

**Queries & Clarifications:**

**We have recently received queries from teams, who have sought a clarification on the Moot Problem as under:**

- Q1. Whether Delphi is the capital of Moda or of the Democratic Republic of Ionia?
- A1. Delphi is the capital of the Democratic Republic of Ionia and is located within the state of Moda.
- Q2. What is the exact meaning of the term 400 hrs and 600 hrs stated in para 11?
- A2. The meaning of 400 hours and 600 hours is 4:00 am and 6:00 am respectively.
- Q3. What is the Relevance of the phrase "MPR case filed in the United States" mentioned in the document E of the moot problem?
- A3. The phrase in Document E is "MPR case filed in the United Nations." The Kingdom of Ionia was granted independence from the British Empire in 1955 and the Democratic Republic of Ionia was born. Power was handed over to a caretaker government comprising largely of nominated statesmen, selected from the prominent Ionian National Party (INP), which was the largest pro-independence party in state of Moda. The states of Mixolydia and Lydia were given the choice as to either join the newly formed Democratic Republic of Ionia or to form their own sovereign territories. Without conducting any plebiscite, the princely ruler of these conjoined territories signed an agreement with the Democratic Republic of Ionia for temporary unification of the territories with Ionia. Meanwhile, the Mixolydian Partito Popolare (The People's Party of Mixolydia) (MPP), a pro-independence party that was leading the freedom struggle against the Italians in the erstwhile colony of Mixolydia, filed a complaint in the newly formed United Nations asserting the right of the Lydians to self-determination. This complaint remained unresolved. The MPP would go on to later contest domestic elections in Lydia and Mixolydia.
- Q4. What components of Crime360 are being used by the local law enforcement agencies in Europe and the United States of America? (Para-4)
- A4. The prevalent use of artificial intelligence tools by countries in Europe and in the United States of America can be compared to various components of Crime 360 and considered as having originated from related AI/software developers.
- Q5. Specify the voluntary government application mentioned in para 6 of the moot problem and please specify the services that are being provided by these applications?
- A5. *Voluntary government applications* include applications for facial recognition linked airport and railway boarding passes, applications for receiving payments under rural employment guarantee schemes, applications for procuring rations for below poverty line families, applications for registering for health insurance, applications for

vaccinations in public health emergencies, applications for obtaining/renewing government identification cards like passports and driving licenses.

Q6. Clarify the names of the suspects mentioned in document B?

A6. No answer is required.

Q7. Specify the timing of the Pre-recorded telecast and the low graded bombing as mentioned in para 4?

A7. No answer is required.

Q8. What authority or specialization did DW-1 Saara Ahmed have? (Para-19)

A8. Defence Witness No. 1 Saara Ahmed has a Ph.D. in Ionian History, University of Oxford. Her areas of expertise include Ionian History, Post-Colonial Studies, Ethnic Conflict. She has 20+ years of research and publications on Ionia and has published 5 Oxford University Press books on Mixo politics and the history of Mixo radical movements.

Q9. We would like to clarify the approach regarding the arguments for **Issue 2** and **Issue 3**. Should we proceed by arguing **Issue 2** before addressing **Issue 3**? Also, looking from the prosecution's side, ISSUE 2 is about Culpable homicide not amounting to murder and then ISSUE 3 is about conviction under Murder. How can we prove culpable homicide not amounting to murder and murder at the same time. Are both the issues framed correctly?

A9. Issue 2 and Issue 3 may be argued together. Mr. Yaara will seek to have the conviction set aside entirely. The prosecution will seek to have the conviction enhanced (Issue 3) or at the very least sustained (Issue 2).

Q10. What was the judgement of the trial reserved for determination mentioned in para 16?

A10. The question of admissibility of the Crime 360 Report (Document B) was reserved for determination at the stage of final judgement along with all other issues in the case.

Q11. All laws are pari materia to India or just the four mentioned in para no.23. Also, Ionia could be considered India in the present factual matrix in terms of the incidents that took place in India?

A11. Only the four mentioned laws in para 23 are in para materia with the specified laws in India. Other laws can be cited for persuasive value. Ionia is different from India.

