

MOOT PROPOSITION

IN THE HIGH COURT OF VAYUVANA AT NIRMALPUR
[Under Article 226 of the Constitution of Indica, 1950
Clubbed with a Criminal Miscellaneous Petition under Section 528 of the
Indica Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023]

AZAD DIGITAL FOUNDATION & ORS. v. STATE OF VAYUVANA & ORS.

Writ Petition (Criminal) No. 226 of 2026

Clubbed with

KABIR AHLUWALIA v. STATE OF VAYUVANA & ORS.

Criminal Miscellaneous Petition No. 528 of 2026

STATEMENT OF FACTS

I. BACKGROUND

1. The State of Vayuvana is a technologically advanced State within the Union of Indica. Its capital city, Nirmalpur, is widely known for digital media start-ups, independent comedy collectives, artificial intelligence laboratories, online journalism platforms, and influencer-led public commentary.
2. In the last few years, public discussion in Vayuvana has increasingly moved from television studios and newspapers to podcasts, short-video platforms, subscription-based comedy shows, and live-streamed digital events. Several creators use satire, parody, dark humour, political mimicry, artificial intelligence filters, and audience-interactive formats to discuss public policy and current affairs. The State Government has repeatedly expressed concern that certain online creators, under the cover of humour, were normalising vulgarity, insulting vulnerable communities, spreading misleading synthetic content, and weakening respect for constitutional institutions. On the other hand, digital rights groups, artists, comedians, and independent media collectives have argued that the State has begun using the language of “decency”, “public order”, “misinformation”, and “synthetic content” to suppress dissent, criticism of governance, and politically uncomfortable satire.
3. In February 2026, the Union Government amended the Information Technology (Intermediary Guidelines and Digital Media Ethics Code) Rules, 2021. The amended framework introduced specific obligations concerning synthetically generated information, including deepfake audio, altered visuals, AI-generated videos, misleading voice clones, impersonation content, and harmful synthetic media. The amended framework also required intermediaries to take greater due diligence measures by deploying reasonable technical tools to label permissible AI-generated content, preserve metadata of uploaded media, and act expeditiously upon receipt of a court order or reasoned intimation from the appropriate Government or its authorised agency. Civil society welcomed regulation of non-consensual deepfakes, impersonation, child sexual abuse material, and AI-enabled fraud. However, concerns were also raised that an overbroad reading of the amended Rules could convert intermediaries into private censors and may have a chilling effect on satire, parody, political commentary, creative artistic expression, and reasonable criticism of the Government.

II. THE SHOW “PUBLICLY OFFENSIVE”

4. In March 2026, a popular creator-led digital platform called StageAdda, operated by StageAdda Digital Pvt. Ltd., launched a members-only online show titled “Publicly Offensive”. The show was hosted by Kabir Ahluwalia, a 31-year-old stand-up comedian and political satirist, and co-hosted by Meera Sanyal, a 29-

year-old podcast host known for interviewing artists, bureaucrats, entrepreneurs, and public commentators. “Publicly Offensive” show was marketed as a late-night adult comedy and satire show. The access page of the show stated: “This programme contains mature humour, political satire, strong language, and content intended only for adults above the age of 18 years. Viewer discretion is advised.” Access to the full episodes required payment of a monthly subscription. StageAdda's internal policy required users to self-declare that they were above 18 years of age. However, the platform did not use any government identity-based age verification system. The format of the show involved invited guests, young performers, social media creators, and audience-submitted jokes. A segment titled “Roast the Republic” involved participants making jokes about public policy, bureaucracy, political hypocrisy, censorship, influencer culture, and moral policing.

5. Kabir was known for sharp criticism of the State Government's recently launched public campaign called “Clean Screens Mission”, which claimed to promote “responsible online culture”. Kabir had frequently mocked the campaign as “a moral science class wearing the uniform of cyber law”. Meera, though less politically aggressive, had previously hosted episodes questioning the transparency of digital takedown orders, selective targeted police action against artists, and the growing role of executive directions in online speech regulation.

