion is furnished.

1. The injuries recorded on examination, and the fracture of the seventh rib demonstrated on computed tomography, are compatible with blunt-force trauma. The rib fracture may result from a direct blunt impact or from the chest striking a hard fixed surface. On the medical material alone, the two mechanisms cannot be distinguished.

2. No opinion is expressed as to the identity of the person by whom any of the said injuries was caused.

Sd/- [authorised signatory]

Medical Officer, CityCare Hospital, Indrapur

Date: as recorded in the original record.

ANNEXURE 13

CITYCARE HOSPITAL — MEDICAL RECORD OF NAINA SHARMA

History as narrated by the patient: Alleged struggle at the residence on the night of 28.03.2025.

On examination:

(a) Superficial abrasion over the right wrist.

(b) Bruising over the left forearm.

Advice: Local dressing, analgesics.

Note: The abrasion and bruising are compatible with recent blunt contact or a physical struggle. No opinion is expressed as to the precise mechanism or the identity of any person in relation to their causation.

Sd/- [authorised signatory]

Medical Officer, CityCare Hospital, Indrapur

ANNEXURE 14

CCTV FOOTAGE LOG AND SECURITY-DESK REGISTER EXTRACT — LAKEVIEW RESIDENCY

Part I — CCTV FOOTAGE LOG

Prepared from the footage copied from the digital video recorder installed at Lakeview Residency, Indrapur, and furnished to the Investigating Officer.
Cameras from which footage was copied

Camera	Coverage
C-1	Ground-floor lobby and principal entrance
C-2	Eighth-floor lift lobby/corridor; does not show interior of Flat 804

Log — 12.03.2025 (Wednesday), camera C-1

Time	Observation
19:06	Raghav Sharma enters the building lobby.
19:47	Raghav Sharma exits through the principal entrance.

Log — 28.03.2025 (Friday), camera C-1

Time	Observation
21:49	Dev Malhotra enters the building.
22:18	Raghav Sharma enters the building.
22:55	Police personnel enter the building.
23:11	Raghav Sharma exits through the principal entrance.

Log — 28.03.2025, camera C-2

Time	Observation
22:19	Raghav Sharma is seen leaving the lift area in the direction of Flat 804.
22:52	Raghav Sharma appears in the eighth-floor lobby near the lift for several seconds and then moves out of camera view in the direction of the flats.
22:56	Police personnel emerge from the lift and proceed along the corridor.

Notes recorded by the person preparing this log

- (i) Camera C-2 covers the corridor only. It does not record the interior of Flat No. 804.
- (ii) There is no camera covering the interior of Flat No. 804.
- (iii) No camera records the incident alleged to have taken place inside Flat No. 804.
- (iv) The timings shown above are as displayed by the recording system.

Sd/- [authorised signatory]
Designation: as per original record.
Date: as recorded in the original record.

Part II — SECURITY DESK VISITOR REGISTER EXTRACT

Extract from the handwritten visitor register maintained at the ground-floor security desk for the night of 28 March 2025.

Time entered	Visitor / entry	Flat	Remark
22:15	R. Sharma	804	Visitor
22:54	Police patrol	804	Directed to eighth floor

Note: The visitor register is handwritten. It does not record whether the time was written at the moment of entry or shortly thereafter. The CCTV-system timestamps are reproduced in Part I above.

ANNEXURE 15

FORENSIC EXAMINATION REPORT — WOODEN DECORATIVE OBJECT

Article received

One sealed parcel stated to contain Article W-1, the wooden decorative object seized from Flat No. 804, Lakeview Residency, Indrapur. The seal was found intact and tallied with the specimen seal received.

Examination conducted

The article was examined for latent fingerprints and for biological and other trace material.

Results

1. No fingerprint of a quality sufficient for comparison was developed on the article.
2. A small reddish-brown stain on one surface tested positive for human blood. DNA profiling yielded a profile corresponding to Dev Malhotra. No scientific method applied in this examination can determine when or by what mechanism the blood was deposited on the article.

