

NATIONAL MOOT COURT COMPETITION

GENERAL RULES:

1. “Organizers” means the Core Organising Committee under the Centre For Clinical Legal Education, Faculty of Legal Sciences, Shoolini University
2. “Competition” means the National Moot Court Competition, 2026.
3. “Participating Team” means the team that has registered itself for the competition as per the rules given below.
4. “Participating College/Institution/University” shall be presumed to be the parent institution of the participating team.
5. “Participants” means the speakers and the researcher of the Participating Team.
6. The rules of the Moot Court shall be strictly adhered to. Any deviation there from them would attract disqualification or other penalties as decided by the Organizers.
7. Decisions taken by the Organizers in case of any doubt, dispute, disqualification etc shall be final.
8. Registration will be on 1st come 1st serve basis (Maximum 32 Teams will be approved).

DATE AND VENUE:

The National Moot Court Competition, 2026 shall be held from
Friday 19th November to 21st November, 2026.

Venue: Faculty of Legal Sciences, Shoolini University of Biotechnology and Management Sciences, Bajhol P.O. Sultanpur, Solan, HP (173229) .*

* All the Teams have to participate in offline mode.

ELIGIBILITY:

The Competition is open to bona fide undergraduate students of recognized Colleges/Institutions/Universities who are currently pursuing their Bachelor's Degree in Law i.e.

3 years LLB or 5 year Integrated or Honors'LL.B Programme with all combinations on a regular basis.

A maximum of two teams from one law college can participate but no student must be repeated.

TEAM COMPOSITION:

1. Each team shall comprise a maximum of 3 members and a minimum of 2 members consisting of either 2 speakers and 1 researcher or 2 speakers only. The number cannot be modified under any circumstances.
2. Teams shall identify the speakers and researcher at the time of Registration. No extra member/faculty/observer shall be allowed. Also, no deviation from the chosen names shall be allowed.
3. Cross University teams are not allowed in the competition. This means that the members of a team must be from the same University.

STRUCTURE OF THE COMPETITION:

- Preliminary Round
- Semi Finals Round
- Final Round

Preliminary Round-

1. All the teams must prepare the memorial from both sides.
2. The teams will be arranged on the basis of lots drawn and grouped in pairs of two to determine who will contest against whom and for which side each team will argue.
3. All the teams will be paired in groups of two and after contesting a single time from the side chosen by Draw of lots
4. The round will be of 90 minutes in which 30 minutes will be given to each team from which sometime will be used for questions from the bench and the last 30 minutes will be for rebuttal and sur-rebuttal based upon the discretion of the judges.
5. Each team will inform the bench and the court masters regarding the division of time and issues between the speakers at the beginning

6. Only one speaker will be permitted to Rebut/Sur-rebut

Semi-Finals Round-

1. The 6 teams qualified will again be arranged on the basis of draw of lots and grouped in pairs of two to determine who will contest against whom and for which side each team will argue.
2. The round will be of 90 minutes in which 30 minutes will be given to each team from which sometime will be used for questions from the bench and the last 30 minutes will be for rebuttal and sur-rebuttal based upon the discretion of the judges.
3. Each team will inform the bench and the court masters regarding the division of time and issues between the speakers at the beginning.
4. Only one speaker will be permitted to Rebut/Sur-rebut.
5. One team from each courtroom will qualify for the finals.

Final Round-

1. The two teams qualified will again be arranged on the basis of draw of lots to determine who will contest against whom and for which side each team will argue.
2. The Round will be of 90 minutes in which 30 minutes will be given to each team from which sometime will be used for questions from the bench and the last 30 minutes will be for rebuttal and sur-rebuttal based upon the discretion of the judges.
3. Each team will inform the bench and the court masters regarding the division of time and issues between the speakers at the beginning.
4. Only one speaker will be permitted to Rebut/Sur-rebut.

RULES REGARDING MOOT MEMORIAL:

(a) Submission Guidelines-

1. Teams are required to submit a memorial from each side i.e. from the side of Petitioner/Appellant and from the side of Defendant/Respondent.

