

34 encounters in 3 months in Punjab, a third in police custody

EXPRESS
investigation

State govt yet to reply to an NHRC notice from last year

Kamaldeep Singh Brar
Amritsar, February 18

IN THE first such statement on police action in the state, Punjab DGP Gaurav Yadav said in November last year that since April 2022, a month after the Aam Aadmi Party formed the government in Punjab, the state police had recorded "324

encounters with gangsters", resulting in the death of 24 and arrest of 515.

"Of the 515 gangsters arrested... 319 sustained bullet injuries," the DGP said.

Yadav's statement followed a notice issued by the National Human Rights Commission (NHRC) to the Punjab Home Secretary, seeking an Action

Taken Report on allegations of "state-sanctioned extra-judicial killings". Two months on, the state has not filed a reply.

In the period since Yadav shared the data, the number of encounters in Punjab has continued, as the AAP government feels the heat over gang violence and brazen shootings.

»CONTINUED ON PAGE 10

34 encounters in 3 months in Punjab, a third in police custody

In the three-month period between November 2025 and January 2026, police records investigated by *The Indian Express* show, the Punjab Police reported 34 encounters — or a little over one every three days — resulting in five deaths and injuries to 45. Of these, 15 happened last month alone.

Officials of the state government, Home Department and Punjab Police did not respond to queries despite repeated attempts, including a written questionnaire on Tuesday.

The circumstances show several similarities, with self-defence being the most common refrain by police. More than a third of the encounters happened when the accused were in custody; in several, police said the “handcuffed” accused, when taken for “recovery”, grabbed a hidden weapon and opened fire.

In at least eight of these incidents, police personnel were shot at under “indiscriminate” firing. But policemen got saved, records state, “because of bullet-proof jackets”. At other times, bullets struck police vehicles.

In around half of the encounters, police said they set up checkpoints based on tip-offs, resulting in a shootout. At least 34 accused suffered gunshot injuries in such shootouts.

In their reports, police say they shot at the accused in the feet or legs, only after issuing warnings, and after the latter had “opened fire”. The recoveries were mostly 30-32 bore (foreign or country-made) pistols.

The encounters were spread across the state — Bathinda, Faridkot, Muktsar, Moga, Hoshiarpur, Fazilka, each 2 each in Patiala, Bata, Khanna, Ferozepur, Mohali, Tarn Taran and Jalandhar; and five in Ludhiana with Amritsar district at nine seeing the most such encounters.

In July 2025, *The Indian Express* reported how the first seven months of the year had seen 20 encounters in which the accused were already in custody and were being taken by police for “recovery”. The encounters had led to five deaths. It was on the basis of this that an advocate went to the NHRC.

In 2024, the Punjab Police reported 64 encounters, leading to deaths of four, including one police personnel. Fifty-six accused and nine police personnel were injured in the incidents.

The most recent encounter was in Moga on Sunday, when police arrested two men accused of last week’s firing on

migrant workers, after an exchange of fire.

Advocate Nikhil Saraf, who approached the NHRC against the alleged fake encounters in Punjab, said: “According to directions issued by the Supreme Court, in the event of a police encounter in which the accused sustains grievous injuries, an FIR must be registered and an investigation conducted, by a police officer of a rank senior to the head of the police party involved in the encounter. If casualty is reported, inquiry by a magistrate is a must. But nothing is being followed in Punjab.”

Sabit Singh Verka, who has been pursuing alleged fake encounter cases in the state since the 1990s, said there was “political shelter” for the same. “Even if an encounter is clean, a proper inquiry is required legally. The judiciary should give that the details are almost identical.”

The encounters

NOVEMBER 2025: SELF-DEFENCE THE REFRAIN

November 11: Harkaran Singh and Gurtej Singh, wanted for a murder, were injured in an encounter with the Khanna police. Then Khanna SSP Jyoti Yadav said Harkaran “opened fire at a police party... when taken for weapon recovery”, and struck a sub-inspector. “In self-defence, the S-1 fired one round, which hit Harkaran Singh in the leg,” Gurtej reportedly got injured jumping from the first floor.

November 12: The Dera Bassi police said two members of the Golden Dhillon gang — Sharanjit Singh and Aman Kumar — were injured during an exchange of fire. SSP Harmandeep Hans said the two tried to evade a police checkpoint and fired. “In retaliation, officers fired, with both accused shot in the legs.”

November 15: Police claimed to have arrested Arshdeep Singh, an alleged associate of the Prabh Dasuwal gang, following an encounter. “Acting on a tip-off that he was in Paritkot and planning a major crime, police set up a naka (checkpoint). When officers signalled his... motorcycle to stop, he attacked the team,” said Faridkot police.

November 19, 26: Police arrested Jat in Kail, the alleged mastermind in the November 15 murder of Naveen Arora, the son of BSS worker Baldev Rai Arora, after an exchange of fire in Ferozepur district, along with three associates. Police said: “Our team no-

ticed a fast-moving motorcycle... The rider ignored the signal to stop.” SSP Bhupinder Singh Sidhu said: “As police chased, the rider opened fire... Police personnel returned fire, leaving Kail injured.”

In the second encounter in the same case, on November 26, police arrested Badal, the alleged main shooter, from Zira. According to the Ferozepur police, when a team was with Badal at Mamu Jora village for “recovery”, two of his accomplices “hiding there” opened fire. Deputy Inspector General, Ferozepur Range, Harmanbir Singh said: “A bullet hit a Head Constable. Police fired in retaliation, in which Badal was injured... He succumbed to his injuries.”

The two alleged attackers escaped, the DIG said. Police said another of its men was fired at, but the bullet struck his bulletproof jacket. **November 20:** The Ludhiana police busted a “gangster-terror module”, allegedly backed by the ISI and “with links to gangster Lawrence Bishnoi”, with the arrest of Deepak and Ram Lal following an exchange of fire in the Ludhiana area. Ram Lal was injured.

Ludhiana Police Commissioner Swapan Sharmasaid the two opened fire when they were intercepted following a tip-off. “Some bullets hit a police vehicle,” the officer said.

November 20: The same day, the Amritsar police claimed to have foiled a murder with the encounter killing of “notorious gangster” Harinder Singh, who had got out of prison 13 days earlier. Police said Harinder was shot “in self-defence” after he and his accomplice opened fire at a police checkpoint. Officials said one of the bullets hit a police vehicle.

November 23: Harpreet Singh and Gautam Badshah of Nabha, allegedly associated with the Bambha gang, were injured in an encounter. Patiala SSP Vansh Sharma said they set up a checkpoint based on a tip-off. “Asked to surrender, the two accused... fired at (police). The cops, showing utmost restraint, responded and shot both of them in their lower body.”

November 23: The same day, Malkit Singh was injured when allegedly attempting to flee Bata police custody. DGP Yadav said they had arrested Malkit and Vijay Masih, “key associates of gangster Amrit Dalam”, just then, said police.

Malkit opened fire using a “hidden weapon”. “He was overpowered after a brief exchange of fire.”

PUNJAB POLICE’S ANTI-CRIME RECORD



Police officers at the site of an encounter on January 14, 2026.

5 fatal fires	IN AROUND half of the encounters, police said they had set up checkpoints based on tip-offs, accused arrived on bikes and opened fire, forcing retaliation	IN OVER 10 encounters, police said the accused in their custody were taken for weapon recovery, managed to grab a hidden gun, and opened fire
45 injured		
0 police casualties, 8 incidents of indiscriminate firing at officers, lives saved by bullet-proof jackets		

*BASED ON NOV 2025 AND JAN 2026

November 26: The Batala Police captured an alleged gang member and robbery accused, Kawalit Singh, following an “encounter”. “Based on investigations, police teams managed to intercept the accused... When police team tried to apprehend him, he later opened fire,” said DIG, Border Range, Sandeep Goel, adding that Kawalit was shot in his left leg.

DECEMBER 2025: TARGETING THE LEG

December 4: Alleged shooter Daler Singh, wanted for murder, was injured in an encounter while in police custody in Amritsar. Police Commissioner Gurpreet Singh Bhullar said, “Daler was targeted by police for the recovery of a pistol. He pulled out a weapon from the bushes and fired at the team.” Police said Daler was fatally shot in the right leg.

December 6: The Sri Muktsar Sahib Police claimed to have solved the kidnapping-murder of a minor girl within hours, and arrested the accused, Akshay Kumar, following an encounter. As per police, “the accused opened fire trying to flee”.

December 12: The Moga police claimed to have held an aide of US-based gangster Prabh Dasuwal, Gurbinder Singh alias Gindi, following an exchange of fire, leaving Gindi injured. Moga SSP Ajay Gandhi said “the accused opened fire at a police party when intercepted”.

December 12: The same day, Robin Masih, an alleged accomplice of gangster Amrit Dalam, was held after an “encounter” with Ludhiana police.

DCP Jasranjit Singh Teja said: “Police laid a trap to catch the duo, who opened fire.” Masih was shot in the leg.

December 15: The Amritsar Rural police claimed to have cracked several extortion and robbery cases following the arrest of Vanshpreet Singh and Bhupinder Singh, after an exchange of fire in Ainalla.

Police said that acting on a tip-off, they set up a naka at Chahar-pur village. The occupants sped away on spotting them, with police giving chase. In the subsequent exchange of fire, the men narrowly escaped, but one of the accused was shot in the leg. DIG, Border Range, Sandeep Goel said.

December 17: An accused, Nirmaljit Singh, was injured allegedly during weapon recovery in Amritsar. Police Commissioner Gurpreet Singh Bhullar said, “Acting on specific inputs, police arrested Nirmaljit Singh, Manpreet Singh and Karandeep Singh. During the recovery of a country-made pistol, Nirmaljit pushed a police guard, snatched a carbine and attempted to fire at police personnel.” ASI Navtej Singh returned fire in self-defence, shooting Nirmaljit in the left leg.

December 26: Anurkpal Singh Rami was injured during an “encounter” when taken to the Amritsar City police for weapon recovery near a crematorium ground. “The accused suddenly picked up the pistol and fired at ASI Jahnir Singh... In self-defence, ASI Talwinder Singh fired a round,” said Amritsar Police Commissioner Gurpreet Singh Bhullar.

December 27: Two accused who allegedly opened fire at a sarpanch of Rajgarh village were held after an “encounter” by Khanna police. Then Khanna SSP Jyoti Yadav said police had laid a trap to apprehend Indjeet Singh and Gurvir Singh, but they “tried to escape”. The SSP said police held Gurvir for a chase, but Indjeet opened fire, and two bullets hit the police vehicle. Police retaliated, and Indjeet was injured in the leg, Yadav said.

December 28: The Hoshiarpur police arrested three robbers accused following an “encounter” in a forest area near Garhsankar. DSP Daljeet Singh Khakh said, “When signalled to stop, the accused opened fire. Police retaliated after issuing warnings. Onkar Singh, alias Gora, sustained a bullet injury.”

JANUARY 2026: ATTEMPT TO FLEE
January 6: Hamru, allegedly a close associate of gangsters Prabh Dasuwal and Afrak, was killed in an encounter in Tarn Taran district. DIG, Border Range, Sandeep Sharma said, “Acting on a tip-off that Nour was travelling on a motorcycle, a joint team intercepted him, (but) he opened fire. A bullet struck a police personnel, but he escaped due to his bullet-proof jacket. Nour suffered serious injuries, and succumbed to them.”

January 7: The Amritsar Police said that accused Gurpreet Singh Lal was injured during an encounter as he tried to flee when taken for weapon recovery. Amritsar Police Commissioner Gurpreet Singh Bhullar said: “Lal was taken near Batala Road... The accused opened fire. Taking retaliatory action, police shot at the accused.”

January 12: Three alleged operatives of the Rohit Godara gang were held after “an exchange of fire” with the Ludhiana Police. Commissioner Swapan Sharmasaid, “The trio attempted to break a checkpoint and opened fire... Police fired in self-defence. The two who sustained bullet injuries were identified as Sunil Kumar and Sanju.”

January 14: Sukhraj Singh alias Gunga, a key accused linked to the Prabh Dasuwal gang and believed to be involved in several killings, died after he was shot, allegedly attempting to snatch a service pistol in the Vallah area of Amritsar.

Police claimed two “unidentified motorcyclists” opened fire at them in a bid to free Gunga during “recovery proceedings”. While one police

personnel was injured, Gunga allegedly tried to wrest a pistol from ASI Harinder Singh. Three shots were fired — one hitting a police vehicle and two striking Gunga, who died at hospital.

January 17: A gang member, Karan Pathak alias Karan “Defaulter”, arrested for the killing of Babaddi promoter Rana Balachouari, in front of a stadium full of people, was shot in an encounter.

Police claimed he had tried to flee their custody. In a statement, police said Pathak complained of severe chest pain at night, and was being taken to the hospital when he fled after the police van he was in hit a median. Police admitted Pathak was handcuffed at the time and escorted by three policemen. He was reportedly traced to a location in Kharar around 6 am and started shooting. Pathak was hit in the leg, police said, while an officer was injured. Pathak succumbed to his injuries in hospital, police said.

January 18: The Bathinda police claimed to have arrested Sewak Singh, wanted for an alleged extortion demand of Rs 1 crore, after an “encounter” near village Kat at Singh Wala at a check-post set up following a “tip-off”.

January 18: The same day, two accused, Chandra Shekhar and Jagat Singh, were injured in an encounter while in Jalandhar police custody. SSP, Jalandhar Rural, Harvinder Singh Virk said they had received information that those wanted for a January 16 murder would come to a site to retrieve their weapons. “Police teams cordoned off the area. When the police party... was approaching... the accused retrieved the hidden weapons, and attempted to flee, opening fire.”

Virk said that while one bullet struck a police vehicle, another hit a tree, and a third missed the target. Police fired in “self-defence”.

January 19: An encounter was reported from Dorrana, Ludhiana. The police statement said: “Two criminals, travelling in a Scorpio, hit a police jeep. They fired three rounds, one of which hit an SHO in his chest, but he was saved due to his bulletproof jacket. In retaliation, the SHO fired back, in which one of the criminals, Harshman alias Mans, was injured in the leg.”

