

Shailendra Mani Tripathi vs Union Of India on 28 July, 2026

Note added by Neil pahuja: Points referenced are highlighted on page 6

ITEM NO.28 to 32

COURT NO.1

SECTION PIL-W

S U P R E M E C O U R T O F I N D I A
RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS

Writ Petition(s)(Criminal) No(s).280/2026

SHAIENDRA MANI TRIPATHI

Petitioner(s)

VERSUS

UNION OF INDIA & ORS.

Respondent(s)

WITH

Item No.29

Writ Petition(s)(Criminal) No(s).279/2026

IA No. 213827/2026 – APPROPRIATE ORDERS/DIRECTIONS

IA No. 215310/2026 – INTERVENTION APPLICATION

Item No.30

Writ Petition(s)(Criminal) No(s).286/2026

Item No.31

Writ Petition(s)(Criminal) No(s).282/2026

IA No. 215863/2026 – EX-PARTE AD-INTERIM RELIEF

Item No.32

Writ Petition(s)(Criminal) No(s).283/2026

Date : 28-07-2026 These petitions were called on for hearing today.

CORAM : HON'BLE THE CHIEF JUSTICE
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JOYMALYA BAGCHI
HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE V. MOHANAFor Petitioner(s) :Mr. Gopal Sankaranarayanan, Sr. Adv.
Mr. Gaurav Kumar, Adv.
Mr. Vishal Sinha, Adv.
Mr. Pradeep Kumar Yadav, Adv.
Mr. Shailendra Mani Tripathi, Adv.
Mr. Sanjiv Misra, Adv.
Mr. Siddharth Venugopal, Adv.
Mr. Naman Shrestha, Adv.

Signature Not Verified

Ms. Pooja Shilpkar, Adv.

Digitally signed by
SACHIN KUMAR
SRIVASTAVA

Mr. Shourya Dasgupta, Adv.

Date: 2026.07.28

14:56:04 IST

Reason: Mr. Smruthi Gangadharaiah, Adv.
Mr. Samprity Kar, Adv.
Mr. Priyendu Raghav Mishra, Adv.

1

Mr. Mukesh Kumar Thalour, Adv.
Mr. Rakesh Kumar, Adv.
Mr. Vishal Kumar, Adv.
Mr. Praveen Kumar, Adv.
Mr. Chand Qureshi, AOR
Mr. Mujahid Ahmad, Adv.
Mr. Mohit Yadav, Adv.
Mr. Mohd Shahzad Ansari, Adv.
Mr. Gaurav Yadav, Adv.
Mr. Saurav S., Adv.
Mr. Anurag Yadav, Adv.
Ms. T. Geetha, Adv.
Mr. Chand Qureshi, AOR

Mr. Shyam Divan, Sr. Adv.
Mr. Ritin Rai, Sr. Adv.
Ms. Trisha Chandran, AOR
Ms. Samiksha Godiyal, Adv.
Mr. Daksh Kadian, Adv.
Mr. Udayaditya Banerjee, Adv.
Ms. Tahira Kathpalia, Adv.
Mr. Harsh Srivastava, Adv.
Ms. Mallika Aggarwal, Adv.
Mr. Tenzing Namgyal, Adv.
Mr. Sreekar Aechuri, Adv.
Ms. Smruthi Gowda, Adv.
Mr. Arpith Jacob Varaprasad, Adv.
Mr. Shaishir Divatia, Adv.
Ms. Aadya Khanna, Adv.
Mr. Abhishek Singh, Adv.
Mr. Mridul Godha, Adv.
Ms. Ankita Gupta, Adv.
Mr. Rithwik Narayanan, Adv.
Ms. Sarah Ayreen Mir, Adv.
Mr. Gladson Rodrigues, Adv.

Mr. Narendra Mishra, Adv.
Ms. Aakanksha Tiwari, Adv.
Ms. Preeti Chauhan, Adv.
Mrs. Priyanka Dwivedi, Adv.
Mr. Keshav Choudhary, Adv.
Ms. Nazish Fatima, Adv.
Mrs. Monika, Adv.
Mr. Neeraj Shrivastava, Adv.
Mr. Shiv Sagar Tiwari, AOR

Mr. Gopal Sankaranarayanan, Sr. Adv.
Ms. Ashima Mandla, AOR
Mr. Nipun Saxena, Adv.
Ms. Mandakini Singh, Adv.

Ms. Vanshika Tewari, Adv.
Mr. Dev Nagar, Adv.
Ms. Aadya Pandey, Adv.

2

Ms. Deepali Dabas, Adv.
Mr. B.D. Rao Kundan, Adv.
Mr. Siddharth Venugopal, Adv.
Mr. Shaurya Dasgupta, Adv.
Ms. Smruthi Gangadhar, Adv.

Dr. Abhishek Manu Singhvi, Sr. Adv.
Mr. Shoeb Alam, Sr. Adv.
Ms. Fauzia Shakil, Adv.
Mr. Amit Bhandari, Adv.
Mr. Ujjwal Singh, AOR
Ms. Nazmeen Ahmed, Adv.

Mr. Shadan Farasat, Sr. Adv.
Mr. Harshit Anand, Adv.
Mr. Yashwant Singh, AOR

For Respondent(s) :Dr. Abhishek Manu Singhvi, Sr. Adv.