2. Soft copy should be mailed at **ccle.shooliniuniversity@gmail.com** latest by **10th November**. Memorials shall not be accepted thereafter and the said team shall be disqualified.
3. Five hard copies of the memorial (five each for the respective side) have to be sent before **18th November 2026** at the following address-
Faculty of Legal Sciences, Shoolini University of Biotechnology and Management Sciences, Bajhol P.O. Sultanpur, Solan, HP (173229).

(b) Format of the Memorial-

1. Each memorial shall have the following details;
 - Cover Page
 - Table of Contents
 - List of Abbreviations
 - Index of Authorities
 - Statement of Jurisdiction
 - Statement of Facts
 - Issues Raised
 - Summary of Arguments
 - Written Submissions
 - Prayer

(c) Cover page-

The following details should be there on the cover page and nothing else:

1. Team code on the top right hand corner of the cover page
2. Name and place of the forum
3. Name of the parties and their statutes
4. Memorial submitted to ...
5. Memorial filed and appearing on behalf of ...

(d) Content Specification-

1. The following content specification must be adhered to:
 - Language - English
 - Font and Size (Body) - Times New Roman, 12 pts
 - Line Spacing (Body) - 1.5 lines
 - Font and Size (Footnotes) - Times New Roman, 10 pts
 - Line Spacing (Footnotes) - Single line
 - Page Margins - 1 inch on all sides
 - Page Limit (i) Entire Memorial - 30 pages maximum
(ii) Body of Arguments - 10 pages minimum and 15 maximum
 - Paper Specification - White A4 Size Paper
 - Body of the Memorial - Justified
2. The cover pages must be Blue for the Plaintiff or Petitioner or Appellant and Red for the Defendant or Respondent.

(e) Evaluation of Memorials-

MARKING CRITERIA	MARKS ALLOTTED
Presentation of Facts and Law	10
Interpretation of Law	20
Ingenuity and Logical Reasoning	20
Extent and Use of Authority	20
Relief Sought	10
Format and Citation	10
Grammar and Style	05
Adherence to the Guidelines	05
TOTAL	100

(f) Deduction of marks for late submission of Soft copy of the Memorial-

Late submission, if any, of soft copy of the memorials may be permitted by the Organizing Committee in exceptional circumstances on case to case basis upon prior request of the participants subject to deduction of 2 marks per day for late submission of the hard copies and subject to a maximum limit of 2 days after which it won't be accepted.

Note: - Participants are requested to strictly adhere to the rules concerning time limit for submission of the memorials.

(g) Exchange of Memorials:

The Exchange of the memorial will be done according to the team codes allocated by the Moot Court Committee.

RESEARCHER'S TEST-

1. In the case of Teams with three Members, only the designated Researcher shall write the test and such Researcher shall not be allowed to address the forum during the Oral Rounds.
2. A Team violating this rule may be disqualified from the Competition.
3. The duration of the Researchers' Test shall be 1 hour. The questions may be subjective or Multiple-Choice Questions or mixed.
4. Researchers' Test shall test the knowledge of the laws involved as well as the factual details of the Case and the application of the relevant laws to the circumstances in the moot problem.

COMPENDIUM-

1. The teams are allowed to bring a Compendium for both sides in both propositions during oral rounds.
2. Teams are requested to send a soft copy of the compendium along with the memorials in PDF format.

SCOUTING-

1. "Scouting" is not permitted and it shall be deemed to have happened if the Speakers, Researcher, or any other person affiliated with a team is found:

2. Witnessing, hearing, observing, etc. the oral submissions in an oral round, except where the oral round is the final round or one in which the team to which he/she is affiliated is participating;
3. Reading a Memorial of a team except where; it is of the team to which he/she is affiliated, or the Memorials have been obtained on account of an exchange of Memorials before a Round of the team to which he/she is affiliated

GENERAL CLARIFICATIONS-

1. All the queries and clarifications must be sent to the official mail ID of the organizers i.e. “ccle.shooliniuniversity@gmail.com” and the subject of the mail must read “MOOT COURT COMPETITION QUERY”. No query without the subject “MOOT COURT COMPETITION QUERY” would be entertained.
2. The last day to raise a query is 30th October 2026.

