

EVIDENCE AGAINST THE MODI ADMINISTRATION

(COMMUNALISM COMBAT JULY AUGUST 2007)

Truth in the Sreekumar Affidavits

Role of state intelligence

The four affidavits filed by RB Sreekumar before the Nanavati-Shah Commission between 2002 and 2005 record startling details of sheer brazenness and collusion. The first affidavit, filed in July 2002, documents the assiduous attempts by the state intelligence bureau (SIB) to warn of the consequences of the rabid communal mobilisation undertaken by cadres of the BJP, RSS, VHP and Bajrang Dal on their way to Ayodhya. Sreekumar has stated that the SIB issued regular warnings about the likely threats to public peace that could be expected because of unruly mobilisation by communal outfits. It was the executive wing of the police – influenced no doubt by Modi, key cabinet colleagues and the top echelons of the Indian Administrative Service (IAS), including the chief secretary, G. Subbarao, and the principal secretary to the chief minister, PK Mishra – who simply did not translate these into strict directives for preventive action. The then DGP, K. Chakravarti issued no special instructions for the maintenance of law and order and no strict instructions on how mobs should be dealt with.

The affidavit also records a significant aspect of the post-Godhra genocidal violence in Ahmedabad, one of the areas worst affected by the violence. The attacks in Ahmedabad did not take place in communally sensitive areas and ghettos but in areas where minority communities live(d) in isolation surrounded by Hindus.

In para 17 of his first affidavit, Sreekumar states that as far back as February 13, 2002, in response to a message received from the inspector general (IG) (CI) of the UP intelligence department in Lucknow, the SIB in Gujarat requested the superintendents of police from all districts and commissioners of police from all cities and towns in Gujarat to: “inform the SP, Faizabad, about the movement of *kar sevaks* from their respective jurisdictions. Following this missive (the) SP, Western Railways, Baroda had informed (the) IGP (communal intelligence), UP, Lucknow, through his fax message...dated February 16, 2002 that Prahlad J. Patel, president of Bajrang Dal, Mehsana, would be leading a group of 150-200 Bajrang Dal activists of Mehsana for the Ayodhya Maha Yagna by 9165 DN Sabarmati Express on February 22, 2002. It was also mentioned in the said fax message that the Bajrang Dal activists travelling to Ayodhya would be carrying *trishuls* with them. Similarly, SP, Mehsana, also sent a...message to IGP (communal

intelligence), intelligence department, Lucknow, UP...dated February 19, 2002, stating, among other things, that a group of 150 Ram *bhakt*s armed with *trishuls* would be leaving Ahmedabad by train for Ayodhya on February 22, 2002 under the leadership of Prahlad Jayantibhai Patel, president, Bajrang Dal, Mehsana and would be arriving at Ayodhya on February 24, 2002.”

It was some of these *kar sevaks* who, on their return journey from Ayodhya, became victims of the Godhra arson incident on February 27, 2002, and this has also been mentioned in the affidavit.

Failure of central intelligence

Sreekumar’s first affidavit also records the utter failure of both the UP state intelligence department and the central intelligence bureau (IB) to forewarn local authorities about the *kar sevaks*’ movements. In para 18, Sreekumar states that: “It is pertinent to note that there was no intimation from (the) intelligence branch of UP police or central Intelligence Bureau, which has an extensive nationwide network to collect intelligence on developments relevant to internal security, about the return journey of these *ram sevaks* who had gone to Ayodhya.” (It is perhaps significant to note that during this period, while the BJP-led NDA coalition ruled at the Centre, in UP it was Rajnath Singh’s BJP government that was in power until March 8, 2002, following which president’s rule was imposed in the state.)

There was also no information from the central IB or any inputs from any other agency about the possible attack on Ram *sevaks* returning from Ayodhya by fundamentalist and militant elements among the minority community or other antisocial elements. Worse, in para 19, Sreekumar records that the UP police did not inform the Gujarat state intelligence department or the police about the unruly behaviour of Ram *sevaks* on their return journey even though there had been an altercation between some Ram *sevaks* and Muslims when the latter tried to board the train at Rudauli railway station in UP at around 9 a.m. on February 24, 2002. A note dated February 27, 2002, addressed to all DGPs of the country from the IG, intelligence department, UP, about the return journey of *ram sevaks*, was received a day later, post facto, at 8.15 a.m. on February 28 – that is, *after* the arson incident on the Sabarmati Express took place.

In this connection, Sreekumar states that: "Though there were intelligence inputs pertaining to the movements of *kar sevaks* to Ayodhya from Gujarat state, there was no specific information about the return of *kar sevaks* from Ayodhya, from (the) UP police or central intelligence bureau, which has the onerous responsibility of timely forewarning the law enforcement officers in the state about nationwide or interstate emerging trends so that suitable precautionary countermeasures can be taken. The only message about the return of *kar sevaks* sent by the Uttar Pradesh police was received (by the) Gujarat police only on February 28 i.e. after

the incident on February 27, 2002. No intelligence input either from the government railway police (GRP), the Godhra district LIB or central intelligence was available about the possibility of any conspiracy or planning by Muslim militants or any antisocial elements to attack or cause harm to the Ram *bhakt*s returning from Ayodhya. The only intelligence received from the GRP indicated that the Ram *bhakt*s, led by Prahlad J. Patel, president of Bajrang Dal, Mehsana, (were) to start from Ayodhya on February 26, 2002 at night and return to Ahmedabad on February 28, 2002.”

Maintenance of internal security is a fundamental if unwritten component of the central intelligence bureau’s charter of duties. And this is precisely what the central IB so singularly failed to do. In not providing advance preventive intelligence with regard to the Godhra incident and its aftermath, the bureau compromised internal security and put thousands of people in mortal danger.

Standard IB practice and procedure requires that whenever there are nationwide activities involving large numbers of organised groups, such as the communal mobilisation of *kar sevaks*, IB agents travel with these contingents. Through the detailed analysis provided in RB Sreekumar’s first affidavit it appears that this procedure was not followed in the case of *kar sevaks* travelling from Gujarat to Ayodhya in February 2002. If this procedure had been followed, the Gujarat police and intelligence network would have been alerted to the belligerent behaviour of the *kar sevaks*, their altercation with vendors and others at railway stations, their return to Gujarat a day earlier than scheduled and other related information. Sreekumar’s affidavit states that the central IB did not provide such intelligence to the local police. This ruled out any likelihood of the Gujarat police arranging effective police deployment at railway stations on the *kar sevaks*’ route.

However, given the communal mobilisation that had been under way from early February 2002, the absence of any deployment of army or paramilitary forces in Godhra, a communally sensitive spot, was conspicuous and even suspicious. This is a task that rests with the state’s home ministry.

Sreekumar’s first affidavit also reveals that the SIB had alerted all police commissioners and SPs in all districts of Gujarat to take precautionary steps to prevent likely communal clashes in their jurisdictions. In effect it was the perverse will of the chief minister, imposed through a supine bureaucracy and top police leadership, which disregarded systematic warnings from its own intelligence bureau. The SIB had sent out as many as three separate notes in this regard on February 27, 2002 itself. In addition to these messages, on February 27, specific information was also sent to the CP, Ahmedabad city, about the VHP’s call for a Gujarat *bandh* (on February 28) to protest against the Godhra train burning and a meeting being held by the organisation in that connection at 4 p.m. that afternoon.

The affidavit also records that these warnings continued unheeded. Even after the initial outbreak of genocidal violence, the SIB periodically provided specific data to jurisdictional police, particularly to the CP, Ahmedabad city, where incidents of communal violence persisted. For instance, a written report dated April 15, 2002 was sent to the CP, Ahmedabad, by the ADGP (int.), informing him about the move by extremist and fundamentalist elements among Muslims to resist large-scale house-to-house search operations ("combing") conducted by the police. The same missive also warned of the plan by radical Hindu elements to organise a major assault in Juhapura, a predominantly Muslim colony. In another despatch to the CP, Ahmedabad city, dated April 26, 2002, the SIB provided information on the (1) The plan by Bajrang Dal leaders to distribute lethal weapons (2) The migration of Muslim families from certain areas in Ahmedabad city (3) The plan by Islamic militants from within and outside the country to distribute sophisticated weapons to local Muslim militants.

The central IB unit in Gujarat is called the subsidiary intelligence bureau, Ahmedabad. Strangely, it was Rajendra Kumar, the then joint director, central IB, (subsidiary intelligence bureau, Ahmedabad), who, within hours of the train arson, came out with the theory of an 'ISI conspiracy' behind the Godhra incident. On the afternoon of February 27, 2002 itself, the then DGP, K. Chakravarti, had informed Sreekumar that Rajendra Kumar had advised and even tried to persuade the DGP to pursue investigations into the Godhra incident along those lines.

During the course of that year, in personal conversations with Sreekumar too, Rajendra Kumar repeatedly stressed the urgent need for the Gujarat police to collect evidence that would prove the ISI conspiracy angle. When Sreekumar questioned the basis of the conspiracy theory, Kumar could not provide any sound and acceptable material to substantiate it. Curiously, Kumar did not send any formal reports, from the central IB to the state IB, containing inputs on the genesis, course and perpetration of the ISI conspiracy and the persons involved in it. Senior BJP leaders, supported by bureaucrats like the secretary (law & order), GC Murmu, and officers like Rajendra Kumar, were hell-bent on projecting an unsubstantiated 'ISI conspiracy angle' without furnishing details or proof.

Interestingly, on March 28, 2002, as significant political moves were afoot to project an ISI conspiracy behind the Godhra tragedy, a 'secret' fax message, signed by GK Naicker, section officer, home department, was received from the union home ministry, suggesting "counter-aggression by radical Muslim youth organised by the banned SIMI (Students Islamic Movement of India) in Juhapura" and that the administration was not firmly dealing with these developments.

Significantly, it has also been reliably deduced that the collusion between the central NDA and Modi's government extended to hand-picking key officials for key postings before the carnage. Rajendra Kumar and Narendra Modi were old friends. The two men grew close when Rajendra Kumar, an officer from the Indian Police Service (IPS)'s Manipur Tripura cadre, was posted at the central IB in Chandigarh and Modi, as BJP secretary, was in charge of Punjab, Haryana, Himachal Pradesh and Jammu & Kashmir during the 1990s. Within the Gujarat administration it is widely believed that Rajendra Kumar also played a key role in guiding and even prompting former DCP of the Ahmedabad Crime Branch, DG Vanzara, to organise the 'elimination' of several Muslims from late 2002 onwards. Rajendra Kumar was also instrumental in having many Muslim youth arrested under POTA and instituting cases against them through the Ahmedabad Crime Branch. Some of these cases were discharged by the court for want of evidence before they reached trial.

