

Date: 19.05.2022

-
Performing citizen's duty under Article 51A of the constitution

To,

1. Police Station In-charge

2. Commissioner of Police (Superintendent of Police)

Subject: Providing necessary legal support in performing our fundamental duties under article 51-A of the constitution of India by informing fellow citizens about the 1. **Policies of the Union of India regarding Covid-19 vaccinations and masks**, 2. various **Judgements of High Court's**, 3. Decisions of **Public Interest Litigations (PIL) in the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India and various High Courts**, 4. **Informed Consent** before taking vaccinations and side effects of vaccines and masks, 5. **Dangers of kids vaccination**

Sir/Mam,

1. We introduce ourselves as a composite of various groups of concerned citizens, lawyers, doctors, and parents. By writing to you we hope to garner support, co-operation in securing a safe environment for the citizens of the country.

2. As per Supreme Court Order in the case of **Jacob Puliyel Vs. Union of India 2022 SCC Online SC 533**, decided on May 2nd 2022, as regards discriminatory treatment as well restrictions put on unvaccinated persons rules as under;

*“60. We have already referred to the material placed by the Union of India and the States appearing before this Court. While there is abundant data to show that getting vaccinated continues to be the dominant expert advice even in the face of new variants, **no submission nor any data has been put forth to justify restrictions only on unvaccinated individuals when emerging scientific evidence appears to indicate that the risk of transmission of the virus from unvaccinated individuals is almost on par with that from vaccinated persons. To put it differently, neither the Union of India nor the State Governments have produced any material before this Court to justify the discriminatory treatment of unvaccinated individuals in public places by imposition of vaccine mandates.** No doubt that when COVID-19 vaccines came into the picture, they were expected to address, and were indeed found to be successful in dealing with, the risk of infection from the variants in circulation at the time. However, with the virus mutating, we have seen more potent variants surface which have broken through the vaccination barrier to some extent. While vaccination mandates in the era of prevalence of the variants prior to the Delta variant may have withstood constitutional scrutiny, **in light of the data presented by the Petitioner, which has not been controverted by the Union of India as well as the State Governments, we are of the opinion that the restrictions on unvaccinated individuals imposed through vaccine mandates cannot be considered to be proportionate, especially since both vaccinated and unvaccinated individuals presently appear to be susceptible to transmission of the virus at similar levels.**”*



3. **All mandates** issued by all Government and private bodies which **discriminates between vaccinated and unvaccinated and which restrict any benefit or Services to unvaccinated people are proved as illegal, unconstitutional, arbitrary and violative of Article 14, 19 & 21 of the Constitution of India.** Now no one can be compelled to produce RTPCR Tests only because he is not vaccinated. The status of vaccinated and unvaccinated is held to be the same. [**Para 58 of Jacob Puliyeel Vs. Union of India 2022 SCC OnLine SC 533**]

4. All contrary judgments passed by any courts in India and orders or directions given by any officials, Ministers or authority stands overruled even if they were before the Supreme Court or not. **As per Article 141 of the Constitution of India** this judgment of the Supreme Court is binding to all authorities, Courts, private bodies etc. Other judgments are impliedly overruled.

[**State Bank of Travancore Vs. Mathew K.C. (2018) 3 SCC 85, C.N.Rudramurthy (1998) 8 SCC 275, S.E Graphites Private Vs. State of Telangana 2019 SCC OnLine SC 842**]

5. The ratio laid down by the constitution bench in **Common Cause vs. Union of India (2018) 5 SCC 1** is binding to all cases of vaccine mandates and any direct or indirect force or SOP which compels a person to get vaccinated for availing any benefits or services are prohibited. **It is a choice of every person to refuse to get vaccinated or refuse any treatment which is suggested by the government. No one can force them. No authority or courts in India can ask any person to give reasons for not getting vaccinated.** It is an integral part of the fundamental right of each person under **Article 21 of the Constitution** and no law in future cannot be brought to take away this right. **Article 13 of the constitution is clear on this point.**



6. The Conclusions of this judgment as per Point 93 says;

“(v) -In light of this, restrictions on unvaccinated individuals imposed through various vaccine mandates by State Governments / Union Territories cannot be said to be proportionate. we suggest that all authorities in this country, including private organizations and educational institutions, review the relevant orders and instructions imposing restrictions on unvaccinated individuals in terms of access to public places, services and resources, if not already recalled.”