III. THE CONTROVERSIAL EPISODE

6. On 12 April 2026, StageAdda recorded Episode 7 of “Publicly Offensive” at a small studio in Nirmalpur with an audience of around 200 people. The episode was titled “Can the Internet Behave?”. The core show panel included 6 persons:

- a. Kabir Ahluwalia – The Host and a comedian;
- b. Meera Sanyal – The Co-host and a podcaster;
- c. Raghav Raina – A lifestyle influencer with a large youth following;
- d. Tara Sen – A disability rights activist and law student;
- e. Ojas Verma – A young stand-up performer with partial visual impairment; and
- f. Dr. Ira Menon – A professor of media ethics.

7. During the episode, the discussion turned to whether comedy should have legal limits. Tara Sen argued that jokes punching down on vulnerable communities should not be normalised. Kabir responded that the law should punish real harm, not every bad joke. Dr. Menon cautioned that humour could be protected speech, but commercial creators owed greater care because clips often travelled beyond the original audience. The sitting audience was enjoying the show and some of them were even taking photos and making reels to post on their social media profiles tagging the panelists.

8. During the “Roast the Republic” segment, Ojas Verma voluntarily performed a short routine about how society treats persons with disabilities as either “inspirational heroes” or “objects of pity”. The routine was self-deprecating and received applause. Shortly thereafter, Raghav Raina made an off-colour remark about “sympathy discounts”, “blind auditions”, and “people who cannot see the joke but still want to cancel it”. Tara objected immediately and said the remark was insulting to persons with disabilities. Kabir attempted to defuse the tension by saying: “The joke is bad, the Constitution is safe, and Raghav should probably apologise before the internet drafts a chargesheet.” Raghav laughed and said: “This is an adult show. People paid to be offended. If you entered this room, you signed away the right to act shocked.”

9. In another part of the episode, Kabir used crude and sexually explicit language while mocking online moral policing. One exchange involved a hypothetical question framed in vulgar terms about family privacy, adult humour, and hypocrisy in public culture. The remark was greeted with nervous laughter in the studio. Meera immediately said: “We are cutting that. There is a difference between satire and career suicide.” According to Kabir and Meera, the most explicit portion was removed from the final edit. StageAdda's compliance team also inserted a warning card before the episode, stating that the programme contained mature language,

satire, and discussion of offensive speech.

10. On 15 April 2026, the edited episode was uploaded behind StageAdda's members-only subscription wall. It was accessible only to paying subscribers who had self-declared that they were adults.

IV. THE VIRAL CLIP

11. On 17 April 2026, a 58-second edited clip containing clips from the episode began circulating on Chirrup, a micro-video platform operated by Chirrup Interactive Pvt. Ltd. The clip showed Kabir, Meera, and Raghav laughing immediately after Raghav's remark concerning persons with disabilities. It also showed Kabir asking a vulgar hypothetical question. The clip ended with a freeze-frame of Tara Sen looking visibly uncomfortable.

12. Within hours, the clip went viral across Chirrup, LoopLine, QuickCast, and private messaging groups. Several users accused Kabir, Meera, Raghav, and StageAdda of insulting persons with disabilities, corrupting public morality, and hiding obscenity behind a paywall. The hashtag #BoycottPubliclyOffensive trended nationwide. Several political spokespersons stated on television that "influencer privilege cannot become a licence to abuse Indica values".

13. Kabir publicly stated that the viral clip was misleading because it removed the surrounding discussion, Tara's objections, Ojas's own performance, Meera's intervention, and the later apology offered to Tara during the episode. Meera stated that the viral clip included audio fragments that did not exist in the final version uploaded on StageAdda. She alleged that a synthetic voice layer had been added using some AI tool to make it appear as if she had mocked Tara's objection.