Although it is the central IB that is responsible for reporting on internal security, Rajendra Kumar, as joint director, central IB, has not filed any affidavits before the Nanavati-Shah Commission. This amounts to a significant abdication of duty. It is especially significant given the fact that the IB has filed affidavits before other commissions investigating other catastrophes in the past, including the assassination of Indira Gandhi, the assassination of Rajiv Gandhi and so on. Not surprisingly, when on September 6, 2005 the Gujarat government served a charge sheet on RB Sreekumar, Rajendra Kumar, who is currently joint director, IB, at the IB headquarters in New Delhi, under the UPA's home ministry, offered to be a witness on behalf of the state government!

RB Sreekumar filed his second affidavit before the commission in October 2004, after the commission's terms of reference had been expanded. This document contains a minefield of information especially with regard to the internal discussions held with KPS Gill, former DGP, Punjab, who was brought in by the NDA regime to 'bring normalcy to Gujarat'. The affidavit records the first meeting with the 'supercop' on May 4, 2002, at which, in keeping with their proclamations to the world, blatant attempts were made by the chief secretary and principal secretary to suggest that 'normalcy' had indeed returned to Gujarat. A few officers present at the meeting, including ADGP Maniram and Sreekumar himself, contradicted this by presenting the true picture. They also offered their suggestions on what could be done to improve the status quo. Among other things, Sreekumar gave Gill a copy of the report on Ahmedabad and other communally sensitive areas that he had prepared. His "Analysis of the Communal Situation" dated April 24, 2002, carried with it an unsigned note containing certain points of action that could be implemented to defuse the communally explosive situation.

The suggestions included: “(1) Restoration of the faith of the public, particularly the minorities, in the criminal justice system (2) Replacement of the present incumbents in executive posts at the cutting edge level from those places where the police did not act conscientiously during the riots (3) Effective action to unearth stock of arms and booking of criminal and communal elements of both majority and minority communities (4) Action through non-political spiritual and religious leaders to de-communalise those under the spell of fundamentalist/extremist sections (5) Action at the social level to bring together both communities by proliferating interaction at various facets (6) Action against radical groups (7) Measures to improve the security ambience in the riot affected areas for facilitating the refugees to go back to their pre-riot residential areas (8) Purposeful legal action against publication and distribution of pamphlets/handbills, etc./reports in the vernacular press, etc. fomenting animosity between different groups on grounds of religion.”

The report also warned that alarming tendencies could grow and flourish (within the minorities) if such measures were not taken.

Unsurprisingly, Chief Minister Modi’s personal intervention after this report was recorded and circulated (on May 7, 2002;) and ‘supercop’ Gill’s succumbing to political pressure (May 8, 2002) thwarted constructive suggestions from policemen like Maniram and Sreekumar. Gill, in fact, even ‘instructed’ policemen not to try and reform politicians.

Sreekumar’s second affidavit records that, at this time, the SIB had also issued detailed communications (through this report) on signs that the Gujarat police should watch out for: i) some information that about a dozen communal elements from the minority community were trying to instigate violence (May 2, 2002); similar attempts were being made by minority communal elements in the Panigate area of Vadodara (May 4, 2002); likelihood of violence in the Dhobhighat area of Ahmedabad (May 5, 2002); Thakor Hindus trying to foment violence in the Ranip area of Ahmedabad city (May 6, 2002); likelihood of communal violence in the Vadaj and Vasna areas of Ahmedabad city (May 7, 2002); certain tribal sections violently instigated to oppose rehabilitation of Muslims in Panwad and Kanwat areas of Chhotaudaipur in Vadodara Rural district (May 7, 2002); plans by extremist Hindu elements to create disturbances in the Paldi Muslim colony and peripheral areas of Ahmedabad city such as Juhapura, Kagadiwad, etc. (May 9, 2002); miscreants moving in specific vehicles with a view to cause explosions in Danilimbda and other areas of Ahmedabad city (May 11, 2002); communal elements trying to violently prevent the rehabilitation of Muslims in Tejgadh and Kadwal areas of Chhotaudaipur in rural Vadodara (May 13, 2002).

It is significant to note that other senior officers of the SIB who met Gill on May 10, 2002 and presented their own assessments of the scenario concurred with the ADGP (int.)'s assessment of the situation in his report of April 24. OP Mathur, IGP (administration & security), E. Radhakrishnaiah, DyIGP (communal branch), Sanjiv Bhatt, SP (security) and RB Sreekumar all attended the meeting. Interestingly, Rajendra Kumar, joint director (central IB), was also present.

The disgraceful saga continues. Through May and June 2002, as head of state intelligence, Sreekumar continued to alert his men to the potential dangers on hand. Following Sreekumar's detailed missives, which included maintaining a strict watch on aggressive Hindu and Muslim communal elements, in June 2002, PS Shah, additional secretary, home department, asked for a report assessing the communal situation in Gujarat. In response to Shah's request, an assessment of the prevailing situation was prepared (on June 15, 2002) in which it was emphasised that the measures suggested in the April 24 communication needed to be implemented so as to achieve total normalcy on the communal front.

Subsequently, following a further request by PS Shah, a review of the law and order situation dated August 20, 2002 was prepared. This report covered aspects regarding the rehabilitation of riot victims wherein it was observed that about 75,500 persons who had migrated from various districts in the state had not returned to their original habitats owing to a feeling of insecurity. Not surprisingly, the additional chief secretary (home), Ashok Narayan, who was clearly a part of Modi's core group, had responded to this report with a report of his own dated September 9, 2002, stating that he did not agree with most aspects of the assessment.

A clash of wills also ensued between Sreekumar and Modi's willing coterie with regard to the implementation of directions by the NHRC as contained in its report of May-July 2002. In its report titled "Run up to the Assembly Poll – Emerging Law and Order Trends" dated August 28, 2002, the SIB, under Sreekumar's jurisdiction, stated that the non-implementation of the NHRC's recommendations was also a key factor responsible for the delay in normalisation of the communal situation. This assessment was based on feedback from riot affected parties. Not content with a mere assessment, Sreekumar's report recommended certain administrative measures. Among these was the suggestion that senior policemen and bureaucrats should issue comprehensive instructions in tune with various police manuals and compilations prepared by former Gujarat policemen. He said that it was time that a brochure on step by step measures to be taken in specific situations was issued by the state of Gujarat, and followed stringently. The brochure should be supported by a detailed drill on actions that need to be taken.

RB Sreekumar's second and third affidavits before the Nanavati-Shah Commission, filed in October 2004 and April 2005 respectively, contained several incriminating facts that exposed the criminal and immoral conduct of the chief minister, Narendra Modi, and some senior officers. However, the Nanavati-Shah Commission has not taken any action on this alarming evidence. The commission did not call Sreekumar for further enquiry, nor did it order/conduct an independent enquiry into the allegations made and the facts revealed in his affidavits. The commission is empowered to summon documents from state government files before it comes to its final conclusions. It can also order investigations. But the commission has been a silent one so far. It has made no demands of the Gujarat government, nor has it called for any important documents relevant to its proceedings.

The behaviour of government advocates is another aspect that warrants attention. The conduct of Arvind Pandya, government counsel before the commission, contravenes the fundamental process of law and far overreaches his duties as an advocate. Pandya's conduct, both inside and outside the commission, raises serious ethical questions. Instead of assisting the commission to arrive at the truth, he has been an active agent in Modi's machinations; he formed part of the trio who, in August 2004, openly tried to intimidate former ADGP, RB Sreekumar, 'not to tell the truth before the commission'. His conduct, however, has not elicited even a mild reprimand from the learned judges.

It was Rahul Sharma and RB Sreekumar who, suo motu, guided by their own conscience, submitted crucial documents and data from state government records. Even the startling revelations contained in these have not moved the Nanavati-Shah Commission to take any action or order any enquiry.

With his third affidavit, Sreekumar encloses more stunning evidence. A tape recorded conversation with Dinesh Kapadia, undersecretary of the Gujarat government, and an equally revelatory set of conversations with GC Murmu (secretary, law & order), both of whom were trying to persuade and then intimidate an honest officer into perjuring himself before a commission of enquiry. These meetings, which took place on August 21 and August 31, 2004, constitute the most blatant attempts by officers of the Gujarat state and even its own lawyer, to subvert the commission by intimidating officers.

At the first meeting Kapadia observed that newspaper reports conveyed the impression that Sreekumar was pro-Muslim and anti-Hindu. Sreekumar replied that he stood for the Indian Constitution and the ideals of citizenship. Kapadia then changes track, accusing him of being biased against the government and the ruling party. Sreekumar replied that it was not a question of community, party, office or regime. As a police officer, he failed to see the difference between majoritarian or

minoritarian communalism. The undersecretary listens to Sreekumar earnestly explaining his position about the hate filled mindset that has resulted in such violence. Kapadia then asks him to 'moderate his position', requesting that 'some circumspection be shown'. He also suggests that Sreekumar be 'totally objective' by 'withholding ideology'. Responding to this, Sreekumar draws a clever comparison between Bhavnagar and Jamnagar, where violence was controlled, and other parts of Gujarat, including Ahmedabad, where it was not.

Kapadia then tries to be more specific, saying that it was Modi, not the Gujarat police, who was the target of criticism everywhere. Kapadia says: "What if...Narendra Modi is removed? This Supreme Court, media, all elements making hue and cry, will become silent." He stresses, "You may place this on record. If Narendra Modi is removed, all these elements, self-proclaimed champions of secularism, will be totally silent. The main target is Modi." Kapadia then goes on to laud Sreekumar's honesty and integrity but suggests that the commission is not the forum for interventions. He further adds that although many police officers were quite critical of the government this had not appeared in public. He states that the then CP, Ahmedabad, PC Pande, was the model of officialdom. Incidentally, Pande told the commission that he did "not recollect, remember and recall many relevant things" pertaining to the time he was commissioner.