7. In **M/S. Spencer & Company Ltd. vs M/S. Vishwadarshan Distributors 1995 SCC (1) 259**, it is made very clear by the Supreme Court that even if their words in a judgment are in the form of an advice or suggestion and not an explicit command or direction, it is a judicial order and is considered binding and enforceable throughout the territory of India.

Link to the said judgment can be found here:

https://drive.google.com/file/d/1RhjS8La5m8wd1yfX_Ii9WYA6NkQfkiNI/view

8. **Needless to mention that the judgment of Hon’ble Supreme Court is having retrospective effect on all the cases of any individuals.**

9. Kindly note Bombay High Court Order in **Subrata Mazumdar Vs. Dr. Vidya Yervavdekar, Principal Director of Symbiosis Writ Petition of 4486 of 2022** decided on 13th May 2022 respected judges referred to the Supreme Court Order and Symbiosis education institution had to take back vaccine mandate order and also agree to give withheld salary with compensation. This was widely publicized in newspapers as well. Link:<https://www.freepressjournal.in/legal/pune-symbiosis-to-reinstate-unvaccinated-employees-who-were-asked-to-go-on-unpaid-leave>



The Judgment can be found in the below link:

Link:https://drive.google.com/file/d/1j2_1Yuja-vO08Xw4aL_O-OuFtAzoP42M/view?usp=sharing

Any Employer either discriminating between vaccinated and unvaccinated employees or withholding salary etc will be guilty of Contempt of the Supreme Court as well Bombay High Court.

10. Hon'ble Supreme Court in the case of E. T. Sunup Vs. C. A. N. S. S. Employee Association 2004-CCC(SC)-4-295, has ruled as under;

“A] CONTEMPT OF COURT- Deliberate attempt on the part bureaucracy to circumvent order of court and try to take recourse to one justification or other- this shows complete lack of grace in accepting the order of the Court- this tendency of undermining the courts order cannot be countenanced in democracy the role of Court cannot be subservient to the administrative fiat the executive and legislature and executive within check- the appellant office flouted order of this court is guilty of contempt of court.

B] PUNISHMENT TO BUREAUCRATS- apology tendered order of court complied- held- if the courts are flouted like this, then people will lose faith in the court- therefore it is necessary that such violation should be dealt with strong hands and to convey to the authorities that the courts are not going to take things lightly- order of the high court convincing the officer under contempt of courts act and imposition of fine of Rs. 5000 is affirmed.”

11. In Pramotee Telecom Engineers Forum & Ors. Vs. D. S. Mathur (2008) 11 SCC 579, it is ruled by Hon'ble Supreme Court that the act of authorities in misinterpreting the Supreme Court judgment is a Contempt of Court.



12. Shri Rajesh Bhushan, Union Home Secretary and Chairperson of National Executive Committee, issued a letter dated 25th February 2022 to all States and UTs's about taking various measures in **opening up economic and social activities**. Shri Ajay Bhalla Home Secretary issued a circular dated 23rd March 2022, directing all States and UT's that **henceforth NDMA has taken a decision that Disaster Management Act shall not be invoked by any State or UT for Covid containment measures**. Therefore henceforth it would be an offence for any authority to invoke DM Act and violate the fundamental rights of the citizens. Both the circulars are available on this link.

Hence the person like Chief Secretary, District Magistrate and Collector issuing such unlawful notification/order/circular etc are liable in addition to action under contempt to be prosecuted and punished under section 52, 166, 219, 220, 109, 341, 342, 120(B), 34 etc of the IPC.

<https://drive.google.com/drive/folders/138-wj51ekqXmfr50165hBxuzRiOVHIFn?usp=sharing>

13. As per Union Government's own record and as per recent information given by the ICMR under RTI in January 2022 and also admitted by WHO it is clear that the **vaccination doesn't stop infection and therefore there cannot be any discrimination of any person on the basis of his vaccination status. The vaccinated people can get corona, they can spread infection and they can die due to corona. Vaccinated people can also be a super spreader**. Any mandate which discriminates between vaccinated and unvaccinated are violative of Article 14, 19 & 21 of the Constitution of India and therefore they are unconstitutional, illegal, null & void and vitiated.