LANGUAGE-

The official working language of the Moot Court Competition, 2026 shall be English.

REGISTRATION:

1. Teams are required to complete their Registration by 25th October, 2026.
2. The Registration Fee is **INR 4000/-** which shall be payable through Online Transaction Mode and shall be made in favor of Shoolini University.
3. NOTE- The Registration amount is exclusive of the accommodation charges.
4. The Registration shall be done by filling up the Application Form available on Google Form and submitting an NOC provided by the Organizers duly attested by their Moot Court Faculty Coordinator/Dean/Principal with the details of the participating team along with uploading a screenshot of the transaction along with Transaction ID.
5. Once the Registration form is filled out and the Fee is paid, the teams shall receive the confirmation of their provisional Registration from the Organizers.

6. Once the final registration is done Teams will get the confirmation email and their Team Codes later on.
7. The Registration shall be deemed complete only when the Registration form is duly filled, Email Approval is received and the Registration fee is paid. The teams must send the Screenshot of their Online Transaction Fee through email to ccle.shooliniuniversity@gmail.com.
8. Once the final registration is done Teams will get the confirmation email and their Team Codes also.

CONTACT INFORMATION-

Email- ccle.shooliniuniversity@gmail.com

PAYMENT DETAILS-

[Pay here](#)

CRIME SCENE INVESTIGATION COMPETITION

NATIONAL LAW FEST 5.0

GENERAL GUIDELINES

FORMAT OF THE COMPETITION-

1. Each Team will get a total of 40 minutes to perform.
2. 10 minutes will be given to observe the crime scene and make a note of the evidence found.
3. The observation will be followed by an interview round by the panel of judges where the students will be evaluated and scored. This will also be 10 minutes for the whole team.
4. The team will then prepare a report for which they will get 20 minutes in total. A booklet will be provided to the team once they reach the desired venue.
5. Once done with the report, the team is required to submit the report to the in charge there.

PERFORMANCE GUIDELINES-

1. The team is allowed to carry paper and pen to write down the key observations.
2. They can click photos or record videos during their time of observation for further reference.
3. The participants can use their phones during the report-writing only for reference to the photos clicked, and no other use of the internet will be allowed.

DRESS CODE-

The participants shall adhere to the following dress code when present during the Competition.

1. Girls: White salwar and kurta or white shirt and black trousers along with black coat and black shoes.
2. Boys: White shirt, black trousers and black tie along with black coat and black shoes.

Note: The participating teams shall also adhere to the above-mentioned dress code while attending the inaugural and valedictory ceremonies of the Competition.

PAY FROM HERE-

[Pay Here](#)

**IN THE COURT OF THE HON'BLE SESSIONS JUDGE,
NAVEENPUR DISTRICT**

SESSIONS CASE NO. 231 OF 2026

STATE OF ARANYA

versus

KABIR ANAND & ORS.

MOOT PROPOSITION

Charges under Sections 45, 49, 51 and 105 of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023; Section 13 of the Unlawful Activities (Prevention) Act, 1967; and Section 72A of the Information Technology Act, 2000

(Disclaimer: This moot proposition is a work of fiction. The Republic of Aranya, its institutions, and all persons and events named herein are fictitious, and any resemblance to actual persons, places or events is purely coincidental. For the purposes of this problem, the Constitution of India and all laws of India, including the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023, the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023, the Bharatiya Sakshya Adhiniyam, 2023 and the Information Technology Act, 2000, shall be deemed to be in force in the Republic of Aranya as on the date of issue of this proposition, with all references to "India" read as "Aranya". Indian judicial decisions may be cited as persuasive authority.)