Ms. Neha Rathi, AOR
Mr. Omar Hoda, Adv.
Mr. Amit Bhandari, Adv.
Ms. Kajal Giri, Adv.
Ms. Somya Kumari, Adv.
Mr. Prateek Yadav, Adv.
Mr. Rishav Ranjan, Adv.
Mr. Aman Prasad, Adv.
Mr. Pratul, Adv.
Mr. Parimal Wagh, Adv.

Mr. Tushar Mehta, SG
Mr. S.V. Raju, ASG
Mr. Bhuvan Kapoor, Adv.
Mr. Annam Venkatesh, Adv.
Mr. N. Visakamurthy, AOR
Mr. Arvind Kumar Sharma, AOR

Mr. Sridhar Potaraju, Sr. Adv.
Mr. Venkata R. Vamsi, Adv.
Ms. Chamundeswari P., Adv.
Ms. Yashika Sharma, Adv.

Ms. Ruchi Kohli, Sr. Adv.
Ms. Srishti Mishra, AOR

UPON hearing the counsel the Court made the following
O R D E R

1. These petitions, filed under [Article 32](#) of the Constitution of India, seek the intervention of this Court regarding numerous incidents of violence that occurred during recent protests by demonstrators, predominantly students, at Jantar Mantar, New Delhi, and other locations within

Delhi. Furthermore, these disturbances subsequently spread to various other states, including Maharashtra, Bihar, Assam, Uttar Pradesh, Madhya Pradesh, West Bengal, and Kerala. In essence, the allegations contended are that violations have been committed in violation of the Fundamental Rights guaranteed under [Articles 14, 19, 21, and 22](#) of the Constitution of India, despite the fact that the protesting students were motivated by concerns over the leakage of question papers pertaining to the NEET examination 2026. The petitioners have placed on record a multitude of instances alleging the indiscriminate and excessive use of force by the police in the National Capital Territory of Delhi, which includes lathi charge, deployment of pellet guns, and the use of tear gas, among other measures. The nature of the incidents detailed in this collection of petitions suggests that:

- (i) Pellet guns were used that led to injuries to the young students, including one boy allegedly losing his eyesight;
- (ii) Rubber bullets were used that caused injuries to various persons, including a woman.
- (iii) Electronic batons were used to disperse the crowd.
- (iv) Lathis embedded with nails were also used resulting in permanent injury and life-threatening injuries to some of the protestors.
- (v) Even a member of the media was assaulted, leading to the individual sustaining serious injuries.

2. The violence allegedly was also perpetrated by police personnel in police and civilian dress, among other instances. At this stage, we may also briefly consider the opposing account provided by some of the learned counsel representing the injured police personnel or their family members. Similar allegations were made by them, asserting that protestors or certain anti-social elements who entered the protest site engaged in stone throwing and other acts of violence, thereby inflicting multiple serious injuries on police personnel while they were performing their duties. Photographs, footage recordings, and other evidence of such incidents of violence have also been placed on record.

3. Learned Solicitor General of India, representing the Union of India and NCT of Delhi, at the outset, stated that they have no objection to an independent and fair probe, as proposed by this Court to be held in the instances of violence. However, they firmly denied that any excesses were committed by the police. The Learned Solicitor General further assailed that there were hardened criminals and undesirable elements who had infiltrated the protest site and engaged in violence against police personnel, resulting in serious injuries to over 280 officers.

4. Be that as it may, the allegations made by the petitioners, prima facie, establish a compelling case for an independent and impartial investigation into the incidents of violence. Such an investigation will adequately address the allegations presented by the family members of the police personnel, as well as the issues raised by the learned Solicitor General of India.

5. However, prior to issuing any such order based on a tentative opinion, we consider it appropriate, in the interest of justice, to afford a brief period to the NCT of Delhi and the Union of India to submit their respective versions through an affidavit accompanied by relevant material. Likewise, we find it necessary to grant a short hearing to the various States where similar acts of violence have occurred, as the proposed investigation will encompass inquiries into such incidents within those States as well.

6. Consequently, we issue notice to the Chief Secretaries of the States of Maharashtra, Bihar, Assam, Uttar Pradesh, Madhya Pradesh, West Bengal and Kerala. Their Advocate Generals or respective Standing Counsel (s) shall appear online on the date fixed.

7. Dasti, in addition, is permitted.

8. As an interim measure, we deem it appropriate to issue the following directions:

(i) Although it has already been stated at the bar by the learned Solicitor General of India, on instructions, we also, as an abundant precaution, direct that all CCTV footage, drone footage, body-worn camera recordings, videography, wireless communication records, and PCR lodge collections related to the students' protest be preserved.

(ii) The respondent(s) and police authorities shall ensure that the personal information and digital data of the protestors, collected during the students' protests, are preserved and are not disclosed to the public domain for the time being.

(iii) The respondent(s) may not publish any public data/details of the protestors, especially students.

(iv) The NCT of Delhi and other States may proceed with the investigation of the FIRs registered; however, no coercive measures shall be taken against the protesting students. Such protection, nonetheless, shall not be extended to the persons with criminal antecedents.

(v) All States are hereby instructed to release children under the age of 18, who have been reported to be arrested or detained in connection with the ongoing protests and who do not possess any criminal antecedents. If necessary, these children shall be released upon the execution of a simple bond by themselves or their family members, especially if such a requirement is insisted upon for surety.

9. Post these matters for further consideration on 03.08.2026.

(ARJUN BISHT)
ASTT. REGISTRAR-cum-PS

(PREETHI DILEEP KUMAR)
DY. REGISTRAR