Q12. Whether the report of crime 360 comes under the ambit of the Ionian criminal identification act? Also, faceprint is run through which component of crime 360 as mentioned in para 12?

A12. No response required. Refer to the Moot Problem.

Q13. Whether the Crime 360 report is prepared with all three components given in Document A?

A13. Yes.

Q14. Crimeforcaster runs or works on its own or requires human assistance?

A14. The software runs on its own based on all the data points that are available to it.

Q15. What is the meaning and relevance of the #lock-her-up, #get-inked, #Blackfaceisout, #tribalrightsmatters and the flag in the last tweet mentioned in Document G.

A15. This is open to interpretation and it can be argued by either side as to what these hashtags convey.

Q16. What component from Document A is used by other countries like the USA and Europe?

A16. This can be compared to existing AI programs in use in various countries and accordingly considered as components of Document A in operation in those territories.

Q17. The names mentioned in the table given in Document B are the names of the suspects or the apprehended person?

A17. They are names of suspects based on the Crime 360 analytics. Only those mentioned at para 9 are suspects in the case who were apprehended and convicted in the same trial. The five individuals mentioned at para 9 were tried along with Mr. Yaara in the same trial and convicted under Section 61 read with Section 105, Part II and Section 189(4) of the Ionian Penal Code. The sentence awarded to each of them was the same as that of Mr. Yaara Mixol. Their appeals are not being heard in the present hearing.

Q18. What is the division of seats according to the population in Ionia (para 3)?

A18. No response required.

Q19. Is there any information about the agreement with respect to purchase of crime 360 software?

A19. No other information is available.

Q20. The gun found at the time of pointing out memo has any fingerprints or anything?

A20. No further information apart from that contained in the pointing out memo is available.

Q21. What happened with other arrested persons or the suspected persons?

A21. The five individuals mentioned at para 9 were tried along with Mr. Yaara in the same trial and convicted under Section 61 read with Section 105, Part II and Section 189(4) of the Ionian Penal Code. The sentence awarded to each of them was the same as that of Mr. Yaara Mixol. Their appeals are not being heard in the present hearing.

- Q22. Whether the computer and phone seized from Mr. Yaara Mixol's house on 05.06.2024 were security/ password protected? If yes, whether he consented to disclosing the security/ password?
- A22. Mr. Yaara Mixol used a facial recognition linked password on his devices. The police used this feature to unlock the devices in furtherance of the order passed by the Magistrate at para 12.
- Q23. Since the new Criminal Codes do not have a retrospective effect and the incident of the shooting happened on 4 June 2024, will the old Criminal Codes apply?
- A23. Retrospectivity of the New Criminal Codes is not an issue in the present case. It can be considered that the New Criminal Codes apply retrospectively.
- Q24. Are we permitted to dispute the trial proceedings and annexures?
- A24. Yes, since this is a first appeal all issues of law and fact are available.
- Q25. Can the order of the issues be changed?
- A25. Yes.
- Q26. Can we draft Issue 3 before Issue 2 in our memorials or does it have to be in sequence as per the moot problem?
- A26. It does not need to be in sequence.
- Q27. Is the case being appealed directly to the High Court because of the nature of the offense, or are there other factors affecting the jurisdiction? Also, there's no mention of an appeal number, can it be clarified if there is any?
- A27. It may be considered that the first appeal in the present case lies directly in the High Court. The maintainability of the appeal is not an issue. The cases are to be heard under Criminal Appeal No. 532 of 2024 which is the appeal filed by Mr. Yaara Mixol. All issues are framed in this appeal, in which the State is a Respondent.
- Q28. What is Yaara Mixol's defense stance regarding the rest of the conviction? The proposition only mentions an objection to the admissibility of the Crime360 report and does not elaborate on other charges. Does the defense completely deny these charges or Yaara's presence at the site, or is there a different stance being taken?
- A28. All other defences are available in the facts and circumstances of the case.
- Q29. The fourth issue concerns the conviction under section 189(4). Could you please clarify whether the trial for the other five individuals apprehended is ongoing separately, or have they been discharged from their liabilities? If they were discharged, how can a case for unlawful assembly be established against a single person?

