

INDEX

SL	PARTICULARS OF DOCUMENTS	PAGE NO. OF PART TO WHICH IT BELONGS		REMARKS
		Part – I (Contents of Paper Book		Part – II (Contents of file alone
(i)	(ii)	(iii)	(iv)	(v)
1.	Court Fees			
2.	Office Report on Limitation		A	
3.	Listing Performa		A1-A2	
4.	Cover Pages of Paper Book		A3	
5.	Index Record of Proceedings		A4	
6.	Limitation Report Prepared by the Registry		A5	
7.	Defect List		A6	
8.	Note Sheet		A7	
9.	Synopsis and List of Dates	B-		

10.	Writ Petition under article 32 of the Constitution of India with accompanying Affidavit.	1-25		
11.	<u>ANNEXURE P-1</u> True copy of the order dated 18.08.2026 passed by this Hon'ble Court in W.P.(CrI.) No. 280/2026 and connected matters.	26-43		
12.	<u>ANNEXURE P-2</u> True copy of the report published by The Indian Express concerning the demonstrations on 02.10.2026, along with link https://indianexpress.com/article/cities/delhi/jantar-mantar-protest-gyanesh-kumar-700-detained-delhi-10904136/			
13.	<u>ANNEXURE P-3</u> True copy of the report published by The Indian Express concerning the complaints and their reference to the Crime Branch, along with link https://indianexpress.com/article/cities/delhi/delhi-police-crime-branch-probe-sexual-harassment-journalists-jantar-mantar-protest-cec-gyanesh-kumar-10905997			

14.	<u>ANNEXURE P-4</u> True copy of the press release dated 08.10.2026 issued by the National Human Rights Commission, along with link https://nhrc.nic.in/media/press-release/nhrc%2C-india-takes-suo-motu-cognizance-of-the-reported-sexual-harassment-of-three-journalists-by-delhi-police-personnel-during-a-protest-at-jantar-mantar%2C-new-delhi-on-3rd-october-2026			
15.	<u>ANNEXURE P-5</u> True copy of the order passed by this Hon'ble Court in W.P.(C) Diary No. 63560/2026 dated 09.10.2026			
16.	<u>ANNEXURE P-6</u> True copy of the statement published by the Internet Freedom Foundation concerning the suspension of mobile internet services, along with link https://internetfreedom.in/delhi-learned-of-its-internet-shutdown-from-a-leaked-top-secret-police-letter-not-the-government/			

17.	<u>ANNEXURE P-7</u> True copy of the post dated 10.10.2026 made by Scroll.in on X, along with screenshots of the accompanying material and link https://x.com/scroll_in/status/2108855126165455295			
18.	<u>ANNEXURE P-8</u> True copy of the report titled “Dragged and detained: Inside the Delhi police's October 10 crackdown on journalists” published by The News Minute on 11.10.2026, along with link https://www.thenewsminute.com/news/dragged-and-detained-inside-the-delhi-polices-october-10-crackdown-on-journalists			
19.	<u>ANNEXURE P-9</u> True copy of the post dated 10.10.2026 made by Ms. Radhika Bordia on X, recording the forcible detention of a journalist, along with screenshots of the accompanying video and link https://x.com/radhikabordia/status/2108872125583065575			

20.	<u>ANNEXURE P-10</u> True copy of the account published by Mr. Shoaib Daniyal on Scroll, along with link https://scroll.in/article/1096303/what-delhi-police-told-scrolls-shoaib-daniyal-while-detaining-him-21-km-away-from-jantar-mantar			
21.	<u>ANNEXURE P-11</u> True copy of the report published by Newslaundry concerning the detention of its journalists, along with link https://www.newslaundry.com/2026/10/10/2026/10/10/four-newslaundry-reporters-detained-by-delhi-police			
22.	<u>ANNEXURE P-12</u> True copy of the post dated 10.10.2026 made by Mr. Hemant Rajaura on X, along with screenshots of the accompanying video and link https://x.com/hemantrajora_/status/210894409157250292			

23.	<u>ANNEXURE P-13</u> True copy of the post dated 10.10.2026 made on the X account @allthingzabsurd, along with screenshots of the accompanying material and link https://x.com/allthingzabsurd/status/2108915264431775965			
24.	<u>ANNEXURE P-14</u> True copy of the order dated 11.10.2026 passed by this Hon'ble Court in Contempt Petition (Civil) Diary No. 63801/2026 and connected matters			
25.	<u>ANNEXURE P-15</u> True copy of the post dated 11.10.2026 made by Mr. Sreenivasan Jain on X, along with screenshots of the accompanying material and link https://x.com/sreenivasanjain/status/2109230114454319606			

26.	<u>ANNEXURE P-16</u> True copy of the post dated 11.10.2026 made by DeKoder on X, along with screenshots of the accompanying material and link https://x.com/dekoderai/status/2109250512470323539			
27.	<u>ANNEXURE P-17</u> True copy of the post dated 11.10.2026 made by Mr. Mayank on X, along with screenshots of the accompanying material and link https://x.com/mr_mayank/status/2109253511032819866			
28.	<u>ANNEXURE P-18</u> True copy of the post dated 11.10.2026 made by Mr. Mayank on X, along with screenshots of the accompanying material and link https://x.com/mr_mayank/status/2109253511032819866			

29.	<u>ANNEXURE P-19</u> True copy of the report published by The Indian Express concerning their detention, along with link https://indianexpress.com/article/cities/delhi/cjp-protest-in-delhi-indian-express-journalists-detained-connaught-place-chhatrasal-stadium-supreme-court-section-163-bnss-10916688/			
30.	<u>ANNEXURE P-20</u> True copy of the post made by Ms. Dhanya Rajendran on X concerning the detention of Ms. Nidhi Suresh, along with link https://x.com/dhanyarajendran/status/2109277584462942593			
31.	<u>ANNEXURE P-21</u> True copy of the report published by The Caravan concerning the assault and detention of Mr. Ryan Thomas, along with link https://caravanmagazine.in/news/delhi-police-beats-caravan-journalist-sir-protests			

32.	<u>ANNEXURE P-22</u> True copy of the post dated 11.10.2026 made by Pragya Live on X, along with screenshots of the accompanying video and link https://x.com/pragyalive/status/2109342268511653939			
33.	<u>ANNEXURE P-23</u> True copy of the report published by The Hindu concerning the detention of journalists and the explanation attributed to Delhi Police, along with link https://www.thehindu.com/news/national/anti-cec-protests-continue-journalists-detained-despite-sc-order-rahul-gandhi-announces-march-to-supreme-court-as-delhi-braces-for-fresh-curbs/article71572486.ece			
34.	<u>ANNEXURE P-24</u> True copy of the post dated 12.10.2026 made by Peek TV on X, along with screenshots of the accompanying material and link https://x.com/peektv_in/status/2109531792814526667			
35.	Filing Memo			

36.	Vakalatnama and Appearance			
37.	Resolution			

Place: New Delhi
Date: 12.10.2026

Filed By:

AARTHI RAJAN
Advocate for Petitioner
AOR CODE 2547

SYNOPSIS

The present Writ Petition under Article 32 of the Constitution of India is instituted by Network of Women in Media, India (“NWMI”), through its authorised representative, Ms. Laxmi Murthy, a collective of women journalists and media professionals formed in 2002, with a membership of around 950 women working in the media across almost all States of the country. The Petitioner is committed to promoting gender equality and justice within the media, defending freedom of speech and expression and press freedom, and safeguarding the dignity, safety and professional rights of women journalists. Through its website, <https://nwmindia.org/>, the Petitioner regularly publishes statements and reports concerning issues affecting women in the media and violations of journalists’ rights.

