OFFICE OF THE COMMISSIONER OF POLICE: DELHI.

No. 346 /PRO/PHQ dated Delhi, the 15.05.2020 .

To

The Editor,
The Wire, (News Portal)
F44-45, Bhagat Singh Market,
Shaheed Bhagat Singh Marg,
opp. Jain Bhavan, Gole Market,
New Delhi, Delhi 110001

Sub: Rejoinder to story published under the title "Delhi Communal Violence Case: Jail for Pregnant Safoora, Bail for 'Gun Supplier' Sirohi", published on 13th May 2020 with web-link as https://thewire.in/communalism/delhi-communal-violence-case-jail-for-pregnant-safoora-bail-for-gun-supplier-sirohi

Sir,

Kindly refer to the above mentioned story.

The news article opens with the lines *'How can a person who was found in possession of illegal arms during a riot be granted bail in a riots case when others from whom nothing was recovered are still behind bars?'*

The author has agitated the case of a lady, presently in judicial custody for her alleged role in the riots in Delhi in February 2020, by conjuring up imageries of discrimination and by extrapolating facts and circumstances related to an entirely different case.

The author begins the article with the line *'Consider the case of two people arrested by the Delhi Police in connection with the Delhi riots of February 2020'* and thereafter, goes on to discuss the arrests of two accused, specifically referred to as *'a Muslim woman'* and *'a Hindu man'* and draws various conclusions suiting a pre-conceived narrative, the curtain raiser of which is mentioned in the fourth paragraph as *'both are eventually booked under the*

same FIR – 59 of March 6, 2020 – registered by the Crime Branch and investigated by the Special Cell, but the contrast in their treatment is glaring'.

The author, in a frenzy to buttress a hypothesis of bias and discrimination, has most dull-wittedly, mixed up two separate FIRs, both bearing the same number i.e. 59, one registered by Crime Branch on March 6, 2020 concerning the riots (and which was subsequently transferred to Special Cell for further investigation) and the other registered **nine days earlier** by the Special Cell on February 26, 2020 regarding an accused referred to by the author as '*a Hindu man'*, who was arrested, quite ironically, alongwith a Muslim co-accused, for possession of illicit firearms. While the first FIR, concerning the riots, is still being investigated under various sections of the Indian Penal Code, Arms Act and Unlawful Activities (Prevention) Act, the second, separate, unrelated FIR, was registered under the provisions of Arms Act, **has nothing to do with the riots case**, and the investigation thereof has already been completed, charge-sheet has been filed and the matter is now sub-judice. These facts are clearly mentioned even in the court order granting bail to the accused in the firearms case, from which the author has cherry-picked portions to lend on air of authenticity to this piece of fiction.

As if such blending together of distinct FIRs did not satisfy the journalistic adventurism of the author, she rushes ahead brazenly and accuses the Delhi Police of misleading the court. Not in a mood to spare any institution, the subsequent paras of the article contain quotes and comments which go to the extent of questioning the wisdom of the court in granting bail to one accused person and denying it to another accused in the same case, the author has displayed her own rather surprising lack of understanding of the functioning of the criminal justice system of the country. If any doubt was left about the chaos prevailing while putting together this concoction masquerading as news analysis, the author has expounded an entirely new and hitherto unheard of interpretation of section 43 (D) sub-section 5 of the Unlawful Activities (Prevention) Act.

<u>While you may persist with your mindset, don't forget to cross-check</u>

It is quite distressing to note that while forging these two distinct cases of two separate FIRS into one fanciful story of "*single FIR, double standard*", the author

dispensed with the usual journalistic norm of cross-checking facts from an authorized source. It is requested that this rejoinder be taken into consideration and be published and tweeted with equal prominence, in line with the best professional ethics of objective journalism.

Yours faithfully,

(Mandeep S. Randhawa)IPS
Public Relations Officer,
Delhi Police, **Delhi**