January 20: The Fazilka police were involved in an “encounter” near village Aniswala with gangster Preetpal Singh, wanted in a murder case, leading to his arrest. Police said they had set up a naka, and Preetpal opened fire. “He sustained a

bullet injury in his knee and was apprehended on the spot,” DIG, Ferozepur Range, Sandeep Sharma said.

January 20: The same day, police shot alleged gangster Money Prince following an encounter near Amrit, close to the international border. Police said that acting on a tip-off, they laid a trap in the area. DIG Sandeep Goyal said that Prince spotted them and opened fire, “but bullet-proof jackets protected our personnel”. He was killed in retaliatory fire, police said.

January 22: Alleged gangster Harinder Singh Ladi was injured in an encounter in Patiala. DIG Kuldeep Singh Chahal said they set up a checkpoint on a bypass following a tip-off. They tried to stop Harinder, but he started shooting, police said.

January 23: Following an encounter, the Jalandhar Rural police arrested Lovpreet Singh, wanted for a December 2025 firing incident. “Acting on specific information, a police team was conducting a search operation near Ahluwarp. The suspect was intercepted... but opened fire at the police party... The accused sustained a bullet injury in his right arm,” police said.

January 23: The same day, the Tarn Taran police said they had arrested alleged gangster Jagtar Singh alias Jagga Pattu after an encounter near Kairon village. SSP, Tarn Taran, Surendra Lamba said, “Police brought Jagga Pattu to a canal near village Kairon to recover a weapon, when the accused fired two rounds.”

January 24: The Anti-Narcotics Task Force said it arrested four alleged drug peddlers after an “exchange of fire” in Ludhiana’s Sadar police station jurisdiction. Police said they recovered 305 grams of heroin, and said the accused “tried to break the police checkpoint... and opened fire”. The cops retaliated in self-defence during which an accused, Taranpreet Singh, sustained a bullet injury in his waist,” police said.

January 29: The Amritsar police said an accused, Jotanjot, tried to escape after snatching a police officer’s service pistol and, in the ensuing struggle, was shot in the leg. “The police party had taken Jotanjot along to look for his associates. The accused said he was feeling unwell... As soon as police stopped the vehicle, he tried to snatch a service weapon from one of our personnel,” Police Commissioner Gurpreet Singh Bhullar said.

With inputs from DIVYA GOYAL GOPAL



दिल्ली-एनसीआर में लापता लोगों के मामले में सरकार व पुलिस को नोटिस

हाईकोर्ट ने मांगा जवाब, मामले की अगली सुनवाई मार्च में

नई दिल्ली, 18 फरवरी (एजेंसियां)। दिल्ली हाईकोर्ट ने 800 से अधिक लोगों के मामले में बुधवार को दिल्ली पुलिस, केंद्र, दिल्ली सरकार और राष्ट्रीय मानवाधिकार आयोग (एनएचआरसी) को नोटिस जारी किया। हाईकोर्ट ने इस मामले में नई याचिका पर पुलिस, सरकार और एनएचआरसी से जवाब तलब किया है। हाईकोर्ट में नई याचिका जयिता देब सरकार ने दायर की। बुधवार को सुनवाई करते हुए हाईकोर्ट के मुख्य न्यायाधीश देवेन्द्र कुमार और न्यायमूर्ति तेजस कारिया की डिवीजन बेंच ने संबंधित अधिकारियों को चार हफ्ते में अपना जवाब फाइल करने का



निर्देश दिया। हाईकोर्ट में मामले की अगली सुनवाई मार्च में होगी। इससे पहले, 11 फरवरी को पीआईएल पर सुनवाई करते हुए हाईकोर्ट ने अर्थांरिटीज से जवाब मांगा था। हालांकि, 9 फरवरी को राष्ट्रीय मानवाधिकार आयोग (एनएचआरसी) ने इस मुद्दे पर स्वतः संज्ञान लिया था। एनएचआरसी ने कहा कि अगर यह रिपोर्ट सही है, तो यह गंभीर मानवाधिकार उल्लंघन का मामला बनता है।

पिछले माह 15 दिनों में
800 से ज्यादा लोग
गायब होने का दावा

दरअसल, पिछले महीने एक रिपोर्ट में राजधानी दिल्ली में सिर्फ 15 दिनों में 800 से ज्यादा लोग गायब होने का दावा किया गया था। रिपोर्ट के अनुसार, इनमें 191 नाबालिग और 616 वयस्क शामिल थे। इस खबर से लोगों में काफी चिंता फैल गई। 6 फरवरी को दिल्ली पुलिस ने रिपोर्ट को खारिज करते हुए कहा कि आंकड़ों को गलत तरीके से पेश कर लोगों में डर फैलाया जा रहा है। पुलिस ने लोगों को चेतावनी भी दी थी।



Source: <https://www.deccanchronicle.com/southern-states/telangana/dc-impact-nhrc-directs-centre-icmr-to-file-report-on-improper-drug-trials-in-hyderabad-1938260>

DC Impact: NHRC Directs Centre, ICMR To File Report on Improper Drug Trials in Hyderabad

Balu Pulipaka 19 February 2026 12:15 AM

The NHRC, in its directions issued on Wednesday, said allegations in a complaint it received over the issues faced by the participant, “prima facie seem to be violations of the human rights of the victim”

In the directions, the NHRC made it clear that the complaint must be investigated and an action taken report submitted to it in four weeks.

Hyderabad: The National Human Rights Commission (NHRC) has directed the Union health ministry, and the Indian Council for Medical Research (ICMR) to investigate the case involving a drug trial in Hyderabad last year which resulted in one of the trial participants suffering a heart attack. The NHRC, in its directions issued on Wednesday, said allegations in a complaint it received over the issues faced by the participant, “prima facie seem to be violations of the human rights of the victim.” In the directions, the NHRC made it clear that the complaint must be investigated and an action taken report submitted to it in four weeks.

The complaint with NHRC was filed by human rights lawyer Rama Rao Immaneni following reports in Deccan Chronicle on the trials and tribulations of Dipanker Dey, a migrant worker who signed up for the trial that was being conducted by a city-based clinical research organisation (CRO) for a breast cancer drug. During the course of the trial, Dey, reportedly suffered a cardiac arrest but was not attended to by the CRO which sent him off to Gandhi Hospital to get treatment.

Dey had also complained then when he was fighting with the CRO that he was under intense pressure from the CRO to delete his posts on social media platforms about the problems he was facing both health and financial wise, finally had said he was willing to take any compensation he can get and give a letter to the CRO giving it a clean chit, and after a nearly two month struggle, returned to his hometown Kolkata.

“He was under severe duress and with no one helping him and the CRO pressurising him for any compensation, he was likely tricked by agents to take whatever money the company gave him in return for his silence. Now that the NHRC has initiated action, he will hopefully receive justice finally,” Rama Rao Immaneni said.

In its notice to the Union health ministry, the NHRC said “the complainant alleged that a poor and illiterate labourer was made to participate in a clinical trial for a breast cancer drug by an agent who made false promises. During the trial, the victim suffered a heart attack but did not receive proper medical care until the police intervened.”

The NHRC continued, “Afterwards, the clinical research organisation and the sponsoring pharmaceutical company pressured the victim to sign a false declaration claiming he was cured. When he refused, the ethics committee and others involved failed to report the adverse event to the drug authorities. As a result, the victim suffered a second heart stroke, leading to permanent disability and loss of livelihood.”

“The complainant has requested that the licenses of the companies involved be cancelled and that they be ordered to pay compensation of Rs.1 crore to the victim. They also requested legal action against those responsible for exploiting poor and uneducated individuals in clinical trials,” the NHRC said.

(Source : Deccan Chronicle)

Source: <https://www.hindustantimes.com/cities/delhi-news/delhi-hc-junks-plea-on-special-cells-in-police-stations-for-missing-persons-cases-101771438413710-amp.html>

Delhi HC junks plea on special cells in police stations for missing persons cases

The bench stated that decisions relating to creation of dedicated cells in police stations and the internal structure of the force fall squarely in police authorities' domain.

Published on: Feb 19, 2026 04:02 am IST

By Shruti Kakkar

The Delhi High Court on Wednesday dismissed a petition seeking the creation of a special cell in every police station to report cases pertaining to missing persons in the Capital, observing that policing is a matter that must be left to the concerned authorities and that it is not for the court to dictate how the police should organise their functioning.

A bench of Chief Justice D.K. Upadhyaya and Justice Tejas Karia, while dealing with a petition filed by Anand Legal Aid Forum trust, further stated that decisions relating to creation of dedicated cells in police stations and the internal structure of the force fall squarely in police authorities' domain.

"It is not for the court to give directions to the police as to how their organisation shall function, constitution or creation of specific cell in each police station in Delhi for reporting missing person is the job which must be entrusted to the police authorities as it relates their functioning. What is the structure of the police can be best entertained by the authorities itself," the court remarked.

The trust's petition was filed against the backdrop of recent reports published on February 5, citing Delhi Police data on missing persons, which indicated that 807 people went missing in the Capital during first two weeks of January, with only 235 traced so far.

In an official statement, on February 6, the Delhi Police said that claims about a surge in missing girls in the Capital were being amplified through paid promotions, and warned of strict action against those spreading panic for monetary gain.

However, on February 9, the National Human Rights Commission (NHRC) said that it has taken suo motu cognisance of the reports. It issued notices to the Delhi chief secretary, and police commissioner, demanding a report on the matter within two weeks.

The trust had also sought directions to the police to register FIRs in cases of missing persons and to transfer all such reported cases in Delhi to the CBI for an in-depth probe, alleging that the police were refusing to register FIRs despite families' requests.

The court rejected this prayer as well, observing that the petition lacked specific details of such instances and that it could not entertain or grant omnibus relief in the absence of concrete particulars.

"Except for giving the numbers of the persons who have been reported as having gone missing in 2025, as detailed in paragraph 11 of the writ, no specific instance has been cited where a person has gone missing and an attempt to lodge an FIR has failed," the court said in the order.

Even while dismissing the trust's plea, the same bench on Wednesday issued notice to the Centre, the Delhi Government, the Delhi Police, and the National Human Rights Commission in a separate petition filed by advocate Jayeeta Deb Sarkar, and fixed April 15 as the next date of hearing.

In her plea, Sarkar sought urgent directions for the authorities to establish a robust mechanism to trace missing persons in the Capital and to address the rising instances of trafficking and disappearances.

To be sure, the court last week also sought the Centre and the Delhi police's stand in a petition seeking strict enforcement of the statutory investigative protocols for missing persons.



Source: <https://indianexpress.com/article/express-exclusive/34-encounters-in-3-months-in-punjab-a-third-in-police-custody-10539833/lite/>

34 encounters in 3 months in Punjab, a third in police custody

Written by: Kamaldeep Singh Brar 16 min read Amritsar

Updated: Feb 19, 2026 07:39 AM IST

In the three-month period between November 2025 and January 2026, police records investigated by The Indian Express show, the Punjab Police reported 34 encounters — or a little over one every three days — resulting in five deaths and injuries to 45. Of these, 15 happened last month alone.

In the first such statement on police action in the state, Punjab DGP Gaurav Yadav said in November last year that since April 2022, a month after the Aam Aadmi Party formed the government in Punjab, the state police had recorded “324 encounters with gangsters”, resulting in the death of 24 and arrest of 515.

“Of the 515 gangsters arrested... 319 sustained bullet injuries,” the DGP said.

Yadav’s statement followed a notice issued by the National Human Rights Commission (NHRC) to the Punjab Home Secretary, seeking an Action Taken Report on allegations of “state-sanctioned extra-judicial killings”. Two months on, the state has not filed a reply.

Kamaldeep Singh Brar is a Principal Correspondent at The Indian Express, primarily covering Amritsar and the Majha region of Punjab. He is one of the publication's key reporters for stories involving the Akal Takht, the Shiromani Gurdwara Parbandhak Committee (SGPC), and the sensitive socio-political issues of the border districts. Core Beats & Specializations Religious & Panthic Affairs: He has deep expertise in the internal workings of the Akal Takht and SGPC, frequently reporting on religious sentences (Tankhah), Panthic politics, and the influence of Sikh institutions. National Security & Crime: His reporting covers cross-border drug smuggling, drone activities from Pakistan, and the activities of radical groups. Regional Politics: He is the primary correspondent for the Majha belt, covering elections and political shifts in Amritsar, Tarn Taran, and Gurdaspur. Recent Notable Articles (Late 2025) His work in late 2025 has been centered on judicial developments, local body elections, and religious controversies: 1. Religious Politics & Akal Takht "Akal Takht pronounces religious sentences against former Jathedar Giani Gurbachan Singh" (Dec 8, 2025): Covering the historic decision to hold the former Jathedar guilty for granting a pardon to Dera Sacha Sauda chief Gurmeet Ram Rahim in 2015. "YouTube suspends SGPC's channel for a week over video on 1984 Army action" (Nov 20, 2025): Reporting on the digital friction between global tech platforms and Sikh religious bodies. "As AAP govt grants Amritsar holy tag, a look at its fraught demand" (Nov 28, 2025): An analytical piece on the long-standing demand for declaring Amritsar a "holy city" and its political implications. 2. Crime & National Security "Mostly Khalistanis on Amritpal's hit list: Punjab govt to High Court" (Dec 16, 2025): Reporting on the state government's claims regarding jailed MP Amritpal Singh orchestrating activity from prison. "Punjab man with links to Pakistan's ISI handlers killed in encounter" (Nov 20, 2025): Detailing a police operation in Amritsar involving "newly refurbished" firearms likely sent from across the border. "15 schools in Amritsar get bomb threat emails; police launch probe" (Dec 12, 2025): Covering the panic and police response to mass threats against educational institutions. 3. Political Analysis & Elections "AAP wins 12 of 15 zones in SAD stronghold Majitha" (Dec 19, 2025): Highlighting a significant shift in the 2025 rural elections where the Akali Dal lost its grip on a traditional fortress. "Tarn Taran bypoll: woman faces threats after complaining to CM Mann about drug menace" (Nov 9, 2025): A ground report on the personal risks faced by citizens speaking out against the illegal drug trade in border villages. "AAP wins Tarn Taran bypoll, but SAD finds silver lining" (Nov 14, 2025): Analyzing the 2025 assembly by-election results and the surprising performance of Independents backed by radical factions. 4. Human Interest "Two couples and a baby: Punjab drug addiction tragedy has new victims" (Nov

20, 2025): A tragic investigative piece about parents selling an infant to fund their addiction. "Kashmiri women artisans debut at Amritsar's PITEX" (Dec 8, 2025): A feature on financial independence initiatives for rural women at the Punjab International Trade Expo. Signature Beat Kamaldeep is known for his nuanced understanding of border dynamics. His reporting often highlights the "drug crisis in the underprivileged localities" (like Muradpur in Tarn Taran, Nov 9, 2025), providing a voice to marginalized communities affected by addiction and administrative neglect.