STATEMENT OF JURISDICTION

For the purposes of this moot proposition, it is stipulated that the Court seized of the matter is duly competent to try the offences alleged against both accused, including the offence under the Unlawful Activities (Prevention) Act, 1967, and the connected offences under other applicable laws. The joint trial of the accused is also assumed to be validly instituted in accordance with the applicable procedural law. The Court's jurisdiction and the permissibility of the joint trial shall not constitute issues for adjudication in this moot.

STATEMENT OF FACTS

1. On the night of 2nd of the October, a vehicle registered to the private fleet of the Minister for Urban Development, Aranya, struck and killed one Rohan Verma, aged 19, a food-delivery rider, on the Naveenpur Ring Road. The occupant of the vehicle was identified as Aryan Kapoor, son of the Minister.
2. Closed-circuit television footage recorded at a nearby toll plaza captured Aryan Kapoor being escorted from the scene by two plain-clothes individuals within minutes of the collision. The footage was retained during the investigation and had not been officially released. Approximately eleven hours after the collision, an extract of the footage appeared on the encrypted messaging and livestream platform "PulseNet." The extract showed no visible administration of a breath-analysis test, no seizure of the vehicle at the scene, and no uniformed officer approaching the driver's side of the vehicle.
3. Subsequent investigation traced the source of the leak to Ramesh Oberoi, a control-room operator employed by the private contractor responsible for maintaining the toll-plaza surveillance system. His login credentials allowed him to view recorded footage for maintenance and fault-checking only. System logs showed that his credentials were used to copy a short clip to a personal storage device about nine hours after the collision. Ramesh admitted that he shared the clip on PulseNet. He said he did so because he believed the police were shielding an influential person and that the public had a right to know. He denied receiving any payment or benefit. He has been arrayed as Accused No. 2 and charged under Section 72A of the Information Technology Act, 2000.
4. Following circulation of the footage, a decentralised protest movement organised under the hashtag #JusticeForRohan and coordinated principally through PulseNet. No political party, registered association, or civil society body claimed responsibility for or leadership of the movement. Coordination of logistics, including assembly points, legal-aid contacts, and medical-tent locations, occurred through numerous anonymous or pseudonymous PulseNet accounts.
5. One PulseNet channel, "HoldTheSquare," attained approximately 2.1 million subscribers over nine days and functioned as a principal source of logistical information for participants in the occupation of Constitution Square, Naveenpur. The channel was administered under the pseudonym "K," subsequently identified as Kabir Anand, aged 24 ("Accused No. 1"), a

postgraduate student with no prior criminal record and no office-bearer status in any registered body.

6. On the eighth day of the occupation, the State Government issued a prohibitory order requiring dispersal of Constitution Square by 22:00 hours the following night. On the ninth night, police personnel commenced a clearance operation using barricades, loudspeaker warnings, tear-smoke, and water cannons. The State's operational log records that no firearms were sanctioned for use by personnel on ground duty that night.
7. At 22:57 hours, Accused No. 1 sent a private message to a five-member PulseNet moderator group. At 23:02 hours, he issued a public livestream broadcast on the "HoldTheSquare" channel. The contents of both communications are reproduced at Annexures O and E respectively.
8. At approximately 23:10 hours, a single gunshot was fired in the vicinity of the fountain barricade at Constitution Square. Aisha Bedi, aged 22, a protest volunteer and livestreamer, sustained a fatal gunshot wound and was declared dead on arrival at Naveenpur General Hospital at 00:20 hours. No firearm was recovered from any person present at the scene. No police officer on duty that night has on the record, as it presently stands, been shown to have discharged a firearm.
9. In the course of investigation, a video purporting to show the fatal shot being fired by a masked individual was circulated and briefly relied upon by the Prosecution before being found, on independent forensic examination, to be a digitally fabricated (deepfake) video. The identity of the person or persons responsible for creating this video has not been established, and no person has been charged in that respect. This finding is set out at Annexures F and K.
10. Accused No. 1 was arrested on the fourth day following the incident and held in police custody for eleven days under the provisions of the Unlawful Activities (Prevention) Act, 1967. Accused No. 2 was arrested nine days after the incident, following the tracing of the leaked footage to his workstation credentials, and was released on bail nineteen days later. The chargesheet in respect of both accused was filed on the ninetieth day. Cognizance has been taken by the Sessions Court, Naveenpur.
11. A connected petition challenging the applicability of the Unlawful Activities (Prevention) Act, 1967, to an anonymous administrator of a leaderless movement has similarly been clubbed for argument.
12. The Prosecution's case against Accused No. 1 rests entirely on circumstantial and documentary evidence. No eyewitness has identified the person who fired the fatal shot. The material particulars of the evidence relied upon by both parties, in respect of both accused, are set out in the Annexures below.

