



2025:KER:53543

'C.R.'

IN THE HIGH COURT OF KERALA AT ERNAKULAM

PRESENT

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE P.V.KUNHIKRISHNAN

FRIDAY, THE 18TH DAY OF JULY 2025 / 27TH ASHADHA, 1947

WP(CRL.) NO.1150 OF 2024

PETITIONER :-

**ASIF AZAD, AGED 32 YEARS
DARUSSALAM, PARAYATHUKONAM P.O, KIZHUVILAM,
THIRUVANANTHAPURAM, KERALA, INDIA, PIN - 695 104**

BY ADV ASIF AZAD(PARTY-IN-PERSON)

RESPONDENTS :-

- 1 SHAFNA C
CHETTI THODIYIL HOUSE AMAYOOR PO, PALAKKAD KERALA,
INDIA, PIN - 679 303**
- 2 MUHAMMED SALIM ALIAS MAMBI
SON OF UMMER, PONNACHAMTHODI SALIM MANZIL,
NELLAYA PO, MOSCO, POTTACHIRA, PALAKKAD, KERALA,
INDIA, PIN - 679 335**
- 3 HABEEBULLAH PT
POURATHODIYIL HOUSE, PARUDUR P.O, KODIKUNNU,
PALAKKAD, KERALA, INDIA, PIN - 679 305**
- 4 ARAFA NALLA KANDY
DAUGHTER OF HAMEED CHEETHAYIL PUTHIYAPURAYIL, ARAFA,
ANJARAKANDY, KANNUR, KERALA, INDIA, PIN - 670 612**
- 5 ANAS
PONNACHAMTHODI SALIM MANZIL, NELLAYA PO, MOSCO,
POTTACHIRA, PALAKKAD, KERALA, INDIA, PIN - 679 335**
- 6 ABDUL MUNEER
KUNNATHU HOUSE, PARUDUR PO, PALLIPPURAM, PATTAMBI,
PALAKKAD, KERALA, PIN - 679 305**
- 7 SHAHADA TK
THANIKKATT HOUSE, KAVANCHERY P.O, KAIMALASSERY,
ALINGAL, TIRUR, MALAPPURAM, KERALA, INDIA,
PIN - 676 561**



- 8 **ABDUL WAHID TK**
 THANIKKATT HOUSE, KAVANCHERY P.O, KAIMALASSERY,
 ALINGAL, TIRUR, MALAPPURAM, KERALA, INDIA,
 PIN - 676 561
- 9 **STATION HOUSE OFFICER**
 CHERUPPULASSERY POLICE STATION, KACHERIKUNNU,
 CHERUPPULASSERY, PALAKKAD, KERALA, INDIA,
 PIN - 679 503
- 0 **DEPUTY SUPERINTENDENT OF POLICE**
 DYSP OFFICE, SHORNUR, PALAKKAD, KERALA,
 INDIA, PIN - 679 121
- 11 **DISTRICT POLICE CHIEF**
 YAKKARA ROAD, NEAR KSRTC BUS STAND, PALAKKAD,
 KERALA, INDIA, PIN - 678 014
- 12 **STATE POLICE CHIEF**
 STATE POLICE HEADQUARTERS, VELLAYAMBALAM,
 CITY-THIRUVANANTHAPURAM, KERALA,
 INDIA, PIN - 695 010
- 13 **SUPERINTENDENT OF POLICE**
 CENTRAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION,
 SPECIAL CRIME BRANCH, TC 1757/5,
 "CBI OCR COMPLEX", MUTTATHARA, VALLAKADAVU POST
 THIRUVANANTHAPURAM - KERALA, PIN - 695 008
- ADDL.14 UNION OF INDIA**
 MINISTRY OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS REPRESENTED BY FOREIGN
 SECRETARY, SO(DB), 74B, SOUTH BLOCK, NEW DELHI,
 INDIA, PIN - 110011.

ADDL.R14 IS SUO MOTU IMPEADED AS PER ORDER DATED
08/01/2025 IN WP(CRL.) 1150/2024.