Source: <https://english.hindusthansamachar.in/Encyc/2026/2/18/DELHI-HC-NOTICE-POLICE-GOVT.php>

Cracks Down on Alarming Spike in Missing Persons Crisis

18 Feb 2026 18:09:54

New Delhi, 18 February (H.S.): The Delhi High Court issued notices on Wednesday to the Centre, Delhi government, Delhi Police, and National Human Rights Commission in response to a petition demanding action over more than 800 people reported missing in the national capital within the first 15 days of the year. A bench presided over by Chief Justice DK Upadhyay directed the respondents to file replies within four weeks.

The petitioner's counsel argued during the hearing that the Right to be Found forms an essential component of the right to life under Article 21 of the Constitution. The plea asserts that mandatory protocols for tracing missing persons are not being followed, despite the issuance of Standard Operating Procedures (SOPs), which remain unenforced, resulting in large-scale disappearances without adequate response.

According to a news report, 807 individuals vanished from Delhi between January 1 and January 15, triggering widespread public outrage. On February 6, Delhi Police posted on X dismissing reports of a surge in missing persons cases as paid misinformation designed to incite fear, while warning of action against those spreading panic.

The National Human Rights Commission took suo motu cognizance of the issue, issuing notices to the Delhi government and police demanding detailed responses within two weeks, deeming the matter gravely serious if verified.

Hindusthan Samachar / Jun Sarkar



Source: <https://www.barandbench.com/news/litigation/delhi-high-court-seeks-response-from-police-central-government-over-disappearance-of-807-people>

Delhi High Court seeks response from police, Central government over disappearance of 807 people

According to a news report, between January 1, 2026 and January 15, 2026, 807 people were reported missing in Delhi.

Prashant Jha | Published on: 18 Feb 2026, 2:04 pm

1 min read

The Delhi High Court on Wednesday sought replies from the Delhi Police, the Central government, the Delhi government and the National Human Rights Commission (NHRC) on a plea seeking action over the disappearance of over 800 people from the national capital during the first 15 days of 2026.

A Division Bench of Chief Justice Devendra Kumar Upadhyaya and Justice Tejas Karia directed the authorities to file their reply in four weeks.

"Let the respondents file the response to this petition in four weeks. Two weeks for rejoinder," the Court said.

The Bench passed the order while hearing a public interest litigation (PIL) petition filed by one Jayeeta Deb Sarkar. A news report recently revealed that between January 1, and January 15, 807 persons were reported missing from Delhi. The news sparked widespread public concern.

On February 6, the Delhi Police posted a tweet saying that the hype around the surge in missing persons is "paid promotion" and warned action against people who create panic for monetary gains.

Meanwhile, the National Human Rights Commission (NHRC) took suo motu cognisance of the reports and issued notice to the Delhi government and Delhi Police chief, seeking a detailed report within two weeks. The Commission said that the figures, if accurate, could raise serious human rights issues.



Source: <https://www.etvbharat.com/en/state/disappearance-of-over-800-people-hc-issues-notice-to-centre-delhi-govt-and-police-enn26021803894>

Disappearance Of Over 800 People: HC Issues Notice To Centre, Delhi Govt & Police

The petition stated that the right to be found is an essential part of the right to life enshrined under Article 21 of the Constitution.

By ETV Bharat English Team

Published : February 18, 2026 at 3:29 PM IST

1 Min Read

New Delhi: Hearing a petition seeking action on the disappearance of more than 800 people in the first 15 days of 2026, the Delhi High Court on Wednesday issued notices to the Centre, Delhi government, Delhi Police, and the National Human Rights Commission (NHRC), asking them to respond within four weeks.

During the hearing, the lawyer representing the petitioner stated to a bench headed by Chief Justice DK Upadhyay that the right to be found is an essential part of the right to life enshrined under Article 21 of the Constitution, and mandatory protocols for locating missing persons are not being followed.

The petition further said that although standard operating procedures (SOPs) have been issued for locating missing persons, they are not strictly enforced. This is the reason why people are disappearing on a large scale in Delhi, yet no action is being taken, it added.

About 807 people reportedly disappeared from Delhi between January 1 and January 15, generating widespread reaction. On February 6, the Delhi Police wrote on X, stating that reports of an increase in disappearances were being promoted for money and warned of action against those creating fear.

However, the NHRC took suo motu cognisance of the matter and issued a notice to the Delhi government and Delhi Police, demanding a detailed response within two weeks. The Commission stated that if found true, it is a very serious matter.



Source:

<https://www.newindianexpress.com/amp/story/cities/delhi/2026/Feb/18/du-bans-protests-on-campus-for-a-month-sparks-backlash-from-faculty-and-students>

DU bans protests on campus for a month; sparks backlash from faculty and students

Citing concerns over public safety and law and order, the directive stated that unrestricted gatherings could obstruct traffic, endanger human life and disturb public peace.

Ifrah Mufti | Updated:18th Feb, 2026 at 8:54 AM

NEW DELHI: Triggering sharp reactions across academic and political circles, the University of Delhi on Tuesday imposed a month-long ban on public meetings, protests, demonstrations and processions across its campus, drawing allegations of a crackdown on democratic dissent.

The order, issued by University Proctor Prof. Manoj Kumar, will remain in force from February 17, 2026, and will be applicable to students, faculty members and staff. Citing concerns over public safety and law and order, the directive stated that unrestricted gatherings could obstruct traffic, endanger human life and disturb public peace. It further noted that, in the past, organisers had failed to control protests that allegedly escalated and disrupted normal functioning on campus.

The Proctor referred to an earlier order issued on December 26, 2025, by the Assistant Commissioner of Police, Civil Lines, based on a notification from the Ministry of Home Affairs. That directive prohibited public meetings, rallies, sit-ins or demonstrations that could disturb peace or disrupt traffic within the university area. The latest order reiterates those restrictions for a one-month period.

The development came a day after the National Human Rights Commission issued notices to the Deputy Commissioner of Police, North Delhi, and the Vice Chancellor of DU over the alleged assault of a female journalist during a protest at the university's North Campus on February 13.

According to the NHRC, the journalist was covering a protest in support of the University Grants Commission when she was allegedly attacked by a mob. The complaint claimed she was targeted based on her caste identity, verbally abused, physically assaulted and threatened, with an alleged attempt to outrage her modesty. The episode was described as caste-based violence and a direct attack on press freedom.

However, the prohibition order sparked intense criticism from sections of the faculty and student bodies.

Senior Executive Council member Mithuraj Dhusiya said the move amounted to a clampdown on dissent.

"Strongly disagree with this notice. All protests and movements against wrong policies of the government, university and its constituent colleges must be peaceful, and it is the duty of the university to ensure this.

However, a blanket ban in the name of 'obstruction of traffic' is not acceptable," he said, demanding the order be rolled back.

Professor Nandita Narain wrote on social media, "All the casteist fangs of the ruling dispensation are out on full display." Another professor, Sujeet Kumar, stated, "This is not an undeclared emergency, but a declared one. I strongly condemn it in the strongest possible terms. The government is entirely responsible for this, and therefore I strongly condemn the government as well."

National Students' Union of India National President Varun Choudhary also termed the decision a "calculated attempt by the Modi Government to crush the democratic spirit of campuses and silence SC, ST, and OBC students."

Meanwhile, the Students' Federation of India said in its official statement, "The solution to such incidents is not

the suppression of democratic voices.” The Democratic Teachers’ Front also demanded an “immediate revocation of this unconstitutional order,” calling it a draconian measure to stifle legitimate democratic expression.



Source: <https://www.thehansindia.com/news/national/bikram-returns-to-jail-without-surgery-1049486>

Bikram returns to jail without surgery

Created On: 18 Feb 2026 9:45 AM IST

By Sunil Mohan Patnaik

Berhampur: In a dramatic turn of events that has stirred legal and political ripples, Bikram Panda, the prime accused in the sensational Pitabas Panda murder case, was discharged from MKCG Medical College and Hospital on Monday and sent back to jail, without undergoing the anticipated surgery.

Bikram, a former MLA, had been admitted to the government-run hospital five days ago citing ill health. His discharge, however, has triggered sharp reactions from his defence counsel and family members, who allege negligence and even conspiracy.

Advocate Dipak Patnaik, defence lawyer of Bikram Panda, launched a scathing attack on the seven-member medical board that examined his client. "Under what medical basis was he discharged?" he questioned, announcing his decision to move court seeking judicial intervention. The doctors must clarify what ailments Bikram was suffering from, what treatment protocol was followed, and whether surgery was ever formally scheduled, he demanded.

Dipak further urged the State government to institute a thorough inquiry into the episode, stating that MKCG Hospital functions under the direct supervision of the State administration. "If any mishap occurs, the doctors, jail authorities, and police administration will be held accountable," he warned, adding that he would not hesitate to approach the National Human Rights Commission (NHRC) if necessary.

He also asserted that provisions under law allow an undertrial prisoner to avail treatment in a private hospital at personal expense and demanded that Bikram be shifted accordingly if adequate medical care cannot be ensured within the government facility.

Meanwhile, Bikram's family members, including his wife, son, sister, and father, also voiced grave concerns.

Responding to the allegations, Durga Satpathy, Superintendent of MKCG and head of the medical team, clarified that Bikram has been diagnosed with gall bladder stones and is also suffering from piles. "Yes, surgery will be required," he admitted. "However, there is a definite medical procedure to be followed. The patient must undergo anaesthesia and cardiology evaluations and provide informed consent before any surgical intervention."

According to hospital sources, preliminary investigations were conducted, and further pre-operative assessments were advised. As the formalities were yet to be completed, the medical board deemed him stable enough for discharge back to judicial custody.

Source: <https://www.news9live.com/india/delhi-hc-seeks-responses-from-police-centre-over-report-of-807-missing-persons-in-15-days-2932631>

Delhi HC seeks responses from police, Centre over report of 807 missing persons in 15 days

The Delhi High Court has sought replies from key authorities over a plea highlighting that 807 people were reported missing in the first 15 days of 2026. The NHRC has also taken suo motu cognisance of the reports and sought a detailed response. The Court has granted four weeks for responses and two weeks for rejoinder.

Adan Khan Published: 18 Feb 2026 15:46:PM

New Delhi: The Delhi High Court on Wednesday issued notices to the Delhi Police, the Centre, the Delhi government and the National Human Rights Commission in connection with a petition raising concern over hundreds of reported missing persons cases in the capital earlier this year.

A Division Bench comprising Chief Justice Devendra Kumar Upadhyaya and Justice Tejas Karia asked the respondents to place their stand on record within a stipulated time. "Let the respondents file the response to this petition in four weeks. Two weeks for rejoinder," the Court said.

The direction came during the hearing of a public interest litigation filed by Jayeeta Deb Sarkar.

Plea flags alarming figures

The PIL refers to a recent news report which stated that 807 people were reported missing in Delhi between January 1 and January 15, 2026. The reported figures triggered widespread public concern and debate over the safety situation in the national capital.

The petitioner has sought appropriate action and accountability from the authorities, arguing that such numbers, if accurate, require urgent intervention and transparency from law enforcement agencies.

Police dismiss "hype" around cases

Amid growing discussion on social media and news platforms, the Delhi Police issued a clarification earlier this month. On February 6, the police posted on X that the hype surrounding the alleged spike in missing persons cases was a "paid promotion" and cautioned that action could be taken against individuals spreading panic for financial gains.

The statement sought to downplay fears of an unusual surge, though it did not immediately provide detailed data in the public domain to counter the figures cited in the report.

NHRC takes suo motu cognisance

Separately, the National Human Rights Commission took suo motu cognisance of the media reports and sent notices to the Delhi government and the Commissioner of Delhi Police. The Commission has sought a detailed report within two weeks.

In its notice, the NHRC observed that the reported data, if found to be correct, could raise serious human rights concerns. The matter will now be examined further once responses are filed before both the High Court and the Commission.

The High Court has listed the matter for further hearing after completion of pleadings.



Source: <https://www.livelaw.in/amp/high-court/delhi-high-court/delhi-high-court-issues-notice-on-pil-seeking-robust-mechanism-to-trace-missing-persons-curb-disappearances-523645>

Delhi High Court Issues Notice On PIL Seeking Robust Mechanism To Trace Missing Persons, Curb Disappearances

By - Nupur Thapliyal

Update: 2026-02-18 09:07 GMT

The Delhi High Court on Wednesday issued notice in a Public Interest Litigation seeking urgent directions to the authorities to put in place a robust mechanism to trace missing persons in the national capital and curb the rising incidents of trafficking and disappearances.

A division bench comprising Chief Justice DK Upadhyaya and Justice Tejas Karia sought response of Union Government through Ministries of Home Affairs and Women and Child Development, Delhi Government, Delhi Police and National Human Rights Commission.

The Court asked the authorities to file their responses to the plea before four weeks.

The matter is listed now in April 15.

The plea, moved by advocate Jayeeta Deb Sarkar, highlights what it terms a “silent emergency” in Delhi, pointing to a sharp surge in cases of missing persons—particularly women and children. Sarkar has alleged systemic failure on the part of the city authorities to trace them effectively.