14. StageAdda issued a statement saying that the clip circulating on Chirrup was not a faithful reproduction of the published episode. It claimed that portions of the clip had been "synthetically altered, re-sequenced, and captioned in a manner calculated to inflame outrage". Tara Sen issued a separate statement saying that she had felt hurt by Raghav's remark during the recording but had later received an apology from him. However, she also stated that the viral circulation of the clip had caused harm to the dignity of persons with disabilities because the larger online audience was laughing at the insulting portion without the corrective context. Ojas Verma stated that he was "angry at both sides", he expressed his anguish towards Raghav for making a careless remark and also at anonymous users for converting a complex discussion about disability and comedy into a weaponised viral outrage campaign.

V. THE SYNTHETIC VERSION OF THE VIRAL CLIP AND GOVERNMENT ACTION

15. On 18 April 2026, an anonymous Chirrup account named @NaitikNagrik108 uploaded a second version of the clip titled "Creators Exposed: They Laugh at Disability and Family Decency". This second version added dramatic background music, enlarged subtitles, AI-generated crowd laughter, and a voice resembling Kabir's voice saying: "Disabled people should not come to comedy shows if they cannot take jokes." Kabir denied ever making this statement. The second version also contained a brief synthetic visual in which a person resembling Meera appeared to roll her eyes when Tara spoke. Meera claimed that this was AI-generated manipulation.

16. By 19 April 2026, both versions had together crossed 80 million views. Protests were held outside StageAdda's office. Certain groups demanded immediate arrest of the creators. Some users issued threats to Kabir, Meera, Raghav, Tara, and Ojas. A few persons vandalised posters outside StageAdda's studio.

17. On 20 April, 2026 the Department of Digital Safety, Government of Vayuvana, issued an emergency communication to Chirrup, StageAdda, LoopLine, QuickCast and other social media intermediaries directing them to:

- a. remove the viral clips and all "substantially similar content";
- b. disable access to all the episodes of "Publicly Offensive";

- c.prevent re-upload of all content containing the impugned remarks;
- d.deploy automated tools to detect and block synthetic versions of the clip;
- e.disclose the details of the first originator of the viral clip and the synthetic version; and
- f.submit a compliance report within three hours.

The communication stated that the content was *prima facie* obscene, derogatory towards persons with disabilities, harmful to public order, and violative of the amended IT Rules relating to synthetically generated information.

18.Chirrup partly complied with the direction and disabled access to several versions of the clip. However, it stated that identifying “all substantially similar content” was technologically difficult because many users were uploading commentary, criticism, news clips, fact-checks, parody responses, and legal analysis. StageAdda removed the imugned Episode 7 temporarily but objected to the direction insofar as it required disabling access to all the episodes of the show. It argued that other episodes contained serious discussions on free speech, disability dignity, digital outrage, and State censorship. It also stated that removal of the all the episodes prevented the public from seeing the context that allegedly exonerated Kabir and Meera. The Department of Digital Safety replied that once a harmful clip had gone viral, platforms could not hide behind “context” while the damage continued to multiply. It stated that subscription walls and disclaimers could not protect unlawful content from constitutional and criminal scrutiny.

VI. REGISTRATION OF FIRs

19.On 20 April 2026, the Cyber Crime Cell, Nirmalpur, registered FIR No. 77/2026 against Kabir Ahluwalia, Meera Sanyal, Raghav Raina, unknown employees of StageAdda, and unknown users including @NaitikNagrik108. The FIR invoked, *inter alia*:

- a.Sections 296, 352, 353, 356, and 61(2) of the Indica Nyaya Sanhita, 2023, relating to obscene acts or words, intentional insult, statements conducing public mischief, defamation, and criminal conspiracy;
- b.Sections 66C, 66D, 66E, 67, and 67A of the Information Technology Act, 2000, relating to identity misuse, cheating by personation using computer resource, violation of privacy, and publication or transmission of obscene or sexually explicit material in electronic form;
- c.Section 69A and Section 79 of the Information Technology Act, 2000 read with the Information Technology (Intermediary Guidelines and Digital Media Ethics Code) Rules, 2021 as amended in 2026; and
- d.Section 92(a) of the Rights of Persons with Disabilities Act, 2016, for publicly insulting and humiliating entire community of Persons with Disabilities.