- A29. The five individuals mentioned at para 9 were tried along with Mr. Yaara in the same trial and convicted under Section 61 read with Section 105, Part II and Section 189(4) of the Ionian Penal Code. The sentence awarded to each of them was the same as that of Mr. Yaara Mixol. Their appeals are not being heard in the present hearing.
- Q30. The acts mentioned in the proposition are referred to as IPC, CrPC, and Evidence Act in para materia to BNS, BNSS, and BSA, respectively. Will it be correct to address the provisions of law as BNS, BNSS, and BSA instead of mentioning IPC, CrPC, and the Evidence Act?
- A30. Yes.
- Q31. Whether the Accused, Yaara Mixol has been convicted and punished under the 1st or the 2nd part of Section 105?
- A31. Mr. Yaara Mixol was convicted under Part II of Section 105, “if the act is done with the knowledge that it is likely to cause death, but without any intention to cause death, or to cause such bodily injury as is likely to cause death.”
- Q32. Has Yaara Mixol approached the High Court of Moda under Criminal Writ or Normal Appeal?
- A32. This is a first appeal.
- Q33. Whether the investigation agency had the access to the Data Sets and Source Code pertaining to 'Crime 360'?
- A33. No.
- Q34. Clarify whether the Ionian Criminal Identification Act is para materia with Indian Criminal Identification Act.
- A34. No. Only those provisions that are contained in the Ionian Criminal Identification Act as specified in the Moot Problem are in force.
- Q35. What was they cause of death mentioned in the medical records of the deceased commando.
- A35. Blunt force trauma to the head along with blood accumulation in the thoracic cavity due to chest injuries, asphyxia and rib injuries was the cause of death. The post mortem also records other injuries including that (1) a pellet was lodged in the right eye causing complete loss of vision, (2) severe bleeding from the injured eye; (3) subdural haematoma from the internal bleeding in the eye, and a cracked skull.
- Q36. What was the distance between the pellets point of origin and the stage.
- A36. The distance from which the gun was shot was stated to be approximately 50 feet away from the stage by the Investigation Officer.

## **K.K. LUTHRA MEMORIAL MOOT COURT, 2025**

---

- Q37. What work did Yaara exactly do for poor mixolydian forest dwellers and fisherfolk.
- A37. No response required. Refer to the Moot Problem.
- Q38. Was Yaara's social media account private or public.
- A38. Public.
- Q39. The section 63 certificate (see para 15) was presented pertaining to which evidence.
- A39. To the Crime 360 Report itself.
- Q40. What was the HASH value stated in the section 63 certificate.
- A40. No response required. Refer to the Moot Problem.
- Q41. Was any co-accused tried along with Yaara in the same trial.
- A41. The five individuals mentioned at para 9 were tried along with Mr. Yaara in the same trial and convicted under Section 61 read with Section 105, Part II and Section 189(4) of the Ionian Penal Code. The sentence awarded to each of them was the same as that of Mr. Yaara Mixol. Their appeals are not being heard in the present hearing.
- Q42. When was report no 67/2024 (see para 9) registered against the five individuals that were apprehended.
- A42. At 8 pm on the date of the incident, that is 04 June 2024.
- Q43. Did Yaara give his consent to the updated terms and conditions (see para 6) of any of the application.
- A43. Mr. Yaara is a DigiTravel user. No further response required. Refer to the Moot Problem.
- Q44. Para 3 of document B titled as 'CRIME 360 ANALYTICS RESULTS' states that "Mr. Yaara's geolocation shows him at the site of the event as soon as the alerts kicked in." How was his geological location traced.
- A44. No response required. Refer to the Moot Problem.
- Q45. Are all the other laws that are for time being in force in The Democratic Republic of Ionia except The Ionian Criminal Identification Act, 2024 and apart from the laws mentioned in para 23 of the moot proposition, also in para materia with the laws in force in The Republic of India.
- A45. No, only those laws stated at para 23.
- Q46. If the state would argue in issue 2 that pertains to conviction under section 102 as good in law and then the same would be contented for section 103, then would it not be contradictory? Can both the parties contend against the same issue?

