

Petition to the Working Group of Arbitrary Detention

I. IDENTITY

1. Family Name: Satyam Verma
2. First Name:
3. Sex: Male
4. Birth Date or age (At the time of Detention): 65 years
5. Nationality: Indian
6. Identity document:
Issued by:
Issued date:
No:
7. Profession and/or activity if believed to be relevant to the arrest/detention): Satyam Verma is a renowned journalist, and he has worked at UNivarta for several years. He is the editor of the landmark work "Bhagat Singh aur Unke Saathiyon ke Sampurna Uplabdh Dastavez" (The Complete Available Works of Bhagat Singh and his Comrades). He has translated classic works like Balzac and Upton Sinclair's novels. Satyam translated Romila Thapar's book Somnath into Hindi. Satyam has expressed his solidarity on social media for the Noida workers' protest.
8. Address of usual residence: Lucknow, Uttar Pradesh

II. Arrest

1. Date of Arrest: 17.04.2026
2. Place of Arrest: Satyam Verma was arrested by the Uttar Pradesh Special Task Force official from Janchetna Bookstate in Nirala Nagar, Lucknow
3. Arrested by: Uttar Pradesh Special Task Force Police.

- | | | |
|----|--|--|
| 4. | Did they show a warrant or other decision by a public authority? | No |
| 5. | Authority who issued the warrant or decision: | He was arrested without executing arrest warrant. |
| 6. | Reasons for arrest: | Alleged involvement in a crime, registered in First Information Report (FIR) No. 162/2026, registered on 12.04.2026 at Phase II Police Station. Under Sections 191 (1), (2), 115 (2), 121 (1), 125 (a), 351 (3), 352 of BNS, 2024 and Section 7 of Criminal Law (Amendment) Act, 1932. |
| 7. | Legal basis of arrest, including legislation applied: | |

III. Detention

- | | | |
|----|---|--|
| 1. | Date of detention: | 17.04.2026 |
| 2. | Duration of detention (if not known, probable duration): | From 3.30 PM of 17.04.2026 to till today |
| 3. | Forces holding the detainee under custody: | Prison officials of Luksar Jail, Kasna, Uttar Pradesh |
| 4. | Places of detention (indicate any transfer and present place of detention): | After arrest, Satyam was produced before the ACJM-III, Gautam Buddha Nagar for remand in FIR 163 of 2026 and remanded him to police custody from 19 April 2026 to 21 April 2026. Then he was remanded to the Judicial Custody at Luksar Jail, Uttar Pradesh. |
| 5. | Authorities that ordered the detention: | Additional Chief Judicial Magistrate-III, Gautam Buddha Nagar |
| 6. | Reasons for the detention imputed by the authorities: | Alleged involvement in a crime, registered in FIR No. 162/2026, registered on 12.04.2026 at Phase II Police Station. |
| 7. | Legal basis for the detention, including relevant | Satyam was arrested for allegedly being involved in a crime registered in Crime No. 163 of 2026 under section 191 (1), (2), 115 (2), 121 (1), 125 (a), 351 (3), |

legislation applied (if known):

352 of BNS, 2024 and Section 7 of Criminal Law (Amendment) Act, 1932.

IV. Describe the circumstances of the arrest.

Workers in Delhi NCR launched spontaneous strikes and protests in the first two weeks of April, raising demands for better wages, compliance of rules, better working conditions. After the successful strike by workers in Gurgaon, Haryana, the workers in Gautam Buddha Nagar, Noida, also launched a strike commencing from 9 April 2026 with the participation of thousands of textile and automobile workers. They were demanding the Government of Uttar Pradesh for revision of minimum wages.

On April 10, 2026, the strike which has initially started by the workers of Richa Global Export Company in Phase II, Gautam Buddha Nagar (Nodia) has intensified, workers from Samvardhana Motherson International Ltd., Paramount Products Pvt. Ltd., Anubhav Apparels and other multiple factories in Phase II joined the strike.

On April 11, 2026, the strike continued to prolong, and workers protested from Sectors 82 to 84. Workers from Motherson Sumi Systems and Minda Sai Ltd joined the protest, which led to a road blockade near NSEZ metro station. At 3 PM, Adithya Anand and Rupesh Roy had administered a pledge to the workers that they will continue the peaceful protest.

On April 12, 2026 an FIR in Crime No 163 of 2026 has been registered against Rupesh Roy, Manisha Chaudhary, Aditya Anand, Aakriti, Srishti, and several other workers have instigated a large group of workers. The FIR was registered under section 191 (1), (2), 115 (2), 121 (1), 125 (a), 351 (3), 352 of BNS, 2024 and Section 7 of Criminal Law (Amendment) Act, 1932 basing on the complaint given by Yogesh Kumar before Phase II police station.

On April 13, 2026 around 2000 workers participated in the strike and the police restored to lathi charge and used tear gas shells to disperse the protestors.