According to the petition, official data shows that between January and early February this year, as many as 3,151 persons were reported missing in the national capital, of whom nearly 81% remain untraced.

The plea further states that between October 2025 and January 2026 alone, over 11,000 persons went missing. Sarkar has sought a declaration that the “right to be traced” and the “right to investigation” in missing persons cases are intrinsic facets of the right to life under Article 21 of the Constitution.

The plea argues that disappearances often lead to trafficking, forced labour, sexual exploitation, or organ trade, thereby implicating Articles 21 and 23 of the Constitution of India.

Further, the plea criticizes the response of the Delhi Police, stating that instead of treating the issue as a humanitarian crisis, authorities dismissed concerns as “hype” and “panic creation.” It contends that such responses reflect institutional apathy and violate Articles 14 and 21 of the Constitution of India.

The petition also notes that the National Human Rights Commission has taken suo motu cognizance of the issue and sought a report from authorities, observing that the figures, if accurate, raise serious human rights concerns.



Source: <https://www.pw.live/state-govt-jobs/exams/up-si-polity-and-moolvidhi-revision-practice-set-6>

UP SI Polity & Moolvidhi Revision Practice Set 6 for UP SI 2026 Exam

UP SI Polity & Moolvidhi Revision Practice Set 6 for UP SI 2026 Exam provides concise revision of constitutional definitions, fundamental rights limits, governance structures, commissions, historical developments, and economic concepts important for objective questions.

Soumya Tiwari | 18 Feb, 2026

UP SI Polity & Moolvidhi Revision Practice Set 6 for UP SI 2026 Exam is a comprehensive revision resource covering constitutional definitions, governance mechanisms, fundamental rights, and key historical developments relevant to the UP SI syllabus. The set explains core legal concepts like the definition of State under Article 12, reasonable restrictions on speech, and parliamentary powers, alongside institutional roles such as the National Human Rights Commission and security forces like the Indo-Tibetan Border Police.

The Definition of 'State' under Article 12

The term 'State', as defined in Article 12 of the Indian Constitution, is comprehensive. It includes four main components:

The Executive Branch: Covers both Union (Government of India) and State governments.

The Legislative Branch: Includes the Parliament of India and State Legislatures.

Local Governments: Encompasses all forms of local self-government.

Other Authorities: Any other authorities operating within India or under the Government of India's control.

This definition ensures 'State' is not limited to just the central government but covers all levels of governmental and associated authorities.

Restrictions on Freedom of Speech and Expression

The Constitution guarantees the right to freedom of speech and expression under Article 19(1)(a). However, this right is not absolute and is subject to reasonable restrictions outlined in Article 19(2), which was added by the First Constitutional Amendment.

Grounds for Restriction

Valid Grounds:

Defamation: Speech harming an individual's reputation.

Contempt of Court: This is an independent, punishable offense and cannot be claimed under freedom of speech.

Friendly Relations with Foreign States: Speech that could damage India's international relationships.

Invalid Ground (in this context):

Protection of Scheduled Tribes: This ground restricts other fundamental rights like freedom of movement, but not freedom of speech and expression.

Government of India Act, 1858

The Government of India Act, 1858, marked a significant shift in India's administration. Key features include:

Transfer of Power: Sovereignty was officially transferred from the East India Company to the British Crown.

Establishment of Direct Rule: This was the first law by the British Parliament for India's governance under the direct rule of the Crown.

Principle of Absolute Control: The Act established absolute imperial control without popular participation or representation for Indians.

Duties and Scrutiny of a Governor's Actions

A Governor's actions are subject to parliamentary scrutiny depending on their role:

The Sixth Schedule and Autonomous District Councils

The Constitution provides special administrative provisions for certain tribal areas.

Fifth Schedule: Applies to tribal areas in 10 states but does not create Autonomous District Councils.

Sixth Schedule: Specifically establishes Autonomous District Councils (ADCs), granting them significant autonomy for regional decision-making, reducing reliance on state or central governments. It applies to Assam, Tripura, Meghalaya, and Mizoram, where 10 ADCs have been formed. Demands from regions like Ladakh to be included in the Sixth Schedule reflect a desire for similar powerful autonomous councils for tribal self-governance.

The Establishment of Azad Hind Radio

Subhas Chandra Bose founded the Azad Hind Radio in 1942 in Germany. Its headquarters later moved to Singapore and then Rangoon. It was through this radio that Bose famously addressed Mahatma Gandhi as the 'Father of the Nation'.

Acceptance of the Cabinet Mission Plan (1946)

The Cabinet Mission Plan, which rejected the Muslim League's demand for a sovereign Pakistan, was accepted by major political parties as follows:

Muslim League: Accepted on June 6, 1946.

Indian National Congress: Accepted on June 24, 1946.

Founding of the Hindu Mahasabha

The Hindu Mahasabha was founded in 1915 by Madan Mohan Malaviya during the Haridwar Kumbh Mela. Its objective was to protect the interests and rights of the Hindu community.

Indo-Tibetan Border Police (ITBP)

The ITBP was formed on October 24, 1962, following the India-China war. Its motto is Shaurya, Dridhata, Karmnishtha (Valour, Determination, Devotion to Duty). As a mountain-trained force, it primarily deploys along the Himalayan border with China. Between 2004-2005, the ITBP replaced the Assam Rifles for border protection in Sikkim and Arunachal Pradesh. The force has 56 service battalions.

National Pension Scheme (NPS) in the Private Sector

For the private sector, the maximum age to join the National Pension Scheme (NPS) is 65 years, a provision reportedly introduced in 2019.

Functions of the National Human Rights Commission (NHRC)

The NHRC's broad mandate includes:

Suo Motu Inquiry: Initiates investigations into human rights violations on its own.

Inquiry on Petitions: Investigates complaints from victims.

Jail Inspections: Visits prisons to examine inmate conditions and make recommendations.

Research and Promotion: Undertakes and promotes human rights research.

A critical limitation is that the NHRC can only investigate cases that are a maximum of one year old (Memory Tip:

Think of 'one year' as the 'time limit' for NHRC inquiries).

The Attorney General for India

The Attorney General (AG) is the highest law officer in India.

Correct Statements:

The AG is the first law officer of India.

They are entitled to all privileges of a Member of Parliament, including participating in parliamentary proceedings.

Their qualification must be the same as that required to be a judge of the Supreme Court.

Incorrect Statement: The AG is not a full-time counsel for the government and is permitted to engage in private legal practice.

The Council of Ministers and the President

Key principles governing the Council of Ministers:

Collective Responsibility: The Council of Ministers is collectively responsible to the Lok Sabha.

Role of Cabinet Ministers: All Cabinet Ministers are part of the Council of Ministers.

Removal of a Minister: The President cannot remove a minister without the Prime Minister's advice.

Constitutional Amendment Bills

Key features of Constitutional Amendment Bills:

Introduction: Can be introduced by any Member of Parliament, including a private member.

Presidential Assent: The President cannot withhold assent to such a bill and cannot return it for reconsideration.

They are obligated to give assent once passed by both Houses with the requisite majority.

Parliament's Legislative Power over Union Territories

Parliament has the power to make laws on any subject across all three lists (Union, State, and Concurrent) for Union Territories (UTs). This power extends to Delhi and Puducherry, despite them having their own legislatures. For Delhi, Parliament specifically legislates on crucial State List subjects such as police, public order, and land. Finance Minister in the Interim Government (1946)

The Interim Government was formed on September 2, 1946, with the Muslim League joining on October 26, 1946. The Finance Minister in this government was Liaquat Ali Khan from the Muslim League. Other Muslim League ministers included Jogendranath Mandal (Law), I. I. Chundrigar (Commerce), Abdur Rab Nishtar (Communications), and Ghazanfar Ali Khan (Health).

Stalking under the Indian Penal Code

The offense of stalking is defined under Section 78 of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita. Stalking is broadly defined to include not just physical following, but also monitoring internet usage, contacting via email, or any other electronic surveillance. An exception applies to government agencies or police conducting lawful surveillance as part of their duties.

Land Acquisition, Rehabilitation, and Resettlement Act, 2013

Provisions of the 2013 Act include:

Consent Requirement: For land acquisition by private companies, consent of 80% of affected families is required. For Public-Private Partnership (PPP) projects, consent of 70% of affected families is required.

Rehabilitation and Resettlement (R&R): It is mandatory for private companies acquiring large land tracts to adhere to the Act's rehabilitation and resettlement provisions, ensuring proper resettlement of displaced populations.

The Economic Concept of Reflation

Reflation is a deliberate macroeconomic policy aimed at countering deflation by stimulating the economy and increasing demand. Governments induce reflation through:

Monetary Policy: The central bank can lower interest rates (e.g., repo rate), making borrowing cheaper and encouraging spending.

Fiscal Policy: The government can reduce taxes, increasing disposable income for higher consumption and investment.

Decentralization under the 73rd Constitutional Amendment

The 73rd Constitutional Amendment Act, which constitutionalized Panchayati Raj, led to the decentralization of:

Decision-making powers

Administrative powers

The overall system of governance ("Purna Vyavastha")

However, judicial powers were not decentralized through this amendment; Panchayats do not possess formal judicial authority.

Types of Inflation by Speed

Inflation can be classified by its rate or speed:

Creeping/Moderate Inflation (मंद मुद्रास्फीति): A slow, gradual price rise.

Running/Rapid Inflation (द्वुत मुद्रास्फीति): A fast price rise.

Hyperinflation (अति मुद्रास्फीति): An extremely rapid and uncontrollable price rise.

Cost-push Inflation (लागत जन्य मुद्रास्फीति) is classified by its cause (rising production costs), not its speed.

Panchayat Elections

Key facts about Panchayat elections:

Conducting Body: Panchayat elections are conducted by the State Election Commission.

Appointment of Commissioner: The State Election Commissioner is appointed by the Governor.

Legislative Power: The State Legislature has the authority to make laws concerning all matters related to Panchayat elections.

National Commission to Review the Working of the Constitution (NCRWC)

This commission was established in 2000 by the government led by Prime Minister Atal Bihari Vajpayee. Its chairman was Justice M.N. Venkatachaliah, a former Chief Justice of India



Source: <https://www.thelawadvice.com/news/delhi-hc-seeks-replies-on-plea-over-disappearance-of-800-people-in-delhi>

OVER 800 PEOPLE MISSING IN DELHI, MOSTLY MINORS

18 Feb, 2026

Delhi HC Seeks Replies on Plea Over Disappearance of 800+ People in Delhi

The Delhi High Court on Wednesday sought responses from the Delhi Police, the Government of India, the Government of NCT of Delhi, and the National Human Rights Commission on a plea seeking action over the disappearance of more than 800 persons from the national capital during the first 15 days of 2026.

A Division Bench comprising Chief Justice Devendra Kumar Upadhyaya and Justice Tejas Karia directed the concerned authorities to file their replies within four weeks.

“Let the respondents file their response to this petition within four weeks. Two weeks thereafter for rejoinder,” the Court said.

The Delhi High Court passed the order while hearing a public interest litigation (PIL) filed by Jayeeta Deb Sarkar. A news report recently disclosed that between January 1 and January 15, as many as 807 persons were reported missing from Delhi, triggering widespread public concern.

On February 6, the Delhi Police issued a post on social media, terming the heightened discourse around the spike in missing persons as “paid promotion” and cautioning that action would be taken against those allegedly creating panic for monetary gains.

Meanwhile, the National Human Rights Commission took suo motu cognisance of the reports and issued notices to the Delhi government and the Delhi Police Commissioner, seeking a detailed report within two weeks. The Commission observed that if the reported figures were accurate, they could raise serious human rights concerns.



Source: <https://medicaldialogues.in/amp/health-news/nmc/nmc-reconstitutes-internal-complaints-committee-under-posh-act-2013-164906>

NMC reconstitutes internal complaints committee under POSH Act 2013

Written By : Adity Saha

Published On 2026-02-18 01:43 PM | Update On 2026-02-18 01:43 PM

New Delhi: The National Medical Commission (NMC) has reconstituted its Internal Complaints Committee (ICC) under the provisions of the Sexual Harassment of Women at Workplace (Prevention, Prohibition and Redressal) Act, commonly known as the POSH Act, 2013.

An office order issued in this regard on February 17, 2026, mentioned that the apex regulatory body formed the new committee in supersession of its earlier order issued on June 30, 2025. The decision has been taken with the approval of the Secretary, NMC.

The reconstituted Internal Complaints Committee will be headed by Ms Leena George, Under Secretary (UGMEB), as Chairperson. The other members include Shri Pankaj Kumar, Under Secretary (MARB); Ms Neetu Gahlaut, Section Officer (Ethics/EMRB); and Advocate Shefali Sewak, Member of YWCA, who will serve as the external member.

"In supersession of this Commission's Office Order of even number, dated 30/06/2025, an Internal Complaint Committee (ICC) under sexual Harassment of women at work Place (Prevention, prohibition, and Redressal) Act, 2013-POSH Act, 2013, is hereby reconstituted in National Medical Commission," read the order.

The Internal Complaints Committee is responsible for addressing complaints related to sexual harassment at the workplace and ensuring a safe working environment for women employees, as mandated under the PoSH Act, 2013.

Medical Dialogues had earlier reported that the National Medical Commission (NMC) directed the medical colleges/institutes across the country to strictly adhere to the National Human Rights Commission's (NHRC) directions of implementing the provisions of the Sexual Harassment of Women at Work Place (Prevention, Prohibition and Redressal) Act, 2013 (POSH Act, 2013).

Complying with these provisions, the medical colleges are required to constitute the Internal Complaint Committees (ICCs), Local Committees (LCs), and Internal Committees (ICs) at an appropriate level, and the same should be displayed on the website of the Organisation.

However, earlier NHRC had observed that the websites of medical colleges do not display such information including information about the composition of the ICC/LCs/ICs, the details of the email IDs, the contact numbers of the designated persons, or the procedure prescribed for submitting an online complaint.