Judgments of Seven High Courts :-

- i. **Registrar General Vs. State of Meghalaya** 2021 SCC OnLine Megh 130
- ii. **Re Dinthar Incident Vs. State of Mizoram** 2021 SCC OnLine Gau 1313



- iii. **Madan Mili Vs. Union of India** 2021 SCC OnLine Gau 1503
- iv. **Osbert Khaling Vs. State of Manipur** 2021 SCC OnLine Mani 234
- v. **Dr. Aniruddha Babar Vs. State of Nagaland** 2021 SCC OnLine Gau 1504
- vi. **In –Re Vs. State of Nagaland** 2021 SCC OnLine Gau 1506
- vii. **Feroze Mithiborwala Vs. State of Maharashtra** 2022 SCC OnLine Bom 356

14. Already Central Government in their **reply before Lok Sabha, reply under RTI** and also in their **Affidavit** before Supreme Court and High Court have specifically mentioned that;

- (i) Taking vaccine is completely voluntary and not mandatory.
- (ii) There cannot be any discrimination on the basis of person's vaccination status.
- (iii) No benefit or service can be denied to any citizen on the basis of his vaccination status.

15. In a recent affidavit dated 13th January, 2022 submitted before Supreme Court on behalf of Union of India which is affirmed by Dr. Veena Dhawan, Joint Commissioner (UIP) in the Ministry of Health & Family Welfare, Government of India, it is once again made clear that;

- (i) **The vaccination is voluntary and no one can be given a vaccine against his wish.**
- (ii) **No one should be required to carry & show the vaccination certificate to any authority.**
- (iii) Before giving vaccines to anyone, **each person should be informed about adverse side effects of vaccines** by the person/doctor giving vaccines.



16. In criminal writ petition no. St. 18017 of 2021 **Smt Kiran Yadav vs The State of Maharashtra & Ors**, the petitioners lone son, **Shri Hitesh Kadve, age 23**, died due to side effects of vaccine which was unwillingly taken by him due to condition put by the officials of the State of Maharashtra that, only vaccinated people can travel through the local train or enter mall and also the direction that the office staff of all private establishments should get vaccinated.

A petition in the Bombay High Court filed by the **father of a medical student Dr Snehal Lunawat seeks Rs 1,000 crore compensation alleging that his daughter died due to side effects of the Covid-19 vaccine.**

<https://www.livelaw.in/news-updates/bombay-high-court-covid-19-vaccine-death-due-to-side-effect-1-crore-compensation-190899>

There have been many AEFI (After Effects Following Immunization) fatalities due to vaccine side effects. Also this dismantles false narratives that the vaccines are 110% safe.

Many deaths have occurred post Covid vaccination even amongst young adults in India as well and the following link provides a list of more than **12,586** deaths following covid vaccination as reported in media.

https://drive.google.com/file/d/1uikc1a6_KDzUx7HNLrfaI1NJRt0D_YP/view

17. There is no availability of long term safety data for Covid-19 vaccines, as the vaccines were developed fast, using a new experimental technology and they are being used under **Emergency Use Authorization**, which means that this is an ongoing global clinical trial pending full FDA approval. Whereas, there are safer methods to mitigate Covid-19, such as the AYUSH approved Ayurvedic protocol, Anandaiah's protocol and Homeopathic protocol for Covid-19.

<https://drive.google.com/file/d/1HI76y7BwU8i57z5Z3xk8XbPvMzG>



[366II/view?usp=sharing](https://www.vigiaccess.org/366II/view?usp=sharing)

18. To see how devastatingly damaging and life-threatening the side effects of Covid-19 vaccines are, please follow these steps > Go to www.vigiaccess.org
> Scroll to the bottom of the page and click – ‘I understand’ > Click ‘Search Database’ and type in ‘Covid-19 Vaccine’ and click Search > Click ADRs then click on each ADR for its details.

Keeping the above in mind, stringent adherence to ‘**Informed Consent**’ is of utmost importance. These provisions were made keeping ethics and safety in mind. Experimental medical malfeasance carries serious legal liabilities. **Informed Consent** is the bedrock principle on which most of modern research ethics rest... This is at the heart of the crucial ethical provision stated in the first words of the Nuremberg Code, and it remains equally compelling a half century later. The principles enshrined in the Nuremberg Code came into being following the painstaking trials of those who participated in biological war crimes during the Nazi regime. These codes were put in place to protect our bodily integrity <https://bioethics.nih.gov/sites/nihbioethics/files/bioethics-files/courses/pdf/2012/Grady2.pdf>

19. Canada and Japan have published warnings and advisories against covishield vaccine

- a. On 9th November, 2021 Canada’s Health Department warned about side effects on Covishield:

*“Health **Canada** adds autoimmune disorder warning to AstraZeneca, J&J COVID-19 vaccines Health Canada is updating the labels for the AstraZeneca and Johnson & Johnson COVID-19 vaccines to add immune thrombocytopenia (ITP), an autoimmune condition, as a potential side effect.”*



Link: <https://globalnews.ca/news/8362363/astrazeneca-covid-vaccine-autoimmune-disorder-health-canada-update/>

- b. The government of **Japan** made companies of Covid “vaccines” to warn of dangerous and potentially deadly side effects such as myocarditis. In addition, the country is reaffirming its commitment to adverse event reporting requirements to ensure all possible side effects are documented.

