

THE N. NATARAJAN CHARITABLE TRUST
(A Public Charitable Trust)

29/08/2025

MOOT CLARIFICATIONS

- 1. Did the Trial Court convict Aaron on all the charges mentioned in the chargesheet, or only on specific charges? If the latter, which charges were affirmed?**
 - A. Aaron was convicted under all the charged sections mentioned in Para 14 of the Moot Proposition.
- 2. Was the petition filed under Section 245 BNSS decided by the High Court, and on what grounds was it filed?**
 - A. Yes. It was filed before the High Court. No further clarification is required.
- 3. As mentioned in paragraph 8(a), were any of the members of the criminal syndicate previously charged for any offence, and did the court take cognizance of the same?**
 - A. Regarding members of the criminal syndicate, no criminal records are available in Tagaland's police records. However, they have been accused of offences in other states in Indica which are pending trial.
- 4. What was the total amount of money taken out of the Pensioners' Account by Aaron and his syndicate?**
 - A. Rs.76.50 crores.
- 5. At present, who has possession of the funds withdrawn by the money mules under Aaron's direction?**
 - A. No clarification required.
- 6. Has Aaron or any of the members of the syndicate utilised the stolen money?**
 - A. Yes.
- 7. Were there any previous charge sheets filed against Aaron, and did the court take cognizance of the same?**
 - A. None.
- 8. In paragraph 5, it is stated that third parties were allowed access to data under the guise of "Technical Consultancy". Who**

1K Gaiety Palace, 1st Floor, Blackers Road, Chennai 600 002
thennatarajancharitabletrust@gmail.com
www.thennatarajancharitabletrust.com

THE N. NATARAJAN CHARITABLE TRUST
(A Public Charitable Trust)

were these third parties, and on what specific date were they allowed access to?

A. Paragraph 5 is self-explanatory.

9. What was the exact confession provided by Aaron during police interrogation?

A. No clarification required.

10. Were there any previous charge sheets filed against the money mules, and did the court take cognizance of the same?

A. No criminal records are available in Tagaland's police records. However, they have been accused of offences in other states in India which are pending trial.

11. Whether Aaron was part of the "Private AI Developers" mentioned in paragraph 3, who were empanelled with the Tagaland Tech Vision Framework 2023?

A. No clarification required.

12. Was the automated decision-making system mentioned in paragraph 15, powered by Artificial Intelligence?

A. Yes. Artificial Intelligence was used only for random number generation.

13. Was the appeal made by way of an SLP under Article 136 of the Constitution?

A. Yes.

14. Is the statement provided under Paragraph 11 a part of Aaron's confession?

A. No clarification required.

15. On what exact date was Aaron arrested by the investigating authorities?

A. No clarification required.

THE N. NATARAJAN CHARITABLE TRUST
(A Public Charitable Trust)

16. On what exact date was the search and seizure operation conducted at Aaron's residence/workplace?

A. No clarification required.

17. Was the search of Aaron's premises and his subsequent arrest carried out in compliance with the procedure established by law, and was a valid warrant issued for the same?

A. No clarification required. Procedural compliance/non-compliance is one of the points of contest.

18. Were the search and seizure proceedings of Aaron's articles recorded on camera?

A. Yes.

19. Was any NDA or any agreement executed between TTPL and Aaron?

A. Letter of Internship and Non-Disclosure Agreement were entered into.

20. Had Aaron's professor been informed about the project that he was working on prior to the alleged incident?

A. No clarification required.

21. In Paragraph 15 of the proposition, whose chat logs were recovered, and do they pertain directly to Aaron?

A. The chat logs includes chat logs of Aaron, among others.

22. In Paragraph 27, what is the status of the petition filed under Section 245 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973?

A. No order has been passed in the petition under Section 245 BNSS.

23. Who was responsible for training, monitoring, and validating the AI system, the State or a private contractor?

A. No clarification required.

24. There is a contradiction in Paragraph 4 (j) and Paragraph 10 regarding presence of mahazar witnesses.

THE N. NATARAJAN CHARITABLE TRUST
(A Public Charitable Trust)

A. There is no contradiction.

25. Paragraph 28 refers to opinion of one Judge. The opinion of the other Judge is missing.

A. No clarification required.

26. Whether State of Tagaland is in pari materia with legislation of state of Tamil Nadu.

A. Yes.

27. Is there any official record or acknowledgment of the undated letter allegedly sent by Aaron to the Cyber Security Cell, or is it only produced by the defense at trial ?