Consequently, the Postgraduate Medical Education Board (PGMEB) of NMC on 01.07.2024 asked all health institutes and medical colleges to adhere to the directions issued in this regard by the Supreme Court, further warning that failure to comply with these directions would attract punitive action against the medical colleges.



Source: <https://www.newsgram.com/delhi/2026/02/18/du-ban-protest-ugc-equity-regulations>

DU Imposes One-Month Ban on Campus Protests After Clashes Over UGC Equity Regulations—Faculty Call It “Blanket Clampdown”

The order was issued by the Delhi University Proctor's Office, citing concerns over law-and-order, safety and public nuisance. Teachers and student groups questioned the sweeping nature of the restrictions and demanded its withdrawal.

Author: NewsGram Desk

Edited by : Ritik Singh

Updated on: Feb 18, 2026, 18:00

Key Points

Delhi University has prohibited public meetings, rallies, demonstrations, processions and assemblies of five or more people on campus from 17 February 2026, citing concerns over traffic disruption, safety risks and law and order.

The decision comes after confrontations during a protest over UGC Equity Regulations, cross FIRs between student groups and a YouTuber, and an NHRC notice over an alleged assault of a journalist.

Teachers and student bodies have condemned the order, calling it a “blanket clampdown” and an attack on democratic space, demanding that the ban be withdrawn.

Delhi University (DU) on Tuesday, 17 February 2026, imposed a one-month ban on public meetings, demonstrations, processions and protests across its campus, citing concerns over traffic obstruction, safety risks and disturbance to public peace.

The order, issued by the Proctor's Office, comes after recent protests in and around campus resulted in clashes between student groups and an attack on a professor.

What Does the Order Say?

The notification specifically bars:

Holding any public meeting, rally, dharna, protest or agitation

Assembly of five or more persons

Carrying hazardous materials including mashals, beacons or torches

Engaging in activities that affect public tranquillity or traffic flow

Shouting slogans and making speeches

The notification states that the decision was taken in view of “information received indicating that unrestricted public gatherings, processions, or demonstrations on campus may lead to obstruction of traffic, threats to human life, and disturbance of public peace.” It further notes that in the past, organisers have “often failed to control such protests, which have escalated and spread widely, resulting in deterioration of law and order within the University campuses”.

The Proctor's office referred to an earlier directive issued by the Assistant Commissioner of Police, Civil Lines, which similarly prohibited public meetings and demonstrations that could disrupt peace or traffic in the area. DU Proctor Manoj Kumar Singh described the move as a precautionary step aimed at preventing escalation. Referring to events on 13 February 2026, he said the university did not want a repeat of such incidents and emphasised the need to maintain law and order on campus. He added that while seminars are welcome, protests are completely banned for the duration of the order.

Recent Campus Clashes

On 13 February 2026, the All India Students' Association (AISA) took out an 'Adhikar rally' in support of the new University Grants Commission's proposed Equity Regulations. At the rally, YouTuber Ruchi Tiwari, who refers to herself as a 'Brahmin journalist', was seen having an altercation with a Dalit journalist. AISA DU secretary Anjali Sharma attempted to intervene, resulting in a clash, with both sides accusing the other of violence.

Videos from the incident show Tiwari throwing Sharma to the ground and then being restrained by AISA activists. Tiwari later claimed that she was surrounded and targeted for her Brahmin identity. She alleged that the AISA activists issued rape threats against her and tried to lynch her. AISA refuted the allegations in a statement, saying that Tiwari had "a notorious reputation of creating chaos and inciting violence," and adding that AISA activists were "getting rape and death threats constantly."

The matter escalated when AISA attempted to file a complaint at Maurice Nagar police station. While inside, the building was surrounded by a mob, abusing and threatening the activists inside. Videos of the scene show another YouTuber, Megha Lawariya, shouting "Brahmanvaad Zindabaad" while part of the crowd.

Cross FIRs were later registered at the police station under multiple provisions of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita (BNS), including sections related to assault, wrongful restraint and common intent. The National Human Rights Commission (NHRC) sent notices to the Deputy Commissioner of Police, North Delhi, and the Vice Chancellor of Delhi University regarding the alleged assault of a female journalist during the protest, seeking a report on the incident.

A day earlier, on 12 February 2026, AISA had organised a 'People's Literature Festival' outside the DU Arts Faculty. At the event, historian Irfan Habib was disrupted during his address when a bucket of water was thrown at him, while attending students were pelted with bricks. AISA attributed the attack to the Akhil Bharatiya Vidyarthi Parishad (ABVP), which denied the allegation.

Faculty and Student Opposition

The university's decision has drawn sharp criticism from sections of the faculty and student bodies, who have described it as a "blanket clampdown" on democratic rights.

Mithuraj Dhusiya, associate professor of English at Hansraj College, questioned the grounds cited by the administration. While acknowledging that protests must remain peaceful and that the university has a responsibility to maintain order, he argued that invoking "obstruction of traffic" to bar gatherings was unacceptable. He demanded that the order be withdrawn and raised concerns about whether the administration was attempting to curb mobilisations on issues such as appointments, implementation of the National Education Policy (NEP), the UGC Equity Bill and recent teacher suspensions.

Speaking to Newslandry, Abha Dev Habib, associate professor at Miranda House and secretary of the Democratic Teachers' Front, described the move as an "attack on a vibrant democratic space." She argued that the right to protest is constitutionally guaranteed and said universities have established procedures to regulate demonstrations without imposing sweeping prohibitions.

The Students' Federation of India (SFI) said the solution to campus incidents was not the suppression of democratic voices. The National Students' Union of India (NSUI) termed the decision an attempt to silence student mobilisation, particularly on issues concerning equity and representation. Other faculty members also publicly opposed the order, describing it as an unacceptable restriction on democratic functioning within the university. Delhi University has historically been a politically active campus, with student organisations mobilising on issues ranging from fee hikes and faculty appointments to national education reforms. The latest restriction has intensified debate over how universities should balance the maintenance of law and order with the protection of peaceful assembly and dissent within academic spaces.

[DS]



Source: <https://thelogicalindian.com/delhi-university-imposes-30-day-ban-on-protests-after-violent-clashes-over-ugc-equity-rules/>

Delhi University Imposes 30-Day Ban on Protests After Violent Clashes Over UGC Equity Rules

The university enforced temporary restrictions on gatherings after student clashes erupted during protests over the now-stayed UGC equity regulations.

Syed Muskan Shafiq | February 18, 2026

Delhi University imposes a month-long ban on protests, rallies and gatherings on campus from February 17, citing ongoing law and order concerns after violent clashes during demonstrations over the now-stayed University Grants Commission's equity regulations.

The University of Delhi has issued a one-month ban on all public meetings, protests, processions and demonstrations across its campuses, effective 17 February 2026, as authorities seek to contain tensions that have erupted over the controversial University Grants Commission (UGC) Equity Regulations 2026.

The order, promulgated by the office of University Proctor Prof. Manoj Kumar Singh, prohibits assembly of five or more people, slogan-shouting, meetings, rallies and similar activities on university grounds.

In a notification seen by The News Mill and other independent outlets, the administration said the measure was taken following inputs including from police that "unrestricted public gatherings" could obstruct traffic, threaten human life and disturb public peace on campus. It stressed that some recent protests spiralled into confrontations that hindered normal academic life and campus safety.

The order reiterates similar provisions outlined earlier by the Assistant Commissioner of Police, Civil Lines subdivision, under directives linked to a Ministry of Home Affairs notification. It remains in force for a month unless reviewed or withdrawn earlier.

Violence and Counterclaims: What Sparked the Ban

The ban comes against the backdrop of violent clashes during demonstrations on 13 and 14 February near the Arts Faculty and North Campus zones, where student groups had assembled to protest in support of the UGC's equity rules.

These regulations were framed to strengthen mechanisms for addressing caste-based discrimination in higher education institutions including mandating equity committees, helplines and monitoring frameworks but have been mired in controversy since their notification.

Students aligned with organisations like the All India Students' Association (AISA) took to the streets calling for immediate and full implementation of the equity regulations, which they say are critical to protecting marginalised students.

However, others, including some general category students, raised objections to specific provisions and the Supreme Court subsequently stayed the regulations on the ground that certain clauses could be vague or misused.

During these protests, skirmishes broke out between rival student groups, with each side levelling serious accusations against the other. In particular, a female journalist and content creator, Ruchi Tiwari, alleged she was assaulted while covering a demonstration a claim that triggered an inquiry by the National Human Rights Commission (NHRC) and led to notices being issued to both the Delhi Police and the DU Vice-Chancellor.

Students and activists on social media shared videos of the confrontations, showing heated exchanges, shoving and clashes between groups. Multiple first information reports (FIRs) were filed by Delhi Police after complaints from both sides. Authorities have said investigations are underway.

Official Rationale and Administrative Comments

In defending the ban, Proctor Manoj Kumar Singh told The Indian Express that the order was intended as a temporary, precautionary measure to restore calm and prevent further escalation on campus. He said the administration did not want issues around protests to deepen divisions among students or disrupt academic routines.

The notification explicitly cited patterns from prior protest activity, where organisers allegedly failed to control crowds and de-escalate confrontations, leading to wider disruption. The ban not only prohibits protests, meetings and rallies but also makes clear that assembly of any group that could affect traffic and peace will not be permitted.

Policing authorities echoed these concerns, pointing out that the previous scuffles had spilled beyond internal campus boundaries and drew law enforcement involvement including cross-FIRs and public safety considerations. Pushback from Students, Faculty and Rights Groups

The decision has been met with sharp criticism from multiple quarters. Student organisations such as AISA described the ban as a blanket clampdown on democratic expression, arguing that it disproportionately targets peaceful protest and stifles legitimate dissent on issues of equity and inclusion.

In its statement "Reject Arbitrary Curfew Imposed in Delhi University!", AISA condemned the administration's move as deepening the crisis rather than addressing the root causes of unrest.

Sections of faculty, including the Democratic Teachers' Front (DTF), have echoed similar concerns, characterising the ban as "undemocratic" and a violation of constitutional rights. They argue that while law and order is a legitimate concern, a blanket ban on assembly fails to differentiate between violent conduct and peaceful discourse.

Rights groups and academic commentators have also noted that curbs of this nature risk eroding the culture of open debate and academic freedom that universities are meant to foster. Several critics have called for structured dialogue and mediated platforms where concerns about policy, equity and student welfare can be aired constructively.

Policy Context

The protests that precipitated the ban are rooted in deeper disagreements over the UGC's Promotion of Equity in Higher Education Institutions Regulations, 2026. These regulations, notified earlier this year, aimed to build on older frameworks by mandating stronger institutional mechanisms to tackle caste-based discrimination a long-standing challenge in Indian higher education.

However, several groups opposed specific provisions, terming them either overly broad or favouring certain categories at the expense of others. Within weeks, multiple petitions reached the Supreme Court, which chose to place the regulations on hold pending detailed examination, citing vagueness and potential misuse.

This legal uncertainty has compounded tensions on campuses nationwide, as student bodies differ sharply on how equity and inclusion should be operationalised, and what mechanisms would best protect vulnerable learners while safeguarding rights for all.

The Logical Indian's Perspective

At a time when academic spaces should be centres of respectful debate and intellectual exchange, the developments at Delhi University remind us how deeply policy, identity and democratic expression intersect in higher education. Safety and peace on campus are undeniably important, but so too is the right to peaceful protest and robust dialogue especially on issues like equity, discrimination and student welfare.

Blanket bans may offer short-term stability, but they risk undermining the very culture of discourse that universities exist to nurture. Our institutions must work harder to create structured avenues for engagement where students, faculty, administrators and civil society can exchange views without fear or intimidation.



Source: <https://www.moneycontrol.com/news/india/high-court-seeks-response-from-centre-police-over-807-missing-cases-in-first-half-of-january-13834675.html/amp>

High Court seeks response from Centre, police over 807 missing cases in first half of January

A Division Bench comprising Chief Justice Devendra Kumar Upadhyaya and Justice Tejas Karia was hearing a public interest litigation (PIL) filed by Jayeeta Deb Sarkar.

Rewati Karan | February 18, 2026 / 19:39 IST

Delhi HC seeks responses on plea about 807 missing persons in 2026

Police say missing cases dropped, urge public not to panic

NHRC issues notices, flags possible human rights concerns

The Delhi High Court on Wednesday asked the Delhi Police, the Central government, the Delhi government and the National Human Rights Commission (NHRC) to respond to a plea highlighting the disappearance of more than 800 people from the national capital within the first 15 days of 2026.

A Division Bench comprising Chief Justice Devendra Kumar Upadhyaya and Justice Tejas Karia was hearing a public interest litigation (PIL) filed by Jayeeta Deb Sarkar.

Passing directions in the matter, the Bench stated, "Let the respondents file the response to this petition in four weeks. Two weeks for rejoinder."

The petition follows a news report that disclosed that between January 1 and January 15, as many as 807 individuals were reported missing in Delhi, triggering widespread concern.

Police data and clarification

Official figures accessed by PTI show that 807 people were reported missing during the first half of January, translating to an average of 54 cases per day. Of the total, 509 were women and girls, while 298 were men. The data further indicates that 191 of those reported missing were minors and 616 were adults.

Amid public anxiety, Delhi Police sought to downplay the alarm, asserting that there is "no cause for panic or fear" and that the numbers represent a dip compared to the same period in earlier years. While maintaining that January 2026 recorded a reduction in such reports over previous corresponding periods, the police did not disclose comparative totals in their statement.

Earlier, on February 6, the force had posted on social media that the hype around the rise in missing persons was a "paid promotion" and cautioned that action would be taken against individuals spreading panic for monetary gains.

Procedures and investigation

In its statement, the police emphasised adherence to due process. "Standard operating procedures (SOPs) are strictly followed in all missing persons cases. Immediate efforts are initiated to trace the missing individual, with cases involving children being accorded the highest priority," the statement read.

Authorities underlined that complaints can be registered not only at police stations but also via online platforms and the Emergency Response Support System (112). Dedicated teams dealing with missing persons have been set up across all districts, while the Crime Branch's Anti Human Trafficking Unit is handling cases, particularly those involving children, to ensure speedy tracing and recovery.