Note : No usable fingerprint or other trace capable of identifying the person who handled Article W-1 at the relevant time was recovered.

Sd/- [authorised signatory]

Assistant Director

Forensic Science Laboratory, Indrapur.

ANNEXURE 16

STATEMENT OF DEV MALHOTRA

Recorded during investigation under section 180 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023; unsigned as required by section 181 and subject to the uses permitted by law.

1. I married Naina Sharma on 18 August 2024. We met in 2022. After the marriage we began living at Flat No. 804, Lakeview Residency. Both of us continued in our own work and we ran the household separately from our families.
2. By November 2024 we were arguing often. My case is that Naina had become controlling about my money, my friends and where I went. She would ask for my phone. She would question me about talking to people at work and to my friends. She told me that if I did not do as she wanted she would show my private messages to my office and to my family.
3. On 18 November 2024 we argued about a payment that had gone out of our joint account. During that argument she slapped me and pushed me against the wall. When I tried to walk out of the room she scratched the left side of my neck. I went to CityCare Hospital that evening and was examined. I did not go to the police that night.
4. The next day, 19 November 2024, I went to Lakeview Police Station and gave a written complaint. I gave a copy of my hospital paper with it. Inspector Vikram Rana was on duty. Naina was also called and spoken to. I was asked whether I wanted to end the marriage and I said no. Inspector Rana told me that quarrels between husband and wife should not be turned into criminal cases. He asked me whether I wanted to send my wife to jail. No FIR was registered. We were told to go for counselling.

5. On 2 December 2024 we both went to the Indrapur Family Assistance Centre. Rhea Thomas took the session. I said that I was worried about the arguments at home and that I did not know whether going to the police had made things worse. I also said that I did not think anybody would believe me because I am the husband.

6. On 14 January 2025 there was another argument. Naina stood near the main door and did not let me go out of the flat. She picked up the metal table lamp and hit me on the head with it. I went into the bedroom afterwards. When I tried to come out and leave the flat I found that the bedroom door had been locked from outside and she had the key. I was inside for about forty minutes. I went to CityCare Hospital the same night and was examined.

7. On 15 January 2025 I gave a second written complaint at Lakeview Police Station with a copy of the hospital paper. Inspector Rana said that the police could not keep registering cases every time a husband and wife fight. Again no FIR was registered.

8. On 3 February 2025 I sent an email to the office of the Deputy Commissioner of Police. I attached both complaints, both hospital papers and photographs of my injuries. Inspector Rana telephoned me on 5 February 2025. He did not discuss what was in the complaints.

9. On 20 February 2025 Naina and I exchanged messages on WhatsApp about my having written to the DCP office. In those messages she wrote, "After the way you behaved, if you go to the police again, you will regret it," and "You know who they will believe."

10. On 12 March 2025 Raghav Sharma, Naina's brother, came to our flat after she telephoned him following an argument. He spoke to me about the complaints I had made. He told me that nobody would take a husband's complaint seriously. He left after some time. I did not complain about that visit.

11. On 28 March 2025 I came back to Lakeview Residency at about 9:50 p.m. Naina was already in the flat. At about 10:18 p.m. Raghav came to the flat. Naina asked me about my having continued to contact the police. She took my mobile phone from me. She then struck me with a wooden decorative object that we keep in the drawing room. I fell towards the kitchen counter. When I tried to get out of the room she stood in the doorway and did not let me pass. Raghav came into the room a short time later and stood near the doorway. He also did not let me leave, and Naina went on hitting me.

12. At about 10:41 p.m. I managed to make a call on the emergency number. I said that my wife had hit me and that I was bleeding. The call was short. The police came at about 10:57 p.m. I was in the kitchen area and there was blood on my shirt. Naina and Raghav were in the flat. The wooden object was on the floor near the kitchen counter. The police took photographs and took the object away.

13. I was taken to CityCare Hospital and examined the same night. I was told later that a scan had shown a fracture of a rib.