A. Defense document.

28. Was the mandatory certificate under Section 63 of the Bharatiya Sakshya Adhiniyam formally filed by an authorized officer and was it verified by expert ?

A. Certificate under Section 63 BSA was filed by the Investigating Officer and no Expert was notified as on the date of its marking.

29. Was Trio Technologies Pvt. Ltd. (TTPL) formally implicated as an accused in connection with the fraud?

A. No.

30. There appears to be a notable discrepancy in the numbers relating to the pensioner population mentioned in Para 1 and Para 2. Could the committee clarify the reason for this significant discrepancy in the total number of pensioners mentioned in Para 1 and Para 2?

A. The statistics given are as on the date of the moot proposition. There are several applications pending verification and to be updated in the database and there are also persons whose rights are subject matter of pending proceedings before Courts.

31. Should it be presumed that approximately 4.62 lakh have not yet generated or uploaded their life certificates and not completed their digital onboarding?

A. Please see response to Cl.30.

1K Gaiety Palace, 1st Floor, Blackers Road, Chennai 600 002
thennatarajancharitabletrust@gmail.com
www.thennatarajancharitabletrust.com

THE N. NATARAJAN CHARITABLE TRUST
(A Public Charitable Trust)

32. Were the individuals who reported the scam predominantly among this group?

A. The Individuals who reported the scam were registered.

33. Considering that bank debit SMS typically specify each transaction and its amount, please clarify whether Mr. Rajesh received a single SMS summarizing multiple transactions, or multiple SMS messages, each for a specific transaction and its corresponding amount?

A. No clarification needed.

34. What kind of investigation was conducted (e.g., forensic, cyber-surveillance, traditional police inquiry), and who were investigated to arrive at these conclusions?

A. No clarification needed.

35. What conclusive proofs or evidence were available and submitted to substantiate these investigation revelations? Are these revelations solely based on reports from the CCW, or were other forms of evidence (e.g., forensic reports, witness statements, confessions) used?

A. No clarification needed.

36. How did the CCW arrive at the conclusion the syndicate was led by Aaron, and what specific proof or evidence exists to establish Aaron's leadership of this "criminal syndicate"? Was there any further specificity about the syndicate's structure or members beyond Aaron?

A. Based on evidence found from the hard drives seized from Aaron's residence.

37. The proposition mentions that "Five money mules were apprehended from different locations" and were charged under Section 317 read with 61 of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023. On what specific basis were these money mules arrested?

A. Based on confession statements, money trail, bank statements and information retrieved from gadgets seized during investigation.

38. What was the nature of Aaron's association with these money mules? Were any statements recorded from the arrested money

THE N. NATARAJAN CHARITABLE TRUST
(A Public Charitable Trust)

mules during the investigation, and if so, what was their content? If not, why were no statements mentioned?

A. No clarification required.

39. What was Aaron's stand or testimony regarding these arrested money mules during his interrogation or trial?

A. No clarification required.

40. From where were these "old photographs" for AI comparison sourced? Were they primarily uploaded by the pensioners themselves, retrieved from existing government databases, or obtained through other specified means?

A. No clarification required.

41. Clarify the specific scope and nature of the third-party access permitted under the 'Pension Pay' portal's privacy policy? Were the "private AI developers empanelled with the Tagaland Tech Vision Framework, 2023" considered among these third parties, and what level of access were they granted?

A. No clarification required.

42. Could the committee provide details regarding the specific encryption standards or methods employed by the official 'Pension Pay' portal for storing sensitive data such as Aadhaar information and voice data?

A. No clarification required.

43. What specific "illegal means" were identified and proven for obtaining the database of government employees' personal and family details? On what basis was it concluded that this data was exclusively obtained through illegal means?

A. No clarification required.

44. What was the basis for identifying the network involved in the communication logs as an "international cybercriminal network"? What evidence supported this classification?

A. No clarification required.

45. Elaborate on the precise nature of the "insider knowledge" Aaron possessed regarding the Pension Pay system's

THE N. NATARAJAN CHARITABLE TRUST
(A Public Charitable Trust)

vulnerabilities and how he acquired it? Was this knowledge exclusively derived from his internship at TTPL, or were other sources or methods involved?

A. No clarification required.

46. What specific types of "pension data" were categorized as "publicly available" on government websites and social media platforms, as collected by the syndicate? Did this "publicly available" data include sensitive personal information that would typically not be considered public?

A. No clarification required.

47. Provide more specific details about the "automated results derived by decision making systems of the CCW" that were used as evidence? What kind of system is it (e.g., a specific software, platform, or methodology), and were its results AI-powered? What were the processes by which these results were generated and validated for evidentiary purposes?