BY ADVS.
SHAFNA C(PARTY-IN-PERSON)
SRI.A.HAROON RASHEED
SRI.T.C.KRISHNA, SENIOR PANEL COUNSEL
SMT.SEETHA S., SR.PP

THIS WRIT PETITION (CRIMINAL) HAVING COME UP FOR ADMISSION
ON 18.07.2025, ALONG WITH WP(C).36119/2024, THE COURT ON THE SAME
DAY DELIVERED THE FOLLOWING:



'C.R.'

IN THE HIGH COURT OF KERALA AT ERNAKULAM

PRESENT

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE P.V.KUNHIKRISHNAN

FRIDAY, THE 18TH DAY OF JULY 2025 / 27TH ASHADHA, 1947

WP(C) NO.36119 OF 2024

PETITIONER :-

**ASIF AZAD, AGED 32 YEARS
DARUSSALAM, PARAYATHUKONAM P.O, KIZHUVILAM,
THIRUVANANTHAPURAM,
KERALA, INDIA, PIN - 695 104**

BY ADV ASIF AZAD, (PARTY-IN-PERSON)

RESPONDENTS :-

- 1 SHAFNA C,
CHETTI THODIYIL HOUSE AMAYOOR PO, PALAKKAD KERALA,
INDIA, PIN - 679 303**
- 2 MUHAMMED SALIM ALIAS MAMBI,
SON OF UMMER, PONNACHAMTHODI SALIM MANZIL,
NELLAYA PO, MOSCO, POTTACHIRA, PALAKKAD, KERALA,
INDIA, PIN - 679 335**
- 3 HABEEBULLAH P T,
POURATHODIYIL HOUSE, PARUDUR P.O, KODIKUNNU,
PALAKKAD, KERALA, INDIA, PIN - 679 305**
- 4 ARAFA NALLA KANDY,
DAUGHTER OF HAMEED CHEETHAYIL PUTHIYAPURAYIL,
ARAFA, ANJARAKANDY, KANNUR, KERALA,
INDIA, PIN - 670 612**
- 5 ANAS,
PONNACHAMTHODI SALIM MANZIL, NELLAYA PO, MOSCO,
POTTACHIRA, PALAKKAD, KERALA, INDIA, PIN - 679 335**
- 6 ABDUL MUNEER,
KUNNATHU HOUSE, PARUDUR PO, PALLIPPURAM, PATTAMBI,
PALAKKAD, KERALA, PIN - 679 305**
- 7 SHAHADA T K,
THANIKKATT HOUSE, KAVANCHERY P.O, KAIMALASSERY,
ALINGAL, TIRUR, MALAPPURAM, KERALA, INDIA,
PIN - 676 561**



- 8 **ABDUL WAHID T K,
THANIKKATT HOUSE, KAVANCHERY P.O, KAIMALASSERY,
ALINGAL, TIRUR, MALAPPURAM, KERALA, INDIA,
PIN - 676 561**
- 9 **STATION HOUSE OFFICER,
CHERUPPULASSERY POLICE STATION, KACHERIKUNNU,
CHERUPPULASSERY, PALAKKAD, KERALA, INDIA,
PIN - 679 503**
- 0 **DEPUTY SUPERINTENDENT OF POLICE,
DYSO OFFICE, SHORNUR, PALAKKAD, KERALA,
INDIA, PIN - 679 121**
- 11 **DISTRICT POLICE CHIEF,
YAKKARA ROAD, NEAR KSRTC BUS STAND, PALAKKAD, KERALA,
INDIA, PIN - 678 014**
- 12 **STATE POLICE CHIEF,
STATE POLICE HEADQUARTERS, VELLAYAMBALAM,
CITY-THIRUVANANTHAPURAM, KERALA,
INDIA, PIN - 695 010**
- 13 **MINISTRY OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS,
REPRESENTED BY FOREIGN SECRETARY, SO(DB),
74B SOUTH BLOCK, NEW DELHI, INDIA, PIN - 110 011**
- 14 **REGIONAL PASSPORT OFFICE,
REPRESENTED BY REGIONAL PASSPORT OFFICER,
SNSM BUILDING, KARALKADA JUNCTION, PETTAH P.O.,
TRIVANDRUM, KERALA, PIN - 695 024**
- 15 **EMBASSY OF INDIA,
REPRESENTED BY AMBASSADOR OF INDIA TO UAE,
PLOT NO. 10, SECTOR W-59/02, DIPLOMATIC AREA,
OFF THE SHEIKH RASHID BIN SAEED STREET (EARLIER KNOWN
AS AIRPORT ROAD), NEAR TO PEPSICOLA,
ABU DHABI, UNITED ARAB EMIRATES P. O. BOX 4090**