14. I gave written information at the police station and FIR No. 118/2025 was registered on 29 March 2025.

15. I deny that I assaulted Naina at any time. I deny that I pushed her on 28 March 2025.

ANNEXURE 17

STATEMENTS OF WITNESSES

Recorded during investigation under section 180 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023; unsigned as required by section 181 and subject to the uses permitted by law.

17(i) — ARJUN MEHTA

1. I have known Dev Malhotra for some years and we are friends.
2. Shortly after the incident of 28 March 2025 Dev telephoned me. He told me that he had been assaulted. That is what he said to me on the phone.
3. I was not at Lakeview Residency that night. I did not see anything that happened there. Whatever I know about that night is what Dev told me on the telephone and what I have heard afterwards.

17(ii) — RHEA THOMAS

1. I am attached to the Indrapur Family Assistance Centre as a counsellor.
 2. On 2 December 2024 Dev Malhotra and Naina Sharma attended a session at the Centre. I conducted that session. It was the only session they attended with me.
 3. Both of them complained of aggressive conduct by the other. Dev Malhotra said that he was apprehensive about arguments at home and that he did not know whether approaching the police had made the situation worse. He also said that he did not think anyone would believe him because he was the husband. Naina Sharma said that Dev Malhotra was treating every disagreement as a criminal matter and that she did not want the police involved in her marriage.
 4. I made a written record of the session at the time. That record is with the Centre and a copy has been furnished to the police.
- possible for the physical incidents they alleged. I was not present at their residence at any time and I have no knowledge of what took place there.

5. I did not form or record any opinion as to which of them was responsible for the physical incidents they alleged. I was not present at their residence at any time and I have no knowledge of what took place there.

17(iii) — INSPECTOR VIKRAM RANA

1. I was posted at Lakeview Police Station in about March 2024.

2. On 19 November 2024 I was the officer on duty when Dev Malhotra came to the police station and submitted a written complaint against his wife. He produced a copy of a hospital paper along with it. The complaint was entered in the station record.

3. I spoke to Dev Malhotra. His wife was also called and heard. The two of them gave materially different accounts of what had happened. Dev Malhotra told me that he did not wish to end the marriage. I advised both of them to attend counselling. No First Information Report was registered on that complaint. There is no audio or video recording of my conversation with Dev Malhotra.

4. On 15 January 2025 Dev Malhotra submitted a second written complaint at the police station, which was also entered in the station record. My assessment at that time was that the allegations arose from a continuing matrimonial dispute in which both spouses were making allegations against each other. They were continuing to reside together. I considered that the matter required counselling. No First Information Report was registered on that complaint either.

5. I did not record a written assessment explaining the treatment of the complaint of 15 January 2025. The decision was taken in the ordinary course of dealing with matrimonial complaints at the station.

6. I received the communication forwarded from the office of the Deputy Commissioner of Police on 3 February 2025. I telephoned Dev Malhotra on 5 February 2025 and told him that the matter would be examined.

7. I have given my explanation in the departmental inquiry into the handling of these complaints and I say the same here.

8. I was not present at Flat No. 804 on 28 March 2025 and I have no personal knowledge of what took place there. I was not the officer who registered FIR No. 118/2025 and I have not investigated this case.

17(iv) — SAMEER KHAN, SECURITY SUPERVISOR, LAKEVIEW RESIDENCY

1. I was the security supervisor on duty at Lakeview Residency on the night of 28 March 2025. I did not go inside Flat No. 804 and did not witness any argument or assault there.

2. The building CCTV system covers the ground-floor lobby and the eighth-floor lift lobby/corridor. I supplied the relevant export to the police. I also supplied the relevant page of the handwritten visitor register maintained at the security desk. The system does not record the interior of any flat.

3. I can identify Raghav Sharma from having seen him visit the building on earlier occasions. The footage shows him entering the building at about 10:18 p.m., appearing again in the eighth-floor lobby at about 10:52 p.m., and leaving through the principal entrance at about 11:11 p.m. The police are seen entering the building at about 10:55 p.m. From the camera views alone I cannot say what occurred inside Flat No. 804 or whether Raghav was preventing anyone from leaving.