On April 14, 2026 an FIR in Crime No. 164 of 2026 under section 191 (1), 191 (2), 115 (2), 127 (2), 333, 324 (2), 352 of BNS, 2023, Section 7 of Criminal Law (Amendment) Act, 1932, Section 3 and 4 of Prevention of Damage to Public Property Act, 1984 by the Phase II police station basing on the complaint given by Rajesh Kumar stating that on April 13, 2026 around 2000 workers gathered within the premises of the

Samvardhan MotherSon International Limited company and when the security persons tried to disperse them they damaged the property of the company.

On April 15, 2026 an FIR in Crime No. 165 of 2026 under section 191 (1), 191 (2), 115 (2), 127 (2), 333, 324 (2), 352 of BNS, 2023, Section 7 of Criminal Law (Amendment) Act, 2932, Section 3 and 4 of Prevention of Damage to Public Property Act, 1984 by the Phase II police station basing on the complaint given by Sub Inspector Dharendra Singh. The FIR states that police force was deployed in Section 84 for maintaining peace and order. When the police force reached MotherSon Company in Section 84, they were confronted with 500 protestors who were blocking the road and the front gate of the company. The complaint allege that protestors engaged in severe arson and vandalism, completely burning or severely damaging multiple police and private vehicles, including a Tata Nexon (belonging to SI Sushil Sharma), Honda Elevate (Insp. Ranjeet Kumar Singh), Bolero Camper (Const. Kapil Singh), Mahindra Bolero PCR-51, Maruti Swift (HC Gudhal), a Scooty (Woman SI Naini), Tata Altroz (SI Lokendra Singh), two Scorpio PRVs, two PAC Tata trucks, and a Honda motorcycle. They also damaged civilian vehicles owned by Vivek Sharma, Akhil Kumar Rawat, Navneet Upadhyay, Manoj Kumar, and Bakul Pant. Furthermore, the mob vandalized the gates and infrastructure of twelve commercial establishments, specifically Vinay Boxes, Leiner Shoes, Motherson, Heera Sweets, Califonix Tech, Dixon Electro Appliances, Subros Ltd, R.M.X Joss Fashions, S.M.S Exports, Highwaymen Pvt Ltd, Rexam Dixon Electronics, and Nikunj Textiles. During these attacks, four police personnel sustained injuries: Recruit Constable Praveen Kumar, SI Sunil Sharma, Driver Constable Kapil Singh, and the complainant, SI Dharendra Singh.

On April 17, 2026 at 03.30 PM, the Uttar Pradesh Special Task Force Police has forcibly entered Janchetna Bookstate in Nirala Nagar, Lucknow where they detained Satyam Verma and searched the premises of the book store, then at 11.00 PM the police went to the residence of Satyam Verma and searched his residence and seized his notebooks and diaries.

On April 19, 2026 Satyam Verma was produced before the ACJM-III, Gautam Buddha Nagar for remand in FIR 163 of 2026 and remanded him to police custody from 19 April 2026 to 21 April 2026.

On May 8, 2026, the Supreme Court of India in Writ Petition (Criminal) No. 174 of 2026 filed by Keshaw Anand brother of Aditya Anand, regarding the custodial violence of Aditya Anand and Satyam Verma. The Supreme Court has issued a notice to the Uttar Pradesh Police and Union of India and posted for hearing on 15 May 2026.

On May 12, 2026, Satyam Verma has been taken into preventive custody under the National Security Act (NSA).

V. Indicate reasons why you consider the arrest and/or detention to be arbitrary. Specifically, provide details on whether:

- (i) The basis for the deprivation of liberty is authorized by the Constitution or the domestic law?**
- (ii) The reason the individual has been deprived of liberty is a result of the exercise of his or her rights or freedoms guaranteed by articles 7, 13, 14, 18, 19, 20 and 21 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and, insofar as States parties are concerned, by articles 12, 18, 19, 21, 22, 25, 26 and 27 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights?**
- (iii) The international norms relating the right to a fair trial have been totally or partially observed, specifically, articles 9 and 10 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and, insofar as States parties are concerned, by articles 9 and 14 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights?**
- (iv) In the case of an asylum seeker, migrant or refugee who has been subjected to prolonged administrative custody, if he or she has been guaranteed the possibility of administrative or judicial review or remedy?**
- (v) The individual has been deprived of his or her liberty for reasons of discrimination based on birth; national, ethnic or social origin; language; religion; economic condition; political or other opinion; gender; sexual orientation; or disability or other status which aims towards or can result in ignoring the equality of human rights?**

Satyam has been arrested on 17 April 2026 and subsequently remanded by the Judicial Magistrate to police custody without following the due process of Arrested under the BNSS 2023.

Satyam has been implicated in the cases registered in Crime No. 162, 163 and 164 of 2026 which were registered against protestors. He has been targeted by the Uttar Pradesh Special Task Force police for expressing solidarity with the protestors on facebook.