The Petition seeks urgent enforcement of the fundamental rights guaranteed under Articles 14, 19(1)(a), 19(1)(d) and 21 of the Constitution. It concerns repeated instances of unlawful detention, forcible removal, physical assault, manhandling, intimidation, disregard of press credentials and exclusion of journalists from places where matters of public importance were unfolding. While the incidents complained of concern journalists generally, they raise a distinct and serious constitutional concern for the Petitioner, particularly as women journalists were subjected to physical handling, dragging, detention and confinement while discharging their professional duties at the hands of police personnel.

Journalists are required, by the very nature of their profession, to report from protests, public assemblies, police operations and other situations involving the exercise of State power. Their ability to enter, remain in, observe and report from such spaces cannot depend upon the discretion of police personnel on the ground. Physical handling, intimidation, forcible removal or detention of women journalists in particular interferes not only with newsgathering and freedom of the press, but also with their dignity, bodily integrity, personal liberty and equal ability to participate in the profession.

On 10.10.2026, journalists covering protests concerning the Chief Election Commissioner and the Special Intensive Revision of electoral rolls were reportedly detained, obstructed, transported away from reporting locations and prevented from documenting events. The affected journalists included persons associated with Scroll, Newslaundry, Reuters, Business Standard, BOOMLive, India Today, The News Minute, Maktoob Media, The Indian Express, PTI, The Quint and other media organisations. These incidents occurred amid extensive barricading, disruption of transport and Metro services, suspension of internet services, deployment of more than 40,000 police and paramilitary personnel and the sealing of Jantar Mantar even to media personnel.

Of particular concern to the Petitioner are the reported incidents involving women journalists. The material refers, inter alia, to women journalists being physically handled,

dragged and detained while engaged in reporting. The prospect of physical handling or detention merely for remaining sufficiently close to observe and document events creates a distinct chilling effect upon the ability of women journalists to report freely from public spaces.

The incidents arise in a broader context already before this Hon'ble Court. By orders dated 28.07.2026 and 18.08.2026, this Hon'ble Court took cognisance of allegations concerning indiscriminate and excessive police force, including assault upon a member of the media, and constituted a High-Powered Enquiry Committee to examine, inter alia, proportionality of police action, accountability, identification of officers, chain of command and violence against women. Thereafter, on 09.10.2026 and 11.10.2026, this Hon'ble Court was further informed of transport shutdowns, internet disruption, restrictions upon movement, harassment and illegal detention extending beyond the area covered by Section 163 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023.

On 11.10.2026, upon recording the assurance made on behalf of the authorities, this Hon'ble Court expressly directed that lawyers, journalists and other professionals shall not be hindered in the discharge of their professional duties in any manner whatsoever. The said direction necessarily protects journalists engaged in bona fide observation, recording and reporting of events of public importance.

Notwithstanding the aforesaid direction, the available accounts describe further detention, coercive removal, dragging and prolonged confinement of journalists. Reporters who identified themselves, displayed press cards or were visibly recording were treated as participants rather than independent observers. No specific offence, disobedience of a lawful direction or individualised necessity was communicated in the reported incidents. In several instances, release followed only after transportation, delay or belated recognition of professional status.

On 12.10.2026, the Petitioner issued a public statement condemning the assault, harassment and detention of journalists while covering the events of 10.10.2026 and 11.10.2026. The Petitioner specifically recorded the physical handling of women journalists and continued interference with journalistic work despite the direction of this Hon'ble Court dated 11.10.2026. The Petitioner called for protection of journalists against further detention and interference, full compliance with the direction of this Hon'ble Court and an independent inquiry into the conduct of the personnel concerned.

The Petitioner submits that a free press must be able to approach, observe, question, record and report the exercise of public power, particularly during protests, dispersals, arrests and crowd-control operations. Observation cannot be equated with participation, nor can proximity to a protest, possession of recording equipment, questioning of officials

or documentation of police action, by itself, constitute a ground for detention or forcible removal.

The constitutional protection afforded to the press extends not merely to publication but also to the antecedent processes of access, observation, newsgathering, documentation, verification and dissemination of information. A journalist cannot report what she is prevented from witnessing. State action obstructing journalists at the stage of newsgathering directly burdens Article 19(1)(a) and also implicates dignity and bodily integrity under Article 21, equality and non-arbitrariness under Article 14 and freedom of movement under Article 19(1)(d).

Beginning with *Romesh Thappar v. State of Madras* and *Brij Bhushan v. State of Delhi*, and continuing through *Sakal Papers v. Union of India*, *Bennett Coleman & Co. v. Union of India*, *Indian Express Newspapers v. Union of India*, *Secretary, Ministry of Information & Broadcasting v. Cricket Association of Bengal*, *Anuradha Bhasin v. Union of India* and *Kaushal Kishor v. State of Uttar Pradesh*, this Hon'ble Court has consistently recognised that freedom of the press forms an indispensable part of the freedom of speech and expression and that citizens possess a corresponding right to receive information concerning matters of public importance.

The present Petition accordingly seeks effective and enforceable safeguards governing interaction between police personnel and media professionals during protests,

public assemblies and crowd-control operations, with specific safeguards for the dignity and safety of women journalists. Such safeguards are necessary to ensure that women journalists are able to occupy and report from public spaces on equal terms and without fear of physical force, intimidation or arbitrary detention.

Hence, the present Writ Petition.