Link: <https://rairfoundation.com/alert-japan-places-myocarditis-warning-on-vaccines-requires-informed-consent/>

20. According to guidelines of Ministry of Health and Family Welfare

“4.1 Persons having no symptoms are not to use mask Medical masks should not be used by healthy persons who are not having any symptoms because it creates a false sense of security that can lead to neglecting other essential measures such as washing of hands. Further, there is no scientific evidence to show health benefit of using masks for non-sick persons in the community. In fact, erroneous use of masks or continuous use of a disposable mask for longer than 6 hours or repeated use of same mask may actually increase risk of getting an infection. It also incurs unnecessary cost.”

21. The Ministry of Health and Family Welfare’s response to an RTI dated **27th May 2021** to Shri Sourav Bysack is as under:

“Question 1: Is face mask compulsory for everyone ?

Answer: Use of mask/face cover has been advised to all in various SOPs/Guidelines issued by MoHFW. However as per these guidelines/SOPs its use has not been explicitly made mandatory.”



22. The ICMR National Institute of Virology under the Department of Health Research, Ministry of Health and Family Welfare's response to an RTI dated 14th September 2021 to Shri Vijay Ramdas Tathe is as under:

“Question 2: Kindly provide scientific study and proof that tell us wearing a mask prevents spread of coronavirus ?

Answer: No study has been carried out on this subject and hence information cannot be provided.”

23. The ICMR's response to an RTI dated 09th January 2022 to Amit Chouhan is as under:

“Question 1: Has any scientific study been done in India to prove that the 6 feet Physical Distancing can prevent the transmission of Covid 19 ?”

“Question 2: Has any scientific study been done in India to prove that the sanitizer is safe and effective with respect to Covid 19 ?”

“Question 3: Has any scientific study been carried out in India to prove that the lockdown can break the chain of transmission of Covid 19 ?”

“Answer: Point no. 1, 2, 3) ICMR has not conducted such studies”

24. The ICMR NIV's response to an RTI dated 21st April 2022 to Shrekanth RG is as under;

“Question 1: Does MoHFW or ICMR or NIV have any documentary evidence or documents of scientific experiments conducted for the conclusion and declaration of corona COVID19 as an infectious disease.

Question 2: If so then please provide the evidence under Section 76 of the Evidence Act 1872

Question 3: Is wearing for face masks mandatory

Question 4: Please provide us with documentary evidence under Section 76 of Indian Evidence Act 1872 of any tests or experiments as such conducted by either the Indian Government or MoHFW or ICMR or NIV or WHO to substantiate the claim that wearing of face masks could reduce or prevent COVID19

Question 5: Please provide documentary evidence under Section 76 of Indian Evidence Act 1872 to prove that social distancing will reduce or prevent a person from getting infected by COVID19

Question 6: Please provide documentary evidence under Section 76 of Indian Evidence Act 1872 to prove that washing hands frequently with soap will prevent or reduce COVID19 infection.

Question 7: Please provide documentary evidence under Section 76 of Indian Evidence Act 1872 from the Indian Government or MoHFW or ICMR or NIV or WHO to prove that using of hand sanitizers will reduce or prevent a person from getting infected by COVID19.

Question 8: Please provide documentary evidence under Section 76 of Indian Evidence Act 1872 to prove that an unmasked person will spread COVID19 infection.

Question 9: Please provide documentary evidence under Section 76 of Indian Evidence Act 1872 to provide that an unmasked person will become carrier of the Corona COVID19 infectious disease

Answer(For all above questions): This is not part of our records. Hence this information cannot be shared”

Link:<https://drive.google.com/file/d/1vECsQpIN4ktaPQgxmZ0jB7V1age4YXxi/view?usp=sharing>

25. In the reply to appeal filed by Shri Ambar Koiri the ICMR on 04.03.2022 has given the following clarification to the RTI query as under:

RTI Query: Reports and evidence from **scientific studies conducted to prove that if corona Covid-19 is an infectious disease then that is not**



transmitted to others by those who have been vaccinated and that it is only transmitted or increasingly spread by those who have not been vaccinated.