4. Police personnel entered the building at about 10:55 p.m. I directed them to the eighth floor. I did not accompany them into the flat.

17(v) — PRIYA MENON, RESIDENT OF FLAT NO. 806, LAKEVIEW RESIDENCY

1. I reside in Flat No. 806 on the eighth floor of Lakeview Residency. On the night of 28 March 2025, sometime after 10:30 p.m., I heard raised voices from the direction of the neighbouring flats. I first heard a female voice saying words which sounded like “leave me alone”. Shortly thereafter I could make out a male voice saying words which sounded like “open the door” or “let me out”. I then heard a thud. I did not come out immediately and I did not see what was happening inside Flat No. 804.

2. I cannot identify either voice with certainty. I do not know whether any door was actually locked or blocked, who was standing near it, whether either person was being physically restrained, or who caused any injury. A few minutes later I became aware that police personnel had arrived on the floor.

3. I have no other personal knowledge of the events inside Flat No. 804.

ANNEXURE 18

COMPLAINT OF NAINA SHARMA DATED 31 MARCH 2025

To, The Station House Officer, Lakeview Police Station, Indrapur

Date: 31.03.2025

Sir,

1. I, Naina Sharma, aged 32 years, resident of Flat No. 804, Lakeview Residency, state that my marriage with Dev Malhotra has been under serious strain for several months. I have not earlier made a police complaint because I did not want the police involved in our marriage.

2. Dev has repeatedly questioned me about my spending and communications, demanded explanations for my calls and messages, and threatened during arguments that he would leave me without financial support. He has shouted at me during disputes and has on occasions held or pushed me when I tried to move away.

3. On the night of 28.03.2025 there was another argument at our residence. Dev was shouting. I telephoned my brother Raghav because I was worried that the argument was escalating. When I tried to move away Dev pushed me. There was a struggle. The wooden object near the kitchen was knocked down and Dev fell towards the kitchen counter. My brother came after the argument had begun and tried to separate us.

4. I was examined after the incident and had an abrasion on my right wrist and bruising on my left forearm. I deny that I deliberately caused the injuries alleged by Dev or that I asked my brother to prevent him from leaving.

5. I request that my complaint be recorded and dealt with according to law.

Sd/- Naina Sharma

ANNEXURE 19

INQUIRY REPORT — HANDLING OF EARLIER COMPLAINTS

Office of the Deputy Commissioner of Police, Indrapur

1. Scope: administrative inquiry into the handling of the written complaints dated 19.11.2024 and 15.01.2025 and the DCP-office forwarding dated 03.02.2025.
2. Material examined: the two written complaints; corresponding station diary entries; CityCare Hospital records supplied with the complaints; DCP-office electronic receipt and forwarding endorsements; and the written explanation of Inspector Vikram Rana.
3. Inspector Rana stated that the parties had given conflicting versions after the first complaint, that Dev Malhotra did not wish to end the marriage, and that he considered counselling appropriate. As to the second complaint, he stated that he treated the allegations as part of a continuing matrimonial dispute in which both spouses were making allegations against each other.
4. The inquiry notes that the complaint dated 15.01.2025 expressly alleged that the complainant had been struck on the head and prevented from leaving a bedroom, and that a medical paper was produced. No written assessment explaining the treatment of that complaint was recorded. The DCP-office communication of 03.02.2025 was received at Lakeview Police Station; no further written action on the earlier complaints is shown before 20.02.2025.
5. Finding: deficiencies are recorded in the manner in which the complaints and the DCP-office forwarding were documented and dealt with. The matter is placed before the competent authority for such administrative action as may be considered appropriate.
6. This inquiry does not determine the truth of the allegations made by either spouse and does not record a finding that Inspector Vikram Rana committed a criminal offence.