LIST OF DATES

DATE	EVENTS
18.08.2026	This Hon'ble Court constituted a High-Powered Enquiry Committee to examine use of force, proportionality of the police response, pellets, identification of officers, surveillance, violence against women, compensation, blanket orders under Section 163 BNSS and use of Section 152 BNS. It was directed that the Committee may consider incidental issues and report periodically, while broader constitutional questions were reserved. It is pertinent that while the enquiry addressed the legality and proportionality of policing protests, the enumerated issues do not include access, detention or removal of journalists, or safeguards for reporting and newsgathering at the sites.
09.10.2026	In WP (C) Diary No. 63560/2026, heard with WP (Crl.) Diary No. 63544/2026, this Hon'ble Court recorded that a complete ban on essential public transport appears overreaching. The Ld. Solicitor General submitted that he would seek reassessment.

It was directed inter alia that there be no outright prohibition on Metro trains, that any such regulation be publicized including by way of traffic advisory, and a compliance report be submitted.

09.10.2026 DMRC announces closure of 57 Metro to stations, later revised to 45; mobile internet is

10.10.2026 suspended within four (4) kilometers of the Janpath–Kartavya Path crossing; more than 40,000 police and central armed police personnel are deployed; and Jantar Mantar is reported sealed “even to media personnel”.

Contempt Petition (Civil) Diary No. 63801/2026 challenges the breach of this Hon’ble Court’s direction specific to transport services and movement of persons.

However, the restrictions designed for public order/crowd control are applied so as to prevent the press from observing and communicating how those very restrictions are enforced.

10.10.2026 Journalists covering the protests are detained in Delhi and elsewhere. Mr. Ayush Tiwari of Scroll, though wearing a press pass, is detained outside HKS Surjeet Bhawan after an officer remarks, “aaj kal sab hi press waale hai”. Scroll reports the detention of its journalists Ayush Tiwari and Shoaib Daniyal

in Delhi and Divya Aslesha in Pune, together with journalists of Newsland, The Quint, Navbharat Times, Reuters, Alt News, Boom Live, Molitics and Reporter TV; Reporters Sans Frontières counts at least 16 journalists.

No offence, prohibitory direction or individual conduct justifying their removal is identified in the accounts.

The interference/hindrance to journalists is not an isolated dispute over access to one site, but a recurring pattern of treating proximity to a protest, possession of recording equipment, or the act of reporting as sufficient grounds for restraint.

11.10.2026 During urgent proceedings in CP (C) Diary No. 63801/2026 and WP (Crl.) Diary No. 63858/2026, submissions were made before this Hon'ble Court of widespread illegal detention of a large number of persons, including beyond the area covered by Section 163 BNSS.

On the Ld. Solicitor General's assurance, this Hon'ble Court directed in para 16(f): *"Lawyers, journalists and other professionals shall not be hindered in discharge of their professional duties in any manner whatsoever."*

11.10.2026, After the Court's categorical direction, **after the** accounts placed before the Petitioner **direction** describe journalists at RK Ashram Marg being put into a police vehicle for questioning a colleague's detention; Vedanta Agarwal and Sara Khan of Peek TV being dragged and detained at Connaught Place despite showing press cards; injury to a cameraperson; Nidhi Suresh of The News Minute and another woman journalist being held for hours; and a reporter of The Hindu being released only after her professional status was eventually accepted. The incidents disclose force, confinement and disregard of press identification without communication of a specific offence or recorded necessity. They demonstrate that the constitutional breach was continuing and operational, not historical or speculative.

11.10.2026, Reports stated that journalists were detained **evening** at different locations, including persons wearing identity cards or recording on phones, and attributed the police action to reporters being 'too close' to protesters or to 'confusion'. The Petitioner relies on these accounts as reports requiring verification against official records. Even on the police explanation as reported, proximity and confusion cannot constitute lawful grounds

for violence, detention or removal of identifiable journalists. The Respondents' records are necessary to disclose the full scale, duration, location and chain of responsibility.

11.10.2026 Contempt Petition (C) Diary No. 63801/2026, to WP (Crl.) Diary No. 63858/2026 and **13.10.2026** connected diary matters are listed on 13.10.2026, with compliance due.

12.10.2026 A further protest march to this Hon'ble Court is announced, and the extensive arrangements of 10.10.2026 are reported likely to return.

Journalists covering the next public assembly remain dependent upon the general words of para 16(f) of this Hon'ble Court's Order, without a stated protocol or framework guiding authorities/officers on the ground preventing repetition.

It is respectfully submitted that the continuing prospect of restraint demonstrates that retrospective contempt and assurances have not secured the institutional freedom of the press or the public's corresponding right to receive information.

12.10.2026 The Petitioner, Network of Women in Media, India, issued a statement titled *NWMI Condemns Assault and Detention of*

Journalists Despite Supreme Court Directions, condemning the assault, harassment and detention of journalists while reporting the events of 10.10.2026 and 11.10.2026. The statement records, inter alia, the physical handling of women journalists, detention of journalists despite identification as members of the press, and continued interference with journalistic work notwithstanding the direction of this Hon'ble Court dated 11.10.2026.

The Petitioner called for protection against further detention or interference with journalists performing their professional duties, preservation of their equipment, an independent inquiry into the conduct of the personnel concerned, and full compliance with the direction of this Hon'ble Court dated 11.10.2026.

10.2026 Hence the present Petition

NO.3

WRIT PETITION UNDER ARTICLE 32 OF THE
CONSTITUTION OF INDIA

TO

THE HON'BLE CHIEF JUSTICE OF INDIA
AND HIS COMPANION JUSTICES OF THIS
HON'BLE SUPREME COURT OF INDIA

THE HUMBLE PETITION OF THE
PETITIONER ABOVENAMED

MOST RESPECTFULLY SHOWETH:

INTRODUCTION:

1. The present Writ Petition under Article 32 of the Constitution of India is instituted by Network of Women in Media, India ("NWMI"), through its authorised representative, Ms. Laxmi Murthy. The Petitioner is a collective of women journalists and media professionals formed in 2002, with a membership of around 950 women working in the media across almost all States of the country, committed to promoting gender equality and justice within the media, defending freedom of speech and expression and press freedom, and safeguarding the dignity, safety and professional rights of women journalists.

2. The Petition concerns a grave and continuing attack upon the freedom of the press. The issue is whether the State may, without an identified offence, recorded necessity or proportionate basis, treat the act of witnessing and reporting police action as grounds for detention or force. The Constitution and this Hon'ble Court's jurisprudence answers that question in the negative. • The conduct complained of

affects individual journalists, disables the institutional functioning of the press and deprives the public of contemporaneous information concerning the exercise of State power. The injury assumes particular significance where women journalists are physically handled, dragged, removed or detained while discharging their professional duties in public spaces.