20.Two more FIRs were later registered in the neighbouring States of Nayantika and Suryagarh on similar allegations after local complainants claimed that the viral clip had hurt public morality and insulted persons with disabilities. Kabir and Meera alleged that they were being subjected to coordinated and targeted legal harassment. They argued that multiple FIRs in multiple States were being used to punish digital creators before any court had determined whether an offence was made out. The State of Vayuvana stated that the FIR in Nirmalpur concerned the creation, publication, monetisation, and circulation of unlawful digital content from within Vayuvana. It further stated that the role of each accused could be determined only after investigation.

VII. ARREST, SEIZURE, AND INVESTIGATION

21.On 21 April 2026, Kabir Ahluwalia was called for questioning at the Cyber Crime Cell. He appeared with his lawyer at 11:00 a.m. The investigating officer asked Kabir to unlock his mobile phone, laptop, cloud storage,

creator dashboard, private messages with editors, and unpublished scripts of previous episodes. Kabir refused to disclose passwords to personal chats and unpublished scripts, stating that the demand was excessive, unrelated to the FIR, and violative of his privacy, creative freedom, and right against compelled self-incrimination. The police seized Kabir's phone, laptop, two hard drives, and studio editing notes. The seizure memo stated that these materials were necessary to determine whether the viral clip was deliberately manufactured as a publicity stunt and whether the synthetic version had been created by someone connected with StageAdda.

22. Kabir was arrested at 8:40 p.m. on 21 April 2026. His arrest memo stated that arrest was necessary to prevent destruction of digital evidence, secure cooperation, and investigate conspiracy. Kabir's counsel alleged that the arrest memo was not supplied to the family until the next morning. The State denied this and stated that all mandatory safeguards under the Indica Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 were complied with. On 22 April 2026, Kabir was produced before the Judicial Magistrate, First Class, Nirmalpur. The police sought fourteen days' custody for forensic extraction, interrogation regarding the synthetic clip, and identification of the first originator. Kabir's counsel opposed police custody, arguing that the entire case arose from a recorded show already in the possession of the police, that Kabir had appeared voluntarily, that seizure of his devices was disproportionate, and that the investigation was being used to examine his show scripts and unpublished satire, and to also limit his creative expression. The Judicial Magistrate granted fourteen days' police custody, observing that digital manipulation, synthetic content, and coordinated online dissemination required prompt technical investigation.

23. Meera Sanyal was not arrested but was directed not to leave Indica without permission. Raghav Raina joined the investigation and tendered a public apology while maintaining his stand that his remark, though tasteless, did not constitute a criminal offence.

VIII. THE WRIT PETITION

24. On 23 April 2026, Azad Digital Foundation, a registered civil liberties organisation, filed a writ petition before the High Court of Vayuvana at Nirmalpur. The petition was joined by Meera Sanyal, StageAdda Digital Pvt. Ltd., and a collective of independent comedians, podcasters, and online educators through separate interlocutory applications. The petition challenged:

- a. the emergency communication dated 20 April, 2026 issued by the Department of Digital Safety;
- b. the blocking of all the episodes of "Publicly Offensive" show;
- c. the direction to disable "all substantially similar content";
- d. the requirement imposed on platforms to use automated tools to prevent re-upload without clear standards;
- e. the threatened loss of intermediary safe harbour for failure to comply within three hours; and
- f. the chilling effect of criminal prosecution on digital creators, comedians, and political commentators.