Answer: ICMR has not conducted any study to assess the transmission potential of SARS-CoV-2 in vaccinated vs unvaccinated individuals. Therefore, the requested information is not available with ICMR.

26. From the above responses to RTI's it is clear that there is no proof with any authority that use of masks, sanitizer, 6 feet distancing, lockdown prevent the spread of Covid 19.

That **Face masks do not prevent contraction or transmission of Sars-Cov-2** virus and tons of peer-reviewed research proves that face mask causes a host of negative health effects including death.

1. New study: **Face mask usage correlates with higher death rates Using data from 35 countries and 602 million people, peer-reviewed study confirms previous research and cautions use of face masks "may have harmful unintended consequences."**

*"while the correlation between mask usage and deaths was positive and significant ($\rho = 0.351$, $p = 0.039$)."
That is to say, more mask usage correlated with a higher death rate."*

Link: <https://www.israelnationalnews.com/news/326734>

2. About 150 world-renowned research papers and especially a study published in the "International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health" on April 20, 2021 (Peer Reviewed Research conducted by clinical trial meta-analysis methods) it has been found that the mask has serious side effects on your body like;



(i) Decreases the oxygen level of body, which reduces your ability to fight corona or any other disease (ii) Fatigue, Dizziness, Listlessness, Impaired thinking, Concentration Problem (iii) Increase of carbon dioxide (iv) Damages your lungs (v) lack of oxygen in the blood (vi) Shortness of breath and other breathing disorders like asthma etc (vii) increased heart rate (viii) increased body temperature (ix) Headache, chest pain and other diseases (x) Psychological Changes (xi) Those wearing masks have a higher risk of death (xii) loss of vision (xiii) effects verbal communication (xiv) increased risk of cancer.

Is a Mask That Covers the Mouth and Nose Free from Undesirable Side Effects in Everyday Use and Free of Potential Hazards?

Link: <https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/33923935/>

3. More than 150 Comparative Studies and Articles on Mask Ineffectiveness and Harms.

Link: <https://brownstone.org/articles/more-than-150-comparative-studies-and-articles-on-mask-ineffectiveness-and-harms/>

4. There are 47 studies that confirm the ineffectiveness of masks in COVID and other thirty-two studies that, confirm the negative health effects of masks.

Link: <https://bit.ly/47studies>



27. That, the legal position settled is that the Police cannot register an FIR & arrest under section 188 of IPC and section 51(b) of Disaster Management Act 2005, Epidemic Diseases Act 1897 for not following orders regarding masks.

(i) Police do not have any right to register F.I.R. under **section 188** of IPC due to **bar under section 195 of Cr.P.C.**

(ii) For filing a case under **section 269, 270 of Indian Penal Code**, there should be a proof that the person is already infected and instead of staying at home/quarantine, he/she is moving and spreading infection. **HLA Shwe and Others vs State of Maharashtra 2020 SCC OnLine Bom 959**

(iii) It is against the Supreme Court Judgements as well as recent Judgements in a case related with non-wearing of mask **Rafat Khan Vs. State of Maharashtra 2022 SCC OnLine Bom 298**

Therefore, police cannot register F.I.R., and consequently they cannot investigate and cannot arrest. If any police officer acts against above law then he can be prosecuted under **section 166, 220, 341, 342, 409 etc. of Indian Penal Code.**

28. The Police are also rampantly and scandalously using section 269 of IPC to harass the common public to extort money when there is no proof with any authority that following any Covid Protocol prevents the spread of Coronavirus.

29. People not following unscientific, illegal Covid Protocols of the State government cannot be made liable under Section 51B of Disaster Management Act because the Central Government has clearly stated in Covid Guidelines that healthy people should not wear masks and state government circular or guidelines cannot go against the Central government. The Disaster Management Act does not envisage collecting fines hence any order or guideline which directs collection of fine is illegal and ultra vires



and is liable to be quashed. According to the Judgement laid down by the hon'ble Supreme Court in the case of **Nandini Satpathy Vs. P.L. Dani(1978) 2 SCC 424, Re: M.P. Dwivedi (1996) 4 SCC 152** any authority has to obey only legal guidelines/SOP/Orders of government and not illegal guidelines/SOP/Orders. Infact those officers who maliciously take any action against citizens are liable to be prosecuted under Section 51B and 55 of the Act because they are working against the guidelines of the Central Government.