BY ADV O.M.SHALINA, DSGI

**THIS WRIT PETITION (CIVIL) HAVING COME UP FOR ADMISSION ON
18.07.2025, ALONG WITH WP(CrI.).1150/2024, THE COURT ON THE SAME
DAY DELIVERED THE FOLLOWING:**



'C.R.'

P.V.KUNHIKRISHNAN, J

W.P.(Crl.) No.1150 of 2024
and
W.P.(C) No.36119 of 2024

Dated this the 18th day of July, 2025

JUDGMENT

The rule of law demands obedience to court orders. Disregard for court orders undermines the integrity of the justice system. The petitioner herein will appear only as a party in person; of course, there is no bar to the same. However, a litigant appearing as a party in person should be familiar with the basics of courtroom decorum, and he should know the consequences for making unnecessary submissions even after a warning. These two writ petitions are filed by Mr. Asif Azad, who appeared 'party in person' through online mode. The prayers in W.P.(Crl.) No.1150 of 2024 are extracted hereunder:-

- "1. Issue a writ in the nature of mandamus, directing any of the respondent No.9 to 12 or 13 to immediately lodge the FIR against respondent No.1 to 5 on Exhibit P1 (Exhibit P9 in WP(C) 36119/2024) under Sections 1(4), 1(5), 308(6), 311, 61(2) and 3(5) of BNS.
2. To allow this petition with cost." [SIC]



2. The prayers in W.P.(C) No.36119 of 2024 are as follows :-

- “1. Issue a writ in the nature of mandamus, directing Respondent No.12 to immediately locate and collect the petitioner’s old passport, currently unlawfully retained by Respondents No.1 to 5, and hand it over to Respondent No.14 and additionally this honourable high court may direct Respondent No.14 to issue a new passport to the petitioner within 72 hours and forward it to Respondent No.15 and additionally, Respondent No.15 may direct to hand over both the newly issued passport and the old passport to the petitioner within 96 hours.
2. To allow this petition with cost.” [SIC]

3. When these writ petitions came up for consideration, the petitioner who appeared ‘party in person’ through online submitted that this Court should avoid these writ petitions, because this Court had earlier imposed cost on the petitioner in another proceeding. The petitioner also submitted that he has filed a complaint against me before the Hon’ble President of India and also before the Registrar General of this Court. According to the petitioner, he will not get justice from this Bench. Hence, he submitted that these cases are to be avoided by this Court.



4. The same petitioner appeared before this Court in W.P.(C)(Filing) No.33689 of 2024 (***Asif Azad v. Jaimon Baby*** [2025 KHC online 757]) and made the same submission before this Court. This Court, after considering the above submission, observed like this in the above case:-

“Mr. Asif Asad filed the above case, and he appeared in the case as ‘party in person’. The prayers in the writ petition are extracted hereunder:

- i. To issue a writ, order or direction in favour of the petitioner for the facts, reasons and circumstances stated in the accompanying petitions which is duly supported by an affidavit, It is most humbly prayed that in the interest of Natural Justice by restoring the violated constitutional and fundamental rights of Article 14, 20, 21 and 141 of Constitution of India by set-aside Exhibit P 8 and quash Exhibit P 5 of the Complaint Case dated 30.06.2018 lodged by respondent no. 1 registered as ST 2600/2018 under Section 138, Negotiable Instruments Act filed before Hon’ble First-Class Magistrate Court I Kottarakkara, Kollam.
- ii. To issue any other suitable order or direction in the nature to which this Hon’ble Court deems just proper in favour of the petitioner.
- iii. To allow this petition with cost. (SIC)

2. The writ petition was represented after curing the defects with a petition to condone the delay of 40 days in representation. This court issued notice to the 1st respondent



on 04.11.2024 in the above delay condonation petition. Notice was returned with an endorsement 'Addressee left'. When this writ petition came up for consideration on 13.06.2025, this Court passed the following order :

"Petitioner will take steps to cure the defect within two weeks. If no steps are taken, Registry will post the matter in the defect list, after two weeks."