After a while Sreekumar becomes quite blunt, stating that his loyalty is only to the Constitution. Kapadia replies that revealing the truth before the commission would be futile: "These commissions are paper tigers." Sreekumar retaliates, saying "Truth is truth". To this, Kapadia, equating Modi to the state, replies, "It is against the public interest."

The subsequent meeting with Murmu was in response to a direct summons. Murmu is accompanied by state government pleader before the commission, Arvind Pandya, who begins the conversation. Pandya remarks that he is surprised by the attention that Sreekumar's affidavits have attracted considering that when the affidavit was first filed in 2002, it was one of 5,000 documents and no one noticed it. Trivialities about Sreekumar's early years in the service are then discussed. Pandya carries on talking, questioning Sreekumar as if he were before Justice Nanavati, cautioning him "not to be very quick or very hasty in answering questions" and instructing him to "stall, and say 'I don't understand the question'." Pandya tries to further the theory of a conspiracy behind the Godhra incident (which Sreekumar has already denied in his affidavits) and basically instructs him to toe the chief minister's line.

As is obvious, Sreekumar does not succumb to these pressures.

He has placed tape recordings and transcripts of both these conversations before the Nanavati-Shah Commission but no action has been taken so far. During his testimony and subsequent cross-examination before the commission, however, crucial questions are not put to him by either the government advocates or those representing victims or NGOs. This was and is a glaring deficiency.

It is in his third affidavit before the commission that Sreekumar places these details on record. The state responds by filing, on September 6, 2005, a set of nine charges against Sreekumar, simultaneously initiating a departmental enquiry against him. The charges for misconduct relate mainly to his depositions before the Nanavati-Shah Commission. These include the fact that he maintained a private diary of official behaviour which he then claimed was an official diary, conduct that is unbecoming of an officer. Second, that he had not obtained permission to do this. Third, that the unofficial diary contained secret information that had been clandestinely released to the press. Finally, the charges allege that Sreekumar had failed to obtain permission to place certain documents before the commission. Sreekumar has challenged this action before the **central administrative tribunal** and arguments by both parties have just concluded.

In his fourth affidavit, Sreekumar replied forcefully to these charges, contending that an officer's loyalty was to the Constitution and not an elected government. He argued that the rule of law encompassed the activities of an elected chief minister. He added that personal whim or party ideology cannot be equated to law. He maintained that the official is not always true, nor always ethical or legal. Therefore, an officer who disobeyed a verbal order which covertly demanded illegal action could well be doing his duty. Sreekumar also held that as a professional, as head of the state intelligence bureau, he was only following the rules of his professional training in prudently and confidentially recording illegal orders for future reference. The message he sends out is a powerful one. Duty must follow the Constitution and basic ethics of equity and non-discrimination. In certain circumstances to dissent or disobey an illegal order may be the ultimate act of duty.

For his foresight and his insight, Sreekumar continues to be hounded even today. After his retirement and his decision to join **Citizens for Justice and Peace (CJP)**, the state government has stepped up its offensive while an old case filed by the VHP has been resurrected for ammunition. As SP, Kutch, in 1986, Sreekumar had taken firm action against the VHP for instigating communal violence. This matter lay stagnant until it was recently revived by a vindictive administration. As we go to press, RB Sreekumar was served a non-bailable warrant by an acquiescent court in Kutch. Fortunately, however, he was granted bail by the local court on July 23. This courageous and upright officer from Gujarat now joins the list of human rights defenders who have faced arrest in a similar fashion. There appears no end

to the lengths that Modi's government will go. And courts in the state seem only too willing to oblige.

This **saga** is another litmus test for Indian institutions, the judiciary and the executive.

Badge of courage

“If observance of Truth was a bed of roses, if Truth cost one nothing and was all happiness and ease, there would be no beauty about it.”

– Mahatma Gandhi, *Harijan*, September 26, 1936.

Analysis of the Sreekumar register

It is the duty of a competent officer in the intelligence department to collect data from various sources of which he then maintains a record. Sreekumar was issued what he interpreted as unconstitutional oral directives from the top man in the state. He not only resisted these orders, which he clearly saw as illegal, he did more. He maintained a record of these orders for the future. Not directed by his superiors, this personal register is a contemporaneous document maintained by an officer who grasped the wider motives at work and decided to provide a detailed record of those moments.

Sreekumar's register consisted of three columns. The first recorded the date and the time when each instruction was given, the second recorded the nature and source of the instructions that were issued and the third recorded the nature of action taken. The contents of this register provide invaluable information about the workings of the Modi regime.

Sreekumar makes his first entry on April 16, 2002. He notes that the chief minister, Narendra Modi called a meeting attended by his principal secretary, PK Mishra, the then DGP, K. Chakravarti, and Sreekumar himself. Modi claimed that some Congress leaders were responsible for the continuing communal incidents in Ahmedabad. As head of the **State Intelligence Bureau (SIB)**, Sreekumar said that he did not have any information to this effect. Nevertheless, Modi asked him to immediately start tapping state Congress president, Shankarsinh Waghela's telephone lines. The chief minister's principal secretary also tried to persuade Sreekumar in this regard. Sreekumar replied that it was neither legal nor ethical to do this since they had received no information about Waghela's involvement in any crime. A terse comment contained in the third column of Sreekumar's register states: "The chief minister's instruction, being illegal and immoral, not complied with."

At two separate meetings held on April 22, 2002 some officers, including Sreekumar and a few others, brought up the question of the Muslim community's severe disenchantment with the police for its failure to register **first information reports (FIRs)** and conduct proper investigations into incidents of communal violence. At the first meeting, which was convened by the chief secretary, G. Subbarao, and where Ashok Narayan, additional chief secretary (home), and the Ahmedabad municipal commissioner were also present, Sreekumar brought up the issue of the Muslim community's lack of faith in the state administration vis-à-vis arrests of perpetrators and recommended that action be taken. The chief secretary said such action (against Hindu perpetrators) was not immediately possible as it went against government policy. At the second meeting too, the chief secretary evaded the issue of arrests. Sreekumar's register reads: "This response of the chief secretary was reflective of government policy of evading, delaying or soft-peddalling the issue of arrests of accused persons belonging to Hindu organisations."

On April 30, 2002, ADGP RB Sreekumar received another illegal instruction from the chief minister routed via DGP K. Chakravarti. The DGP informed Sreekumar that the chief minister had instructed him to book Congress leaders for their alleged involvement in instigating Muslims to boycott and obstruct the ongoing Class XII examinations and that he (the DGP) had told the chief minister that action could only be taken on the basis of specific complaints. The next day, on May 1, the DGP told Sreekumar that the chief secretary was being persuaded to create a policy that would allow the 'elimination' of 'Muslim extremists' disturbing communal peace in Ahmedabad. Sreekumar records his reply that this would be cold-blooded and premeditated murder with which the DGP concurred. The emergent picture exposes Modi's plans to script yet another saga of illegal state driven violence and the chief secretary and additional chief secretary's willingness to go along with this. The DGP emerges as a man caught in the throes of a battle with his conscience, prompted by a little help from RB Sreekumar.

On May 2, 2002, former DGP, Punjab, KPS Gill took charge as special security adviser to Narendra Modi. Two days later i.e. on May 4, 2002 he called a meeting of senior officers for an informal briefing. DGP K. Chakravarti, the **commissioner of police (CP)**, Ahmedabad city, PC Pande, the ADGP (law & order), **Maniram**, the **additional commissioner of police (ACP)**, Ahmedabad, MK Tandon, the **deputy inspector general of police (DIGP)-CRPF**, **Sharma**, and ADGP Sreekumar were all present.

While PC Pande, the then CP, Ahmedabad (and currently DGP, Gujarat), tried to paint a positive picture about the situation, ADGP Maniram provided his frank assessment that the police force in Gujarat, and particularly in Ahmedabad city,

was extremely demoralised and the situation demanded that there should be a change of (police) leadership at every level, from the CP, Ahmedabad, downward. Maniram also stated that police officers had become subservient to political leaders and in matters of law and order, crime, investigation, etc; they carried out the instructions of political masters because these individuals, local BJP legislators or sangh parivar leaders, had a lot of clout. Political leaders arranged police postings and ensured continuance in choice executive posts. Maniram pleaded for the restoration of sanity and professionalism in the police force.

Sreekumar endorsed Maniram's assessment and informed Gill that for the past five or six years the BJP government had been pursuing a policy of (1) saffronisation/communalisation, (2) de-professionalisation and (3) subversion of the system. He explained the subtle methodology adopted by the BJP government to persuade, cajole and even intimidate police personnel at the ground level. Sreekumar gave Gill a copy of his report on the prevailing situation in Ahmedabad. He also told Gill of the Muslims' loss of faith in the criminal justice system and suggested remedial measures. Gill, however, did not respond to these suggestions. In his register Sreekumar notes: "It is felt that Shri Gill has come with a brief from Shri LK Advani, union home minister. So he will carry out the agenda of Shri Narendra Modi, the chief minister."

On the afternoon of May 7, 2002, the chief minister, Narendra Modi summoned Sreekumar for a meeting where he asked the ADGP for his assessment of the continuing violence in Ahmedabad. Sreekumar promptly referred to his note on the prevailing communal situation whereupon Modi said that he had read the note but believed Sreekumar had drawn the wrong conclusions. The chief minister argued that the violence in Gujarat did not necessitate such elaborate analysis – it was a natural uncontrollable reaction to the incident in Godhra. He then asked Sreekumar to concentrate on Muslim militants. Sreekumar pointed out that it was not Muslims who were on the offensive. Moreover, he urged the chief minister to reach out and build confidence within the minority community. Modi was visibly annoyed at Sreekumar's suggestions.

Quoting statistics of heavy casualties among Muslims due to police firing, Sreekumar appealed to Modi to see reason and to acknowledge that it was Hindus who were on the offensive. The chief minister instructed him not to concentrate on the sangh parivar since they were not doing anything illegal. Sreekumar replied that it was his duty to report accurately on every situation and "provide actionable, preventive, real time intelligence having a bearing on the order, unity and integrity of India".