25. The petitioners contended that the State's action was vague, overbroad, disproportionate, procedurally unfair, arbitrary, unreasonable and violative of Articles 14, 19(1)(a), 19(1)(g), and 21 of the Constitution of Indica. The petitioners stated that the present matter affects the public at large as it not only infringes fundamental rights of the petitioners but also attacks on civil liberties of citizens at large. The petitioners did not claim that creators had an absolute right to insult persons with disabilities or publish obscene content. Their case was that constitutional courts must distinguish between illegality, vulgarity, bad taste, satire, adult humour, political dissent, and synthetically manipulated outrage.

26. The State of Vayuvana and Union of Indica opposed the writ petition. They argued that digital creators cannot monetise vulgarity, insult vulnerable communities, and then claim immunity merely because the original episode was placed behind a subscription wall. The State further contended that AI-manipulated content can cause irreversible harm within minutes and that intermediaries must be required to act swiftly where synthetic media, obscenity, disability-based humiliation, and public disorder intersect.

IX. THE CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS PETITION

27. Kabir Ahluwalia separately filed a Criminal Miscellaneous Petition under Section 528 of the Indica Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023, seeking quashing of FIR No. 77/2026 dated 20 April, 2026, interim protection from coercive action in connected FIRs, return of seized devices after forensic imaging, and a direction that the police shall not access privileged legal communication, unpublished creative material, or unrelated personal data. Kabir argued that the allegations, even if taken at face value, did not disclose the commission of cognisable offences under the invoked provisions. He further argued that obscenity must be judged by contemporary community standards, context, purpose, and the tendency of the material as a whole, not by isolated viral fragments. Kabir also argued that the alleged synthetic statement was not made by him and that the State had failed to distinguish between:

- a. the full members-only episode;
- b. the edited viral clip;
- c. the AI-manipulated second version;
- d. third-party commentary and criticism; and
- e. unlawful threats and harassment by unrelated users.

28. The State opposed quashing, submitting that the matter involved disputed facts, forensic analysis, possible conspiracy, platform accountability, and public harm to persons with disabilities. It stated that courts should not prematurely interfere with investigation where digital evidence is still being examined.

29. Since the writ petition and criminal petition involved overlapping issues concerning free speech, obscenity, disability dignity, AI-generated content, intermediary obligations, criminal investigation, and procedural safeguards, the Chief Justice of Hon'ble High Court of Vayuvana directed that both matters be heard together by a Special Division Bench.

30. The matters are now listed for final hearing before the High Court of Vayuvana at Nirmalpur.

LEGAL ISSUES FOR CONSIDERATION

The following issues shall be argued before the Special Division Bench of the Hon'ble High Court of Vayuvana:

Issue 1: Whether the writ petition and the connected criminal miscellaneous petition are maintainable in their present form under Article 226 of the Constitution of India and Section 528 of the Indica Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023?

Issue 2: Whether the emergency takedown, blocking, automated filtering, disclosure, and compliance directions dated 20 April, 2026 issued by the State in relation to the controversial episodes, viral clips, and substantially similar content are constitutionally valid, proportionate, and consistent with the Information Technology Act, 2000 and the Information Technology (Intermediary Guidelines and Digital Media Ethics Code) Rules, 2021 as amended in 2026?

Issue 3: Whether the impugned content, or any part of it, is protected under Article 19(1)(a) of the Indian Constitution as satire, adult humour, creative expression, political commentary, or influencer-led public discourse, or whether it falls within the permissible restrictions under Article 19(2), including decency, morality, defamation, public order, and protection of the dignity of persons with disabilities?

Issue 4: Whether the registration of FIR No. 77/2026 dated 20 April, 2026, arrest of Kabir Ahluwalia, seizure of electronic devices, remand order, and continuation of criminal investigation are lawful and proportionate under the Indica Nyaya Sanhita, 2023, Indica Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023, Information Technology Act, 2000, and allied laws; and whether the FIR deserves to be quashed or whether interim protection shall be granted?