Sd/- Inquiry Officer, Office of the Deputy Commissioner of Police, Indrapur

ANNEXURE 20

REPORT OF THE INVESTIGATING OFFICER ON COMPLETION OF INVESTIGATION

Under section 193 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023

In the Court of the Judicial Magistrate First Class, Indrapur

1. Accused persons sent for trial

(1) Naina Sharma, aged 32 years, wife of Dev Malhotra, resident of Flat No. 804, Lakeview Residency, Indrapur — under sections 117(2) and 127(2) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023.

(2) Raghav Sharma, aged 36 years, brother of accused No. 1, resident of Indrapur — under sections 117(2) and 127(2) read with section 3(5) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023.

2. Course of investigation

Investigation was taken up on registration of the First Information Report on 29.03.2025 and was completed in May 2025.

The place of occurrence at Flat No. 804, Lakeview Residency was inspected. Photographs were taken and one wooden decorative object was taken into possession from the floor near the kitchen counter, the process being recorded as required by section 105 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023.

The medical records of Dev Malhotra of 18.11.2024, 14.01.2025 and 28.03.2025, the radiology report and the final medical opinion were collected. The medical record of Naina Sharma was also collected.

The two written complaints submitted by Dev Malhotra on 19.11.2024 and 15.01.2025, the corresponding station diary entries, and the e-mail sent by him to the office of the Deputy Commissioner of Police

on 03.02.2025 together with the office endorsements, were collected. The allegation contained in the complaint of 15.01.2025 that Dev Malhotra had been prevented from leaving the bedroom on 14.01.2025 was investigated in this case.

The handsets used by Dev Malhotra and associated with the WhatsApp account of Naina Sharma were obtained and forwarded for cyber forensic examination, from which the conversation of 20.02.2025 and relevant call-log metadata were extracted. The call-log metadata records an outgoing call from the device associated with Naina Sharma to the contact/number associated with Raghav Sharma shortly before his arrival at Lakeview Residency on 28.03.2025; the content of the call is unavailable. Footage was obtained from the digital video recorder at Lakeview Residency and a log was prepared. The relevant page of the handwritten visitor register maintained at the building security desk was also collected. The recording of the emergency call of 28.03.2025 was obtained from the emergency response system. The electronic material is accompanied by the certificate relied upon for its admission.

The wooden decorative object was forwarded for forensic examination.

Statements of witnesses were recorded. The competing versions of Naina Sharma and Raghav Sharma, as emerging from the material collected during investigation and their stand before the Court, have not been treated as police statements supplied for substantive use.

3. Observations of the Investigating Officer

(a) The medical evidence collected in this case establishes the nature of the injuries sustained by Dev Malhotra. It has not been treated as identifying the person who caused those injuries.

(b) The CCTV footage establishes the presence of Raghav Sharma at Lakeview Residency on 28.03.2025 and his movements in the lobby. No camera captured the incident alleged to have taken place inside Flat No. 804.

(c) The forensic examination of the wooden decorative object did not yield any usable fingerprint capable of identifying the person who handled it. A small bloodstain yielded a DNA profile corresponding to Dev Malhotra; the forensic examiner could not determine when or how the blood was deposited on the article.

(d) The investigation recorded the explanations attributed to Naina Sharma and Raghav Sharma. Those explanations form part of the material placed before the Court and remain to be tested at trial.

(e) Naina Sharma submitted a complaint against Dev Malhotra on 31.03.2025. A copy is placed at Annexure 18. Proceedings arising out of that complaint are separate and are not the subject of this report.

4. List of documents relied upon

Annexures 1 to 19 of this paperbook, insofar as relevant to the charges sent for trial.

5. List of witnesses proposed to be examined

Dev Malhotra; Arjun Mehta; Rhea Thomas; Inspector Vikram Rana; Sameer Khan, security supervisor/camera custodian; Priya Menon, neighbouring resident; the treating medical officer(s) of CityCare Hospital; the competent witness connected with the emergency-response record; the forensic examiner(s); and the Investigating Officer.