3. Today, the petitioner appeared in person online and submitted that, this Court should avoid this writ petition because earlier this Court imposed a cost on the petitioner in another proceeding. The petitioner refused to submit anything else. The imposition of cost in one case will never lead to the imposition of cost in all the cases filed by the petitioner. Each case will be decided based on the merit of that particular case. A litigant cannot dictate to the Court that the case should be avoided by a Judge. The roster is prepared by the Hon'ble the Chief Justice. The Judge, who is hearing the case, can decide to avoid the case if necessary. But a litigant cannot dictate to the Court to avoid his case by a Judge who is allotted the jurisdiction by the Hon'ble Chief Justice as per the roster. If such a practice is started, the litigants can pick and choose the judge who has to hear their case. The same cannot be allowed. A Judge is bound to hear the cases allotted as per the roster notified by the Hon'ble the Chief Justice. Admittedly, this case is to be heard by this Court as per the present roster. The petitioner is not ready to argue the case before this Court. The submission of the petitioner itself is contemptuous. But I restrain myself from taking any action against the petitioner because the petitioner is appearing in person, and he may not be aware of the decorum of a court of law and the submission to be made in a court of law. But the petitioner had appeared before this court earlier in other cases also. If any such submissions are made in the future, this court will be forced to take action in accordance with the law. As far as



the present case is concerned, no steps have been taken to cure the defect as ordered by this Court on 13.06.2025.

Therefore, this writ petition is dismissed for default.”

5. The above judgment was delivered by this Court on 08.07.2025. Thereafter, the petitioner again appeared before this Court today on 18.07.2025, i.e., just after ten days and made the same submission. The petitioner is also threatening this Court, stating that he has filed a complaint before the President of India and other authorities against me. On 08.07.2025, this Court clearly stated that such submission made by the petitioner is contemptuous, and I restrained myself from taking any action against the petitioner because the petitioner is appearing in person, and he may not be aware of the decorum of a court of law and the submission to be made in a court of law. But the petitioner appeared again and made the same submission. I am told that the petitioner has made such submissions before the other Benches of this Court as well, because an adverse order was passed against him. My brother, Justice Bechu Kurian Thomas, dismissed a writ petition filed by the same petitioner after imposing costs. It will be better to extract the relevant paragraphs of that judgment, **Asif Azad v. Union of India** [2023(4) KHC 77]:



“10. As mentioned earlier, the reliefs claimed by the petitioner are odious and repugnant to the orderly filing of writ petitions. The proclivity to file writ petitions without any basis and to threaten the system into ridicule cannot be permitted under any count. Access to justice, though a fundamental right, cannot be extended to a right to prefer misconceived and frivolous petitions. The nature of reliefs claimed for and the nebulous pleadings are indicative of absence of any particular right of the petitioner having been infringed.

11. Apart from the above, in the absence of violation of any specific right, a person cannot approach this Court under Art.226 of the Constitution of India. The nature of pleadings and the reliefs claimed for reveals that the writ petition is filed on an experimental basis and in bad taste. The manner in which the petitioner has raised his pleadings in the writ petition and the nature of reliefs sought compels this Court to visit the petitioner with costs as a disincentive for indulging in such frivolous writ petitions.

12. In this context the observation of the Supreme Court in Dr. Buddhi Kota Subbarao v. K. Parasaran and Others, 1996 (5) SCC 530 is pertinent to be borne in mind. It was observed therein that 'No litigant has a right to unlimited drought on the courts time and public money in order to get his affairs



settled in the manner as he wishes. Easy access to justice should not be misused as a license to file misconceived or frivolous petitions'."

