

News

Delhi Police fight bail for Umar Khalid and others in the Supreme Court amid a regime change operation and a plot to murder non-Muslims.



The Delhi High Court's ruling, which held those on bail accountable for the trial's delay in the conspiracy case and said that it was affecting those still incarcerated, has been a major source of support for the police.

The Delhi Police have submitted a 389-page document explaining why the accused should not be released on bail after the Supreme Court criticized it for taking so long to respond to the bail requests made by Umar Khalid, Sharjeel Imam, and others in the Delhi Riots

conspiracy case.

"Ocular and irrefutable documentary as well as technical evidence" that suggests a plot to ignite "nationwide riots on communal lines" has been highlighted by the police.

Additionally, it has made extensive use of the recent ruling in *Tasleem Ahmed v. State Govt. of NCT of Delhi*, when the Delhi High Court held the defendants on bail in the Delhi Riots plot case accountable for the trial's delay and claimed that this was having an effect on those who were still incarcerated.

These are the eight reasons why the Delhi Police had rejected the bail requests.

1. The "regime change operation" was a pan-Indian conspiracy.

"The petitioner conceived, fostered, and carried out a plot that aimed to undermine the nation's sovereignty and integrity by upsetting community peace and inciting the populace to not only disregard public order but also to the point of armed insurrection...

...Note: These kind of coordinated or sponsored protests have been referred to as "Regime Change Operation(s)" in the international theory that has emerged in recent years.

The available evidence indicates that the current plot was intended to be reproduced and carried out throughout India.

2. Well-planned demonstrations during Trump's visit

"There is no question that the immediate conspiracy was prearranged to be carried out when the US president was scheduled to visit India on official business, as evidenced by the documents on file, including the conversations mentioning US President Donald Trump. By depicting the CAA as an act of pogrom against the Muslim population in India, this was done to attract the attention of "international media" and make the problem a worldwide one. The CAA issue was specifically selected to act as a "radicalizing catalyst" under the guise of "peaceful protest."

3. The penalty for UAPA offenses is jail time.

"JAIL AND NOT BAIL is the rule in offenses that go right to the core of India's integrity

[UAPA offenses]." Prima facie, the petitioner is guilty of the charges. It is the petitioners' responsibility to disprove the aforementioned presupposition, which they have utterly failed to do. In this instance, bail cannot be granted only on the basis of delay due to the extremely serious nature of the offense.

4. Held the accused accountable for the trial's delay.

Both the special court and the High Court have issued judicial findings after findings, explaining how the petitioners, acting in concert, have prevented charges from being brought against them;

The Section 207 proceedings (providing the accused with the police report) could only be completed with much difficulty after the appellate courts stepped in;

In spite of the daily hearing order, the petitioners once more prevented the special court from formulating charges and caused the trial to be postponed for more than two years.

The petitioners have attempted to hide the Supreme Court's ruling in Tasleem Ahmed v. State Govt. of NCT of Delhi, which unequivocally states that the petitioners have not let the trial to proceed in this case.

5. Only 155 witnesses, not 900

In addition to being premature, the claim that the trial won't likely be finished anytime soon since there are 900 witnesses is a ruse to get bail.

A review of the witness list would reveal that there are roughly 155 public witnesses, of whom 58 have testified that they have made their remarks. Forty-eight of the 47 witnesses who were granted protected status recorded their testimonies under Section 164 CrPC, while the remaining witnesses made their statements under Section 161 CrPC.

6. Umar Khalid has already retracted his Supreme Court bail request.

The High Court's conclusions are final because Khalid withdrew his appeal before the Supreme Court in February 2024. Therefore, in order to avoid or reopen matters that have already reached a definitive conclusion, the court should not allow the accused to submit multiple bail applications.

7. The murder of non-Muslims by Chakka Jaam

Disruptive Chakka-Jaam's goals were to cause widespread deaths and injuries to non-Muslims and police officers, as well as to do harm to private property and the government by inciting communal riots. It is important to remember that Sharjeel Imam has published a thesis on riots, and his understanding of how to build up critical mass for engineering riots is evident in his lectures, as is the communal tag.

8. WhatsApp meetings and groups

The JCC WhatsApp group was established in order to accomplish their terror incident goals using a cell number that was obtained through forged documents. This is a blatant sign of the questionable use of the number and the secret goal that was pursued.

Under Umar Khalid's guidance, a group WhatsApp group called "Muslim students of JNU" was established. It is clear from BOND's (witness) oath in which he described the distinction between Dharna and Chakka Jaam.