BRIEF BACKGROUND FACTS:

3. **18.08.2026:** This Hon'ble Court constituted a High-Powered Enquiry Committee to examine allegations concerning excessive police force during earlier demonstrations, including proportionality of police action, identification of personnel, surveillance, violence against women, compensation, and the exercise of powers under Section 163 BNSS and Section 152 BNS. The Committee was directed to submit periodic reports, while broader constitutional questions were reserved. • The present Petition concerns subsequent incidents commencing on 02.10.2026, particularly the obstruction, detention, forcible removal and assault of journalists engaged in reporting public demonstrations. • True copy of the order dated 18.08.2026 passed by this Hon'ble Court in W.P.(Crl.) No. 280/2026 and connected matters is annexed hereto and marked as **ANNEXURE P-1 (pgs. 26 to 43)**.

4. **02.10.2026:** Demonstrations commenced in Delhi concerning the Special Intensive Revision of electoral rolls and demands relating to the Chief Election Commissioner. Delhi Police refused permission for the proposed demonstration at Jantar Mantar, barricaded approaches to

the area and detained persons attempting to reach the protest site. The restrictions continued over the succeeding days, during which journalists were required to report upon public assemblies, police deployments, detentions and crowd-control operations. • True copy of the report published by The Indian Express concerning the demonstrations on 02.10.2026, along with link <https://indianexpress.com/article/cities/delhi/jantar-mantar-protest-gyanesh-kumar-700-detained-delhi-10904136/> , is annexed hereto and marked as **ANNEXURE P-2 (pgs. 44 to 50)**.

5. **03.10.2026:** Three women journalists covering the demonstrations near Jantar Mantar complained of sexual harassment by Delhi Police personnel while discharging their professional duties. Delhi Police subsequently acknowledged receipt of the complaints and stated that they had been referred to the Crime Branch for enquiry. The allegations arose during the policing of demonstrations and concerned the conduct of police personnel towards journalists engaged in reporting. • True copy of the report published by The Indian Express concerning the complaints and their reference to the Crime Branch, along with link <https://indianexpress.com/article/cities/delhi/delhi-police-crime-branch-probe-sexual-harassment-journalists-jantar-mantar-protest-cec-gyanesh-kumar-10905997> , is annexed hereto and marked as **ANNEXURE P-3 (pgs. ____ to ____)**.

6. **08.10.2026:** NHRC TAKES SUO MOTU COGNISANCE: The National Human Rights Commission took suo motu cognisance of the sexual harassment of three

women journalists by Delhi Police personnel on 03.10.2026. The Commission issued notice to the Commissioner of Police, Delhi, calling for a detailed report within two weeks. It also recorded that the complaints received by the New Delhi District Police had been referred to the Crime Branch for enquiry. The Commission observed that the allegations, if established, raised serious questions concerning violations of human rights. NHRC • True copy of the press release dated 08.10.2026 issued by the National Human Rights Commission, along with link <https://nhrc.nic.in/media/press-release/nhrc%2C-india-takes-suo-motu-cognizance-of-the-reported-sexual-harassment-of-three-journalists-by-delhi-police-personnel-during-a-protest-at-jantar-mantar%2C-new-delhi-on-3rd-october-2026>, is annexed hereto and marked as **ANNEXURE P-4 (pgs. 54 to 55).**

7. **08.10.2026 TO 09.10.2026:** Delhi Police issued a communication dated 08.10.2026 proposing restrictions upon entry and exit at 57 Delhi Metro stations in anticipation of the demonstrations scheduled for 10.10.2026. Further restrictions concerning railway services and vehicular movement were also proposed. Aggrieved by the proposed restrictions upon essential public transportation, the petitioner in W.P.(C) Diary No. 63560/2026 approached this Hon'ble Court.

8. **09.10.2026: ORDER OF THE SUPREME COURT:** This Hon'ble Court, in W.P.(C) Diary No. 63560/2026, M.A. Baby v. Union of India & Ors., observed that a complete prohibition upon essential public transportation appeared overreaching. The learned Solicitor General submitted that

the restrictions would be reconsidered. This Hon'ble Court directed, inter alia, that Metro services should not be subjected to outright prohibition, that any regulation be appropriately publicised, and that a compliance report be filed within four days. • True copy of the order passed by this Hon'ble Court in W.P.(C) Diary No. 63560/2026 dated 09.10.2026 is annexed hereto and marked as **ANNEXURE P-5 (pgs. 56 to 59).**

9. **09.10.2026 TO 10.10.2026:** Restrictions upon Metro services and vehicular movement were imposed in central Delhi. Mobile internet services were also suspended within a reported radius of four kilometres from the Janpath–Kartavya Path crossing. More than 40,000 police and central armed police personnel were reportedly deployed, and Jantar Mantar was reported to have been sealed even to media personnel. The restrictions affected journalists' access to the locations of the demonstrations and their ability to transmit contemporaneous reports, photographs and recordings. • True copy of the statement published by the Internet Freedom Foundation concerning the suspension of mobile internet services, along with link <https://internetfreedom.in/delhi-learned-of-its-internet-shutdown-from-a-leaked-top-secret-police-letter-not-the-government/>, is annexed hereto and marked as **ANNEXURE P-6 (pgs. 60 to ____).**

10. **10.10.2026: DETENTION OF JOURNALISTS DESPITE PRESS IDENTIFICATION:** Journalists covering the demonstrations were detained at different locations in Delhi, notwithstanding their identification as members of the press. Mr. Ayush Tiwari of Scroll was detained while

recording police action near HKS Surjeet Bhawan. Despite displaying his press identification, a police officer remarked, “aaj kal sab hi press waale hai”. Scroll also reported the detention of its Political Editor, Mr. Shoaib Daniyal, in Delhi and journalist Ms. Divya Aslesha in Pune. Journalists associated with Newsland, The Quint, Navbharat Times, Reuters, Alt News, BOOMLive, Molitics and Reporter TV were also reportedly detained. • True copy of the post dated 10.10.2026 made by Scroll.in on X, along with screenshots of the accompanying material and link https://x.com/scroll_in/status/2108855126165455295, is annexed hereto and marked as **ANNEXURE P-7 (pgs. ____ to ____)**.

11. **10.10.2026: PHYSICAL FORCE AGAINST JOURNALISTS:** Contemporaneous reports recorded journalists being physically dragged, pushed, manhandled and forcibly placed inside police vehicles. Ms. Anushka Bharadwaj of Business Standard was reportedly dragged by her clothes despite identifying herself as a journalist. Reuters journalist Mr. Saurabh Sharma was reportedly dragged and kicked by a masked police officer without visible identification. Mr. Ayush Tiwari of Scroll also reported being pushed while recording police action, resulting in a scratch to his waist and his shirt being torn. A journalist associated with Molitics was similarly pushed and shoved by police personnel before being placed inside a police bus. The News Minute. • True copy of the report titled “Dragged and detained: Inside the Delhi police's October 10 crackdown on journalists” published by The News Minute on 11.10.2026, along with link

<https://www.thenewsminute.com/news/dragged-and-detained-inside-the-delhi-polices-october-10-crackdown-on-journalists>, is annexed hereto and marked as **ANNEXURE P-8 (pgs. ____ to ____)**. • True copy of the post dated 10.10.2026 made by Ms. Radhika Bordia on X, recording the forcible detention of a journalist, along with screenshots of the accompanying video and link <https://x.com/radhikabordia/status/2108872125583065575>, is annexed hereto and marked as **ANNEXURE P-9 (pgs. ____ to ____)**.