CHARGES AS FRAMED

Charge I (Accused No. 1)

That Accused No. 1, Kabir Anand, by his public broadcast and private message, abetted the commission of culpable homicide not amounting to murder, as defined under Section 100 and punishable under Section 105 of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023, read with Sections 45 and 49 or, in the alternative, Section 51 of the said Sanhita, resulting in the death of Aisha Bedi.

Charge II (Accused No. 1)

That the Accused No. 1, Kabir Anand, by his public broadcast and private message, advocated, advised or incited the commission of an unlawful activity within the meaning of Section 2(o), thereby committing an offence punishable under Section 13 of the Unlawful Activities (Prevention) Act, 1967.

Charge III (Accused No. 2)

That the Accused No. 2, Ramesh Oberoi, while securing access to material containing personal information in the course of his employment under a lawful contract, disclosed the said material without the consent of the person concerned or in breach of a lawful contract, with intent to cause, or knowing that he was likely to cause, wrongful loss or wrongful gain, thereby allegedly committing an offence punishable under Section 72A of the Information Technology Act, 2000

ANNEXURES

Annexure A — First Information Report

FIR No. 0417/PS Naveenpur Central, registered at 02:47 hours, lodged by Sub-Inspector R.K. Thapar.

"On the night of clearing operations at Constitution Square, at approximately 23:10 hours, a gunshot was heard from the north-eastern flank of the crowd, near the fountain barricade. The deceased, Aisha Bedi, aged 22, was found with a single gunshot wound to the chest and was declared dead on arrival at Naveenpur General Hospital at 00:20 hours. No weapon was recovered at the scene. A bullet was later recovered from a wooden barricade panel by a constable on duty and handed over to the Investigating Officer the following morning."

The recovering constable is not named in the FIR.

Annexure B — Statement of Neha Oberoi, Protest Volunteer (First-Aid Tent)

Recorded under the provision analogous to Section 180 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 (BNSS); unsigned by the witness. (No relation to Ramesh Oberoi, Accused No. 2.)

"I was 15 to 20 feet from Aisha when it happened. I did not see who fired. I heard the shot come from behind me. Everyone was screaming and running, so I cannot be certain of the direction. I ran to Aisha. She was already unconscious. She said nothing before she died."

Annexure C — Alleged Dying Declaration

Recorded by Constable Devraj Singh.

"The deceased, while being carried to the ambulance, was heard by me to say the words 'Kabir... told... hold...' before losing consciousness. I informed my senior officer of this approximately forty-five minutes after the incident."

Annexure D — Forensic Ballistics Report, Naveenpur Forensic Science Laboratory

"The bullet recovered from Exhibit B-7 is a 9mm jacketed round, consistent with standard police-issue sidearms and with at least two categories of civilian handguns registered in Naveenpur district. Trajectory analysis indicates a downward angle of approximately 30–35 degrees, consistent with a shot fired from an elevated position or from a standing shooter firing toward a kneeling or seated victim. The exhibit was received into laboratory custody thirty-six hours after the incident; the custody log for the intervening period is undated. Head Constable Balbir Rathi, initially credited with recovery of the exhibit, is recorded in the station attendance register as 'off-duty, whereabouts unrecorded' between 23:00 hours and 11:00 hours the following day."

Annexure E — PulseNet Broadcast Transcript, 23:02 Hours

"They are trying to push us out before the cameras come back. Hold the line. Do not move. Do not give them the square. This is peaceful — no one raises a hand tonight, no one. Hold the line."