After the above judgment, I am told that he submitted before my brother, Justice Bechu Kurian Thomas, to avoid his subsequent cases. This is the practice of the petitioner. Now the petitioner is also threatening this court, alleging that he filed a complaint against me. At this stage, it will be beneficial to quote the words of Honourable Justice J.S. Kehar in ***Supreme Court Advocates-on-Record Association and Another v. Union of India*** [2015 KHC 4708];

".....In my considered view, the prayer for my recusal is not well founded. If I were to accede to the prayer for my recusal, I would be initiating a wrong practice, and laying down a wrong precedent. A Judge may recuse at his own, from a case entrusted to him by the Chief Justice. That would be a matter of his own choosing. But recusal at the asking of a litigating party, unless justified, must never to be acceded to. For that would give the impression, of the Judge had been scared out of the case, just by the force of the objection. A Judge before he assumes his office, takes an oath to discharge his duties without fear or favour. He would breach his oath of office, if he accepts a prayer for recusal, unless justified. It is my duty to discharge my



responsibility with absolute earnestness and sincerity. It is my duty to abide by my oath of office, to uphold the Constitution and the laws. My decision to continue to be a part of the Bench, flows from the oath which I took, at the time of my elevation to this Court." (underline supplied)

With great respect, I am following the above words of Honourable Justice J.S. Kehar, who was our former Chief Justice of India. No other words need to be stated. I am confident that I am upholding the oath I have taken, and I am discharging my duty in accordance with the Constitution of India. When I have faith in it, I am not bothered about such threats. The petitioner is threatening this Court by stating that he approached the President of India and other authorities against me. I am least bothered about the complaint submitted by the petitioner before the authorities because I am exercising my judicial powers in accordance with the law and the Constitution of India. A person threatening this Court, stating that he filed a complaint against the Judge, and the case should be avoided by that Judge, cannot be accepted at all. Since the petitioner is not ready to argue these cases, these cases are to be dismissed. Even after giving a warning to the petitioner on 08.07.2025 in the judgment, which is extracted above, the petitioner is



continuing to disobey the orders. I am of the considered opinion that these writ petitions are to be dismissed with heavy costs.

Therefore, these writ petitions are dismissed. The petitioner will pay an amount of Rs. 50,000/- (Rupees Fifty Thousand only) to the High Court Legal Services Authority within one month. If the amount is not paid, the High Court Legal Services Authority is free to take appropriate steps to recover the same from the petitioner as per the Revenue Recovery Act.

Sd/-
P.V.KUNHIKRISHNAN, JUDGE

Jvt



APPENDIX OF WP(C) 36119/2024

PETITIONER EXHIBITS :-

- Exhibit P 1** PHOTOCOPY OF THE CERTIFICATE ISSUED BY DUBAI PUBLIC PROSECUTION TO CLAIM THAT PETITIONER FILED COMPLAINT AGAINST RESPONDENT NO. 2 AND 3 AT DUBAI POLICE WITH REQUEST NO. 178296/2024 DATED 19.08.2024
- Exhibit P 2** PHOTOCOPY OF PETITIONER'S PASSPORT EXPIRING IN 9 DAYS WITH PASSPORT NUMBER M2919252 WITH EXPIRY DATE 19.10.2024
- Exhibit P 3** PHOTOCOPY OF THE WHATSAPP CHATS BETWEEN PETITIONER AND RESPONDENT NO. 2 DATED 19.08.2023
- Exhibit P 4** TRUE COPY OF THE IMAGES OF THE INVENTION OF FRSHAR LAPTOPS MADE BY PETITIONER
- Exhibit P 5** CERTIFIED COPY OF JUDGMENT IN WP(C) 17767/2021 DATED 05.01.2022 OF THIS HONOURABLE HIGH COURT OF KERALA
- Exhibit P 6** PHOTOCOPY OF THE OFFER LETTER GIVEN BY RESPONDENT NO. 3 TO RESPONDENT NO. 4 WITH TRANSACTION NO. MB260536904AE DATED 10.02.2024
- Exhibit P 7** PHOTOCOPY OF ABSCONDING - ELECTRONIC WITH TRANSACTION NO. MB262319023AE AGAINST RESPONDENT NO. 4 BY PETITIONER DATED 12.03.2024
- Exhibit P 8** PHOTOCOPY OF WITHDRAW ABSCONDING REQUEST WITH TRANSACTION NO. MB271085130AE FOR RESPONDENT NO. 4 BY RESPONDENT NO. 2 DATED 01.08.2024
- Exhibit P 9** PHOTOCOPY OF THE COMPLAINTS FILED WITH RESPONDENT NO. 9 TO 12 DATED 12.10.2024
- Exhibit P 10** TRUE COPY OF THE WRIT PETITION OF THIS HONOURABLE HIGH COURT OF KERALA IN WP(CRL.) 1106/2024(FILING NO) DATED 30.09.2024