12. **10.10.2026: DETENTION OF JOURNALISTS AND INTERFERENCE WITH RECORDINGS:** Mr. Shoaib Daniyal, Political Editor of Scroll, was detained while waiting for a taxi in South Delhi, approximately 21 kilometres from Jantar Mantar. Police personnel searched his belongings, photographed his identity document and placed him in a police vehicle. During his detention, police personnel sought to compel him to delete video recordings from his mobile phone. He was released after approximately ninety minutes. Separately, Newslandry reported that its journalists Ashwine Kumar Singh, Astha Savyasachi and Anmol Pritam, and intern Anshu, were detained while reporting. Police personally seized or interfered with their official mobile phones before transporting them to Chhatrasal Stadium. Scroll.in • True copy of the account published by Mr. Shoaib Daniyal on Scroll, along with link <https://scroll.in/article/1096303/what-delhi-police-told-scrolls-shoaib-daniyal-while-detaining-him-21-km-away-from-jantar-mantar>, is annexed hereto and marked as **ANNEXURE P-10 (pgs. ____ to ____)**. • True copy of the

report published by Newslandry concerning the detention of its journalists, along with link <https://www.newslandry.com/2026/10/10/2026/10/10/four-newslandry-reporters-detained-by-delhi-police>, is annexed hereto and marked as **ANNEXURE P-11 (pgs. ____ to ____)**.

13. **10.10.2026: FURTHER CONTEMPORANEOUS RECORDINGS:** Additional video recordings concerning police action during the demonstrations were published on 10.10.2026. The recordings include material published by Mr. Hemant Rajaura concerning the detention of Ms. Neha Bora and a gathering around the police vehicle following her detention. Other recordings were circulated concerning the deployment of police personnel and the detention of persons at the demonstrations. • True copy of the post dated 10.10.2026 made by Mr. Hemant Rajaura on X, along with screenshots of the accompanying video and link https://x.com/hemantrajora_/status/210894409157250292, is annexed hereto and marked as **ANNEXURE P-12 (pgs. ____ to ____)**. • True copy of the post dated 10.10.2026 made on the X account @allthingzabsurd, along with screenshots of the accompanying material and link <https://x.com/allthingzabsurd/status/210891526443177596> 5, is annexed hereto and marked as **ANNEXURE P-13 (pgs. ____ to ____)**.

14. **11.10.2026: EXPRESS PROTECTION TO JOURNALISTS BY THE SUPREME COURT:** This Hon'ble Court assembled for an urgent hearing in Contempt Petition (Civil) Diary No. 63801/2026 and W.P.(Crl.) Diary No. 63858/2026 concerning non-compliance with the order

dated 09.10.2026 and widespread illegal detention._During the hearing, interference with lawyers, journalists and other professionals was specifically brought to the attention of this Hon'ble Court.__The learned Solicitor General, on instructions, assured the Court that such persons would not be impeded in the discharge of their professional duties. Taking note of the assurance, this Hon'ble Court directed in paragraph 16(f):

“Lawyers, journalists and other professionals shall not be hindered in discharge of their professional duties in any manner whatsoever.”

- True copy of the order dated 11.10.2026 passed by this Hon'ble Court in Contempt Petition (Civil) Diary No. 63801/2026 and connected matters is annexed hereto and marked as **ANNEXURE P-14 (pgs. ____ to ____)**.

15. **11.10.2026: DETENTION OF JOURNALISTS AT R.K. ASHRAM MARG**: Notwithstanding the aforesaid direction, journalists continued to be obstructed while reporting. At R.K. Ashram Marg, journalists questioning Delhi Police concerning the detention of another journalist were themselves stopped and placed in a police vehicle. Mr. Sreenivasan Jain recorded the incident. A police officer was heard telling him that it was “not the right time to ask anything”. A subsequent post recorded the detention of at least seven journalists from the location. • True copy of the post dated 11.10.2026 made by Mr. Sreenivasan Jain on X, along with screenshots of the accompanying material and link

<https://x.com/sreenivasanjain/status/210923011445431960>

6, is annexed hereto and marked as **ANNEXURE P-15** (pgs. ____ to ____).

16. **11.10.2026: FURTHER RECORDINGS OF POLICE ACTION:** Contemporaneous recordings concerning the demonstrations and police action were also published by DeKoder and Mr. Mayank. The recordings form part of the material concerning the conduct of police personnel and the circumstances in which journalists and other persons were stopped, detained or removed from reporting locations. • True copy of the post dated 11.10.2026 made by DeKoder on X, along with screenshots of the accompanying material and link <https://x.com/dekoderai/status/2109250512470323539>, is annexed hereto and marked as **ANNEXURE P-16** (pgs. ____ to ____). • True copy of the post dated 11.10.2026 made by Mr. Mayank on X, along with screenshots of the accompanying material and link https://x.com/mr_mayank/status/2109253511032819866, is annexed hereto and marked as **ANNEXURE P-17** (pgs. ____ to ____).

17. **11.10.2026: FORCIBLE REMOVAL OF JOURNALISTS AT CONNAUGHT PLACE:** At Connaught Place, Vedanta Agarwal and Sara Khan of Peek TV were reportedly dragged and detained while covering the demonstrations, notwithstanding the display of press identification. Independent journalist M. Rajshekhar was also reportedly held while photographing the detention of students. Journalists associated with Reporter TV, 24 News and Asianet News were similarly detained and taken away in

police vehicles before being released. • True copy of the report published by Scroll.in concerning the detention and manhandling of journalists, along with link <https://scroll.in/latest/1096321/cec-protests-at-least-nine-journalists-detained-while-covering-demonstrations-in-delhi>, is annexed hereto and marked as **ANNEXURE P-18** (pgs. ____ to ____).

18. **11.10.2026:** JOURNALISTS TRANSPORTED TO CHHATRASAL STADIUM: Shashwat, Siya and Vijay of The Indian Express Hindi were detained while reporting from Connaught Place. Despite displaying press identification, they were placed in a police vehicle and transported approximately twelve kilometres away to Chhatrasal Stadium. They were released after approximately forty-five minutes. • True copy of the report published by The Indian Express concerning their detention, along with link <https://indianexpress.com/article/cities/delhi/cjp-protest-in-delhi-indian-express-journalists-detained-connaught-place-chhatrasal-stadium-supreme-court-section-163-bnss-10916688/>, is annexed hereto and marked as **ANNEXURE P-19** (pgs. ____ to ____).

