



UTTAR PRADESH STATE INSTITUTE OF FORENSIC
SCIENCE, LUCKNOW

presents

First Edition
UPSIFS NATIONAL
MOOT COURT COMPETITION

IN ASSOCIATION WITH



G.GIRI & PARTNERS LLP
ADVOCATES SINCE 1987

MOOT PROPOSITION

KNOWLEDGE PARTNER

SCC[®]
ONLINE

MEDIA PARTNER

SCC[®]
ONLINE **TIMES**

Prefatory Note

The Republic of Indus is a fictional sovereign State. Its Constitution and laws are in pari materia with those of the Republic of India. The facts stated in this proposition are entirely fictitious, and any resemblance to any person, entity or organisation, living or dead, is purely coincidental.

This Moot Proposition has been drafted by Mr. Aditya Giri, Advocate-on-Record, Supreme Court of India. Any attempt by a participating team to contact the drafter, directly or indirectly, in relation to this Moot Proposition shall result in immediate disqualification.

STATEMENT OF FACTS

1. The Republic of Indus is a constitutional democracy whose Constitution guarantees equality before law, freedom of speech and peaceful assembly, the right to life and personal liberty, privacy, and procedural safeguards against arrest and preventive detention. Preventive detention is permitted only in exceptional circumstances affecting public order or national security and is subject to constitutional and statutory safeguards.

2. In 2024, the Union Ministry of Home Affairs introduced the National Predictive Safety Initiative (NPSI), an Artificial Intelligence (AI)-enabled decision-support system developed to assist law-enforcement agencies in crime prevention, public order management, threat assessment and resource allocation. The NPSI uses historical crime records, publicly accessible judicial records, CCTV footage, lawfully obtained communication and travel metadata, and other intelligence inputs to generate risk assessments for individuals and locations. According to the Union Government, the system is advisory in nature, and any coercive action must be based on an independent decision of the competent authority. The Union Government's guidelines expressly provide that no individual shall be detained solely on the basis of an NPSI output and that human authorities must independently evaluate all available material before taking coercive steps.

3. The NPSI was developed after consultations with data scientists, law-enforcement agencies and policy experts. It underwent internal

technical validation and limited external evaluation by a government-accredited institution. Although periodic reviews of the system are conducted under executive guidelines, its source code, training datasets, audit reports and technical methodology have not been made public on the grounds of operational security and confidentiality. Certain internal review notes, not disclosed in full, indicate that the NPSI recorded a number of false positives during its pilot phase in other districts, though the respondents maintain that these were within acceptable margins of error. The State of Aryavarta adopted the NPSI for preventive policing in selected districts affected by organised crime, cyber-enabled offences and recurring public-order disturbances.

4. The NPSI operates within the existing legal framework governing national security and public order. The authorities contend that all measures taken in connection with the NPSI are governed by the applicable laws and procedures and are subject to the safeguards prescribed therein. The authorities further maintain that any coercive action is based on the independent satisfaction of the competent authority and not merely on an automated assessment.

5. The petitioner, Aarav Mehra, is a 27-year-old legal researcher and community organiser. On 12 February 2026, he participated in a peaceful public demonstration held in the Capital City after obtaining the necessary permission from the local authorities. Prior to the demonstration, intelligence agencies had issued a warning that extremist groups might attempt to exploit the gathering to create public disorder. The record also contains a human intelligence input dated 8 February 2026 identifying the petitioner as a person of interest.

6. It is undisputed that the petitioner had been in contact with Kabir Sen, a former university acquaintance who was subsequently named in proceedings concerning unlawful activities. The petitioner maintains that his contact with Kabir Sen was limited to academic discourse and student-activism discussions and was unrelated to any unlawful activities. The petitioner has no prior criminal record and has not previously been named in any public-order or national-security proceedings.

7. Following the demonstration, local police intercepted the petitioner after the NPSI classified him as a "High Propensity Individual" requiring preventive verification. The petitioner was taken into preventive custody for questioning, and a detention order was subsequently issued under the applicable preventive-detention framework. Before issuing the order, a supervisory officer recorded reasons referring to the available intelligence inputs, the petitioner's interaction with Kabir Sen, and the NPSI assessment.

8. During the period of preventive detention, the petitioner remained in custody for approximately 48 hours before being released. The police state that the petitioner was informed of the grounds of detention, medically examined upon admission and release, and permitted to consult legal counsel in accordance with the applicable law. However, certain intelligence inputs and technical details underlying the NPSI assessment were withheld on the ground that their disclosure could compromise ongoing investigations and operational security.

9. Following the detention, the investigating agency registered a First

Information Report alleging that the petitioner had links with an associational network sympathetic to a proscribed organisation. Around the same time, the financial investigating authority-initiated proceedings against a civil society organisation associated with the petitioner, alleging that certain financial transactions were connected with unlawful activities.