The very next day, on May 8, 2002, the DGP informed Sreekumar that at a meeting with Gill the latter had told the DGP that (1) The police should not try to

reform politicians (which meant that the BJP and the sangh parivar could continue to suppress, terrorise and attack Muslims even as the police took no action) (2) There was no need to take action against the vernacular press (who were publishing communally incendiary writing that fanned violence against the minorities) (3) The police should begin to play an active role in getting rid of the inmates of relief camps. Sreekumar told the DGP that the police should not be party to the forcible eviction of Muslim inmates of relief camps and the DGP agreed with him.

On June 7, 2002, the chief minister's principal secretary, PK Mishra asked Sreekumar to find out which minister from the Modi cabinet had met a citizens' enquiry tribunal (looking into the Godhra and post-Godhra violence) of which retired supreme court judge, VR Krishna Iyer, was a panel member. Mishra told Sreekumar that minister of state for revenue, Haren Pandya, was suspected to be the man concerned. He also gave Sreekumar the number of a mobile phone (No. 98240 30629) and asked him to trace details of this meeting through telephone records. On June 12, 2002, Mishra reiterated that Haren Pandya was believed to be the minister concerned. In his register Sreekumar states that he had stressed that the matter was a sensitive one and outside the SIB's charter of duties. Call details of the above mobile phone were however handed over to Mishra through IGP OP Mathur.

On June 25, 2002 the chief minister convened a meeting of senior officers to enforce the law *according to their (Modi's) reading of the situation*. Sreekumar writes, "It is... unethical and illegal advice because the police department has to work as per law and not according to the political atmosphere prevailing in the state. He (Modi) also asked police not to be influenced by the **Jawaharlal Nehru University (JNU)** brand of secularism. The indirect thrust of the chief minister was that police officers should become committed to the policies of the ruling party so that law enforcement can be done smoothly."

Battle lines were further drawn on June 28, 2002 when at a meeting convened by the chief secretary, G. Subbarao, to discuss the chief minister's proposed *gaurav yatra* **(or parade of honour)** in September Sreekumar proposed that in light of the prevailing tension the annual Jagannath *rath yatra* in July 2002 should be cancelled. The CP, Ahmedabad, endorsed this view while a few others suggested a change in the parade route. The chief secretary then informed the group that there was no question of such a cancellation or even a change of route. After the meeting, the chief secretary took Sreekumar aside to tell him that anyone trying to disrupt the *rath yatra* should 'be eliminated', adding that this was 'the well-considered decision of the chief minister'. Sreekumar told Subbarao that such an action would be totally illegal and unethical. The chief secretary maintained that it could be justified in terms of 'situational logic'. Sreekumar replied that the police

had to function in accordance with the law. The chief secretary then promptly watered down his request and asked Sreekumar to keep an eye on the plans of anti-social elements.

On July 1, 2002 Narendra Modi himself convened a meeting to review the law and order situation in view of the proposed *gaurav yatra* in September and the annual Jagannath *rath yatra* scheduled to take place that month. At this meeting Sreekumar provided intelligence inputs of 'high voltage threats' from pan-Islamic elements who would use such occasions and elicit support from those damaged and scarred by the recent violence. He advised that the *yatra* should be cancelled. His personal register notes: 'The chief minister said that the *rath yatra* will not, repeat, will not, be cancelled.' Eight days later, describing a follow-up meeting organised by the chief secretary on July 9, 2002 where precautionary measures were discussed, Sreekumar's register entry states that "The chief secretary informed (the meeting) that anybody trying to disturb the *rath yatra* should be shot dead."

On August 6, 2002 DGP Chakravarti informed Sreekumar that the additional chief secretary (home), Ashok Narayan was not too happy with the data on communal incidents that the ADGP's office had provided to the home department. In his register, Sreekumar writes: "I responded that my office has been providing correct information and the ADGP (Int.)'s office cannot do any manipulation of data for safeguarding the political interests of the Narendra Modi government."

Sreekumar's register notes that on August 5, 2002 the additional chief secretary had expressed his annoyance and displeasure at the SIB's presentation of data on the communal situation. Narayan noted that it did not conform to LK Advani's reply in parliament on the Gujarat question! He felt that every incident that occurred was being labelled a communal one, thus presenting a misleading picture of the law and order situation in Gujarat, especially to the Chief Election Commission (CEC). (This was the period when the Gujarat government was trying to push ahead with early assembly elections claiming that 'normalcy' had returned to the state, and the CEC was due to visit Gujarat for an independent assessment.) Sreekumar asked Narayan to define the yardstick for assessment of affected areas but received no satisfactory response. The same afternoon, the home secretary, K Nityanandam, instructed the ADGP's office that they should not send any data on communal incidents whereupon Sreekumar informed him that the data could not be manipulated to serve the interests of the Modi government. By this time it was evident that with elections around the corner, the higher bureaucracy was apprehensive about any information that could embarrass the government.

On August 8, 2002, Ashok Narayan informed Sreekumar and others present that the next day (i.e. August 9, 2002) the election commission, consisting of chief

election commissioner (CEC), James Lyngdoh, and two other members, would be holding a meeting which Sreekumar should also attend. The additional chief secretary also told Sreekumar that he "should not make any comments or presentation which would go against the formal presentation prepared by (home secretary) Shri K. Nityanandam". Sreekumar replied that he would "present the truth and my assessment based on facts".

At the time the Gujarat bureaucracy had planned two presentations to be made before the CEC, one by the home secretary and another by the relief commissioner, CK Koshy. In an informal chat with his officers on August 9, 2002, chief secretary, G. Subbarao said that his men should present a picture of normalcy so that the CEC would have no reason to postpone the Gujarat elections. The CEC met the higher bureaucracy the same day. James Lyngdoh intervened at the start to say that he was not interested in presentations. The chief secretary carried on regardless, saying that "total normalcy was restored in the entire state and no tension was prevailing anywhere". Sounding both annoyed and incredulous, Lyngdoh observed that the commission had just visited affected areas where victims had made numerous complaints. He cited reports of a recently constructed wall barring right of passage to minority members in a particular locality of Ahmedabad. Undeterred, the chief secretary replied that rehabilitation was virtually complete and that most riot victims had returned home. A visibly angry Lyngdoh then asked the chief secretary how he had the 'temerity to claim normalcy' given the quantum and scale of the complaints. Lyngdoh insisted that the Gujarat government provide data along standard lines about the number of FIRs filed, the number of perpetrators arrested, the number of accused released on bail, the number of displaced persons, the compensation paid, and so on.

DGP K. Chakravarti then abruptly steered the discussion to the need for extra paramilitary forces during the forthcoming *gaurav yatra*. Sreekumar reiterated this point. Here, the CEC intervened to point out the contradiction between the chief secretary's claims of normalcy and officers' demands for additional forces. Lyngdoh then asked Sreekumar to elaborate on his claim for more forces. Sreekumar made his presentation (which included data on the number of deaths, property losses, the districts and villages affected and the overall plight of victims), arguing that tension still prevailed in 993 villages and 151 towns that had witnessed riots between February 27 and July 31, 2002. The affected area, he said, covered 284 police stations and 154 out of 182 assembly constituencies. On being asked to estimate the number of additional forces required, the DGP said that they would need at least 202 extra companies.

After all the other officers had left, the chief secretary summoned Sreekumar and shouted, "You have let us down badly! What was the need for you to project all those statistics about displaced people?" Sreekumar told him that he had presented

the facts. Later, as Sreekumar was waiting for another meeting, additional chief secretary, Ashok Narayan came into the room along with the DGP and asked Sreekumar why he had made a statement contrary to the government's 'perception'. Narayan also asked Sreekumar whether as a disciplined officer he accepted the DGP's authority. Sreekumar told him that the question was best answered by the DGP himself. Refraining from comment, the DGP (perhaps to avoid a confrontation) said that there was no point in pursuing the discussion. DGP Chakravarti later told Sreekumar that his assessment, particularly of manpower requirements, was accurate.

This was not all. On September 10, 2002, the National Commission for Minorities (NCM) faxed a message to the Gujarat home department requesting a verbatim copy of the chief minister's speech made at Becharaji, a temple town in Mehsana district, on September 9, 2002. Modi's hate speech formed part of the overall message of his *gaurav yatra*. Keen to block such information, the home department got the DGP to endorse that Sreekumar's department, the ADGP (Int.)'s office, was not required to provide such a report. Sreekumar, however, felt duty bound to comply with the request. Risking the wrath of his superiors, Sreekumar obtained a copy of the speech and forwarded this to the commission. Sreekumar's action, his sending a copy of Modi's speech to the NCM, was the proverbial last straw on the official camel's back. He was immediately transferred from the post of ADGP (Intelligence) and made ADGP (Police Reforms), a position empty of content.

Following protocol, Sreekumar then called on the chief secretary, G Subbarao. The chief secretary told him that he should not have spoken up in contravention of state policy. Sreekumar responded that as a government functionary his oath was to the Constitution and "If the chief minister's policies are in contravention of the letter, spirit and ethos of the Constitution of India, no government officer is bound to follow such policies." Visibly annoyed, the chief secretary brought the meeting to an abrupt end. RB Sreekumar's personal register ends with this episode.

Rahul Sharma
Salute to a serving officer

The extent of state complicity in planning and executing the genocide in Gujarat 2002 has been exposed by the courageous and persistent struggle by victim survivors backed by citizens legal rights groups, and reinforced by the overwhelming corroborative official data that was placed in the public domain. Two policemen stand out for performing this invaluable service, RB Sreekumar and Rahul Sharma. The state has attempted to teach the first a lesson,

unsuccessful so far due to the man's forbearance, sense of humour and courage. The author salutes the second while recording in detail his significant contribution to the pursuit of truth.

Rahul Sharma

Showing rare courage, Rahul Sharma, then superintendent of police (SP), Bhavnagar (currently with the CBI), led his men from the front to prevent an attack on a boarding school that housed more than 400 Muslim children on March 1, 2002. Needless to say, he was transferred out of Bhavnagar soon thereafter. Sharma filed an affidavit before the Nanavati-Shah Commission in July 2002 and testified before the commission in October 2004.

His affidavit narrates the tale of collusion between sections of the law and order machinery and communal elements from the ruling BJP, RSS, VHP and Bajrang Dal. He annexes a letter that he had written to the then state DGP, K. Chakravarti, on March 24, 2002. This relates to an incident that took place in Bhavnagar on March 23, 2002 when a local madrassa was under attack by a mob, following which 21 accused were arrested by the police.