19. **11.10.2026:** CONTINUED DETENTION OF JOURNALISTS: Ms. Nidhi Suresh of The News Minute was reportedly detained at approximately 15:00 hrs while covering the demonstrations. At approximately 19:08 hrs, Ms. Dhanya Rajendran recorded that the detained women had been informed at about 18:30 hrs that they could leave. A reporter associated with The Hindu was also placed in a police bus at Connaught Place and reportedly released only

after police personnel recognised that she was a journalist. The incidents occurred notwithstanding the express direction of this Hon'ble Court protecting journalists in the discharge of their professional duties. • True copy of the post made by Ms. Dhanya Rajendran on X concerning the detention of Ms. Nidhi Suresh, along with link <https://x.com/dhanyarajendran/status/2109277584462942593>, is annexed hereto and marked as **ANNEXURE P-20** (pgs. ____ to ____).

20. **11.10.2026: ASSAULT UPON JOURNALIST OF THE CARAVAN:** At approximately 18:00 hrs, Mr. Ryan Thomas, Assistant Multimedia Producer of The Caravan, was reportedly assaulted and detained by Delhi Police personnel while covering the demonstrations near Janpath Road. According to the published account, police personnel struck Mr. Thomas while he was recording the detention of a demonstrator and sought deletion of the footage from his mobile phone. The report identifies Assistant Sub-Inspector Kapil Kumar among the police personnel concerned. Mr. Thomas was forcibly placed in a police vehicle, where he that further physical force was used against him. He subsequently attended Ram Manohar Lohia Hospital for medical examination. • True copy of the report published by The Caravan concerning the assault and detention of Mr. Ryan Thomas, along with link <https://caravanmagazine.in/news/delhi-police-beats-caravan-journalist-sir-protests>, is annexed hereto and marked as **ANNEXURE P-21** (pgs. ____ to ____).

21. **11.10.2026:** ADDITIONAL VIDEO CONCERNING POLICE ACTION: Further footage concerning police action during the demonstrations was published on 11.10.2026 by Pragya Live. The post was published later that evening and forms part of the additional material furnished concerning police conduct during the demonstrations. • True copy of the post dated 11.10.2026 made by Pragya Live on X, along with screenshots of the accompanying video and link <https://x.com/pragyalive/status/2109342268511653939>, is annexed hereto and marked as **ANNEXURE P-22** (pgs. ____ to ____).

22. **11.10.2026:** DELHI POLICE'S EXPLANATION CONCERNING DETENTION OF JOURNALISTS: The Hindu reported that journalists were detained at different locations in Delhi, including persons wearing press identification and recording events on their mobile phones. Delhi Police reportedly attributed certain detentions to journalists being “too close” to protesters or to “confusion” concerning their identity. The explanation did not deny that the persons detained were journalists reporting upon the demonstrations. • True copy of the report published by The Hindu concerning the detention of journalists and the explanation attributed to Delhi Police, along with link <https://www.thehindu.com/news/national/anti-cec-protests-continue-journalists-detained-despite-sc-order-rahul-gandhi-announces-march-to-supreme-court-as-delhi-braces-for-fresh-curbs/article71572486.ece>, is annexed hereto and marked as **ANNEXURE P-23** (pgs. ____ to ____).

23. **12.10.2026: FURTHER MATERIAL PUBLISHED BY PEEK TV:** Peek TV published further material concerning the detention and treatment of its journalists during the demonstrations. The post concerns incidents previously reported involving journalists covering police action at Connaught Place. The publication date of 12.10.2026 is distinct from the date of the underlying incident. • True copy of the post dated 12.10.2026 made by Peek TV on X, along with screenshots of the accompanying material and link <https://x.com/peektv/status/2109531792814526667>, is annexed hereto and marked as **ANNEXURE P-24 (pgs. ____ to ____)**.

QUESTIONS OF LAW:

24. The present Writ petition raises substantial constitutional questions, including:

- (i) Whether the freedom of speech and expression guaranteed under Article 19(1)(a) of the Constitution includes the freedom of the press and the right of journalists to gather, receive, verify, document and disseminate information concerning matters of public importance?
- (ii) Whether detention, forcible removal, physical assault, dragging, manhandling, intimidation or retaliatory action against journalists engaged in bona fide reporting violates Articles 14, 19(1)(a), 19(1)(d) and 21 of the Constitution?
- (iii) Whether State action that prevents journalists from accessing places where matters of public significance are unfolding, impermissibly

burdens not only press freedom but also the public's constitutional right to receive information and the right to know?

- (iv) Whether restrictions imposed upon journalists in the course of reporting public assemblies, protests and governmental action are required to satisfy the constitutional standards of legality, necessity and proportionality?
- (v) Whether the reported detention and obstruction of journalists notwithstanding the direction of this Hon'ble Court dated 11.10.2026 and the assurance recorded therein that, "*lawyers, journalists and other professionals shall not be hindered in discharge of their professional duties in any manner whatsoever*" is violative of Articles 14, 19 and 21 of the Constitution?
- (vi) Whether interference with journalists while covering matters of public importance has a chilling effect upon independent reporting and democratic accountability, thereby impairing the institutional functioning of the press?
- (vii) Whether the use of force against identifiable journalists, including after production of press credentials or assertion of professional status, can ever be sustained without a specific, recorded and individualised necessity satisfying legality, necessity and proportionality?
- (viii) Whether the failure to ensure visible identification of officers, preserve contemporaneous recordings, maintain

accurate detention records and disclose the chain of command renders allegations of police excess incapable of effective investigation and thereby compounds the violation of Articles 14, 19 and 21?

GROUND:

A. Because the actions complained of violating Articles 19(1)(a), 14 and 21 of the Constitution and strike at the core of the constitutional guarantee of a free press. Beginning with *Romesh Thappar v. State of Madras* and *Brij Bhushan v. State of Delhi*, and continuing through *Sakal Papers*, *Bennett Coleman*, *Indian Express Newspapers*, *Cricket Association of Bengal*, *Anuradha Bhasin* and *Kaushal Kishor*, this Hon'ble Court has consistently recognised that freedom of the press is indispensable to constitutional democracy and that citizens possess a corresponding right to receive information concerning matters of public importance.

B. Because the constitutional protection afforded to the press extends not merely to publication but to the antecedent processes of newsgathering, observation, documentation and dissemination of information. A journalist cannot report what a journalist is prevented from witnessing. The detention, obstruction and removal of journalists while engaged in bona fide reporting activities therefore directly burden Article 19(1)(a) and cannot be justified except in accordance with the strict requirements of legality, necessity and proportionality.