A. No clarification required.

48. Specify which of the two seizures (from the TTPL co-working space or from Aaron's residence) contained the device with the hash value discrepancy? Was any explanation or evidence presented during the investigation or trial by the prosecution or forensic analysts to account for this one-character difference?

A. No clarification required.

49. What is the specific meaning of an "undated letter" in this context? Was it a letter that was drafted or typed but was never actually sent to the concerned department? If the letter was indeed unsent, how could Aaron credibly claim to have "received no response to his vulnerability disclosure attempt"?

A. It was a typed letter, with no date. No further clarification is required.

50. What were the specific grounds or evidence presented by the prosecution to contest the authenticity of this undated letter, arguing it was created post-facto to construct a defense narrative? Was any forensic analysis conducted on the letter itself?

THE N. NATARAJAN CHARITABLE TRUST
(A Public Charitable Trust)

A. No clarification required.

51. Elaborate on the specific “different/independent grounds” relied upon by each of the two Learned Judges of the Division Bench in confirming Aaron's conviction?

A. No clarification required.

52. Whether a certificate of fitness was obtained from the High Court before Aaron appealed to the Hon'ble Supreme Court?

A. No certificate was requested from the High Court on the date of pronouncement of judgment.

53. Is the violation of fundamental rights under Article 21 taken only as a ground for appeal within the existing case, or was a separate writ petition filed before the Supreme Court for this specific violation?

A. Article 21 was raised as a ground in the appeal before the High Court. No separate writ petition was filed.

THE N. NATARAJAN CHARITABLE TRUST
(A Public Charitable Trust)

Other Clarifications :

Accommodation & Participation Guidelines

1. Eligibility for Accommodation

- i) Accommodation will be provided **only to student participants from outside Chennai.**
- ii) Colleges located within Chennai will **not** be provided with accommodation.

2. Room Allocation

- i) Each team will be allotted **one (1) room only.**
- ii) If participants wish to stay separately, the **additional expenses shall be borne by the participants themselves.**

3. Accompanying Persons

- i) Accommodation will **not** be provided to accompanying parents, guardians, or faculty members.

4. Duration of Stay

- i) Accommodation will be available **from 7:00 A.M. on 19th September 2025 to 8:00 A.M. on 21st September 2025** only.

5. Expenses

- i) The organisers will bear the **room charges only.**
- ii) Any additional services (such as room service, laundry, etc.) availed by participants shall be paid directly by the concerned individual.

6. Code of Conduct

- i) The use of alcohol, drugs, or any prohibited substances during the stay is **strictly forbidden.**
- ii) Any team found violating this rule shall be **immediately disqualified** from the competition.

7. Transportation

1K Gaiety Palace, 1st Floor, Blackers Road, Chennai 600 002
thennatarajancharitabletrust@gmail.com
www.thennatarajancharitabletrust.com

THE N. NATARAJAN CHARITABLE TRUST
(A Public Charitable Trust)

- i) A van facility will be arranged for commuting **between the place of stay and the High Court premises.**
- ii) Participants must make their own arrangements to reach the designated accommodation, the details of which will be intimated closer to the competition.

8. Inaugural Ceremony

- i) The Inaugural Ceremony is scheduled for **9:15 A.M. on 19th September 2025** at the High Court of Madras.
- ii) All participants are required to be seated by **9:00 A.M. sharp.**
- iii) Teams are advised to plan their travel accordingly.

9. Van Timings

- i) The van facility will operate at **fixed time slots only.**
- ii) The detailed schedule will be communicated closer to the competition.

10. Competition Schedule

- i) The competition will formally **conclude by 3:00 P.M. on 21st September 2025.**
- ii) Teams are advised to make their travel arrangements keeping this in mind.

11. Communication Details

- i) Each team is requested to provide **one dedicated email ID and WhatsApp number** for official communication.
- ii) The communication details should include the **name of the student contact and the name of the college.**

12. Memorandum Submission

1K Gaiety Palace, 1st Floor, Blackers Road, Chennai 600 002
thennatarajancharitabletrust@gmail.com
www.thennatarajancharitabletrust.com

THE N. NATARAJAN CHARITABLE TRUST
(A Public Charitable Trust)

- i) Based on multiple requests, the deadline for submission of the **soft copies** of the Memorials via email has been **extended to 11th September 2025**.
- ii) The **hard copies** of the Memorials must be **received by 15th September 2025** as per schedule.
- iii) Any delay in submission beyond the stipulated dates shall attract a **penalty** as per the competition rules.