“Following the arrest of the 21 accused in connection with the offence, about 200 women went to the police station that very evening along with the local leaders demanding that the accused be presented before the magistrate immediately and well before the 24 hours that the police could keep them in custody. The city DySP and the PI (police inspector) of ‘A’ division police station assured the leaders and the womenfolk that they would be presented before the magistrate on the same day.”

Sharma remarks that there was something peculiar about the entire incident. A day before (i.e. on March 22, 2002) an unfounded rumour that some Hindu children had been kidnapped by a Muslim from the school had caused tension that led to all business establishments being closed down. The next day, on March 23, as things began to return to normal, a sudden incident disrupted the tenuous calm. Sharma says he was convinced the incident “was pre-planned and premeditated.” He says in his letter that he also feared that these antisocial elements could be operating at the behest of some political masters who had assured them of all legal aid, including an early release from custody. Sharma felt “it was a well thought of plan to keep the communal issue alive till such time elections were to be announced”. (On March 21, a BJP leader told Sharma that elections were now a “near certainty”.)

In his letter to the DGP, Sharma goes on to firmly state that “a message should not be conveyed to the public in general that you can indulge in rioting, arson and

stone pelting and can get away with it if you know someone well enough in the government, or, worse still, if you are acting at the behest of those persons. Such an impression about the police would be catastrophic for the district. In Bhavnagar, till date, there is no charge of a partisan role being played by the police.”

Sharma put his foot down and insisted that the accused would have to spend a day in the lock-up. Again, he was approached by “some prominent political figures urging me (Sharma) to assist in securing an early bail for the accused”. Sharma did not oblige.

The affidavit puts down in detail the repeated attempts made by politically powerful persons to attack and burn down the Akwada Madressa in Bhavnagar and also to attack other Muslim dominated areas of the city from March 1, 2002 onwards. Sharma states clearly that if necessary action had not been taken and adequate use of force not been deployed by him and his men, the number of deaths would have been enormous and “innocent people would have lost their lives”.

Concerned with placing all the facts before the commission, Sharma has enclosed, with his affidavit, a list of persons who died during the communal incidents, a list of persons who died or were injured in police firing, detailed reports and records of police firings and records of messages received and sent by wireless. Put together these contain a minefield of information on the extent to which the political class and sections of the bureaucracy and the police went in their attempts to subvert the law and enact the genocide.

In his deposition before the commission, Sharma states (as he did earlier in his affidavit) that he had recommended action against the *Sandesh* newspaper for publication of inflammatory material on February 28, 2002. He also stated that he had ordered the arrest of Kishore Bhatt, Bhavnagar’s Shiv Sena chief, who was among those who made inflammatory speeches in Bhavnagar. For his courage and for being true to his professional calling, Sharma was transferred out of Bhavnagar to Ahmedabad city, as DCP (control room).

In his new post he was entrusted with the work of assisting in the investigations being conducted by the crime branch of the Ahmedabad police commissionerate. He was specifically asked by PC Pande, then police commissioner (CP) of Ahmedabad, to assist in the investigation of Naroda Patiya and Gulberg Society cases which were being handled by SS Chudasama, then assistant commissioner of police (ACP) in the Ahmedabad crime branch. (Chudasama, incidentally, is one of the policemen who have been implicated in the Sohrabuddin Sheikh and Kausarbi encounter cases.) Sharma states that in all these sensitive cases, “more and more political leaders were being involved”. It was in the course of these investigations

that the joint CP (JCP) (crime branch), PP Pandey, had ordered investigations into the telephone records.

Sharma then told the commission that on the night of May 27/28, 2002 some accused involved in the Naroda Patiya and Gulberg Society incidents were arrested. By now, KR Kaushik had been brought in as CP, Ahmedabad. Sharma was not kept informed of the arrests, to which he objected. Thereafter, Kaushik issued instructions to PP Pandey that Sharma should be kept informed. Neither Kaushik nor Sharma were happy with the first charge sheet that was filed in the Gulberg Society case on June 3, 2002 and the CP communicated this to Pandey immediately.

The very next day, on June 4, Pandey called Sharma for a meeting. He then called for the Naroda Patiya case papers. Sharma was shown all the investigation papers and the JCP asked him to assess whether the investigation was being conducted properly. Initially Sharma said he needed time to make an assessment but Pandey insisted he should do it right away. According to the charge sheet, the violence in Naroda took place “because one person ran over a person of another community by a truck, whole mob got provoked and thereafter serious incidents had happened”. This did not seem convincing to Rahul Sharma. The charge sheet filed in the Gulberg Society case claimed that the gruesome massacre was precipitated by Ahsan Jaffri’s firing on the mob that had collected outside the building.

He stated on oath: “There was serious difference of opinion between me and Mr Pandey and other investigating officers i.e. Mr Vanzara and Mr Chudasama and the discussion had lasted for about two hours... I had told them that since they were the investigating officers and Mr Pandey was superior, it was for them to decide what to do. Whatever difference I had was put in writing by me and handed over to Mr Kaushik by way of a letter dated June 4, 2002.” Sharma produced this letter before the commission.

Police Commissioner Kaushik, who was not satisfied with the charge sheet that had been filed, called Sharma about 10 to 15 days later. He told Sharma to scrutinise the case papers of both cases thoroughly and point out the discrepancies to him. Kaushik instructed Pandey to send the case papers of these two cases to his office. After Pandey had brought the case papers and produced them before Kaushik, photocopies were prepared and they were handed over to Sharma.

Sharma then makes some startling assessments about the case papers. He says he noticed that the FIR and the charge sheet were mutually inconsistent. This was true of both the Gulberg massacre case as well as the Naroda Patiya and Gaon carnage cases. Sharma states on oath that in his assessment the firing by (Ahsan) Jaffri was not the cause for the subsequent attack on residents of Gulberg Society.

In his assessment of the Naroda Patiya case, the incident with the truck was not the reason for the violence that followed. Sharma says that his assessment was based on a close reading of the FIRs and the case papers that were supplied to him.

On July 5, 2002, Sharma was once again transferred because, no doubt, of his honesty and candour. He could not therefore communicate this assessment to the then CP, KR Kaushik.

Rahul Sharma's tale is one of guarded honesty before the commission.

Dial M for murder

In October 2004, when Sharma appeared before the Nanavati-Shah Commission and submitted two CDs with more than five lakh entries of calls made to and from the mobile phones of Gujarat's policemen, this blew the lid off one more facet of state complicity. Despite this staggering evidence, two-and-a-half-years later, neither the Nanavati-Shah Commission, nor the Gujarat High Court, nor the apex court has ordered any suo motu investigation into these revelations. Why is the Indian system so reluctant, or lackadaisical, to pinpoint the guilty?

The CDs contain records of all cellphone calls made in Ahmedabad over the first five days of the genocide when a city racked by violence, witnessed some of the worst massacres. Until October 2004, these telephone records lay with the Gujarat police.

Jaideep Patel, general secretary, Gujarat VHP

Jaideep Patel is a pathologist by profession. His name appeared in 14 FIRs filed immediately after the Naroda massacre. He was seen by eyewitnesses, leading and instructing mobs to attack, rape, kill and burn. When these FIRs were clubbed with dozens of others – an act carried out by Ahmedabad's notorious crime branch, under officers, Tarun Barot and DG Vanzara – Patel's name, as also that of the BJP MLA and co-accused, Maya Kodnani, mysteriously disappeared.

The evidence contained in the CD could prove a nightmare for Jaideep Patel. They contain records of all cellphone calls made in Ahmedabad from February 25, 2002 to March 4. The records begin two days before the horrific attack on the Sabarmati Express and include the five dreadful days that saw the worst communal carnage in recent history.

Investigations carried out first by *The Indian Express* and recently by NGOs in Gujarat and outside show that Patel was in touch with the key riot accused, top police officers, including the police commissioner, top government officials, and even the chief minister's office while Naroda burned. These CDs, obtained by the crime branch of the Gujarat police as far back as April 2004, now sit with the

Nanavati-Shah Commission. Although these are records of calls made, not transcripts of conversations, they reveal:

How the riot accused were in constant touch with politicians, police officers and government officials. All at a time when the city and the state were burning, as the Narendra Modi government looked the other way and the opposition's Congress party slumbered.

Using cellphone tower locations, the data also provides information on the physical locations of the caller and the person receiving the call.

Records show that Patel, a resident of Naroda, was present there when the massacre began. He then left for Bapunagar, which also witnessed killings, to return to Naroda after a while. Patel was in touch with other riot accused, Babu Bajrangi, Ashok Govind Patel, Bipin Patel and local BJP MLA, Maya Kodnani.

Excerpts from the cellphone records of Jaideep Patel

February 27, 2002

Sabarmati Express attacked at 8.05 a.m. *Bandh* called by VHP that evening. BJP backs the *bandh*. Patel is in touch with senior police officials, his VHP colleagues in Delhi, state minister of state for home, Gordhan Zadaphiya, Gujarat BJP president, Rajendrasinh Rana.

- 11.09 a.m.: Patel leaves the city for Godhra.
- 12.48 p.m.: Patel is in Godhra. One of the first persons he speaks to is the Ahmedabad DCP (zone V), RJ Savani, who calls him at 1.05 p.m.
- 2.29 p.m.: Patel receives a call from a Delhi number and speaks for 215 seconds. This number is registered in the name of Bharatiya Sanskriti Pratishthan, Sector-6, RK Puram, New Delhi, the VHP headquarters.
- 3.30 p.m.: Patel calls state Gujarat BJP president, Rajendrasinh Rana, and speaks for 267 seconds. At 4 p.m. the VHP calls for a Gujarat *bandh* the next day. The BJP quickly declares its support.
- 5.00 p.m.: Patel receives a call from Bharatiya Sanskriti Pratishthan, New Delhi, and speaks for 357 seconds.
- 5.07 p.m.: Patel again receives a call from this Delhi institution.
- 5.14 p.m.: DCP Savani calls Patel and speaks for 117 seconds.
- 5.17 p.m.: DCP Savani again calls Patel.
- 8.03 p.m.: State minister of state for home, Gordhan Zadaphiya, calls Patel and speaks for 159 seconds.
- 8.39 p.m.: Patel calls Zadaphiya.
- 9.13 p.m.: Patel calls Zadaphiya again, this time for just 3 seconds.
- 9.16 p.m.: DCP Savani calls Patel and speaks for 138 seconds.
- 9.20 p.m.: Patel again calls Zadaphiya and speaks for 186 seconds.
- After 11.58 p.m.: Patel leaves Godhra for Ahmedabad with the bodies of 58 persons who were killed in coach S-6 of the Sabarmati Express.