C. Because the impugned actions impair not merely the rights of individual journalists but the public's constitutionally protected right to know. Journalists perform a constitutionally significant function as independent observers of public affairs and as a conduit between events occurring on the ground and citizens throughout the country. Interference with journalists reporting events of national importance therefore restricts the flow of information to the public and undermines democratic accountability.

D. Because constitutional protection extends to the entire journalistic process: access, observation, questioning, recording, verification, preservation and dissemination. The State cannot be permitted to suppress scrutiny by physically removing, assaulting or confining the person who creates the contemporaneous record for no other reason than the person simply being present to witness the event. Any restriction must be sourced in law, directed to a legitimate aim, necessary in the circumstances and proportionate in means and effect.

E. Because violence against journalists is a form of censorship by force. A baton, grip, shove, physically carrying away by several personnel, forced entry into a police vehicle, or threat of or actual detention may suppress reporting as effectively as a formal prohibition. When deployed against persons visibly engaged in newsgathering, such force attacks both bodily integrity under Article 21 and the institutional freedom of the press under Article 19(1)(a). The injury extends to every citizen denied an independent account of events occurring in public.

F. Because the reported detentions, removals and acts of force lacked any individualised legal basis. Journalists were restrained at multiple locations, including places removed from the proposed assembly, and in circumstances where their professional status was asserted or objectively apparent. The indiscriminate treatment of bona fide observer and participant alike is manifestly arbitrary, bears no rational nexus to public order and cannot survive constitutional scrutiny under Articles 14, 19 and 21.

G. Because this Hon'ble Court's direction dated 11.10.2026 that journalists shall not be hindered in any manner whatsoever was intended to operate on the ground, not merely in official assurances. Continued detention, dragging, manhandling or obstruction after that direction demonstrates the inadequacy of general instructions unsupported by a field protocol, supervisory responsibility, preservation of evidence and immediate remedies. The freedom of the press cannot depend upon whether an individual officer arbitrarily chooses to honour a press card.

H. Because the impugned practice rests on an unconstitutional conflation of proximity with participation. A journalist must often stand close enough to see, hear and record. Presence near protesters, possession of recording equipment, asking questions or documenting a detention does not convert an observer into a participant. To treat those acts as grounds for force or confinement immunises police conduct from scrutiny and creates a powerful chilling

effect upon all reporting of protests and crowd-control operations.

I. Because the Petitioner craves leave to urge such other grounds as may be necessary at the time of hearing.

J. Because the existing proceedings concerning transport restrictions, habeas corpus and contempt do not comprehensively determine the standards governing police interaction with journalists or supply forward-looking safeguards against repetition. This Petition seeks distinct declaratory, preventive and remedial relief concerning press access, use of force, officer identification, evidence preservation, disclosure, independent inquiry and command accountability.

K. Because allegations of journalists being dragged, manhandled, injured, detained or forcibly transported warrant scrutiny through an independent process operating outside the immediate chain of command of the officers concerned. An internal account cannot satisfactorily determine who authorised the action, which officers participated therein, what warnings or directions were issued, what legal basis, if any, was recorded, where the detained journalists were taken, whether medical assistance was provided, and whether any recordings, notes, devices, footage or journalistic equipment were interfered with. Effective constitutional redress requires the preservation of evidence, time-bound identification of responsible personnel, disclosure of the relevant chain of command, and protection against retaliation directed at journalists, witnesses, complainants or media organisations.

INTERIM PRAYER:

Pending hearing and final disposal of the present Writ Petition, this Hon'ble Court may be pleased to:

- a. Direct the Respondents forthwith to ensure that no journalist or media professional engaged in bona fide newsgathering or reporting is assaulted, physically handled, threatened, detained, transported, removed or otherwise obstructed except pursuant to authority of law and upon a specific, recorded and proportionate basis;
- b. Direct the Respondents to ensure that women journalists engaged in bona fide newsgathering or reporting are not subjected to physical handling, intimidation, arbitrary detention or forcible removal merely by reason of their presence at or proximity to a protest, public assembly, crowd-control operation or other event of public importance;
- c. Direct the Respondents to ensure strict compliance with the Order dated 11.10.2026 passed by this Hon'ble Court that journalists and other professionals shall not be hindered in discharge of their professional duties;
- d. Direct immediate preservation, sealing and production of all CCTV footage, body-worn camera recordings, police videography, wireless communications, PCR call logs, duty rosters, deployment charts, vehicle movement logs, detention registers, arrest memos, medical records and complaint records concerning incidents involving journalists from 10.10.2026 onwards;
- e. Direct the Respondents to disclose, location-wise and officer-wise, the particulars of all journalists and media workers detained, removed, transported, injured or

otherwise prevented from reporting, together with the legal basis asserted in each case, the officers responsible, the place and period of custody and whether medical examination or assistance was provided;

- f. Direct that any journalist taken into custody or removed from a reporting location be permitted immediate access to counsel and to her or his media organisation, and that no journalistic equipment, footage, recordings or data be seized, searched, deleted, damaged or compelled to be disclosed except strictly in accordance with law; and
- g. Pass such other or further interim order or direction as this Hon'ble Court may deem fit and proper in the facts and circumstances of the present case.

PRAYER

In view of the foregoing facts and circumstances, it is respectfully prayed that this Hon'ble Court may be pleased to:

- a. Issue an appropriate writ, order or direction declaring that arbitrary detention, forcible removal, intimidation, assault, dragging, manhandling, injury or other use of force against journalists and media professionals while engaged in bona fide newsgathering or reporting violates Articles 14, 19(1)(a), 19(1)(d) and 21 of the Constitution and impermissibly burdens the public's right to know;
- b. Issue an appropriate writ, order or direction declaring that the physical handling, intimidation, arbitrary detention or coercive removal of women journalists while engaged in bona fide journalistic activity infringes their dignity, bodily integrity and personal liberty under Article 21, in addition to burdening their freedom of speech and expression under Article 19(1)(a), and

directing appropriate safeguards to ensure their equal and safe participation in journalistic work in public spaces;