Copies of this report and of the documents accompanying it have been supplied to the accused persons in accordance with section 230 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023.

Sd/- [authorised signatory]

Sub-Inspector, Lakeview Police Station

Forwarded by:

Sd/- [authorised signatory]

Officer in charge, Lakeview Police Station

ANNEXURE 21

ORDER FRAMING CHARGES, AND THE CHARGES

Part I — Order

In the Court of the Judicial Magistrate First Class, Indrapur, State of
Mandhya

Criminal Case No.: not reproduced in the competition record.

Arising out of FIR No. 118/2025, Police Station Lakeview

State of Mandhya versus (1) Naina Sharma (2) Raghav Sharma

Present: Assistant Public Prosecutor for the State. Both accused present with
counsel.

Date: as recorded in the original record.

ORDER

1. The report of the Investigating Officer under section 193 of the Bharatiya
Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 was submitted on 18.06.2025. Cognizance
of the offences was taken.

2. Copies of the report and of the documents accompanying it have been
supplied to both accused in accordance with section 230 of the Sanhita, and
compliance has been recorded.

3. The case is a warrant case instituted on a police report. I have considered
the report and the documents sent with it and have heard the Assistant
Public Prosecutor and counsel for both accused on the question of charge.

4. On a consideration of the material on record, I am of the view that there is
ground for presuming that accused No. 1 has committed offences triable by
this Court under sections 117(2) and 127(2) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita,
2023, and that accused No. 2 has committed offences triable by this Court
under sections 117(2) and 127(2) read with section 3(5) of that Sanhita.

The material discloses a case fit for trial. Nothing said in this order is an expression of opinion on the merits, and the truth or otherwise of the allegations is to be determined on the evidence to be led at the trial.

5. Charges are accordingly framed under section 263 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 in the terms set out separately.

6. The charges have been read over and explained to both accused in a language understood by them. Both accused have pleaded not guilty and have claimed trial.

7. Put up for prosecution evidence on the date fixed by the Court. The Assistant Public Prosecutor shall ensure the presence of the witnesses cited.

Sd/-

Judicial Magistrate First Class, Indrapur

Part II — Charges

In the Court of the Judicial Magistrate First Class, Indrapur
I, Judicial Magistrate First Class, Indrapur, do hereby charge you as follows.

ACCUSED No. 1 — NAINA SHARMA

Firstly — That on 28 March 2025, at about 10:20 p.m., at Flat No. 804, Lakeview Residency, Indrapur, you voluntarily caused hurt to Dev Malhotra, the hurt which you intended to cause or knew yourself to be likely to cause being grievous hurt, and the hurt caused being grievous hurt, namely a fracture of the seventh rib, and thereby committed an offence punishable under section 117(2) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023, and within my cognizance.

Secondly — That on 14 January 2025, at Flat No. 804, Lakeview Residency, Indrapur, you wrongfully restrained Dev Malhotra in such a manner as to prevent him from proceeding beyond certain circumscribing limits, namely by closing the bedroom door of the said flat from outside and retaining the key for about forty minutes, and thereby wrongfully confined him, and thereby committed an offence punishable under section 127(2) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023, and within my cognizance.

Thirdly — That on 28 March 2025, at about 10:20 p.m., at Flat No. 804, Lakeview Residency, Indrapur, you wrongfully restrained Dev Malhotra in such a manner as to prevent him from proceeding beyond certain circumscribing limits, namely by standing in the doorway of the room and preventing him from leaving it, and thereby wrongfully confined him, and thereby committed an offence punishable under section 127(2) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023, and within my cognizance.

ACCUSED No. 2 — RAGHAV SHARMA

Firstly — That on 28 March 2025, at about 10:20 p.m., at Flat No. 804, Lakeview Residency, Indrapur, in furtherance of the common intention of yourself and accused No. 1, grievous hurt was voluntarily caused to Dev Malhotra, and you are thereby liable for that act in the same manner as if it were done by you alone, and have thereby committed an offence punishable under section 117(2) read with section 3(5) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023, and within my cognizance.