Moreover, since it is a counter appeal, the roles as appellant and respondent would change, or the counter appeal is made under Yaara's appeal leading to no change in the party's role?

A46. Since this is being argued under Mr. Yaara's appeal, the roles will not change. The order of arguments relating to conviction under Section 103, Part I or 105, Part II can be decided by the arguing counsel so that no contradictory arguments are made.

Q47. Is the Madhya Pradesh High Court *pari materia* to the Delhi High Court? If not, how can we cite High Court judgments that will have binding value?

A47. All Indian cases will have persuasive value.

Q48. What was the outcome of the investigation related to the bombing in January 2024, as stated in paragraph 4 of the proposition?

A48. It is still ongoing. No arrests were made.

Q49. Did Mr. Yaara have any prior criminal antecedents, or was he fined for any violations or arrested before?

A49. He was fined for over-speeding and jumping a red light.

Q50. What was the outcome of the investigation mentioned in paragraph 9?

A50. They were also charged and convicted in the same trial as Mr. Yaara.

Q51. As per paragraph 11, a search was conducted at Mr. Yaara's house. Was the search procedure as laid down in the CrPC followed, and did the police obtain a search warrant?

A51. No prior warrant was obtained.

Q52. You mentioned that Mr. Yaara had a public account. Why were the tweets attached as an annexure extracted from his phone if they were already publicly available?

A52. No answer required.

Q53. What does the flag in the last tweet represent?

A53. This is the Mixolydian state flag.

Q54. Since there are two appeals, one filed by Mr. Yaara and a counter-appeal filed by the State, what would be the name of the case in the cause list? Should we write only one appeal, i.e., the one filed by Mr. Yaara, or should we write both appeals, adding "read with" as a conjunction?

A54. You can put Mr. Yaara's appeal first and the state's appeal second in the title.

In the matter of: -

Mr. Yaara Mixol ... Appellant

Versus

State of Moda .. Respondent

And in the matter of: -

State of Moda .. Appellant

Versus

Mr. Yaara Mixol .. Respondent

Q55. As per paragraph 10, the report showed a list of six potential suspects, but the annexure shows only five names. Who is the sixth person?

A55. This is an error. The report showed only 5 suspects.

Q56. In para 6 do the applicants have an option to "not consent" and still continue with the application or do they have to opt out from the service entirely by not consenting to the updated terms and conditions?

A56. They would have to opt out of the service entirely if they don't consent to the updated terms.

Q57. In para 6 What are the updated "terms of services" specifically?

A57. No answer required.

Q58. Regarding the recent clarification, we have a specific query. In points A29 and A41, it is stated that Mr. Yaara was tried under Section 61 read with Section 105 Part II and Section 189(4). Could you confirm if Section 61 is added as a charge, and, if so, under which issue we are expected to address this?

A58. The five individuals mentioned at para 9 were tried along with Mr. Yaara in the same trial and all were convicted under Section 61 read with Section 105, Part II and Section 189(4) of the Ionian Penal Code. The sentence awarded to each of them was the same as that of Mr. Yaara Mixol. In addition, Mr. Yaara was convicted for committing substantive offences under Section 102 read with Section 105 of the Ionian Penal Code for causing the death of the commando and under Section 189(4) of the Ionian Penal Code for joining an unlawful assembly armed with a deadly weapon.

Q59. Whether the computer and phone seized from Mr. Yaara Mixol's house on 05.06.2024 had @NeoNPRer's X-account logged in?



A59. No answer required.

Q60. Paragraph 15 states that " the software had flagged some important inputs which led to the police's reliance on it." What are these important inputs?

A60. These are mentioned in the report.

Q61. Are Indian case laws binding on this pertinent matter? How much reliance can be placed on International case laws?

A61. All Indian High Court and Supreme Court cases have persuasive value. International cases also have persuasive value.

Q62. What do you mean by the phrase " primary piece of evidence" given in paragraph 13? Does it mean "primary evidence" under Section 57 of Bharatiya Sakshya Adhiniyam, 2023 or the layman meaning of important evidence?

A62. Yes, it means primary evidence.