30. Citizens on which such frivolous, baseless FIR/Chargesheet have been filed for non adherence to such unscientific, illegal Covid Protocols and had to face mental torture, loss of business, loss of income etc can pray to court

(i) to discharge, quash such FIR

(ii) Under section 340 of CrPC prosecute the concerned Police officer, Government Pleader, marshalls, and those officers who promulgated such illegal orders to make them liable under IPC 211, 220, 109, 120B, 341, 342

31. We at **Awaken India Movement** have issued a **Letter of Liability for School Principals, Administrators** and other Authorities, forcing children to take experimental corona vaccines and thereby putting their life in danger.

32. The **Indian Bar Association** has also issued a document duly signed by Adv. Dipali Ojha clearly outlining the scientific and legal aspects of vaccinating children. This document outlines the law of '**Informed Consent**' and fixes the liability upon school Authority, Principal etc. who are violating the law and forcing the children to take experimental corona vaccines and thereby putting their life in danger.



33. Awaken India Movement (AIM) has sent details of Covid Vaccine deaths covered by media/social media in India as on 04.02.2022 to various high authorities of our country.

Vaccine Deaths in India covered by the Media! File updated till Victim #12586

https://drive.google.com/file/d/1uikc1a6_KDzUx7HNLrfwaI1NJRt0D_YP/view?usp=sharing



CHILDREN Vaccine Deaths in India covered by the Media! File updated till Victim #20

<https://docs.google.com/document/d/1LZJDp-ub6BfVt-nnc8daISgemhkRieQG/edit?usp=sharing&oid=103856627695944525595&rtpof=true&sd=true>



34. The Indian Council for Medical Research ICMR in its **Advisory on Purposive Testing Strategy for COVID-19 in India** (Version VII, dated 10th January 2022) has stated on who should not be tested:

“People who need not be tested:

1. Asymptomatic individuals in community settings



2. *Contacts of confirmed cases of COVID-19 unless identified as high risk based on age or co-morbidities*
3. *Patients who stand discharged as per home isolation guidelines*
4. *Patients being discharged from a COVID-19 facility as per revised discharge policy*
5. *Individuals undertaking inter-state domestic travel”*

Hence using force or coercion to perform RTPCR test on healthy individuals against their consent would be violation of their fundamental rights.

35. **Any person affected by lockdown and other restrictions can file for compensation U/Sec. 2 OF EPIDEMIC DISEASES ACT, 1897 AND Sec. 12 OF DISASTER MANAGEMENT ACT, 2005, for losses caused to him/her.**

36. In the light of above developments we consider it our solemn duty to inform fellow citizens about their rights and about ongoing developments which affect the life and liberty of common citizens. Our intentions are fortified by S.N. Dhingra J. in case of **Aniruddha Bahal vs State 2010 (119) DRJ 102** which states as follows:

“Duty of a citizen under Article 51A(h) is to develop a spirit of inquiry and reforms. It is fundamental right of citizens of this country to have a clean & incorruptible judiciary, legislature, executive and other organs and in order to achieve this fundamental right every citizen has a corresponding duty to expose corruption wherever he finds. Constitution of India mandates citizens to act as agent provocateurs to bring out and expose and uproot the corruption”.



Further Supreme Court in **Indirect Tax Practitioners Association vs Jain (2010) 8 SCC 281**, it is ruled as under;

*“TRUTH should not be allowed to be silenced by using power of Contempt used by unscrupulous petitioners - Exposing corruption in Judiciary is Duty of every citizen as per Art. 51 - A (h) of Constitution of India - **LET TRUTH AND FALSEHOOD GRAPPLE - WHOEVER KNEW TRUTH PUT TO THE WORSE, IN A FREE AND OPEN ENCOUNTER - TRUTH IS STRONG, NEXT TO THE ALMIGHTY; SHE NEEDS NO POLICIES, NO STRATAGEMS, NO LICENSINGS TO MAKE HER VICTORIOUS; THOSE ARE THE SHIFTS AND DEFENCES THAT ERROR MAKES AGAINST HER POWER.**”*

37. To inform citizens about above mentioned facts and developments we would be running information campaigns in **Covid Vaccine Centres**, hospitals, schools, colleges, housing societies, markets and give the above information in the areas of **Mumbai and Mumbai Suburban**.

This is our notice to you to participate in the information campaign and/or provide us security lest anyone try to obstruct us.

Yours Sincerely
Awaken India Movement Team