APPENDIX OF WP(CRL.) 1150/2024

PETITIONER EXHIBITS :-

- Exhibit P 1** TRUE COPY OF WP(C) 36119/2024 DATED 09.10.2024
- Exhibit P 2** TRUE COPY OF LEGAL TRANSLATION OF SAID FOUCHAL
LEGAL TRANSLATION SERVICES ON THE RESCUE OF
PETITIONER BY ABU DHABI POLICE ALONG WITH
AMBULANCE TREATMENT PETITIONER RECEIVED AT AL
AIN
- Exhibit P 3** PHOTOCOPY OF THE EMAIL RECEIVED BY PETITIONER
(FRSHARASIF@GMAIL.COM) VIA GMAIL FROM KOTAK
BANK (BANKALERTS@KOTAK.COM) ABOUT THE DIRECT
EVIDENCE OF STOLEN PROPERTY DATED 18.12.2024
- Exhibit P 5** Photocopy of the screenshot of Dubai police e-
services enquiring about the cases against
petitioner stating no criminal circulars in
financial cases
- Exhibit P 6** Photocopy of the email communication between
petitioner (ceo@frshar.com) and Kotak Bank
(harikrishnan.n@kotak.com, arya.vl@kotak.com)
to know the status of the cheque respondent
no. 3, forged and produce it before Judicial
First-Class Magistrate Pattambi dated
28.04.2025
- Exhibit P 7** Photocopy of the reply of the email
communication between petitioner (ceo@
frshar.com) and Kotak Bank
(harikrishnan.n@kotak.com, arya.vl @kotak.com)
to know the status of the cheque respondent
no. 3, forged and produce it before Judicial
First-Class Magistrate Pattambi dated
28.04.2025
- Exhibit P 8** Photocopy of the proof of theft by respondent
no. 1 to 5 as the stolen items in Dubai has
used in India in case in CMP 1670/2025 at
Judicial First-Class Magistrate Pattambi by
committing forgery by respondent no. 3 against
petitioner illegally through Advocate Sajina
KM with enrolment number K/000841/2009 on
10.12.2024 as per the date in the cheque
mentioned by the Honourable Magistrate to the
petitioner is the incident after sending
notice in WP(C) 42981/2024 of this Honourable
High Court of Kerala itself is a direct
evidence
- Exhibit P 9** Photocopy of the complaint filed by the
petitioner (ceo@frshar.com) to the SHO
Pattambi Police Station
(shoptmbipskd.pol@kerala. gov.in) in the