Q63. In paragraph 14, from whom are the data sets and source code being asked? Looper Inc or the Investigating Agency?

In the same paragraph, the prosecution denied a copy of the source code on the ground that it is not a relied upon document. Are the source code and data sets not relied upon or is the Crime 360 report not relied upon?

A63. The investigating agency is being asked to supply a copy of the source code. The source code is not "a relied on" document according to the prosecution, but the Crime 360 report is a relied on document.

Q64. What is an investigating agency? Does it refer to an equivalent of CBI or is it just the police? Does the Digital Police force also come under the investigating agency?

A64. Yes, the digital police force is an investigating agency.

Q65. Define faceprint mentioned in Paragraph 12 of the moot problem.

A65. It is a technical term whose meaning can be sought out from technical sources.

Q66. Whether the court has recognized the crime360 report as primary evidence?

A66. Yes.

Q67. Whether the biometrics fed by Home Ministry in Crime360 software (Paragraph 6) is of the persons convicted or accused?

A67. The Home Ministry also fed the biometrics of all persons who had faced an arrest or had been fined for violations of the law into the database.

Q68. What is the distance from the place of the event to Mr. Yaara's house?

A68. 4 kms.

Q69. Who was wearing Mixolydian Flag T-shirts in Paragraph 17?

A69. They were not identified by PW 4 and PW 5.

Q70. Is Digi Travel a voluntary government application? (Document B para-1)

A70. Yes, it is voluntary.

Q71. What is the percentage of people who consented to sharing the data with the Digi Police force? (para-6)

A71. Consent is based on clicked 'yes' to the revised terms of service in widely used government applications. Therefore, almost the entire population that uses a smart phone has consented to these revised terms.

Q72. What is the common object of the unlawful assembly for which they were convicted? (para-20)

A72. The common object was to cause the death of the Prime Minister through use of a deadly weapon and to cause grievous hurt and death to other persons present by instigating unrest and a stampede among the crowd.

Q73. Which court convicted Yaaara Mixol, para 20 only mentions "trial judge"? (para-20)

A73. The Special Court which conducted the trial.

Q74. Under which specific prong of culpable homicide provision was Yaara Mixol convicted? (para-20)

A74. With the knowledge that he is likely by such act to cause death" in Section 100.

Q75. Is the constitutionality of the provisions of Ionia Criminal Identification Act, 2024 in challenge in this appeal?

A75. It can be framed as an issue.

Q76. Can we get the ballistic report?

A76. No.

Q77. Can we assume that Inspector David Dhawan signed and authorized Document B?

A77. Yes.

Q78. Can we get the FIR and chargesheet?

A78. No.

## **K.K. LUTHRA MEMORIAL MOOT COURT, 2025**

---

- Q79. Whether the any test identification parade was conducted to identify the accused by PW 4 and 5 and if not did they identify the accused in court
- A79. No TIP was conducted. PW 4 and PW 5 identified Mr. Yaara in court from the witness stand.
- Q80. It has been mentioned in the answer of clarification 29 that the co accused were convicted 61 of the IPC in addition to the other charges mentioned in the proposition. However, in the proposition Mr. Yaara has only been convicted under sections 102,105 & 189(4). We would like seek clarification on the same.
- A80. The five individuals mentioned at para 9 were tried along with Mr. Yaara in the same trial and all were convicted under Section 61 read with Section 105, Part II and Section 189(4) of the Ionian Penal Code. The sentence awarded to each of them was the same as that of Mr. Yaara Mixol. In addition, Mr. Yaara was convicted for committing substantive offences under Section 102 read with Section 105 of the Ionian Penal Code for causing the death of the commando and under Section 189(4) of the Ionian Penal Code for joining an unlawful assembly armed with a deadly weapon.
- Q81. Do the clarifications hold substantive value as to be referenced directly in the memo and in the oral arguments?
- A81. Yes.
- Q82. Is it permissible to merge two of the given issues into a single issue?
- A82. Yes.
- Q83. Are we allowed to modify the issues as stated in the moot proposition?
- A83. Yes, but the issues framed must be addressed.
- Q84. Under what circumstances is the Digital Police Force called?
- A84. Since the incident was captured online via livestream on social media, the Digital Police Force was called.
- Q85. Is there any option for the participants to add further or additional issues or questions instead of the questions mentioned in paragraph 2 of the moot problem?
- A85. Yes, additional issues can be added. However, the issues framed must also be addressed.
- Q86. Was there any investigation wr.t Delphi Bomb blast, if yes, who were the identified accused?
- A86. That investigation remains ongoing. No arrests were made.
- Q87. Is there any medical report suggesting the cause of death?