Annexure F — Forensic Video Analysis, "Exhibit 14"

Report of Dr. Ananya Krishnan, independent digital forensic examiner engaged by the Defence.

"The video purporting to show a masked individual in protest-faction coloured attire firing a weapon, timestamped 23:09 hours, exhibits frame-interpolation artefacts consistent with AI-generated or deepfake video synthesis. Compression metadata is inconsistent with the claimed capture device. This video did not originate from any verified PulseNet livestream archive."

The Prosecution had relied on this video in an early public statement naming a rival protest faction as suspects and has since withdrawn reliance upon it. No person has been identified as its creator or distributor, and no charge under Sections 66C or 66D of the Information Technology Act, 2000 (identity theft; cheating by personation using a computer resource) has been framed in respect of it for want of an identified accused.

Annexure G — Subsequent Statement of Head Constable Balbir Rathi

Recorded four days after the incident, upon the officer being traced.

"I was not off-duty. I was reassigned that night to escort a VIP convoy, and my attendance was wrongly logged due to clerical error. I recovered a bullet from the

barricade at approximately 23:40 hours and handed it directly to my senior, ASI Yograj Malik. I did not personally log it into evidence."

ASI Yograj Malik has since been transferred to another district and has not been examined.

Annexure H — Public Statement of "Spark Collective" Spokesperson

Unsworn press statement issued the day following the incident.

"We have always said this movement needs its martyr to be taken seriously by the world. We mourn Aisha. We did not kill her. But her death has done what a thousand hashtags could not."

Annexure I — Armoury Issuance Register (Partial, Produced Under Objection)

"One 9mm service weapon issued to a named officer was returned 'with one round short' against its recorded count, with the accompanying remark: 'discrepancy under internal review — see attached explanation.'"

The referenced attached explanation was not included in the extract produced to the Court.

Annexure J — CCTV Maintenance Log, Perimeter Camera 6, Constitution Square

"Camera 6 malfunctioned between 22:50 and 23:20 hours, attributed to power fluctuation. Repair invoice for this camera is dated two days prior to the incident."

Annexure K — Cross-Examination Extract, Dr. Ananya Krishnan

"I confirm the video is a deepfake. I cannot determine who created it or for what purpose. I accept it is possible it was fabricated by sympathisers of the accused to discredit the investigation, just as it is possible it was fabricated by any other party."

Annexure L — Relevant Statutory Provisions (Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 and Unlawful Activities (Prevention) Act, 1967)

Provision	Text
Sec. 45, BNS (Abetment of a thing)	A person abets the doing of a thing who: (a) instigates any person to do that thing; or (b) engages with one or more persons in a conspiracy for the doing of that thing, if an act or illegal omission takes place in pursuance of that conspiracy; or (c) intentionally aids, by any act or illegal omission, the doing of that thing.
Sec. 49, BNS (Punishment of abetment where act is committed and no express provision made)	Whoever abets any offence shall, if the act abetted is committed in consequence of the abetment, and no express provision is made by this Sanhita for the punishment of such abetment, be punished with the punishment provided for the offence.
Sec. 51, BNS (Abettor liable for different act from that abetted)	When an act is abetted and a different act is done, the abettor is liable for the act done, in the same manner and to the same extent as if he had directly abetted it, provided the act done was a probable consequence of

	the abetment and was committed under the influence of the instigation, or with the aid or pursuant to the conspiracy which constituted the abetment.
Sec. 105, BNS (Punishment for culpable homicide not amounting to murder)	Whoever commits culpable homicide not amounting to murder shall be punished with imprisonment for life, or imprisonment of either description for a term of not less than five years but which may extend to ten years, and fine, if the act by which death is caused is done with the intention of causing death or such bodily injury as is likely to cause death; or with imprisonment of either description up to ten years, and fine, if the act is done with the knowledge that it is likely to cause death, but without any intention to cause death or such bodily injury as is likely to cause death.
Sec. 13, UAPA (Punishment for unlawful activities)	Whoever— (a) takes part in or commits, or advocates, abets, advises or incites the commission of, any unlawful activity, shall be punishable with imprisonment for a term which may extend to seven years, and shall also be liable to fine.