The force also clarified that no organised gang or criminal network has been detected in connection with cases involving missing or abducted children in Delhi so far.

NHRC steps in

Separately, the NHRC has taken suo motu cognisance of the reports and issued notices to the Delhi government

and the Delhi Police chief, seeking a detailed account within two weeks. The Commission observed that if the figures are accurate, they could point to serious human rights concerns.

The police have appealed to residents to remain alert yet composed, urging them not to rely on rumours or unverified information circulating on social media and warning that legal action would be taken against those found spreading misinformation.

(With inputs from PTI)

Source: <https://www.bhaskarhindi.com/other/delhi-ncr-mein-logon-ke-lapata-hone-ke-maamle-mein-sarkar-aur-police-ko-notice-highcourt-ne-maanga-jawab-1254035>

दिल्ली-एनसीआर में लोगों के लापता होने के मामले में सरकार और पुलिस को नोटिस, हाईकोर्ट ने मांगा जवाब

18 Feb 2026 3:24 PM

दिल्ली हाईकोर्ट ने 800 से अधिक लोगों के मामले में बुधवार को दिल्ली पुलिस, केंद्र, दिल्ली सरकार और राष्ट्रीय मानवाधिकार आयोग (एनएचआरसी) को नोटिस जारी किया। हाईकोर्ट ने इस मामले में नई याचिका पर पुलिस, सरकार और एनएचआरसी से जवाब तलब किया है।

नई दिल्ली, 18 फरवरी (आईएनएस)। दिल्ली हाईकोर्ट ने 800 से अधिक लोगों के मामले में बुधवार को दिल्ली पुलिस, केंद्र, दिल्ली सरकार और राष्ट्रीय मानवाधिकार आयोग (एनएचआरसी) को नोटिस जारी किया। हाईकोर्ट ने इस मामले में नई याचिका पर पुलिस, सरकार और एनएचआरसी से जवाब तलब किया है।

हाईकोर्ट में नई याचिका जयिता देब सरकार ने दायर की। बुधवार को सुनवाई करते हुए हाईकोर्ट के मुख्य न्यायाधीश देवेन्द्र कुमार और न्यायमूर्ति तेजस कारिया की डिवीजन बेंच ने संबंधित अधिकारियों को चार हफ्ते में अपना जवाब फाइल करने का निर्देश दिया। हाईकोर्ट में मामले की अगली सुनवाई मार्च में होगी। इससे पहले, 11 फरवरी को पीआईएल पर सुनवाई करते हुए हाईकोर्ट ने अथॉरिटीज से जवाब मांगा था।

दरअसल, पिछले महीने एक रिपोर्ट में राजधानी दिल्ली में सिर्फ 15 दिनों में 800 से ज्यादा लोग गायब होने का दावा किया गया था। रिपोर्ट के अनुसार, इनमें 191 नाबालिग और 616 वयस्क शामिल थे। इस खबर से लोगों में काफी चिंता फैल गई।

6 फरवरी को दिल्ली पुलिस ने रिपोर्ट को खारिज करते हुए कहा कि आंकड़ों को गलत तरीके से पेश कर लोगों में डर फैलाया जा रहा है। पुलिस ने चेतावनी दी थी कि जो लोग जानबूझकर भ्रामक जानकारी फैलाकर दहशत का माहौल बना रहे हैं, उनके खिलाफ सख्त कानूनी कार्रवाई की जाएगी

हालांकि, 9 फरवरी को राष्ट्रीय मानवाधिकार आयोग (एनएचआरसी) ने इस मुद्दे पर स्वतः संज्ञान लिया था। एनएचआरसी ने कहा कि अगर यह रिपोर्ट सही है, तो यह गंभीर मानवाधिकार उल्लंघन का मामला बनता है। इसी को ध्यान में रखते हुए आयोग ने दिल्ली सरकार के मुख्य सचिव और दिल्ली पुलिस कमिश्नर को नोटिस जारी कर विस्तृत रिपोर्ट मांगी थी। इससे मामले को लेकर विपक्ष ने सरकार पर भी सवाल उठाए थे। आम आदमी पार्टी ने कहा, "आपके बच्चों की सुरक्षा करने में सरकार के चारों इंजन फेल हो गए हैं, इसलिए अपना और अपने बच्चों का ध्यान रखें।"

Source: <https://www.themooknayak.com/education/delhi-university-imposes-one-month-ban-on-protests-amid-ugc-equity-regulations-row>

DU में एक महीने के लिए 'प्रदर्शन प्रतिबंध': यूजीसी नियमों के समर्थन में विरोध के बाद सख्ती

दिल्ली पुलिस के सहायक आयुक्त (सिविल लाइंस) द्वारा जारी आदेश तथा गृह मंत्रालय की अधिसूचनाओं का हवाला देते हुए पांच या अधिक व्यक्तियों की सभा, रैली, धरना, विरोध प्रदर्शन, खतरनाक सामग्री (जैसे मशालें) ले जाना, नारे लगाना और भाषण देना भी प्रतिबंधित कर दिया गया है। 13 फरवरी को नार्थ कैम्पस में यूजीसी नियमों के समर्थन में प्रदर्शन के दौरान दो छात्र संगठनों के बीच झड़प हुई, जिसमें मारपीट के आरोप-प्रत्यारोप लगे और क्रॉस एफआईआर दर्ज हुई।

Geetha Sunil Pillai | Published on: 18 Feb 2026, 9:59 am

नई दिल्ली- दिल्ली विश्वविद्यालय (डीयू) ने परिसर में सार्वजनिक सभाओं, जुलूसों, प्रदर्शनों और किसी भी प्रकार के विरोध-प्रदर्शन पर एक महीने के लिए पूर्ण प्रतिबंध लगा दिया है। यह आदेश प्रॉक्टर प्रो. मनोज कुमार द्वारा 17 फरवरी को जारी किया गया, जो तत्काल प्रभाव से लागू हो गया है और एक महीने तक प्रभावी रहेगा।

प्रशासन ने आदेश में कहा है कि परिसर में अनियंत्रित सार्वजनिक सभाएं, जुलूस या प्रदर्शन यातायात में बाधा, मानव जीवन के लिए खतरा और सार्वजनिक शांति भंग कर सकते हैं। अतीत में ऐसे प्रदर्शनों के आयोजकों द्वारा स्थिति को नियंत्रित करने में असफलता के कारण कानून-व्यवस्था बिगड़ने के उदाहरण दिए गए हैं। दिल्ली पुलिस के सहायक आयुक्त (सिविल लाइंस) द्वारा जारी आदेश तथा गृह मंत्रालय की अधिसूचनाओं का हवाला देते हुए पांच या अधिक व्यक्तियों की सभा, रैली, धरना, विरोध प्रदर्शन, खतरनाक सामग्री (जैसे मशालें) ले जाना, नारे लगाना और भाषण देना भी प्रतिबंधित कर दिया गया है। यह कदम यूजीसी (यूनिवर्सिटी ग्रांट्स कमीशन) की 2026 समता नियमावली (Equity Regulations) से जुड़े हालिया विवाद के बाद आया है। ये नियम उच्च शिक्षा संस्थानों में जाति-आधारित भेदभाव को समाप्त करने और समानता स्थापित करने के उद्देश्य से लाए गए थे, लेकिन सुप्रीम कोर्ट द्वारा इन पर स्थगन लगाए जाने के बाद परिसर में तनाव बढ़ गया। 13 फरवरी को नार्थ कैम्पस में इन नियमों के समर्थन में प्रदर्शन के दौरान दो छात्र संगठनों के बीच झड़प हुई, जिसमें मारपीट के आरोप-प्रत्यारोप लगे और क्रॉस एफआईआर दर्ज हुई।

नेशनल ह्यूमन राइट्स कमीशन ने नॉर्थ दिल्ली के डिप्टी कमिश्नर ऑफ पुलिस और DU के वाइस चांसलर को प्रोटेस्ट के दौरान एक महिला जर्नलिस्ट पर कथित हमले के मामले में नोटिस जारी किया।

NHRC के मुताबिक, जर्नलिस्ट यूनिवर्सिटी ग्रांट्स कमीशन के सपोर्ट में एक प्रोटेस्ट कवर कर रही थीं, तभी उन पर कथित तौर पर भीड़ ने हमला कर दिया। शिकायत में दावा किया गया कि उन्हें उनकी जाति के आधार पर टारगेट किया गया, गाली-गलौज की गई, मारपीट की गई और धमकी दी गई, साथ ही कथित तौर पर उनकी इज्जत को ठेस पहुंचाने की कोशिश की गई। इस घटना को जाति आधारित हिंसा और प्रेस की आज़ादी पर सीधा हमला बताया गया।

हालांकि, रोक के ऑर्डर की फैकल्टी और स्टूडेंट बॉडीज़ के कुछ हिस्सों ने कड़ी आलोचना की।

इस बीच, सोशल मीडिया पर डॉ. ओम सुधा की पोस्ट चर्चा में रही, जिसमें उन्होंने लिखा: "जब #UGCRegulations के विरोध में और भेदभाव बनाये रखने के लिए कुछ जाति के कुछ लोग उग्र विरोध कर रहे थे तब विश्वविद्यालय प्रशासन को दिक्कत नहीं हुई लेकिन जैसे ही #UGC के समर्थन में और विश्वविद्यालय में व्याप्त भेदभाव को खत्म करने तथा समता स्थापित करने के लिए बहुजन लोकतान्त्रिक तरीके से प्रदर्शन कर रहे हैं तो विश्वविद्यालय प्रशासन को परेशानी हो रही है। जहाँ-जहाँ सामंती और मनुवादी मानसिकता के लोग कुर्सी पर बैठे हैं, वहाँ-वहाँ बहुजन विरोधी फैसले लिए जा रहे हैं।" सोशल मीडिया पर प्रतिक्रियाएं तीखी रही हैं। छात्र और शिक्षक संगठन जैसे डेमोक्रेटिक टीचर्स फोरम (डीटीएफ) ने इसे "असंवैधानिक" और "शांतिपूर्ण सभा को अपराधीकरण" करार दिया। कई यूजर्स ने इसे "लोकतंत्र का गला घोटना" बताया, जबकि कुछ ने प्रशासन के कानून-व्यवस्था बनाए रखने के फैसले का समर्थन किया। छात्र संगठनों ने आदेश वापस लेने की मांग की है, इसे "असहमति दबाने की कोशिश" बताया।

विश्वविद्यालय प्रशासन ने इसे "सावधानीपूर्ण कदम" बताया है, जबकि आलोचक इसे यूजीसी नियमों के समर्थकों के खिलाफ पक्षपातपूर्ण मान रहे हैं।

Source: <https://jantaserishta.com/delhi-ncr/du-bans-protests-on-campus-for-a-month-faculty-and-students-protest-4590431>

DU ने कैम्पस में एक महीने के लिए विरोध प्रदर्शन पर रोक लगाई, फैकल्टी और स्टूडेंट्स ने किया विरोध

Kiran 18 फ़रवरी 2026

NEW DELHI नई दिल्ली: एकेडमिक और पॉलिटिकल हलकों में तीखी प्रतिक्रियाओं को देखते हुए, दिल्ली यूनिवर्सिटी ने मंगलवार को अपने कैम्पस में पब्लिक मीटिंग, प्रोटेस्ट, डेमोस्ट्रेशन और जुलूस पर एक महीने का बैन लगा दिया। इस पर डेमोक्रेटिक असहमति पर कार्रवाई के आरोप लगे। यूनिवर्सिटी प्रॉक्टर प्रो. मनोज कुमार का जारी किया गया यह ऑर्डर 17 फरवरी, 2026 से लागू रहेगा और यह स्टूडेंट्स, फैकल्टी मेंबर्स और स्टाफ पर लागू होगा। पब्लिक सेप्टी और लॉ एंड ऑर्डर को लेकर चिंताओं का हवाला देते हुए, डायरेक्टिव में कहा गया है कि बिना रोक-टोक के जमावड़े ट्रैफिक में रुकावट डाल सकते हैं, इंसानी जान को खतरे में डाल सकते हैं और पब्लिक शांति भंग कर सकते हैं। इसमें आगे कहा गया है कि, पहले भी, ऑर्गनाइज़र उन प्रोटेस्ट को कंट्रोल करने में नाकाम रहे थे जो कथित तौर पर बढ़ गए थे और कैम्पस में नॉर्मल कामकाज में रुकावट डाली थी। प्रॉक्टर ने 26 दिसंबर, 2025 को असिस्टेंट कमिश्नर ऑफ पुलिस, सिविल लाइंस द्वारा जारी एक पुराने ऑर्डर का ज़िक्र किया, जो मिनिस्ट्री ऑफ होम अफेयर्स के एक नोटिफिकेशन पर आधारित था। उस डायरेक्टिव में पब्लिक मीटिंग, रैलियां, सिट-इन या डेमोस्ट्रेशन पर रोक लगाई गई थी, जो यूनिवर्सिटी एरिया के अंदर शांति भंग कर सकते थे या ट्रैफिक में रुकावट डाल सकते थे। नए ऑर्डर में एक महीने के लिए उन पाबंदियों को फिर से लागू किया गया है। यह डेवलपमेंट नेशनल ह्यूमन राइट्स कमीशन के नॉर्थ दिल्ली के डिप्टी कमिश्नर ऑफ़ पुलिस और DU के वाइस चांसलर को 13 फरवरी को यूनिवर्सिटी के नॉर्थ कैम्पस में एक प्रोटेस्ट के दौरान एक महिला जर्नलिस्ट पर कथित हमले के मामले में नोटिस जारी करने के एक दिन बाद हुआ है। NHRC के मुताबिक, जर्नलिस्ट यूनिवर्सिटी ग्रांट्स कमीशन के सपोर्ट में एक प्रोटेस्ट कवर कर रही थीं, जब उन पर कथित तौर पर भीड़ ने हमला किया। शिकायत में दावा किया गया कि उन्हें उनकी जाति के आधार पर टारगेट किया गया, गाली-गलौज की गई, मारपीट की गई और धमकी दी गई, साथ ही कथित तौर पर उनकी इज्जत को ठेस पहुंचाने की कोशिश की गई। इस घटना को जाति-आधारित हिंसा और प्रेस की आज़ादी पर सीधा हमला बताया गया। हालांकि, इस रोक के ऑर्डर की फैकल्टी और स्टूडेंट बॉडीज़ के कुछ हिस्सों ने कड़ी आलोचना की। सीनियर एग्जीक्यूटिव काउंसिल के मेंबर मिथुराज धुसिया ने कहा कि यह कदम असहमति पर रोक लगाने जैसा है। उन्होंने कहा, “मैं इस नोटिस से पूरी तरह सहमत नहीं हूँ। सरकार, यूनिवर्सिटी और उसके कॉलेजों की गलत पॉलिसी के खिलाफ सभी विरोध और आंदोलन शांतिपूर्ण होने चाहिए, और यह पक्का करना यूनिवर्सिटी की ड्यूटी है। लेकिन, ‘ट्रैफिक में रुकावट’ के नाम पर पूरी तरह बैन मंजूर नहीं है,” उन्होंने ऑर्डर वापस लेने की मांग की। प्रोफेसर नंदिता नारायण ने सोशल मीडिया पर लिखा, “सत्तारूढ़ सरकार के सभी जातिवादी नुकिले दांत पूरी तरह से दिख रहे हैं।” एक और प्रोफेसर, सुजीत कुमार ने कहा, “यह कोई बिना बताई इमरजेंसी नहीं है, बल्कि एक घोषित इमरजेंसी है। मैं इसकी कड़ी निंदा करता हूँ। इसके लिए पूरी तरह से सरकार ज़िम्मेदार है, और इसलिए मैं सरकार की भी कड़ी निंदा करता हूँ।” नेशनल स्टूडेंट्स यूनियन ऑफ़ इंडिया के नेशनल प्रेसिडेंट वरुण चौधरी ने भी इस फैसले को “मोदी सरकार की कैम्पस की डेमोक्रेटिक भावना को कुचलने और SC, ST, और OBC स्टूडेंट्स को चुप कराने की सोची-समझी कोशिश” बताया। इस बीच, स्टूडेंट्स फेडरेशन ऑफ़ इंडिया ने अपने ऑफिशियल बयान में कहा, “ऐसी घटनाओं का हल डेमोक्रेटिक आवाज़ों को दबाना नहीं है।” डेमोक्रेटिक टीचर्स फ्रंट ने भी “इस गैर-संवैधानिक आदेश को तुरंत रद्द करने” की मांग की, और इसे सही लोकतांत्रिक अभिव्यक्ति को दबाने के लिए एक कठोर कदम बताया।