- A87. The cause of death was Blunt force trauma to the head along with blood accumulation in the thoracic cavity due to chest injuries, asphyxia and rib injuries was the cause of death. The post mortem also records other injuries including that (1) a pellet was lodged in the right eye causing complete loss of vision, (2) severe bleeding from the injured eye; (3) subdural haematoma from the internal bleeding in the eye, and a cracked skull.
- Q88. What is the area representation of Moda, Lydia and Mixolydia
- A88. The state of Moda is the largest state area wise and is roughly 3 times the size of Lydia and Mixolydia which are smaller in size.
- Q89. In point 9, five individuals are mentioned. In point 10, 6 potential suspects have been identified but only 5 are named in the report in Document B. Where is the detail of 6<sup>th</sup> suspect.
- A89. This is an error. There are only 5 persons names as suspects in the report.
- Q90. Also, in Document B out of five caught persons namely, Gauri Lydia, Fuzail Iqbal, Fanny Luang are not mentioned instead John Doe, Thaang Luang are mentioned. Can you confirm that there is no typo here.
- A90. There is no typo. Document B turned out its own results based on the software.
- Q91. In name of co-accused only Riki Mixol, Fanny Luang and Krish Kumar have been mentioned, who is the fifth co accused apart from Yaara?
- A91. The co-accused who were prosecuted and convicted are the ones mentioned in para 9 - *Gauri Lydia, Riki Mixol, Fuzail Iqbal, Fanny Luang and Krish Kumar.*
- Q92. Whether the CCTV footage, distant footage obtained, and the messages in Document G have a Section 63 certificate? If yes, who is the signatory?
- A92. Yes. The responsible official from the company tasked with maintaining the CCTV cameras in the city signed the certificate.
- Q93. Was the Prime Minister suffering from any sought of medical condition.
- A93. No response required.
- Q94. Had there been any attempt to harm or humiliate the Prime Minister prior to the one on 04th June 2024 at 19:01 hours.
- A94. No response required.
- Q95. Were the paintgun and the pellets purchased locally or were the imported.
- A95. Both paint gun and paint gun pellets were imported since that make is from a renowned American company.
- Q96. When were the paintgun and the pellets purchased

A96. No response required.

Q97. Is the Tippmann Bravo One Elite automatic paintball gun "fully automatic" or "semi-automatic"? (Document C)

A97. It is fully automatic.

Q98. The X handle of the accused is mentioned to be '@YaaraMix'(para 4 Document B), however the screenshots produced in Document G are from a different handle '@YaaraMixology'. Is this discrepancy a typographic error or can we use this discrepancy as a ground of contention?

A98. This is not a typographical error.

Q99. Did Mr. Yaara have any criminal background that was considered by either the Crime360 software, the investigating agency or by the court

A99. Mr. Yaara had been fined for a traffic violation on a previous occasion. No further response required.

Q100. What was the diameter of dustbin?

A100. No response required.

Q101. Is NeoMPR and NeoMPRer's account same?

A101. No response required.

Q102. At what time witness no. 4 and Witness no. 5 saw Yaara.

A102. No response required.

Q103. What are the statements given to police by all other witnesses?

A103. No response required.

Q104. It is mentioned in Para 15 of the proposition that the electronic evidence was submitted along with a certificate. Could you please specify what were the details mentioned in the certificate and did the certificate included all the pre-requisites that an electronic evidence certificate should contain.

A104. In essence, the certificate certified that the computer that prepared the Crime 360 Report was in working order, and that the printout of the report is a true and correct copy of the report available on the computer.

