

IN THE COURT OF SH. RITU RAJ, SEM/ NEW DELHI DISTT, POLICE STATION
MANDIR MARG, NEW DELHI

Kalandra No. 07A

Dated: 14.10.2026

U/S 126/ 170 BNSS

State Vs Ashutosh Ranka & Saurav Das
P.S Parliament Street, New Delhi

Name of I.O/ SI Mohit Bhati

S/T: I.O/ SI Mohit Bhati with SHO Pt. Street

S/V:-

1. Saurav Das s/o [REDACTED]

2. Sh. Ashutosh Ranka s/o [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

Present: Ld. Counsel Sh. Bhairav Dass and Sh. Prashant Prakash for complainant.

Sh. Abhik Chimni, Ld. Counsel for the respondents.

Respondents Ashutosh Ranka and Saurav Das produced from J/C.

An application for extension of J/C of respondents is moved by SHO Parliament Street seeking five days J/C. Copy supplied. The Counsels for the respondents on instruction stated that they do not wish to file any reply to the present application.

At this stage, IO duly assisted by Ld. Counsel stated that the respondents namely Ashutosh Ranka and Saurav Das were detained and subsequently sent to judicial custody by the predecessor of this Court. The IO further submits that there is still imminent continued threat on account of recent development in the present case i.e. receipt of anonymous WhatsApp message / communication to the Ld. Predecessor for which separate D.D Entry stands registered. The IO further states that both the respondents are members of CJP and they mobilized and enticed the general public to assemble and stage protest at Jantar Mantar, which has been de-notified as a designated protest site. The IO assisted by the Ld. Counsel has argued that earlier also the respondents have taken permission, which was allowed as per law only on the basis of their assurance that they would strictly adhere to the terms of permission but they failed to adhere. The IO has submitted that the present respondents while flouting their own undertaking on 11.10.2026 before the Ld. SEM, South-West District have again made a call to the public at large to assemble at Jantar Mantar in furtherance of Protest and their demands which apparently shows the apprehension to commit further offence. It is further submitted that the respondents, through the social media posts has repeatedly called for protest at non-designated site such as Jantar Mantar and Connaught Place. It is further submitted that there are other notified area of protest such but the respondents are adamant in protesting at de-notified area.

The Ld. Counsel for the Respondents have argued that the respondents be immediately released and the respondents will not repeat the offence. It is further submitted that there is no mention of



apprehension to repeat offence in the application moved. It is further argued they have not made any calls after 10.10.2026. It is argued that co-founder / National co-convenor namely Abhishek Dipke by this Court, thus he be also released. It is further submitted that the respondent did not give any call for protest after 10.10.2026 and both the respondents individually went to the Jantar Mantar.

Arguments heard and record perused. Upon hearing of the arguments and perusal of the material placed before me, I find that the respondents have deliberately breached their Bonds dated 11.10.2026 as submitted before the Ld. SEM, South-West District and immediately committed the breach of peace in this case. Further, at this stage, the grounds of apprehension as presented before me apparently suggests that the conduct of the respondents is not above board; rather it shows no respect for law and their habitualness in calling protest at de-notified areas. The Statement of respondents before this Court, during the arguments, that they will not repeat this offence in future does not inspire confidence based on conduct and material placed on record by the IO, in the form of application seeking further detention. The application filed by IO is supported by substantial material on record, raising serious concerns regarding the likelihood of breach of peace and disturbance of public tranquility, which cannot be brushed aside without proper consideration. Considering the imminent apprehension, past conduct of the respondent and the submissions advanced on both sides, I deem it fit that an opportunity be given to the respondents to file and place on record their submissions in writing within 2 days, with advance copy to the Investigating Officer.

Besides, the fresh Sureties on behalf of respondents is presented before me. Upon repeated request of the Ld. Counsel for the respondents, I held the inquiry as to fitness of the sureties and found them unfit to stand as surety as there is apparent mismatch of photographs in Bond and Aadhar card of surety [redacted] which he could not produce any other valid Identity Proof and gave vague/ unsatisfactory answers. Similarly, upon personal inquiry, the Surety namely Ms. [redacted] failed to even give basic details (such as details as mentioned in surety bond i.e. parentage, address etc) of the respondent Sourav Das for which he was standing as surety. Moreover, the inquiry conducted revealed that both the Sureties has no control over the Respondents to produce them before the Court, which is primary essence of keeping Surety. No other Surety present at present. In such a situation, respondents are directed to furnish fresh Sureties.

Re-notify for 21.10.2026 for further proceedings and for reply, if any. In the meantime, having considered the material on record and the continuing necessity of preventive measures as brought out in the application, both respondents are remanded to judicial custody till 21.10.2026. They shall be produced before this Court on 21.10.2026 at 2:00 PM.




(RITU RAJ)

Special Executive Magistrate,
New Delhi Distt., New Delhi.

Dated: - 19.10.2026