10. During the investigation, the petitioner sought access to the material forming the basis of the NPSI assessment, including the categories of data considered, the methodology adopted, and the reasons for his classification as a "High Propensity Individual." The competent authorities declined to disclose the source code, training datasets, algorithmic methodology, detailed scoring process, and audit reports, relying upon considerations of national security, operational confidentiality, vendor confidentiality, and the protection of sensitive information.

11. During the investigation, the authorities relied on AI-assisted forensic tools, including facial-recognition analysis, automated network mapping, digital communication linkage reports, and pattern-recognition software for analysing electronic records. According to the respondents, these tools were used only to assist the investigation, and their outputs were examined by trained forensic experts before being relied upon. The petitioner questions the reliability and transparency of these technologies, particularly in the absence of access to their methodology, validation standards, confidence thresholds and error rates. The facial-recognition software used in this case is acknowledged to have a margin of error,

particularly in crowded, low-light conditions, but the State Forensic Science Laboratory considers its performance adequate for investigative use when considered alongside other materials.

12. The parties also dispute the extent to which the NPSI assessment and the AI-assisted forensic outputs influenced the investigative process and the subsequent proceedings. While the respondents maintain that all actions were taken independently in accordance with the applicable legal framework and subject to human oversight, the petitioner alleges that the AI-generated assessment substantially influenced the decisions taken by the investigating authorities. It alleges that his presence at the demonstration site was solely as a participant and legal observer and denies having played any coordinating role in the assembly.

13. Aggrieved by his preventive detention, the subsequent investigative proceedings, the refusal to disclose the technical basis of the NPSI assessment, and the reliance placed upon AI-assisted forensic tools during the investigation, the petitioner has approached the Hon'ble Supreme Court of Indus seeking appropriate reliefs against the actions of the authorities.

14. For the purposes of this moot proposition, it is assumed that all relevant proceedings are at an investigative stage and that the Hon'ble Supreme Court of Indus is seized of the constitutional and procedural issues arising from the present dispute.

ISSUES FOR CONSIDERATION

I. Whether the use of the National Predictive Safety Initiative (NPSI) in preventive policing and criminal investigations is consistent with the fundamental rights and procedural safeguards guaranteed under the Constitution of Indus?

II. Whether the petitioner's preventive detention was constitutionally and legally valid in the circumstances of the present case?

III. Whether AI-assisted forensic outputs meet the applicable standards of admissibility, reliability and evidentiary value in criminal proceedings?

IV. Whether the proceedings initiated against the petitioner and the associated civil society organisation under the applicable legal framework are legally sustainable?

ANNEXURE A

SAMPLE PERSON-BASED RISK ASSESSMENT REPORT

National Predictive Safety Initiative

Report ID	NPSI/PR/2026/0412
Date	10 February 2026
Subject	Aarav Mehra, Age 27, Male
Overall Risk Score	82 / 100
Classification	High Risk
Alert Level	Orange

Contributing Factors

- Repeated presence in locations linked to prior protest activity.
- Association-network overlaps with individuals previously investigated in public-order cases.
- Frequent visits to high-activity urban zones during peak assembly hours.
- Social-media interaction pattern showing coordination with politically sensitive groups.
- Prior contact with persons named in pending police surveillance files.

Model Output

The subject demonstrates a statistically significant probability of participation in assemblies likely to escalate into unlawful activity or public-order disturbance.

Recommended Policing Action

- Enhanced surveillance for 14 days.
- Field inquiry by local Station House Officer.
- Preventive questioning if found in proximity to crowd-sensitive areas.
- Escalation to district intelligence unit if behavioural pattern persists.

Confidence & Data Quality

Confidence Level	68%
Model Explanation	Limited
Source Data Quality	Mixed

Note: This report is generated by an automated system and is intended for internal law-enforcement use only.

ANNEXURE B

FORENSIC LABORATORY REPORT

State Forensic Science Laboratory, Aryavarta — Digital Forensics Division

Report No.	SFL/DF/2026/077
Date	18 February 2026
Subject	Examination of CCTV footage, mobile-device data, and facial-recognition comparison relating to Aarav Mehra.

Materials Examined

- CCTV clips from Central Secretariat Road.
- Extracted image stills from public surveillance cameras.
- Mobile location metadata provided by the investigating agency.
- Facial-comparison output generated through AI-assisted forensic software.

Findings

- The facial-recognition tool produced a probable match between the subject and the individual appearing in CCTV frame 14B.
- Metadata indicates that the subject's device was in the broader vicinity of the demonstration site during the relevant time window.
- Pattern analysis suggests association with multiple known contacts linked to prior public-order matters.

Opinion

Based on the above materials, the subject appears to have been present at the location and may have played a coordinating role in the assembly.

Caveat

The facial-recognition output is probabilistic in nature and should be considered alongside other investigative materials.

Signed

Assistant Director, Digital Forensics Division.