Q105. The plagiarism and AI allowed in the memorial. Please clarify the same.

A105. Plagiarism is strictly prohibited which includes directly lifting entire texts from other sources without proper citation. Submission of text in memorials that have been generated by an AI tool, even if subsequently edited or modified, is strictly prohibited.

Q106. Was the search and seizure (mentioned in para 10 of the proposition) recorded in an audio-video form.

A106. No.

Q107. Was the search conducted by the officer incharge.

A107. No response required.

Q108. What were the details including grounds for believe etc. that were recorded by the officer in the case diary before the search.

A108. No response required.

Q109. Was Mr. Yaara present at his home during the search and seizure (mentioned in para 11 of the proposition).

A109. No response required.

Q110. Was the search and seizure recorded in an audio-video form.

A110. No.

Q111. Was the search conducted by the officer incharge.

A111. No response required.

Q112. What were the details including grounds for believe etc. that were recorded by the officer in the case diary before the search.

A112. No response required.

Q113. Can International conventions be used in arguments?

A113. Yes.

Q114. What was the age of the Prime Minister.

A114. Mid 60s.

Q115. What was the time gap between the first and the second shot.

A115. No response required.

Q116. Was any subsequent shot taken after the second shot.

A116. No response required.

Q117. Was a search conducted at the residence of the other 4 suspects.

A117. No response required.

## **K.K. LUTHRA MEMORIAL MOOT COURT, 2025**

---

Q118. Was Yaara informed about the specific data and the purpose for which the same would be shared in the updated terms and conditions (mentioned in para 6)

A118. Yes, the terms and conditions contained a disclosure that all data collected would be shared with the Digital Police Force.

Q119. The moot problem is unclear about Yaara's involvement with the previous MPR Party, nor is it clear regarding his participation in the Neo-MPR Party movements.

A119. No response required.

Q120. As per Para 16, the Right to Privacy issue, was to be dealt at the end of the Trial, but the moot problem is silent on the same, has the issue been appealed or not?

A120. The Crime 360 Report has been challenged in appeal on all grounds available under law.

Q121. Have the convicts in Para 9 of the proposition preferred an appeal against their conviction for unlawful assembly and murder?

A121. Yes, they have but their cases will be separately argued.

Q122. Were other suspects in Doc B also investigated and house-searched? If yes, to what extent? Do provide details also for the same.

A122. No response required.

Q123. Were the charges levelled against yaara mixol (as specified in para 14) altered thereafter?

A123. No.

Q124. Was there any CCTV deployment at the event on 04 June, 2024? If yes, what were its findings? Was this footage run through Crime 360?

A124. There was no clear footage from CCTV cameras at the event. There was only entry and exit footage which showed the entry and exit of different persons.

Q125. Was the live streamed video from neo mpr's handle?

A125. No response required.

Q126. Were there any more people from Moda or Lydia who were detained before the event of 04 June, 2024 through predictions of crime forecaster?

A126. No.

Q127. What entails a 360-degree profile of citizens?

A127. No response required.

Q128. What elements of the crime 360 software were incorporated by US and Europe? Is there any specific percentage? Did they buy the software from Looper Inc itself as mentioned in the facts of the proposition? Can we introduce data statistics from these states for persuasive value?

A128. Yes, you can introduce data. The prevalent use of artificial intelligence tools by countries in Europe and in the United States of America can be compared to various components of Crime 360 and considered as having originated from related AI/software developers.

Q129. Did the appellant make an application to the trial court under Sec. 94/95 BNSS for requesting the underlying datasets?"

A129. No. They only applied under Section 230 of the Code.

Q130. What was the time duration of the livestream (mentioned in para 4 of document B titled "CRIME 360 ANALYTICS REPORT").

A130. No response required.

Q131. As mentioned in Para 8, the pellet narrowly missed hitting the Prime Minister, so, where was the pellet supposed to hit the Prime Minister, on which part of the body?

A131. The shot was at her head level.

Q132. In what form was the Crime360 Report furnished as evidence in the Court?

A132. The report was furnished as an original signed report.

Q133. Was the search and seizure during Yaara's arrest recorded by audio-visual means?