February 28, 2002

Ahmedabad erupts. Naroda Patiya is the scene of the worst massacre. Patel is in touch with the Naroda corporator minutes before the massacre begins.

- 2.34 a.m.: Patel enters Ahmedabad with the 58 bodies of the Godhra victims, heads for Sola Civil Hospital.
- 9.17 a.m.: Patel calls the state health minister, Ashok Bhatt, and 10 minutes later, leaves for Naroda.
- 10.11 a.m.: Patel reaches Naroda and at 10.52 a.m. calls one Ashok Govind Patel of Naroda and speaks to him for 80 seconds. (Ashok Govind Patel, who was in constant contact with Jaideep Patel through that period, is a BJP corporator from Naroda and an accused in the killing of eight persons in Naroda on February 28, 2002. He is also a co-accused in the case in which Jaideep Patel was named as an accused, one that was later closed by the crime branch.)
- 11.05 a.m.: Patel receives call from a cellphone that was allegedly being used by the prime accused in the Naroda Patiya massacre, Babu Bajrangi. (The phone is registered in the name of one Priyanka Mahendra Pandya, B/3 Pragat Ghanshyam Society, Ranip. Records reveal that the phone had been carried to Godhra the previous day and was located in the Naroda area from the morning of February 28, 2002 until 8.28 p.m. that night. When *The Sunday Express*, contacted Mahendra Pandya, father of Priyanka Pandya, he said: “I have been using this cell number for more than year. Three years ago, it was with Babubhai (Babu Bajrangi).” According to the police FIR, the attacks in Naroda Patiya began at 11 a.m. and went on until 8 p.m.
- 11.12 a.m.: Patel receives another call from the same Ashok Patel.
- 11.21 a.m.: Jaideep Patel leaves for the Bapunagar area. This was one of the areas in the city that witnessed unprecedented violence. The maximum number of deaths in private firing was reported from this area. The area fell under DCP Savani’s jurisdiction.
- 11.32 a.m.: Patel reaches Bapunagar and calls Zadaphiya.
- 11.37 a.m.: Key accused in the Naroda Patiya massacre, Bipin Panchal alias Bipin Auto, calls Patel and speaks for 62 seconds.
- 11.40 a.m.: Patel calls DCP (zone IV) PB Gondia, under whose jurisdiction Naroda Patiya and Gulberg Society fall – according to the police, 38 persons, including ex-Congress MP Ahsan Jaffri, were killed in Gulberg – and speaks for 85 seconds.
- 11.52 a.m.: Patel again calls DCP Gondia and this time speaks for 106 seconds.
- 11.55 a.m.: Patel calls Ashok Patel and speaks for 63 seconds.
- 12.01 a.m.: Ashok Patel calls back.
- 12.07 p.m.: Patel calls Ashok Patel and speaks for 71 seconds.
- 12.10 p.m.: Patel calls Naroda BJP MLA, Maya Kodnani, and speaks for 79 seconds.
- 12.20 p.m.: Patel calls DCP Gondia and speaks for 42 seconds.

- 12.25 p.m.: Patel returns to Naroda.
- 12.39 p.m.: Patel returns to Bapunagar area.
- 12.57 p.m.: Patel receives call from the cellphone being used by Babu Bajrangi.
- 1.00 p.m.: Bipin Panchal calls Patel and speaks for 86 seconds.
- 1.17 p.m.: Bajrangi calls again.
- 1.19 p.m.: Bipin Panchal calls.
- 1.23 p.m.: Bipin Panchal calls again.
- 1.43 p.m.: Bipin Panchal calls again and speaks for 72 seconds.
- 3.25 p.m.: Patel receives a call from the chief minister's office and speaks for 141 seconds.
- 7.20 p.m.: Patel receives a call from a cellphone registered in the name of Sanjay Bhavsar of the general administration department, government of Gujarat, and speaks for 102 seconds.
- 7.24 p.m.: Bhavsar calls again.
- 7.28 p.m.: Patel calls Bhavsar.
- 7.31 p.m.: For the first time in the day, Patel calls the CP, Ahmedabad, PC Pande, and speaks for 47 seconds.
- 8.29 p.m.: Patel returns to Naroda area.
- 9.11 p.m.: Tanmay Mehta, personal assistant (PA) to the chief minister, calls Patel. The conversation lasts 209 seconds.
- 11.32 p.m.: State BJP president, Rajendrasinh Rana, calls Patel and speaks for 13 seconds.

By midnight, senior police officers, including the JCP, MK Tandon, had reached Naroda Patiya. The massacre over, survivors were being moved to hospitals and relief camps hastily set up by the Muslim community at Shah Alam and Dariya Khan Gummat. Meanwhile, another massacre had also taken place in Gulberg Society. Union defence minister, George Fernandes, arrives in town. The death toll in Ahmedabad alone was 125 and counting.

Certain key questions arise:

- Why was the home minister, Gordhan Zadaphiya, in touch with Jaideep Patel?
- Why did the chief minister's office contact Jaideep Patel?
- Did the crime branch study the cellphone records before closing the case against Patel?
- Will the review panel, set up at the behest of the Supreme Court, look into these records while scrutinising the 2,100 closed riot cases?

Maya Kodnani, BJP MLA, Naroda

Kodnani is a practising gynaecologist whose clinic is barely a kilometre from the site of the Naroda Patiya massacre. The BJP MLA from Naroda, Kodnani was also named in an FIR and her name was subsequently dropped as an accused when the FIRs were illegally clubbed. She was seen by eyewitnesses, leading and instructing mobs to attack, rape, kill and burn.

A study of Kodnani's cellphone, which is still in use, reveals that, like fellow accused and VHP leader Jaideep Patel, the BJP leader, too, had been camping in the Naroda area until the evening of February 28, 2002, and was in close contact with those accused in the massacre, police officers, top politicians and VHP leaders, including the brother of VHP international general secretary, Praveen Togadia, and other accused from the area.

The attacks in Naroda began at 11 a.m. and went on until 8 p.m.

Excerpts from the cellphone records of Maya Kodnani

February 28, 2002

- 7.53 a.m.: Kodnani leaves her residence for Gandhinagar.
- 9.57 a.m.: Kodnani returns from Gandhinagar and heads straight for Sola Civil Hospital.
- 10.37 a.m.: Kodnani calls the office of the ACP (G Division), MT Rana, under whose jurisdiction Naroda and Meghaninagar fall.
- 10.39 a.m.: Kodnani calls the official cellphone of the DCP (zone IV), PB Gondia, Rana's immediate boss.
- 11.23 a.m.: Kodnani leaves Sola Civil Hospital.
- 11.55 a.m.: Kodnani is in Shahibaug area (where she lives) when she receives a call from Dinesh Togadia, brother of VHP leader, Praveen Togadia, and speaks for 128 seconds.
- 12.10 p.m.: VHP general secretary, Jaideep Patel calls Kodnani. Patel was also named as an accused in the Naroda massacre until the case was closed by the police.
- 12.21 p.m.: Kodnani receives a call from Nimesh Patel, a resident of Saijapur Bogha area, adjoining the Naroda Patiya locality. Patel is one of those accused in the killing of eight persons at Naroda village. After the call, Kodnani heads towards Naroda.
- 12.37 p.m.: Kodnani reaches Naroda.
- 12.40 p.m.: Nimesh Patel calls Kodnani.
- 2.10 p.m.: Kodnani receives a call from Sri Swami Vivekanand Karnavati Charitable Trust, Maninagar, and speaks for 134 seconds.
- 2.33 p.m.: Kodnani receives a call from the official residence of state education minister, Anandiben Patel, in Gandhinagar.
- 2.53 p.m.: Kodnani receives a call from the office of the chief whip of the BJP legislative party.
- 3.31 p.m.: Kodnani receives a call from Ashok Govind Patel of Naroda and speaks for 91 seconds. As mentioned earlier, the BJP corporator, Ashok Patel, was a co-accused in the same case as Jaideep Patel.
- 4.09 p.m.: Kodnani leaves Naroda area and heads for Shahibaug.

- 4.52 p.m.: Kodnani calls the DCP (zone V), RJ Savani, under whose jurisdiction widespread violence was reported from Bapunagar, Odhav, Amraiwadi and Hatkeshwar areas.
- 4.53 p.m.: Kodnani calls DCP (zone VI), BS Jebalia, under whose jurisdiction riots were reported from Vatwa, Danilimda and Kagdapith areas.
- 4.55 p.m.: Kodnani calls the ACP (sector I), Shivanand Jha, whose jurisdiction encompasses the western areas of the city, the worst affected areas within his jurisdiction being Paldi, Vejalpur and Navrangpura.
- 5.01 p.m.: Kodnani receives a call from Delhi.
- 5.46 p.m.: State BJP president, Rajendrasinh Rana calls Kodnani.
- 7.03 p.m.: Nimesh Patel calls Kodnani.

According to the police FIR of the Naroda Patiya massacre and the Naroda killings, the attacks started at 11 a.m. and went on till 8 p.m.

Gulberg Society, Chamanpura, Meghaninagar, Ahmedabad

At about 7 a.m. on February 28, 2002, (according to the police, the attacks started at 10.30 a.m.) a mob started to attack the predominantly minority inhabited Gulberg Society, barely a few kilometres from the police commissionerate. The onslaught lasted over nine hours during which about 70 persons were massacred and 15 women were gang-raped. Former parliamentarian from the Congress party, Ahsan Jaffri, was among those killed. Jaffri made over 200 calls to top leaders, seeking help. No one responded. The then CP, Ahmedabad, PC Pande visited Jaffri at around 10.30 a.m. and convinced him not to seek refuge elsewhere along with the 70 other Muslims who had sought shelter in his home. The attack intensified after Pande had left.