Annexure M — Site Plan, Constitution Square

Constitution Square is a rectangular public plaza measuring approximately 180 metres (north–south) by 120 metres (east–west). The central fountain is located at the geometric centre of the square. The fountain barricade, a temporary structure erected by protest participants, runs along the northern edge of the fountain, approximately 15 metres from it, facing the police cordon line positioned along the square's northern boundary road.

The area described in Annexure A as the "north-eastern flank of the crowd" comprises the sector between compass bearings 000° and 090° measured from the centre of the fountain. This sector includes the fountain barricade, which lies at approximately bearing 010°. The first-aid tent referenced in Annexure B is located approximately 20 metres south-west of the fountain barricade.

Perimeter Camera 6, referenced at Annexure J, is mounted at the north-western corner of the square, with a sightline covering only the western half of the fountain barricade.

Annexure N — Supplementary Investigation Report: Farhan Qureshi

Cell-tower triangulation data, obtained under judicial warrant, places one Farhan Qureshi, aged 26, a self-declared member of the Spark Collective, within a twenty-metre radius of the fountain barricade between 23:04 and 23:14 hours.

A gunshot-residue swab taken from Qureshi's right hand and sleeve at 05:30 hours the following morning returned positive for barium and antimony particulates consistent with the discharge of a firearm. Protest participants that night made concededly widespread use of smoke canisters and firework-style flares, per the State's own operational log. Qureshi has not been charged. The Investigating Officer's case diary records the decision not to charge him as based on insufficient corroboration beyond residue and presence.

Annexure O — Forensic Extraction Report, Mobile Device of Accused No. 1

Device was seized pursuant to a validly executed search warrant and extraction was certified in accordance with the electronic evidence certification requirements under Section 63(4) of the Bharatiya Sakshya Adhiniyam, 2023. Chain of custody remains unchallenged.

"They're going to push tonight. Don't let the front row scatter. Whatever happens after this, it puts us on every front page tomorrow."

This message, sent at 22:57 hours to a five-member PulseNet moderator group, was not made public and does not form part of the broadcast reproduced at Annexure E.

A forensic extraction also recovered an unsent draft from Accused No. 1's device, stating: 'The people of the Northern Province must decide whether they will remain part of Aranya. We must organise support for this demand.' The draft had not been transmitted or published. Its origin, context and intended purpose remain disputed

Annexure P – Extracts Relating to Accused No. 2

A: Employment terms of Ramesh Oberoi as per his Employment Contract

- Clause 5: The operator may access recorded footage only for maintenance, fault-checking and system backup.
- Clause 9: The operator shall keep all footage confidential. No footage shall be copied, shared or disclosed without the written permission of the contractor or the authority concerned.

B: System log extract

- The user ID of Ramesh Oberoi was logged in during his regular night shift.
- A 4-minute clip was copied to an external device. No maintenance ticket or fault report was raised for that night.

C: Statement of Accused No. 2

"I only wanted the truth to come out. I did not take any money, and I did not know the clip would be used against anyone."

ISSUES FOR ARGUMENT

Issue 1: Whether Accused No. 1 is liable for abetment of the death of Aisha Bedi under Sections 45 and 49 or, in the alternative, Section 51, read with Section 105 of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023.

Issue 2: Whether the evidence against Accused No. 1 is admissible under the Bhartiya Sakshya Adhiniyam, 2023, and is reliable and sufficient to prove the charge beyond reasonable doubt.

Issue 3: Whether Accused No. 1 is liable under Section 13 of the Unlawful Activities (Prevention) Act, 1967, for advocating, advising or inciting unlawful activity.

Issue 4: Whether Accused No. 2 is liable under Section 72A of the Information Technology Act, 2000, or is protected under the principles of public-interest disclosure.