A133. No.

Q134. Was the source code for Crime 360 and its data sets requested by the defence under Section 230 of the Criminal Procedure Code provided to the magistrate?

A134. No it was not.

Q135. Does the Mixolydian Parito Poplare have any connections with neo-mpr?

A135. No response required.

Q136. What is the height of the stage from which the commando fell?

A136. Regular stage height of about 3-4 feet.

Q137. Clarification regarding Issue III of the moot problem, which states:

*"Whether the Appellant is liable for conviction under Section 103(1) IPC?"*



In relation to this issue, we would like to confirm whether it would be permissible to argue on the punishment for the conviction, specifically regarding the imposition of the death penalty. Section 103 of the BNS prescribes punishment by either the death penalty or life imprisonment.

Whether this aspect can be addressed in our arguments.

A137. Yes.

Q138. Details of the FSL report of the recovered gun

A138. No response required.

Q139. How far was the place of occurrence from the police station

A139. No response required.

Q140. Where was the place of occurrence

A140. No response required.

Q141. What was the distance between the commando and the stage when he was crushed by the crowd

A141. A short distance

Q142. Who were the other witnesses in the case and what did they testify.

A142. No response required.

Q143. Did the court consider the confession made by Yaara

A143. No response required.

Q144. Was the Crime 360 report available in public domain

A144. No.

Q145. Who signed the Section 63 certificate

A145. PW 34 - David Dhawan

Q146. By whom was the Crime 360 software operated

A146. PW 34 – David Dhawan

Q147. By which device was the Crime 360 software controlled

A147. A computer in the custody of PW 34 David Dhawan

Q148. What were details of the observation made by the trial court eg the reason for the judgment, the logic applied etc

A148. No response required.

Q149. What was the evidence against the other accused persons that formed a basis for their conviction

A149. No response required.

Q150. Colonial masters of Lydia

A150. Italy.

Q151. Seats reserved for the State of Moda in the Ionian Parliament

A151. There are no reserved seats. Constituencies are divided based on territory.

Q152. Date of filing chargesheet and framing charges for Yaara Mixol

A152. The chargesheet was filed on 10.07.2024 and charge was framed on 01.08.2024.

Q153. Date and time of filing of FIR for the 5 people apprehended in Para 9

A153. No response required.

Q154. Date of commencement of trial and pronouncing of judgment by trial court

A154. Charge was framed on 01.08.2024. The trial court judgement is dated 01.10.2024.

Q155. Outcome of the general elections of Ionia and whether they were conducted timely as per the schedule

A155. No response required.

Q156. Occupation of people of Mixolydia

A156. No response required.

Q157. Is there absolute homogeneity in respect of ethnicity in all or any particular States in Ionia

A157. No.

Q158. Details of the MySpace platform

A158. MySpace was a pioneering social media platform launched in 2003, popular for customisable user profiles, music sharing, and community interaction. It allowed users to design personal pages with HTML/CSS, embed music playlists, and connect with friends. MySpace became a cultural hub for emerging artists and fans before Facebook's dominance.

Q159. The date of Document B

A159. Document B is dated 06.06.2024 and signed by IO PW- 34 David Dhawan.

Q160. The name of the forum where the Appeal is being heard - Modal High Court or the High Court of Moda

A160. High Court of Moda

Q161. What is the case number allotted for the counter appeal by the state

A161. These are the final appeal numbers. Other numbers can be disregarded.

In the matter of: -

CRIMINAL APPEAL NO. 634/2024

Mr. Yaara Mixol                      ... Appellant

Versus

State of Moda                      ... Respondent

And in the matter of: -

CRIMINAL APPEAL NO. 1214/2024

State of Moda                      ... Appellant

Versus

Mr. Yaara Mixol                      ... Respondent

Q162. Corrigendum and Clarification for Question No. 159.

A162. Document B should be dated 04.06.2024.

Q163. We would like to know if the place of the event held on 04.06.2024 was equipped or fit to accommodate a gathering of 50,000 people?

A163. It was equipped to gather 35-40,000 people. But arrangements were made to accommodate about 50,000 people.

\*\*\*\*\*