- c. Direct strict and demonstrable compliance with the direction contained in paragraph 16(f) of the Order dated 11.10.2026 passed by this Hon'ble Court, including preservation and disclosure of all records relating to incidents involving journalists from 10.10.2026 onwards, identification of the officers and supervisory chain involved, and production of CCTV footage, body-worn camera recordings, police videography, wireless communications, duty rosters, deployment records, vehicle logs, detention records and medical records;
- d. Constitute, or direct the constitution of, an independent and time-bound mechanism to inquire into allegations of detention, physical violence, injury, coercive removal, intimidation and obstruction of journalists, identify individual and command responsibility, recommend disciplinary or other action in accordance with law, and determine appropriate compensation and remedial measures;
- e. Frame, or direct the framing of, binding guidelines governing interaction of police and other law-enforcement authorities with journalists and media professionals during protests, public assemblies, crowd-control operations and other events of public importance;
- f. Direct that the aforesaid guidelines include, inter alia, provisions concerning visible identification of police personnel, recognition of press credentials without making accreditation the sole test of journalistic status, use-of-force thresholds, recording of reasons for detention or removal, immediate access to counsel and editorial organisations,

medical assistance where required, protection of journalistic equipment and data, and preservation of contemporaneous evidence;

- g. Direct that the aforesaid guidelines contain specific safeguards concerning the dignity, bodily integrity and safety of women journalists, including protection against arbitrary physical handling, intimidation, detention and forcible removal while engaged in bona fide newsgathering or reporting; and
- h. Pass such other order or orders as this Hon'ble Court may deem fit to secure press freedom, bodily safety, accountability of public authorities, democratic scrutiny and the effective protection of fundamental rights.

AND FOR THIS ACT OF KINDNESS THE PETITIONER AS
DUTY BOUND SHALL EVER PRAY

Place: New Delhi
Date: 12.10.2026

Filed By:

AARTHI RAJAN
Advocate or the Petitioner
CODE 2547

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF INDIA
WRIT PETITION (CIVIL) NO. OF 2026

IN THE MATTER OF:

NETWORK OF WOMEN IN MEDIA, INDIA

...PETITIONER

VERSUS

UNION OF INDIA & ORS.

...RESPONDENTS

ADVOCATE'S CHECK-LIST

1.	WP (C) has been filed in Form No.28 with certificate.	YES
2.	The Petition is as per the provisions of Order XV Rule 1.	YES
3.	The papers of WP have been arranged as per Order XXI, Rule 3 (1)(f)	YES
4.	Brief list of dates/events have been filed.	YES
5.	Paragraphs and pages of paper books have been numbered consecutively and correctly noted in Index.	YES
6.	Proper and required number of paper books (1+1) have been filed.	YES
7.	The particulars of the impugned judgment passed by the court(s) below are uniformly written in all the documents.	YES
8.	In case of appeal by certificate the appeal is accompanied by judgment and decree appealed from and order granting certificate.	NA
9.	The Annexures referred to in the petition are true copies of the documents before the court(s) below and are filed in chronological order as per List of Dates.	YES
10.	The annexures referred to in the petition are filed and indexed separately and not marked collectively.	YES
11.	In WP against the order passed in Second Appeal, copies of the orders passed by the Trial Court and First Appellate Court have been filed.	YES
12.	The complete listing proforma has been filled in, signed and included in the paper books.	YES
13.	In a petition (PIL) filed under clause (d) of Rule 12 (1), Order XXXVIII, the petitioner has disclosed:	YES

	(a) his full name, complete postal address, e-mail address, phone number, proof regarding personal identification, occupation and annual income, PAN number and National Unique Identity Card number, if any;	
	(b) the facts constituting the cause of action;	NA
	(c) the nature of injury caused or likely to be caused to the public;	NA
	(d) the nature and extent of personal interest, if any, of the petitioner(s);	NA
	(e) details regarding any civil, criminal or revenue litigation, involving the petitioner or any of the petitioners, which has or could have a legal nexus with the issue(s) involved in the Public Interest Litigation.	NA
14.	In case of appeals under Armed Forces Tribunal Act, 2007, the petitioner/appellant has moved the Armed Forces Tribunal for granting certificate for leave to appeal to the Supreme Court.	NA
15.	All the paper books to be filed after curing the defects shall be in order.	YES

I hereby declare that I have personally verified the petition and its contents, and it is in conformity with the Supreme Court Rules, 2013. I certify that the above requirements of Check List have been complied with. I further certify that all the documents necessary for the purpose of hearing of the matter have been filed.

Place: New Delhi
Date: 12.10.2026

Filed By:

AARTHI RAJAN
Advocate or the Petitioner
CODE 2547

**PROFORMA FOR FIRST LISTING IN THE SUPREME COURT
OF INDIA**

SECTION: PIL

The case pertains to (Please tick/check the correct box): -		
(a)	Central Act: (Title)	
(b)	Section	-
(c)	Central Rule: (Title)	
(d)	Rule No (s)	NA
(e)	State Act: (Title)	NA
(f)	Section:-	NA
(g)	State Rule: (Title)	NA
(h)	Rule No (s):	NA
(i)	Impugned Interim order: (Date)	NA
(j)	Impugned Final order/Decree:(Date)	NA
(k)	High court: (Name)	NA
(l)	Names of judges	NA
(m)	Tribunal/Authority:(Name)	NA
1.	Nature of matter (Civil/ Criminal)	CIVIL
2.	(a) Petitioner name	Network of Women in Media, India
	(b) E-mail ID:	NA
	(c) Mobile phone number	NA
3.	(a) Respondent name	1. Union of India 2. Government of NCT of Delhi 3. Commissioner of Police
	(b) E-mail ID:	NA
	(c) Mobile phone number	NA
4.	(a) Main category classification:	18
	(b) Sub classification	1807
5.	Not to be listed before	NA
6.	(a) Similar Disposed of matter with citation, if any, & cases details.	No similar matter disposed of.
	(b) Similar pending matter with case details.	No similar pending matter
7.	Criminal matters:-	
	(a) Whether accused/ convict has surrendered:	NA
	(b) FIR No./Complaint No.	

		Date:	
	(c)	Police Station	
	(d)	Sentence Awarded	NA
	(e)	Sentence undergone	NA
	(f)	Whether any earlier case between the same parties is filed	NA
	(g)	Particulars of the FIR and Case	
	(h)	Whether any bail application was preferred earlier and decision thereupon	NA
8.	Land acquisition matters:		NA
	(a)	Date of section 4 notification	NA
	(b)	Date of section 6 notification	NA
	(c)	Date of section 17 notification	NA
9.	Tax matters: State the tax effect:		NA
10.	Special Category		NA
	(first petitioner/ appellant only):		NA
	(a)	Senior citizen >65 years	NA
	(b)	SC/ST	NA
	(c)	Woman/child	NA
	(d)	Disable	NA
	(e)	Legal Aid case	NA
	(f)	In custody	NA
11.	Vehicle number (in case of motor accident claim matter):		NA
12.	Whether there was / is litigation on the same point of law, if yes details thereof		NA

Place: New Delhi
Date: 12.10.2026

Filed By:

AARTHI RAJAN
Advocate or the Petitioner
CODE 25477

AARTHI RAJAN
Advocate or the Petitioner
CODE 2547