NOTES AND CLARIFICATIONS FOR PARTICIPANTS

1. All names of persons, platforms, institutions, government departments, cities, and States used in this moot proposition are fictional and any similarity with real incidents or persons, platforms, institutions, government departments, cities, or States is purely coincidental. This Moot proposition has been curated for educational and training purposes.
2. The laws applicable to the fictional State of Vayuvana are in pari materia with the laws in force in India, unless expressly stated otherwise. And, the Indica Nyaya Sanhita, 2023, Indica Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023; Indica Sakshya Adhiniyam, 2023 in this moot proposition are in pari materia with Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023; Bharatiya Nagrik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 & Bharatiya Sakshya Adhiniyam, 2023 respectively.
3. Information Technology (Intermediary Guidelines and Digital Media Ethics Code) Rules, 2021 as amended in 2026 shall be treated as being in force on the date of the impugned events.
4. The full episode of "Publicly Offensive" was originally uploaded behind a subscription wall. However, short clips and altered versions later circulated on public platforms.
5. It is undisputed that at least one viral version of the clip contained synthetic alteration. However, the authorship and origin of the synthetic version remain disputed.
6. It is disputed whether the original episode, taken as a whole, was obscene, derogatory, or legally impermissible.
7. It is undisputed that Raghav Raina made an off-colour remark concerning disability. It is disputed whether the remark amounts to a criminal offence.
8. It is disputed whether Kabir Ahluwalia made the statement attributed to him in the synthetic version.
9. No final forensic report has been filed. No chargesheet has been filed against any accused. It shall be assumed that no other application or petition has been filed by the petitioners / applicants other than the ones mentioned in this moot proposition.
10. Participants shall not add new issues. However, they may frame sub-issues arising from the four issues listed above.
11. The constitutionality of the parent statutes is not under direct challenge. However, participants may argue constitutional interpretation, reading down, proportionality, procedural safeguards, and statutory limits where necessary.
12. Participants may argue both on facts and law, provided they do not travel beyond the factual matrix.
13. The matter is to be argued before a Special Division Bench of the High Court of Vayuvana at Nirmalpur.
14. The Schedules provided with the Moot Proposition are not exhaustive and are merely provided as an assistive aid for Participants. Participants may consult other applicable laws, precedents and legal literature as well.

SCHEDULE – A: SUGGESTED LIST OF READINGS

(INDICATIVE APPLICABLE LAWS)

Participants may consult, inter alia, the following list of laws and legal materials. This list is Indicative and not exhaustive (Important Note: This list contains some relevant and some irrelevant laws and legal materials, your task is to also filter the most relevant laws and provisions from the following reading materials for the purpose of creating your arguments):

- 1.The Constitution of India, 1950: Including Articles 14, 19(1)(a), 19(1)(g), 19(2), 21, 32, 226, and 227.
- 2.Information Technology Act, 2000: Including Sections 66C, 66D, 66E, 67, 67A, 69A, 72, 72A, 79, and allied provisions relating to electronic records, intermediary liability, cyber offences, privacy, blocking, and safe harbour.
- 3.Information Technology (Intermediary Guidelines and Digital Media Ethics Code) Rules, 2021, as amended from time to time: Including provisions relating to due diligence by intermediaries, grievance redressal, takedown obligations, user accountability, and platform compliance.
- 4.Information Technology (Intermediary Guidelines and Digital Media Ethics Code) Amendment Rules, 2026: To the extent relevant to synthetically generated information, AI-generated content, deepfakes, labelling, traceable metadata, technical measures, and expedited takedown obligations.
- 5.Information Technology (Procedure and Safeguards for Blocking for Access of Information by Public) Rules, 2009: To the extent relevant to blocking directions, emergency orders, procedural safeguards, and review mechanisms.
- 6.Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023: Including Sections 296, 352, 353, 356, and 61(2) and other provisions relating to general principles of criminal law, obscene acts and words, intentional insult, statements conducing public mischief, defamation, criminal intimidation, conspiracy, and allied offences.
- 7.Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023: Including provisions relating to registration of FIR, arrest, notice of appearance, search and seizure, remand, investigation, inherent powers of the High Court, and safeguards against arbitrary criminal process.
- 8.Bharatiya Sakshya Adhiniyam, 2023: Including provisions relating to electronic and digital records, admissibility, proof of electronic evidence, and admissibility of electronic evidence which is synthetically manipulated.
- 9.Rights of Persons with Disabilities Act, 2016: Including Section 92(a) and other provisions to the extent relevant to dignity, non-discrimination, humiliation, public insult, and protection of persons with disabilities.
- 10.Digital Personal Data Protection Act, 2023: To the extent relevant to personal data, privacy, consent, and processing of digital information during platform compliance and investigation.