Satyam has been targeted due to his activism, for gathering labours for protesting for their rights. The police registered a case based on fabricated charges and arrested him without following the due process of arrest. The acts of police officials to arrest Satyam without following due process is an act of reprisal against the activism of human rights defender.

VI. Indicate internal steps, including domestic remedies, taken especially with the legal and administrative authorities, particularly for the purpose of establishing the detention and, as appropriate, their results or the reasons why such steps or remedies were ineffective or why they were not taken.

On April 23, 2026 Navreen Sabba and others has addressed a complaint to NHRC regarding illegal detention of HRDs, the complaint has been registered in NHRC Diary No. 46017/CR/2026. On May 12, 2026 the complaint has been registered in NHRC case no. 4844/24/30/2026.

On May 8, 2026 the brother of Aditya, Mr. Keshaw Anand approached the Supreme Court of India in Writ Petition (Criminal) No. 174 of 2026. The case is admitted and notice has been issued to the government to submit its response. The case is posted on 15 May 2026.

VII. Full name, postal and electronic addresses of the person(s) submitting the information (telephone and fax number, if possible).

Henri Tiphagne, Executive Director, People's Watch,
Address: 32, Besant Road, Chinna Chokkikulam, Madurai, Tamil Nadu.
Postal Code: 625 002.
Phone No: 9894025859
Email: henri@pwtn.org
Date: May 14, 2026

Signature: 

Enclosures:

A. Consent Form.

1. FIR in Crime No. 163 of 2026
2. FIR in Crime No. 164 of 2026
3. FIR in Crime No. 165 of 2026
4. NHRC complaint dated 23 April 2026.
5. Order of Madurai Bench of Madras High Court in HCP(MD)No.566 of 2026 dated 27.04.2026
6. Remand Order of Adithya Anand dated 30.04.2026
7. The ROP of Supreme Court in W.P (Crl) No. 174 of 2026 dated 08.05.2026.

ANNEXURE

Relevant Laws

1. Provisions of BNS, 2023

191. (1) Whenever force or violence is used by an unlawful assembly, or by any member thereof, in prosecution of the common object of such assembly, every member of such assembly is guilty of the offence of rioting.

191 (2) Whoever is guilty of rioting, shall be punished with imprisonment of either description for a term which may extend to two years, or with fine, or with both.

115. (1) Whoever does any act with the intention of thereby causing hurt to any person, or with the knowledge that he is likely thereby to cause hurt to any person, and does thereby cause hurt to any person, is said “voluntarily to cause hurt”.

115 (2) Whoever, except in the case provided for by sub-section (1) of section 122 voluntarily causes hurt, shall be punished with imprisonment of either description for a term which may extend to one year, or with fine which may extend to ten thousand rupees, or with both.

121. (1) Whoever voluntarily causes hurt to any person being a public servant in the discharge of his duty as such public servant, or with intent to prevent or deter that person or any other public servant from discharging his duty as such public servant or in consequence of anything done or attempted to be done by that person in the lawful discharge of his duty as such public servant, shall be punished with imprisonment of either description for a term which may extend to five years, or with fine, or with both.

121 (2) Whoever voluntarily causes grievous hurt to any person being a public servant in the discharge of his duty as such public servant, or with intent to prevent or deter that person or any other public servant from discharging his duty as such public servant or in consequence of anything done or attempted to be done by that person in the lawful discharge of his duty as such public servant, shall be punished with imprisonment of either description for a term which shall not be less than one year but which may extend to ten years, and shall also be liable to fine.

351. (1) Whoever threatens another by any means, with any injury to his person, reputation or property, or to the person or reputation of any one in whom that person is interested, with intent to cause alarm to that person, or to cause that person to do any act which he is not legally bound to do, or to omit to do

any act which that person is legally entitled to do, as the means of avoiding the execution of such threat, commits criminal intimidation.

352. Whoever intentionally insults in any manner, and thereby gives provocation to any person, intending or knowing it to be likely that such provocation will cause him to break the public peace, or to commit any other offence, shall be punished with imprisonment of either description for a term which may extend to two years, or with fine, or with both.

2. Section 7 of Criminal Law (Amendment) Act, 1932

7. Molesting a person to prejudice of employment or business.—(1) Whoever—

(a) with intent to cause any person to abstain from doing or to do any act which such person has a right to do or to abstain from doing, obstructs or uses violence to or intimidates such person or any member of his family or person in his employ, or loiters at or near a place where such person or member or employed person resides or works or carries on business or happens to be, or persistently follows him from place to place, or interferes with any property owned or used by him or deprives him of or hinders him in the use thereof, or

(b) loiters or does any similar act at or near the place where a person carries on business, in such a way and with intent that any person may thereby be deterred from entering or approaching or dealing at such place, shall be punished with imprisonment for a term which may extend to six months, or with fine which may extend to five hundred rupees, or with both