Source: <https://www.etvbharat.com/hi/state/delhi-police-and-central-government-asked-to-respond-in-the-case-of-disappearance-of-more-than-800-people-in-delhi-delhi-news-dls26021803604>

दिल्ली में 800 से ज्यादा लोगों के गायब होने के मामले में दिल्ली पुलिस, केंद्र सरकार से जवाब तलब

याचिका में कहा गया है कि गुमशुदा व्यक्तियों को ढूंढने के लिए बाध्यकारी प्रोटोकॉल का पालन नहीं किया जा रहा है.

By ETV Bharat Delhi Team

Published: February 18, 2026 at 2:46 PM IST

2 Min Read

नई दिल्ली: दिल्ली हाईकोर्ट ने इस साल के पहले 15 दिनों में आठ सौ से ज्यादा लोगों के गायब होने पर कार्रवाई की मांग करने वाली याचिका पर सुनवाई करते हुए केंद्र, दिल्ली सरकार, दिल्ली पुलिस और राष्ट्रीय मानवाधिकार आयोग को नोटिस जारी किया है। चीफ जस्टिस डीके उपाध्याय की अध्यक्षता वाली बेंच ने चार हफ्ते में जवाब दाखिल करने का निर्देश दिया.

सुनवाई के दौरान याचिकाकर्ता की ओर से पेश वकील ने कहा कि राईट टू बी फाउंड (मिलने का अधिकार) संविधान के अनुच्छेद 21 के तहत जीने के अधिकार का अहम हिस्सा है. याचिका में कहा गया है कि गुमशुदा व्यक्तियों को ढूंढने के लिए बाध्यकारी प्रोटोकॉल का पालन नहीं किया जा रहा है. गुमशुदा व्यक्तियों को खोजने के लिए स्टैंडर्ड आपरेंटिंग प्रोसीजर तो जारी किए गए हैं लेकिन वे कड़ाई से लागू नहीं किए जाते हैं. यही वजह है कि दिल्ली में बड़े पैमाने पर लोग गायब हो रहे हैं लेकिन कोई कार्रवाई नहीं हो रही है.

बता दें कि एक खबर के मुताबिक 1 जनवरी से 15 जनवरी के बीच 807 लोग दिल्ली से गायब हो गए हैं. इस खबर पर दिल्ली में व्यापक प्रतिक्रिया देखने को मिली थी. 6 फरवरी को दिल्ली पुलिस ने इस संबंध में एक ट्वीट किया और कहा कि गायब होने में बढ़ोतरी की खबरों को पैसे लेकर प्रमोट किया जा रहा है. दिल्ली पुलिस ने लोगों में भय पैदा करने वालों पर कार्रवाई करने की चेतावनी भी दी. हालांकि इस मामले पर राष्ट्रीय मानवाधिकार आयोग ने स्वतः संज्ञान लेते हुए दिल्ली सरकार और दिल्ली पुलिस को नोटिस जारी कर दो हफ्ते में विस्तृत जवाब तलब किया है. राष्ट्रीय मानवाधिकार आयोग ने कहा कि अगर ये सही है तो ये काफी गंभीर मामला है.

Source: <https://www.navjivanindia.com/amp/story/india/the-high-court-has-issued-notices-to-the-government-and-police-regarding-the-disappearance-of-people-in-delhi-ncr-and-has-sought-their-response>

दिल्ली-एनसीआर में लोगों के लापता होने के मामले में सरकार और पुलिस को नोटिस, हाईकोर्ट ने मांगा जवाब

हाईकोर्ट में नई याचिका जयिता देब सरकार ने दायर की। बुधवार को सुनवाई करते हुए हाईकोर्ट के मुख्य न्यायाधीश देवेन्द्र कुमार और न्यायमूर्ति तेजस कारिया की डिवीजन बेंच ने संबंधित अधिकारियों को चार हफ्ते में अपना जवाब फाइल करने का निर्देश दिया।

By आईएनएस

Published: 18 Feb 2026, 4:02 PM IST

दिल्ली हाईकोर्ट ने 800 से अधिक लोगों के मामले में बुधवार को दिल्ली पुलिस, केंद्र, दिल्ली सरकार और राष्ट्रीय मानवाधिकार आयोग (एनएचआरसी) को नोटिस जारी किया। हाईकोर्ट ने इस मामले में नई याचिका पर पुलिस, सरकार और एनएचआरसी से जवाब तलब किया है।

हाईकोर्ट में नई याचिका जयिता देब सरकार ने दायर की। बुधवार को सुनवाई करते हुए हाईकोर्ट के मुख्य न्यायाधीश देवेन्द्र कुमार और न्यायमूर्ति तेजस कारिया की डिवीजन बेंच ने संबंधित अधिकारियों को चार हफ्ते में अपना जवाब फाइल करने का निर्देश दिया। हाईकोर्ट में मामले की अगली सुनवाई मार्च में होगी।

इससे पहले, 11 फरवरी को पीआईएल पर सुनवाई करते हुए हाईकोर्ट ने अर्थोरेटीज से जवाब मांगा था।

दरअसल, पिछले महीने एक रिपोर्ट में राजधानी दिल्ली में सिर्फ 15 दिनों में 800 से ज्यादा लोग गायब होने का दावा किया गया था। रिपोर्ट के अनुसार, इनमें 191 नाबालिग और 616 वयस्क शामिल थे। इस खबर से लोगों में काफी चिंता फैल गई।

6 फरवरी को दिल्ली पुलिस ने रिपोर्ट को खारिज करते हुए कहा कि आंकड़ों को गलत तरीके से पेश कर लोगों में डर फैलाया जा रहा है। पुलिस ने चेतावनी दी थी कि जो लोग जानबूझकर भ्रामक जानकारी फैलाकर दहशत का माहौल बना रहे हैं, उनके खिलाफ सख्त कानूनी कार्रवाई की जाएगी।

हालांकि, 9 फरवरी को राष्ट्रीय मानवाधिकार आयोग (एनएचआरसी) ने इस मुद्दे पर स्वतः संज्ञान लिया था। एनएचआरसी ने कहा कि अगर यह रिपोर्ट सही है, तो यह गंभीर मानवाधिकार उल्लंघन का मामला बनता है। इसी को ध्यान में रखते हुए आयोग ने दिल्ली सरकार के मुख्य सचिव और दिल्ली पुलिस कमिश्नर को नोटिस जारी कर विस्तृत रिपोर्ट मांगी थी।

इससे मामले को लेकर विपक्ष ने सरकार पर भी सवाल उठाए थे। आम आदमी पार्टी ने कहा, "आपके बच्चों की सुरक्षा करने में सरकार के चारों इंजन फेल हो गए हैं, इसलिए अपना और अपने बच्चों का ध्यान रखें।"

Source: <https://www.jagran.com/bihar/muzaffarpur-muzaffarpur-pier-thana-incharge-suspended-law-order-issue-hindi-news-40145999.html>

'You are suspended', विधि-व्यवस्था बिगड़ने पर मुजफ्फरपुर के पियर थानाध्यक्ष पर कार्रवाई

By Sanjiv Kumar Edited By: Ajit kumar

Updated: Wed, 18 Feb 2026 12:59 PM (IST)

Bihar Police Disciplinary Action: मुजफ्फरपुर के पियर थानाध्यक्ष रजनीकांत को कानून-व्यवस्था बिगड़ने के आरोप में निलंबित कर दिया गया है। बड़गांव में सरपंच लालबाबू सहनी से मारपीट और अवैध वसूली के आरोपों के बाद स्थिति तनावपूर्ण हो गई थी। एसएसपी कांतेश कुमार मिश्रा ने एसडीपीओ पूर्वी टू की रिपोर्ट के आधार पर यह कार्रवाई की। थानाध्यक्ष को बंधक बनाने के बाद पुलिस ने स्थिति संभाली थी। यह निलंबन लापरवाही और अविवेकपूर्ण निर्णय के कारण हुआ है।

HighLights

पियर थानाध्यक्ष रजनीकांत को तत्काल प्रभाव से निलंबित किया गया।

बड़गांव में कानून-व्यवस्था बिगड़ने पर एसएसपी ने की कार्रवाई।

सरपंच से मारपीट, अवैध वसूली के आरोपों के बाद हंगामा।

जागरण संवाददाता, मुजफ्फरपुर। Pier Thana Incharge Suspended: जिले में विधि-व्यवस्था से जुड़े मामले में एसएसपी ने सख्त रुख अपनाया है। पियर थानाध्यक्ष रजनीकांत को तत्काल प्रभाव से निलंबित कर दिया गया है।

यह कार्रवाई उनके अविवेकपूर्ण निर्णय और लापरवाहीपूर्वक कार्य के कारण थाना क्षेत्र के बड़गांव में कानून-व्यवस्था की स्थिति बिगड़ने के बाद की गई है। एसएसपी कांतेश कुमार मिश्रा ने निलंबन की पुष्टि करते हुए बताया कि पियर थानाध्यक्ष के कार्यों के कारण क्षेत्र में गंभीर स्थिति उत्पन्न हो गई थी। मामले की जांच के बाद एसडीपीओ पूर्वी टू द्वारा दी गई रिपोर्ट के आधार पर यह कार्रवाई की गई है। कर्तव्य के प्रति लापरवाही और अविवेकपूर्ण निर्णय को निलंबन का आधार बनाया गया है।

गौरतलब है कि पिछले दिनों पियर थाना क्षेत्र के बड़गांव में सरपंच लालबाबू सहनी के साथ पुलिस द्वारा बेरहमी से मारपीट किए जाने का आरोप लगा था। इस मामले में पीड़ित सरपंच ने मानवाधिकार अधिवक्ता एस.के. झा के माध्यम से राष्ट्रीय और राज्य मानवाधिकार आयोग में अलग-अलग याचिकाएं दाखिल कर पुलिसकर्मियों पर कार्रवाई की मांग की थी।

याचिका में आरोप लगाया गया कि छह फरवरी को पियर थाना के पुलिसकर्मी गांव के चौक पर अवैध वसूली कर रहे थे। जानकारी मिलने पर जब सरपंच वहां पहुंचे और कारण पूछने का प्रयास किया, तो पुलिसकर्मियों ने उनके साथ मारपीट शुरू कर दी। आरोप है कि कई पुलिसकर्मियों ने मिलकर उन्हें बेरहमी से पीटा और फायरिंग तक की गई।

इस घटना के बाद इलाके में भारी आक्रोश फैल गया था। आक्रोशित लोगों ने थानाध्यक्ष को बंधक बना लिया और जमकर हंगामा किया। स्थिति अनियंत्रित होने की सूचना पर एसडीपीओ पूर्वी टू समेत कई थानों की पुलिस मौके पर पहुंची और हालात को काबू में किया। इसके बाद बंधक बने थानाध्यक्ष को सुरक्षित बाहर निकाला गया।

पूरे प्रकरण के बाद विभागीय स्तर पर जांच तेज की गई और अंततः पियर थानाध्यक्ष के खिलाफ निलंबन की सख्त कार्रवाई की गई है।

Source: <https://www.dailychhattisgarh.com/latest-news/317035/strict-action-should-be-taken-against-the-officers-who-killed-the-innocent-tribal->