- forger of cheque and for using Stolen items from Dubai, dated 23.03.2025
- Exhibit P 10 Photocopy of sworn statement given by petitioner to the District Crime Branch Palakkad and mention signed in forged stolen cheque from Dubai used in Kerala dated 03.04.2025
- Exhibit P 11 Photocopy of the bank statement of petitioner's ADCB bank account at Dubai with Account number 13364578920001 ranging from 23.01.2024 to 15.07.2024 having a total debit of 1529.23 AED (36,089 INR) and a credit of 698 AED (16,472 INR)
- Exhibit P 12 Photocopy of the bank statement of petitioner's ADCB bank account at Dubai with Account number 13364578920001 ranging from 23.01.2024 to 15.07.2024 having a total debit of 1024.80 AED (24,185 INR), a credit of 440,625 AED (10,398,750 INR) and Cheque amount deposited by respondent no. 2 and 3 is 440,000 AED (10,384,000 INR)
- Exhibit P 13 Photocopy of the news extract from E-News Malayalam dated 07.08.2024, the editors got severe threat even from respondent no. 1 to 5 to remove the news link
- Exhibit P 14 Photocopy of the reply of SHO, Pattambi Police Station in the complaint filed by petitioner on forgery dated 26.03.2025, stating that they can't take FIR on cognizable offence, thus by violating the Article 141 of Constitution of India (Lalita Kumari case (Surpa)) and Section 198 of BNS or 166 of IPC [Contempt of Court (Violating Constitution Bench Direction)]
- Exhibit P 15 Photocopy of the complaint to the magistrate of Judicial First-Class Court Pattambi via email communication from petitioner (ceo@frshar.com) to the magistrate (jfcmbptb.court@kerala.gov.in) dated 07.04.2025
- Exhibit P 16 Photocopy of the order passed by the Director General of Police cum Kerala State Police Chief in Endt No K5-187675/2024/PHQ dated 10.10.2024 as 'petitioner's complaint has to be investigated by an officer ranked should not below DYSP'
- Exhibit P 17 Photocopy of chats between petitioner [971581677917] and DYSP Shornur [919497990097] (respondent no. 10) stating that 'petitioner filed the complaint because respondent no. 2 demanded 1 crore amount', but



- the DYSP Shornur (respondent no. 10) changed the statement and complaint filed by the petitioner and reported to the Director General of Police cum Kerala State Police Chief
- Exhibit P 18** Photocopy of the complaint filed against DYSP Shornur (respondent no. 10), SHO Cherupulassery (Respondent no. 9), Sasikumar (Writer of Cherupulassery Police Station) on filing false statement in the Honourable High Court of Kerala which is punishable offence under Sections 167, 218, 192, 201, 466 IPC/ Sections 201, 256, 228, 238, 337 BNS
- Exhibit P 19** Photocopy of the RTI reply from Public Information Officer, Cherupulassery Police Station to Petitioner (Kerala Residential Address), that the statement has read and confirmed with petitioner by the police which is a lie in the RTI reply dated 15.03.2025 to create fabricated document for favouring respondent no. 1 to 5 in relationship with respondent no. 1 to 5 is evident in the YouTube video link of bribery by respondent no. 2 with respondent no. 9
- Exhibit P 20** Photocopy of call history between petitioner (971581677917) and police Cherupulassery (919496352137) mentioned in the RTI reply of Exhibit P 19 are a lie because no one read any kind of Statement to petitioner and take approval or signature from petitioner like Exhibit P 10 of District Crime Branch did in the statement taken and Respondent no. 9 filed compressed 60% statement by changing the complaint and the statement for favouring respondent no. 1 to 5
- Exhibit P 21** Photocopy of the appeal reply in RTI confirming that respondent no. 1 never appeared in this writ petition [WP(Crl) 1150/2025] as party in person either physically or virtually but in all the orders it is mentioning that respondent no. 1 appeared as party in person, which is not true which is confirmed/proved in the appeal of RTI reply send by Registrar General of Honourable High Court of Kerala in RIA (Appeal) No. 13/2025 dated 21.03.2025
- Exhibit P 22** Photocopy of the petitioner received a photograph from an known source related to a celebration, which is alleged to have been staged to deceive the petitioner by