As DCP (zone IV), PB Gondia was the DCP in charge of both areas – Meghaninagar and Naroda – which together marked the most horrific day in the post-Godhra violence. His cellphone records show that Gondia spent a lot of time in areas outside his jurisdiction which reported little violence. They also show that he was in constant touch with the riot accused, including Nimesh Patel, who is accused in the Naroda killings. He was also in touch with accused, Jaideep Patel, VHP's Gujarat general secretary and local BJP MLA, Maya Kodnani, and state revenue minister, Haren Pandya.

Excerpts from the cellphone records of DCP PB Gondia

February 28, 2002

- 10.39 a.m.: Just as DCP PB Gondia, reaches the Naroda area, he receives a call from Naroda BJP MLA, Maya Kodnani. The call lasts 57 seconds.
- 11.05 a.m.: Gondia calls the JCP, MK Tandon's office.

- 11.40 a.m.: Gondia, who is in Thakkarnagar, near Naroda, receives a call from VHP general secretary, Jaideep Patel – who was accused of leading a mob in Naroda – and speaks for 86 seconds.
- 11.52 a.m.: Jaideep Patel calls again. They speak for 107 seconds.
- 11.56 a.m.: Gondia calls Tandon and immediately moves to the Naroda area.
- 12.20 p.m.: Jaideep Patel calls Gondia and speaks to him for 42 seconds.
- 12.35 p.m.: Gondia is in Meghaninagar area (Gulberg Society) and returns to Naroda by 12.53 p.m.
- 12.59 p.m.: Gondia calls the city police control room.
- Gondia remains in the Naroda area till 1.44 p.m. At 1.53 p.m. he is in Meghaninagar area but leaves immediately and returns to Naroda. On the way, at 1.57 p.m., he receives a call from Tandon.
- 2.13 p.m.: Gondia is again in the Meghaninagar area from where he calls Nimesh Patel, an accused in the Naroda village killings. Fifteen minutes later Gondia is in Naroda.
- 2.46 p.m.: Gondia returns to Meghaninagar and calls ACP MT Rana. Within five minutes, he leaves for the police commissionerate and reaches there by 2.55 p.m.
- 3.01 p.m.: Nimesh Patel calls Gondia.
- 3.11 p.m.: Gondia has left the police commissionerate and heads for Revdi Bazaar, an area which does not fall under his jurisdiction, where little violence has been reported.
- 3.16 p.m.: Gondia receives calls from the CP, PC Pande.
- Gondia remains at Revdi Bazaar until 4.03 p.m. and at 4.12 reaches Meghaninagar area.
- 5.05 p.m.: Gondia receives a call from the residence of Naroda BJP MLA, Maya Kodnani. The call lasts 81 seconds. Gondia is in the Meghaninagar area.
- 5.15 p.m.: ACP Rana calls Gondia and speaks to him for 101 seconds.
- 5.24 p.m. and 5.29 p.m.: Gondia receives calls from the official residence of the revenue minister, Haren Pandya.
- 6.55 p.m.: Gondia receives a call from Nimesh Patel.
- 10.06 p.m.: Gondia goes to the Naroda area.
- 10.10 p.m.: Gondia receives a call from Nimesh Patel.

State role

Cellphone records fill in the missing blanks. They show that the Ahmedabad police commissioner, PC Pande received several calls from the chief minister's office throughout the day and in the hours leading up to their meeting. Who kept calling? Narendra Modi's PA, Tanmay Mehta, and Modi's additional principal secretary, Anil Mukim.

Excerpts from the cellphone records of the CP, Ahmedabad, PC Pande

February 27, 2002:

- 8.53 a.m. (within an hour of the Godhra train arson): Pande, who is at his residence, receives a call from the state minister of state for home, Gordhan Zadaphiya.
- 11.05 a.m.: Pande is at his office and receives a call from the DGP, K. Chakravarti.
- 11.38 a.m.: Chakravarti calls again.
- 12.48 p.m.: Chakravarti calls again.
- 1.08 p.m.: Pande calls the Ahmedabad district collector, K. Srinivas.
- 1.53 p.m.: Zadaphiya calls Pande and speaks for 109 seconds.
- 2.59 p.m.: Pande receives a call from Tanmay Mehta, Narendra Modi's PA.
- 3.35 p.m.: Pande receives a call from the chief minister's additional principal secretary, Anil Mukim.
- 3.36 p.m.: Pande receives a call from Mehta. Half a minute later, Mukim calls again.
- 3.40 p.m.: Zadaphiya calls Pande.
- 3.50 p.m.: Chakravarti calls Pande.
- 5.02 p.m.: Pande receives a call from Mukim. He returns the call after a minute.
- 5.28 p.m.: Chakravarti calls Pande and speaks for 107 seconds.
- 6.03 p.m.: Pande receives a call from Mumbai and speaks for 154 seconds.
- 7.09 p.m.: Pande calls Mukim and speaks for 83 seconds.
- At 7.48 p.m. and 8.14 p.m. Pande receives two calls from K. Srinivas.
- 8.26 p.m.: Pande receives a call from Sanjay Bhavsar, officer on special duty (OSD) to the chief minister.
- 9.13. Chakravarti calls Pande and speaks for 52 seconds.
- 9.18 p.m. and 9.19 p.m.: Pande receives calls from Zadaphiya.
- 9.42 p.m.: Pande has left the city for Gandhinagar and is half way there.

February 28, 2002:

- 12.35 a.m.: Pande returns from Gandhinagar and heads straight for his office. He stays there until about one a.m.
- 8.12 a.m.: Pande is back in office and receives a call from Chakravarti.
- 8.50 a.m.: Pande calls Chakravarti.
- 9.30 a.m.: Chakravarti calls Pande and speaks for 126 seconds.
- 9.44 a.m.: Pande receives a call from the JCP (sector II), MK Tandon. Three minutes later, Pande is on his way to Sola Civil Hospital.
- 10.56 a.m.: Pande returns to the police commissionerate.
- 11.05 a.m.: Chakravarti calls Pande. (By this time mobs have taken to the streets. According to police records, the attack on Gulberg Society began at 10.30 a.m. while in Naroda Patiya it began at 11 a.m.)
- 11.31 a.m.: Pande receives a call from Zadaphiya's office.
- 11.40 a.m.: Tanmay Mehta, Narendra Modi's PA, calls Pande.
- 11.43 a.m.: Pande receives a call from Tandon, who has already reached the Meghaninagar area (where Gulberg Society is located).

- 11.56 a.m.: Chakravarti calls Pande.
- 12.06 p.m.: Pande calls Tandon and speaks for 75 seconds. Three minutes after this call, Tandon leaves Meghaninagar.
- 12.37 p.m.: Tandon calls Pande. By this time curfew has been imposed in the city.
- 1.21 p.m.: Mehta calls Pande.
- 1.22 p.m.: Tandon calls Pande.
- 1.45 p.m.: Chakravarti calls Pande and speaks for 116 seconds.
- 1.56 p.m.: Pande receives a call from the office of state minister for water supply, Narottam Patel, and speaks for 125 seconds.
- 2.02 p.m.: Tandon calls Pande and speaks for 125 seconds.
- 2.12 p.m.: Chakravarti calls Pande.
- 2.25 p.m.: Tandon calls Pande.
- 2.53 p.m.: Zadaphiya calls Pande.
- 3.09 p.m.: Pande receives a call from city MLA and state health minister, Ashok Bhatt.
- 3.16 p.m.: Pande calls the DCP (zone IV), PB Gondia, under whose jurisdiction the Gulberg Society and Naroda Patiya localities fall.
- 3.22 p.m.: Pande receives a call from city MLA and state energy minister, Kaushik Patel, and speaks for 60 seconds.
- 3.38 p.m.: Mehta calls Pande.
- 3.54 p.m.: Pande calls Gondia.
- 3.57 p.m.: Mehta calls Pande.
- 3.59 p.m.: Chakravarti calls Pande. Minutes later, Chakravarti is at Pande's office.
- 5.16 p.m.: Pande receives a call from Zadaphiya, who has just left the police commissionerate.
- 5.17 p.m.: Pande receives a call from a cellphone registered in the name of AP Patel, general administration department, government of Gujarat.
- 5.50 p.m.: Tandon calls Pande.
- 6.31 p.m.: Pande receives a call from the official residence of Ashok Bhatt and speaks for 232 seconds.
- 6.51 p.m.: Pande receives a call from Chakravarti, who is by then at Gandhinagar.
- 7.09 p.m.: Pande reaches the Meghaninagar area.
- 7.11 p.m.: Zadaphiya calls Pande.
- 7.26 p.m.: Mehta calls Pande.
- 7.31 p.m.: Pande receives a call from VHP leader and riot accused, Jaideep Patel. Pande leaves the Meghaninagar area and goes back to his office.
- 8.52 p.m.: Pande calls Chakravarti and speaks for 110 seconds.
- 9.03 p.m.: Pande calls Anil Mukim, the chief minister's additional principal secretary, and speaks for 229 seconds.
- 9.14 p.m.: Mukim calls Pande.

- 9.18 p.m.: Pande calls Chakravarti and speaks for 334 seconds.
- 10.27 p.m.: Mehta calls Pande.

Pande's memory loss before the commission

Deposing before the Nanavati-Shah Commission on August 18, 2004, former CP, Ahmedabad city, PC Pande said he only heard about the Naroda Patiya violence at 9.30 p.m. on February 28, 2002, when "I received information that some persons had been killed there". And it was only when he went there at around 10 or 11 p.m. that he realised the "gravity" of the situation.

However, by 9.30 p.m., the Naroda massacre was long over. Eighty-three persons had already been killed and Pande's cellphone records show that right through the afternoon, from 2.30 to 9 p.m., he was, in fact, in regular touch with two police officers in charge of the areas under which both Naroda Patiya and Gulberg Society fall.

During the last half hour of the massacre at Naroda, Pande even received a call from VHP state general secretary and riot accused, Jaideep Patel. Nevertheless, in his deposition before the Nanavati-Shah Commission, Pande said that he had not been "receiving any information regarding the serious incidents which followed after 2.30 p.m.".

Another point on which Pande claimed memory loss was the meeting called by the chief minister, Narendra Modi, on the night of the Godhra arson, hours after the VHP and the BJP had declared a *bandh* for the next day.

