

IN THE SPECIAL COURT FOR THE TRIAL OF NIA CASES, ERNAKULAM

Present: Sri. P.K. Mohandas, Judge, Special Court for NIA Cases

Monday the 1st day of December, 2025 / 10th Agrahayana 1947.

Crl.M.P. 491/2025

in

SC.02/2023

RC No.02/2022/NIA/KOC

Petitioner/Complainant : Union of India represented by National Investigation Agency, Kochi.

**Represented by Sri. Ajith Kumar.S
(Special Public Prosecutor, NIA) and
Sri. Sreenath.S (Public Prosecutor, NIA).**

**Respondent/
Accused No.50** : Shahul Hameed @ Hameed(A50) Age-57 years, S/o. Muhamed, Mavara House, Kattalamadom, Nagalassery, Chalippuram, Vavannur South Post, Koottanadu, Palakkad District, Kerala.

**Represented by
Adv. Sri.Wakarulislam K.S.**

This petition is came up for hearing before me on 01.12.2025 in the presence of the counsel for the petitioner and respondent and Court on the same day passed the following:

ORDER

This is an application filed by the investigating officer for police custody of the Accused No.50 in the case for five days.

2. The case of the petitioner is that the 50th accused is an active member of the Popular Front of India (PFI) and he was a part of a larger

conspiracy of PFI to enact their "India 2047" agenda of establishing Islamic rule in India. He became a member of a terrorist gang, harboured the 18th accused, after committing terrorist act of murder of Sreenivasan. He also committed acts prejudicial to the maintenance of communal harmony between different religious group and disturbed the public tranquillity in the State at large. He remained absconding since the commission of the offence and taken shelter abroad.

3. The accused was arrested at Indira Gandhi International Airport, New Delhi, on 27.11.2025 at 04:15 hrs, on the basis of the LOC. He was produced before this court and remanded to judicial custody.

4. It is reported that the custodial interrogation of the accused is very necessary to collect further evidence as he was absconding since the commission of the offence and not jointed the investigation. The digital devices seized from Shahul Hameed during his arrest have been submitted to the court for forwarding to CFSL Hyderabad for analysis and report, and the extracted data has to be examined in detail. Any incriminating materials revealed are to be confronted with the accused. Investigation also revealed that the accused had used various digital devices and social media platforms for secret communication, during, before and after the crime. Investigation in this regard is also required as he was absconding for over three years.

5. During the investigation, various documents were seized, including details of various 'hit lists', lists of PE trainers and list of 'Reporters of PFI, which are to be confronted with the accused. Investigation has revealed that he

is involved in various other criminal cases registered in Kerala, and his links with various suspects, including absconding accused. Further details in this regard are to be gathered to ascertain his association with other suspects, which requires his custodial interrogation. His activities during the absconding period and his connection with the absconding accused must be investigated. The accused has not fully disclosed the involvement of himself and the co-accused in the offence. Therefore, custodial interrogation is essential to unearth the entire role played by the accused and other suspects in the crime.

6. The accused is produced before this court today. I have heard the Counsel appearing for the accused and the Public Prosecutor and perused the case records. The application is opposed by the defence counsel. He submitted that investigation is completed and final report is filed and there is no necessity of granting police custody at this stage. He submits that the reasons stated in the petition are not sufficient to remand the accused to police custody.

7. The learned Special Public Prosecutor argued that the respondent was an active member of the terrorist gang and had harboured the 19th accused. He had an active role in the offence. He was absconding for more than 3 years. It is submitted that custodial interrogation is necessary in this case.

8. The accused/respondent was arrested only on 27.11.2025. He was absconding for the last more than 3 years. It is true that final report is filed against certain accused, including the respondent. But, further investigation of the case is still going on. It is necessary to collect digital as well as other

evidence connecting the respondent with the alleged incident. Only because final report is filed, police custody cannot be denied. On going through the reasons reported by the learned Public Prosecutor and on a consideration of the progress of investigation, I am of the view that custodial interrogation of the accused is necessary to unearth the entire role played by him in the commission of the offence. I am satisfied that the respondent is mentally and physically fit and good grounds are made out to remand the respondent to police custody. Hence, the respondent is remanded to the custody of the petitioner from 12.30 pm today till 5.00 pm on 05.12.2025. The petitioner shall not harass the respondent while he is in police custody and shall get him examined by medical practitioner and shall also comply the directions of the Hon'ble Supreme Court regarding police custody.

Dictated to the Confidential Asst., transcribed and typewritten by her, corrected and pronounced by me in open court on this the 01st day of December, 2025.

Sd/-
P. K. Mohandas
Judge, Special Court for NIA Cases

Appendix: Nil

Id/-
Judge, Special Court for NIA Cases
(By Order)

// True Copy//

Sd/-
Sheristadar