*This list of not exhaustive. It is merely provided as an assistive aid for participants. ...

SCHEDULE – B: SUGGESTED LIST OF READINGS

(INDICATIVE APPLICABLE PRECEDENTS)

The following readings are suggested to assist participants in understanding the depth of the moot proposition and preparing moot memorials. This list is Indicative and not exhaustive (Important Note: This list contains some relevant and some irrelevant precedents, your task is to also filter the most relevant cases from the following reading materials for the purpose of creating your arguments):

S. No.	Case Name	Citation
1	<i>Shreya Singhal v. Union of India</i>	(2015) 5 SCC 1
2	<i>Anuradha Bhasin v. Union of India</i>	(2020) 3 SCC 637
3	<i>K.S. Puttaswamy (Retd.) v. Union of India</i>	(2017) 10 SCC 1
4	<i>Maneka Gandhi v. Union of India</i>	(1978) 1 SCC 248
5	<i>S. Rangarajan v. P. Jagjivan Ram</i>	(1989) 2 SCC 574
6	<i>Ranjit D. Udeshi v. State of Maharashtra</i>	AIR 1965 SC 881
7	<i>Aveek Sarkar v. State of West Bengal</i>	(2014) 4 SCC 257
8	<i>Apoorva Arora v. State (Govt. of NCT of Delhi)</i>	2024 INSC 223
9	<i>Subramanian Swamy v. Union of India</i>	(2016) 7 SCC 221
10	<i>R. Rajagopal v. State of Tamil Nadu</i>	(1994) 6 SCC 632
11	<i>Kaushal Kishor v. State of Uttar Pradesh</i>	(2023) 4 SCC 1
12	<i>Bennett Coleman & Co. v. Union of India</i>	(1972) 2 SCC 788
13	<i>Indian Express Newspapers (Bombay) Pvt. Ltd. v. Union of India</i>	(1985) 1 SCC 641
14	<i>Modern Dental College & Research Centre v. State of Madhya Pradesh</i>	(2016) 7 SCC 353
15	<i>Om Kumar v. Union of India</i>	(2001) 2 SCC 386
16	<i>State of Madras v. V.G. Row</i>	AIR 1952 SC 196
17	<i>State of Haryana v. Bhajan Lal</i>	1992 Supp (1) SCC 335
18	<i>Neeharika Infrastructure Pvt. Ltd. v. State of Maharashtra</i>	(2021) 19 SCC 401
19	<i>Arnesh Kumar v. State of Bihar</i>	(2014) 8 SCC 273
20	<i>D.K. Basu v. State of West Bengal</i>	(1997) 1 SCC 416
21	<i>Joginder Kumar v. State of Uttar Pradesh</i>	(1994) 4 SCC 260
22	<i>Selvi v. State of Karnataka</i>	(2010) 7 SCC 263
23	<i>District Registrar and Collector v. Canara Bank</i>	(2005) 1 SCC 496
24	<i>People's Union for Civil Liberties v. Union of India</i>	(1997) 1 SCC 301
25	<i>Sakal Papers (P) Ltd. v. Union of India</i>	AIR 1962 SC 305
*This list of not exhaustive. It is merely provided as an assistive aid for participants.		