Respondents No. 4 and 5. Although Respondent No. 4 is married and her husband is currently in Qatar, and Respondent No. 5 is also married with his wife residing in Kerala, both Respondents No. 4 and 5 are reportedly living together. It is further alleged that Respondents No. 4 and 5 are involved in drug trafficking. They allegedly travelled to Saudi Arabia under the pretext of performing Umrah and smuggled drugs from Saudi Arabia to Dubai on behalf of an individual known as Many alias Muhammed Kutty, who is believed to be a drug dealer and mafia don. The petitioner claims to have seen these drugs and reported the matter to the authorities, causing the drug mafia to incur significant financial losses. As a result, the petitioner is allegedly being targeted and trapped in Dubai by the drug mafia. In the photograph, both Respondents No. 4 and 5 are seen wearing sunglasses. It is also claimed that Respondent No. 4 escaped to Dubai after assaulting a police officer and is a fugitive from justice due to pending criminal charges, including evading action under the KAAPA (Kerala Anti-Social Activities [Prevention] Act)

Exhibit P 23 Photocopy of the car photo of the drug mafia don [also known by many aliases as Muhammed Kutty], taken by the petitioner on 10.02.2024 at 09:20 PM under the direction of the Narcotics CID of the Dubai Police [971505516218], was sent to the CID (Dubai) via WhatsApp from the petitioner's number 971581677917

Exhibit P 24 Photocopy of the news extract from The Indian Express is a necessary part of this writ petition, as it highlights how the UAE police initially closed the case as a suicide. However, after a two-year-long fight by the victim's mother, the Hon'ble High Court of Kerala ordered a CBI investigation, treating it as a case of murder. A similar course of action is required in this matter as well, due to the involvement of a drug mafia and the need for a cross-border investigation; particularly regarding how the petitioner's passport travelled from Dubai to Kerala, and how Respondents No. 1 to 3 managed to smuggle it into India while evading airport security scanners



- Exhibit P25** Photocopy of the travel ticket from Dubai to Trivandrum, sent by Respondent No. 2 from Palakkad and dated 16.03.2024, led to the petitioner being treated like a terrorist by customs officials at Trivandrum airport upon arrival. As only Respondents No. 2 and 3 were aware of the petitioner's travel details; Respondent No. 3 being in Dubai and Respondent No. 2 in Palakkad; it raises serious suspicion. While at the Dubai airport, the petitioner noticed that petitioner's bag was tightly wrapped, and on multiple occasions, observed Respondent No. 3 attempting to place something inside the bag. This is believed to be the reason for the harsh treatment by airport customs at Trivandrum. Therefore, a CBI investigation is necessary, as supported by Exhibit P 24
- Exhibit P 26** Photocopy of the flight ticket sent by Muhammed Salim (Respondent No. 2) on 15.07.2024 for the petitioner to travel from Trivandrum to Dubai was part of a plan to trap the petitioner along with drug mafia. All of the petitioner's belongings, including petitioner's passport, were stolen through a conspiracy involving Respondents No. 1 to 5. Respondent No. 2 took all of the petitioner's possessions from petitioner's room while the petitioner was being rescued by Abu Dhabi police from a locked room at Al-Ain located 140 kilometres away from the site of a night-time robbery, where Respondents No. 1 to 3 had confined the petitioner
- Exhibit P 27** True copy of judgment in WP(C) NO. 8944 OF 2023, the Honourable Chief Justice of Kerala, S. Manikumar, passed a judgment in the PIL, stating that the petitioner is entitled to take action against advocates. Accordingly, the petitioner intends to proceed against Advocate Haroon Rasheed on the grounds that, despite knowing the petitioner is residing in Dubai, the advocate misrepresented facts before the court. Advocate Haroon Rasheed has not maintained courtroom decorum and is not addressing the case appropriately. Instead of arguing based on documents and facts, he is presenting fabricated narratives. Initially, he falsely claimed that the petitioner was in Kerala. When that assertion was disproved, he claimed the petitioner was subject to a travel



ban. This conduct appears to be a deliberate attempt to mislead the court. Furthermore, the advocate has been submitting documents to the court secretly, without officially filing them or serving copies to the petitioner, which undermines the transparency of the proceedings. The court's acceptance of such actions raises serious legal concerns, and the relief sought by the petitioner in the PIL becomes even more crucial under these circumstances. The petitioner has complaint against Advocate Haroon Rasheed for arguing beyond the scope of the writ petition. The petitioner asserts that petitioner is being denied a fair opportunity to respond, as filings and arguments are being made without proper notice or procedure