निर्दोष आदिवासी के हत्यारे अफसरों पर हो कड़ी कार्यवाही

18-Feb-2026 7:06 PM

नेता प्रतिपक्ष डॉ महंत ने जजा आयोग को लिखा

'छत्तीसगढ़' संवाददाता

रायपुर, 18 फरवरी। नेता प्रतिपक्ष डॉ. चरणदास महंत ने बलरामपुर के हंसपुर गांव में एक आदिवासी ग्रामीण की मृत्यु की जाँच को लेकर राष्ट्रीय मानवाधिकार आयोग, और राष्ट्रीय अनुसूचित जनजाति आयोग को पत्र लिखकर जाँच की मांग की है।

नेता प्रतिपक्ष डॉ. चरण दास महंत ने कहा कि, छत्तीसगढ़ बलरामपुर जिले के हंसपुर गांव में घटित घटना अत्यंत दुर्भाग्यपूर्ण एवं गंभीर है। जिसमें कथित रूप से प्रशासनिक कार्रवाई के परिणामस्वरूप एक आदिवासी ग्रामीण की हत्या की गई है।

नेता प्रतिपक्ष डॉ. महंत ने पत्र में लिखा कि, जानकारी अनुसार, संबंधित कार्रवाई में नागरिकों की सुरक्षा हेतु नियुक्त अधिकारियों द्वारा अत्यधिक बल प्रयोग किया गया, जिसके परिणामस्वरूप एक निर्दोष आदिवासी की मृत्यु हो गई। इस घटना से स्थानीय समुदायों एवं नागरिक समाज में गहरा आक्रोश एवं पीड़ा व्याप्त है तथा प्रशासनिक आचरण, जवाबदेही और मूलभूत मानवाधिकारों की रक्षा को लेकर गंभीर प्रश्न उठ रहे हैं। यह मानवाधिकारों का घोर उल्लंघन है, जो किसी भी लोकतांत्रिक व्यवस्था में स्वीकार्य नहीं है।

नेता प्रतिपक्ष ने कहा है कि, तथ्यों की स्थापना, न्याय सुनिश्चित करने तथा कानून के शासन में जनविश्वास बनाए रखने हेतु एक व्यापक, निष्पक्ष एवं उच्चस्तरीय जांच अत्यंत आवश्यक है।

उन्होंने राष्ट्रीय मानवाधिकार आयोग से संपूर्ण घटना के सभी तथ्यों का पता लगाने हेतु एक स्वतंत्र, निष्पक्ष एवं उच्चस्तरीय जांच करने की मांग की है।

नेता प्रतिपक्ष डॉ. महंत ने मांग की है कि, पीड़ित परिवार को तत्काल मुआवजा एवं आवश्यक सहायता सुनिश्चित करे एवं घटना से प्रभावित एवं घायल ग्रामीणों के उचित उपचार एवं पुनर्वास की व्यवस्था

Source: <https://bharatexpress.com/legal/delhi-high-court-notice-centre-delhi-police-800-missing-persons-15-days-petition-618080>

दिल्ली में 15 दिनों में 800 से अधिक लोग लापता: हाई कोर्ट ने केंद्र, दिल्ली सरकार और पुलिस से मांगा जवाब

राजधानी दिल्ली में साल के पहले 15 दिनों में 800 से ज्यादा लोगों के लापता होने की खबर ने हड़कंप मचा दिया है। मुख्य न्यायाधीश देवेन्द्र कुमार उपाध्याय की बेंच ने इस मामले में प्रशासन से 4 हफ्तों में जवाब मांगा है, जबकि पुलिस इन दावों को सिरे से खारिज कर रही है।

गोपाल कृष्ण February 18, 2026 4:03 pm

Edited by Radha Priya

Delhi Missing Persons: देश की राजधानी में बड़ी संख्या में लोगों के गायब होने के मुद्दे पर दिल्ली हाई कोर्ट ने सख्त रुख अपनाया है। कोर्ट ने महज 15 दिनों के भीतर 800 से ज्यादा लोगों के लापता होने की घटना पर संज्ञान लेते हुए केंद्र सरकार, दिल्ली सरकार, राष्ट्रीय मानवाधिकार आयोग (NHRC) और दिल्ली पुलिस को नोटिस जारी किया है। मुख्य न्यायाधीश देवेन्द्र कुमार उपाध्याय और जस्टिस तेजस करिया की बेंच ने इन सभी पक्षों से चार सप्ताह के भीतर जवाब दाखिल करने का आदेश दिया है।

क्या है पूरा मामला?

यह आदेश जयिता देव सरकार की ओर से दायर एक जनहित याचिका पर आया है। याचिका में दावा किया गया है कि इस साल के शुरुआती 15 दिनों में ही 800 से अधिक लोग गायब हो गए हैं। पिछली सुनवाई के दौरान कोर्ट ने यह स्पष्ट करना चाहा था कि क्या ऐसा ही कोई मामला सुप्रीम कोर्ट में लंबित है। इस पर याचिकाकर्ता के वकील ने कोर्ट को सूचित किया कि उनकी जानकारी में फिलहाल सुप्रीम कोर्ट में ऐसी कोई याचिका लंबित नहीं है।

प्रोटोकॉल और SOP के उल्लंघन का आरोप

दायर याचिका में प्रशासन और पुलिस की कार्यप्रणाली पर गंभीर सवाल उठाए गए हैं। याचिकाकर्ता का आरोप है कि:

गुमशुदा व्यक्तियों को ढूंढने के लिए निर्धारित बाध्यकारी प्रोटोकॉल का पालन नहीं किया जा रहा है।

स्टैंडर्ड ऑपरेटिंग प्रोसीजर (SOP) की अनदेखी की जा रही है।

यही मुख्य कारण है कि शहर में बड़े पैमाने पर लोग लगातार गायब हो रहे हैं और उनकी तलाश प्रभावी ढंग से नहीं हो पा रही है।

दिल्ली पुलिस का पक्ष और आंकड़ों पर स्पष्टीकरण

दूसरी ओर, दिल्ली पुलिस ने इन खबरों और दावों को सिरे से खारिज कर दिया है। पुलिस का कहना है कि लापता बच्चों और लोगों के मामलों में अचानक बढ़ती खबरें महज अफवाह हैं। पुलिस के अनुसार:

आधिकारिक आंकड़े पिछले एक दशक से लगभग स्थिर बने हुए हैं।

हालिया आंकड़ों के मुताबिक, दर्ज मामलों में से 235 लोगों का पता लगाया जा चुका है, जबकि 572 लोग अभी भी लापता हैं।

पुलिस ने चेतावनी दी है कि इस संवेदनशील मुद्दे पर अफवाह फैलाने वालों के खिलाफ कड़ी कानूनी कार्रवाई की जाएगी।

राजनीतिक प्रतिक्रिया

हरानी की बात यह है कि इस मुद्दे पर विपक्षी दल आम आदमी पार्टी (AAP) ने भी पुलिस के दावों का समर्थन किया है। जहां एक ओर याचिकाकर्ता आंकड़ों को लेकर चिंता जता रहे हैं, वहीं प्रशासन और पुलिस इसे सामान्य प्रक्रिया का हिस्सा बता रहे हैं।

अब सभी की निगाहें चार सप्ताह बाद होने वाली सुनवाई पर टिकी हैं, जब केंद्र और दिल्ली सरकार को कोर्ट के समक्ष अपनी विस्तृत रिपोर्ट पेश करनी होगी।



Source: <https://www.bhaskar.com/amp/local/mp/vidisha/news/drug-injection-supplier-arrested-137234648.html>

नशे का इंजेक्शन सप्लायर पकड़ाया

विदिशा 14 घंटे पहले

विदिशा | सिविल लाइंस थाना पुलिस ने मंगलवार शाम करैयाखेड़ा रोड पर नशीले इंजेक्शन और अन्य मादक पदार्थों की सप्लाय करने वाले गिरोह के एक सदस्य को पकड़ा। टीआई आरके मिश्रा ने बताया, पुलिस ने वार्ड 37 में छापा मारा। मौके से गौतम पासी 22 साल को गिरफ्तार किया गया। उसे जेल भेज दिया गया है।

एक साथी फरार हो गया। गौतम के पास से 5 नशीले इंजेक्शन, सुलोचन और अन्य नशीली सामग्री जब्त की गई। विदिशा जिले में 800 से ज्यादा मेडिकल स्टोर हैं। ड्रग इंस्पेक्टर जॉन प्रवीण ने बिना डॉक्टर की पर्ची के नशीली दवाएं बेचने पर 15 मेडिकल स्टोर संचालकों को शोकाज नोटिस दिया। 15 मेडिकल स्टोर के लाइसेंस भी रद्द किए गए।

चार दिन पहले राष्ट्रीय मानवाधिकार आयोग के सदस्य प्रियंक कानूनगो ने करैयाखेड़ा रोड पर नशे के खिलाफ शिविर लगाया था। इसके बाद पुलिस ने कार्रवाई की। एसपी रोहित काशवानी ने यहां पुलिस सहायता केंद्र खोलने की बात कही है। यहां नियमित काउंसलिंग सेंटर भी शुरू होगा।

Source: <https://www.jagran.com/delhi/new-delhi-city-delhi-hc-centre-govt-must-respond-on-missing-persons-pil-40146560.html>

'पुलिसिंग कैसे करनी है, यह पुलिस पर छोड़ देना चाहिए'; लापता लोगों के मामले पर HC ने सरकार से मांगा जवाब

By Vineet Tripathi Edited By: Abhishek Tiwari

Updated: Wed, 18 Feb 2026 07:55 PM (IST)

दिल्ली हाई कोर्ट ने लापता व्यक्तियों और मानव तस्करी के बढ़ते मामलों पर केंद्र व दिल्ली सरकार से जवाब मांगा है। एक जनहित याचिका में महिलाओं व बच्चों के लापता होने पर चिंता व्यक्त की गई। कोर्ट ने चार सप्ताह में हलफनामा दाखिल करने का निर्देश दिया। हालांकि, कोर्ट ने पुलिसिंग के तरीके तय करने से इनकार करते हुए कहा कि यह पुलिस का अधिकार क्षेत्र है।

HighLights

लापता लोगों, मानव तस्करी पर हाई कोर्ट ने जवाब मांगा

केंद्र व दिल्ली सरकार को चार सप्ताह में हलफनामा देना होगा

कोर्ट ने पुलिसिंग के तरीकों में हस्तक्षेप से इनकार किया

जागरण संवाददाता, नई दिल्ली। दिल्ली में लापता लोगों का पता लगाने और मानव तस्करी की बढ़ती घटनाओं पर रोक लगाने के लिए एक मजबूत व्यवस्था बनाने की मांग वाली याचिका पर दिल्ली हाई कोर्ट ने केंद्र व दिल्ली सरकार से जवाब मांगा है।

मुख्य न्यायाधीश देवेन्द्र कुमार उपाध्याय व न्यायमूर्ति तेजस कारिया की पीठ ने गृह मंत्रालय और महिला एवं बाल विकास मंत्रालय, दिल्ली सरकार, दिल्ली पुलिस और राष्ट्रीय मानवाधिकार आयोग को नोटिस जारी कर जवाब मांगा है। अदालत ने चार सप्ताह में जवाब दाखिल करने का निर्देश देते हुए सुनवाई 15 अप्रैल तक के लिए स्थगित कर दी।

अधिवक्ता जयीता देब सरकार ने याचिका दायर कर कहा कि लापता लोगों में खासकर महिलाओं और बच्चों के मामलों में तेजी से बढ़ोतरी हो रही है और सरकार इनका पता लगाने में नाकाम रही है।

दिल्ली में 3,151 लोगों के लापता होने की रिपोर्ट मिली

याचिका में कहा गया कि आधिकारिक डेटा से पता चलता है कि इस साल जनवरी और फरवरी की शुरुआत के बीच दिल्ली में 3,151 लोगों के लापता होने की रिपोर्ट मिली और इनमें लगभग 81 प्रतिशत का अभी तक पता नहीं चला है।

यह भी कहा गया कि केवल अक्टूबर 2025 और जनवरी 2026 के बीच 11,000 से ज्यादा लोग लापता हो गए। याचिका में कहा गया है कि गायब होने से अक्सर मानव तस्करी, जबरन मजदूरी, यौन शोषण या अंगों की खरीद-फरोख्त होती है।

पुलिसिंग कैसे करनी है, यह पुलिस पर छोड़ देना चाहिए: हाई कोर्ट

हर पुलिस स्टेशन में गुमशुदा लोगों के मामलों के लिए एक विशेष सेल बनाने सहित अन्य मांगों को लेकर दायर याचिका पर विचार करने से इनकार करते हुए हाई कोर्ट ने टिप्पणी की कि पुलिसिंग कैसे करनी है, यह पुलिस पर छोड़ देना चाहिए।

याचिका में इसके अलावा सभी गुमशुदा लोगों के मामलों में प्राथमिकी करने और सीबीआई से गहरी जांच कराने और संयुक्त टास्क फोर्स की निगरानी के लिए एक सेवानिवृत्त हाई कोर्ट जज की अगुवाई में एक कमेटी गठित करने की मांग की गई थी।

याचिकाकर्ता आनंद लीगल एड फोरम ट्रस्ट को फटकार लगाते हुए मुख्य न्यायाधीश देवेन्द्र कुमार उपाध्याय की अध्यक्षता वाली पीठ ने कहा कि जनहित याचिका में ऐसी कोई जानकारी नहीं दी गई है कि जहां पीड़ित व्यक्ति ने पुलिस अधिकारियों से संपर्क किया हो या प्राथमिकी कराई हो।

पीठ ने कहा कि याचिका में यह जानकारी भी नहीं दी गई है कि जहां पुलिस ने प्राथमिकी करने से इनकार किया हो। पीठ ने कहा कि पुलिस को यह बताना कोर्ट का काम नहीं है कि वह कैसे काम करेगी। दिल्ली के हर पुलिस स्टेशन में गुमशुदा लोगों के लिए एक खास सेल बनाने का निर्णय पुलिस अधिकारियों पद छोड़ा जाना चाहिए क्योंकि यह उसके काम करने के तरीके से जुड़ा है।