Secondly — That on 28 March 2025, at about 10:20 p.m., at the said place, in furtherance of the common intention of yourself and accused No. 1, you wrongfully restrained Dev Malhotra in such a manner as to prevent him from proceeding beyond certain circumscribing limits,

namely by standing near the doorway of the room and preventing him from leaving it, and thereby wrongfully confined him, and have thereby committed an offence punishable under section 127(2) read with section 3(5) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023, and within my cognizance.

And I direct that you be tried by this Court on the said charges.

Sd/-

Judicial Magistrate First Class, Indrapur

Date: as recorded in the original record.

Endorsement: The above charges were read over and explained to each accused. Accused No. 1, Naina Sharma, pleaded not guilty and claimed trial. Accused No. 2, Raghav Sharma, pleaded not guilty and claimed trial.

Sd/- Judicial Magistrate First Class, Indrapur

The End

LEADERSHIP



Patron

Dr. Jayasankar Variyar
Vice-Chancellor
IILM University



Chairperson (Execution)

Prof. (Dr.) Babita Singh Parasain
Director, SoL



Event Patron

Prof. (Dr.) Arun Gupta
Dean, SoL

FACULTY CORE ORGANISING COMMITTEE



Co-Convenor

Ms. Garima Prasad
Assistant Professor



Convenor

Dr. Swati Bajaj Seth
Associate Professor



Co-Convenor

Mr. Harshit Mohan
Assistant Professor



Faculty Co-ordinator Judges & Evaluation

Mr. Rachit Sharma
Assistant Professor



Faculty Co-ordinator Sponsorships & Partnerships

Dr. Bhavana Dhoundiyal
Assistant Professor



Faculty Co-ordinator Logistics & Hospitality

Ms. Sadiya Zehra
Assistant Professor

SENIOR MEMBERS OF ORGANIZING TEAM



Prof.(Dr.)Sushma Singh
Professor



**Prof. (Dr.) Mohd. Nizam
Ashraf Khan**
Professor



Dr. Perna Gulati
Associate Professor



Dr. Ghazala Sharif
Associate Professor

OTHER MEMBERS OF ORGANIZING TEAM



Dr. Gaurav Chaudhary
Assistant Professor



Dr. Amandeep Kataria
Assistant Professor



Dr. Neha Purohit
Assistant Professor



Dr. Palak Sharma
Assistant Professor



Dr. Chandani K.Gupta
Assistant Professor



Mr. Paras Yadav
Assistant Professor



Ms. Priyanka Gupta
Assistant Professor



Mr. Vedant Chaudhary
Assistant Professor



Mr. Hardik Malik
Assistant Professor



Ms. Raunak Gupta
Assitant Professor

STUDENT CORE COMMITTEE



Yedik Purohit
President



Khanak Jain
Vice-President



Aastha Mishra
General Secretary



Deepansh Bhargava
Treasurer



Rudra Pratap Singh
Marketing & Promotion
Head



Ankita Kumari
Marketing & Promotion
Co- Head



Palak Luthra
Sponsorship Head



Aditya Goswami
Sponsorship Co- Head



Aarnav Kumar
Social Media Head



Aarna Rohatgi
Social Media
Co- Head



Srijan Gupta
Outreach & Institutional
Relations Head



Shagun Singh
Outreach & Institutional
Relations Co- Head

FOR ANY QUERIES, PLEASE CONTACT:

- Dr. Swati Bajaj Seth - +91 8860859625
- Mr. Harshit Mohan - +91 9891678133
- Yedik Purohit [President – B.A.LLB(Hons.)] – +91 6375450702
- Khanak Jain [Vice-President– B.A.LLB(Hons.)] – +91 8587009471
- Or Email your queries at mocktrialsociety.gn@iilm.edu (with the Subject Heading – Query)

SOCIAL MEDIA HANDLE



INSTAGRAM



LINKEDIN