Lies before the commission

Joint CP (sector II), Ahmedabad, MK Tandon, who was in charge of areas that saw the worst two massacres, told the Nanavati-Shah Commission that he only heard about the attack on Gulberg Society at 2 p.m. on February 28. **This was a massacre in which 70 people were killed**, many of them burnt alive, including former Congress MP, Ahsan Jaffri. "I was not present when the mob was being dispersed as I had gone near the Gulberg Society at about 10.45 a.m. and then had gone to Naroda. I was in Naroda at about 12 p.m.," he deposed.

However, records of Tandon's official cellphone reveal that between 11.34 a.m. and 12.09 p.m., he was in the Meghaninagar area (where Gulberg Society is). From Meghaninagar, records show, he called up the DCP in charge of the area and the CP, PC Pande. **(According to police records, violence at Gulberg Society started at 10.30 a.m. and went on till 7 p.m.)**

He also told the commission that he only heard about the Naroda Patiya massacre at 9.30 p.m. "I do not know when the mob entered this Muslim locality and I also

do not know if the police officials present on the spot tried to contact me during this time. I think that during this time, the telephone lines were jammed. I first came to know about this incident (Naroda Patiya) at 9.30 p.m. when I was in the Gulberg Society and immediately rushed there,” he said.

But his cellphone details reveal that he was constantly in touch with the police officers who were in direct charge of the riot hit areas, and the police control room called him at least four times between 1.24 p.m. and 3.01p.m.

**Excerpts from the cellphone records of JCP (sector II) MK Tandon
February 27, 2002**

- 9.50 a.m.: Tandon receives a call from the police control room.
- 10.05 a.m.: Tandon calls the police control room.
- 10.08 a.m.: Tandon again calls the police control room.
- 10.09 a.m.: Tandon calls the DCP (zone IV), PB Gondia. Immediately, he receives a call from the DCP (zone V), RJ Savani.
- 10.11 a.m.: Tandon receives a call from the DCP (zone VI), BS Jebalia.
- 10.12 a.m.: Savani calls Tandon.
- 10.17 a.m.: ACP MT Rana calls Tandon.
- 11.31 a.m.: Tandon reaches the commissionerate and calls Savani and speaks for 70 seconds.
- 11.56 a.m.: Savani calls Tandon and speaks for 160 seconds.
- 12.16 p.m.: Savani calls Tandon again.
- 12.57 p.m.: Tandon calls Jebalia.
- 12.58 p.m.: Tandon calls Savani and speaks for 128 seconds.
- 2.59 p.m.: Savani calls Tandon.
- 3.18 p.m.: Tandon calls Jebalia.
- 3.49 p.m.: Tandon again calls Jebalia and speaks for 84 seconds. Minutes later, Tandon leaves the commissionerate and goes to Revdi Bazaar, a communally sensitive area.
- 4.02 p.m.: Jebalia calls Tandon.
- 4.22 p.m.: Jebalia calls Tandon.
- 4.25 p.m.: Tandon calls Savani. Tandon goes to the New Cloth Market where the office of the DCP (zone VI) (BS Jebalia) is also situated.
- 4.39 p.m.: Tandon calls Savani.
- 5.20 p.m.: Tandon calls the CP, PC Pande and speaks for 104 seconds. Tandon leaves and heads towards Bapunagar and Naroda areas.
- 5.49 p.m.: Tandon calls Savani.
- 5.57 p.m.: Tandon receives a call from the police control room.
- 6.05 p.m.: ACP Rana calls Tandon. Tandon is in the Rakhial area.
- 6.46 p.m.: Tandon reaches Bapunagar and receives a call from ACP Rana.
- 6.59 p.m.: Tandon reaches the Naroda area and calls Gondia.
- 7.17 p.m.: Tandon returns to the commissionerate.

- 8.42 p.m.: Tandon calls Savani and speaks for 232 seconds.
- 8.55 p.m.: Savani calls Tandon receives a call from DCP Savani.
- 9.34 p.m.: Savani calls Tandon and speaks for 481 seconds.
- 10.32 p.m.: Savani calls Tandon and speaks for 100 seconds.

February 28, 2002

- 12.00 a.m.: Savani calls Tandon. Tandon immediately calls up then state minister of state for home, Gordhan Zadaphiya, and speaks for 133 seconds.
- Three minutes later, Savani calls Tandon and speaks for 96 seconds.
- 6.49 a.m.: Tandon receives a call from Delhi and speaks for 126 seconds.
- An hour later, Tandon speaks to his three DCPs, Gondia, Savani and Jebalia, at length.
- Between 9.20 a.m. and 9.36 a.m.: Tandon speaks at length with Savani and Jebalia and then speaks to the CP, PC Pande.
- 11.20 a.m.: Tandon calls ACP MT Rana of Meghaninagar and Naroda areas.
- 11.34 a.m.: Tandon reaches Meghaninagar (where Gulberg Society is) and calls Gondia, under whose jurisdiction both the areas fall. Ten minutes later, he calls the CP and then makes two successive calls to the city police control room.
- 12.06 p.m.: Pande calls Tandon. Three minutes later Tandon leaves Meghaninagar area.
- 12.11 p.m.: Tandon reaches the Naroda area.
- Between 12.14 p.m. and 12.18 p.m. Tandon makes three calls to Pande. At 12.26 p.m. he makes one call to the police control room.
- 12.33 p.m.: Savani calls Tandon, after which Tandon leaves Naroda.
- 12.37 p.m.: Tandon calls Pande.
- 12.41 p.m.: Tandon calls Rana. Tandon is travelling through Bapunagar, Rakhial, and reaches Relief Road at 1.56 p.m. Tandon remains in the Relief Road and Revdi Bazaar areas until about 4 p.m.
- While Tandon is not in any of the riot hit areas within his jurisdiction, his cellphone details reveal he was constantly in touch with the DCPs, Gondia, Savani and Jebalia, the police control room, the CP, PC Pande and then city mayor, Himmatsinh Patel, during this time. The police control room called him at least four times between 1.24 p.m. and 3.01 p.m.
- 4.12 p.m.: Tandon reaches the police commissionerate.
- 4.28 p.m.: Tandon reaches the Meghaninagar area (Gulberg Society).
- 10.14 p.m.: Tandon visits the Naroda area and leaves by 11.03 p.m.

Meanwhile, what did the police do when Jaffri was desperate for help?

DGP K. Chakravarti:

- 11.56 p.m.: Chakravarti calls the CP, PC Pande, and speaks for 56 seconds.
- 12.18 p.m.: Chakravarti is in Gandhinagar; receives a call from the district collector, K. Srinivas, and speaks for 59 seconds.
- 1.06 p.m.: Srinivas calls Chakravarti.

- 1.43 p.m.: Chakravarti calls Pande and speaks for 116 seconds.
- 1.48 p.m.: Chakravarti receives a call from Badruddin Sheikh (Congress leader and then chairperson, Standing Committee, Ahmedabad Municipal Corporation) and speaks for 91 seconds.
- 2.01 p.m.: Sheikh calls Chakravarti again.
- 2.12 p.m.: Chakravarti calls Pande and speaks for 49 seconds
- 3.50 p.m.: Chakravarti reaches the city and calls his office in Gandhinagar. (Jaffri is suspected to be dead by this time.)
- 3.51 p.m.: Chakravarti receives a call from the ADGP (law & order) Maniram and speaks for 132 seconds.
- 3.55 p.m.: Chakravarti reaches Shahibaug and calls Pande.

CP, PC Pande

- 11.56 p.m.: DGP Chakravarti calls Pande.
- 12.06 p.m.: Calls JCP MK Tandon, speaks for 75 seconds
- 12.37 p.m.: Tandon calls Pande. By this time, curfew has been imposed in the city.
- 1.21 p.m.: Tanmay Mehta, Modi's PA, calls Pande.
- 1.22 p.m.: Tandon calls Pande again.
- 1.45 p.m.: Chakravarti calls Pande again and speaks for 116 seconds
- 2.02 p.m.: Tandon calls Pande for the third time and speaks for 125 seconds
- 2.12 p.m.: Chakravarti calls Pande for the third time.
- 2.25 p.m.: Tandon calls Pande again.
- 2.53 p.m.: Pande receives a call from state minister of state for home, Gordhan Zadaphiya.
- 3.09 p.m.: Pande receives a call from the state health minister, Ashok Bhatt.
- 3.16 p.m.: Pande calls the DCP (zone IV), PB Gondia, under whose jurisdiction the Gulberg Society and Naroda Patiya localities fall.
- 3.38 p.m.: Mehta calls Pande.
- 3.54 p.m.: Pande calls Gondia.
- 3.57 p.m.: Mehta calls Pande again.
- 3.59 p.m.: Pande receives a fourth call from DGP Chakravarti, who reaches Pande's office minutes later.
(Deposing before the Nanavati-Shah commission, Pande said Jaffri was killed between 3 p.m. and 4 p.m.)

Joint CP MK Tandon

Excerpts of MK Tandon's cellphone records have been deliberately repeated below to demonstrate how the calls made and received by him dovetail with those of other officers during the specific period when Ahsan Jaffri was so desperately seeking police assistance.

- 11.58 a.m.: Tandon calls police control room and speaks for 68 seconds. Has reached Meghaninagar, where Gulberg Society is, at 11.34 a.m.
- 12.06 p.m.: The CP, PC Pande calls Tandon. Three minutes later, Tandon leaves Meghaninagar area
- 12.11 p.m.: Tandon reaches Naroda area.
- 12.14-12.18 p.m.: Makes three calls to Pande and one to the police control room at 12.26 p.m.
- 12.33 p.m.: Tandon leaves Naroda.
- 12.37 p.m.: Tandon calls Pande.
- 12.41 p.m.: Tandon reaches Bapunagar and calls ACP MT Rana, under whose jurisdiction Meghaninagar and Naroda fall.
- 1.06 p.m.: Tandon calls DCP PB Gondia and speaks for 60 seconds. He is then in Rakhial
- 1.11 p.m.: Tandon calls the city mayor, Himmatsinh Patel and speaks for 78 seconds.
- 1.22 p.m.: Tandon calls Pande and speaks for 54 seconds.
- 1.24 p.m.: Tandon receives a call from the police control room.
- 1.51 p.m.: Tandon reaches Revdi Bazaar and Relief Road.
- 1.57 p.m.: Tandon calls DCP Gondia and speaks for 98 seconds.
- 1.59 p.m.: Tandon receives a call from the police control room.
- 2.02 p.m.: Tandon calls Pande and speaks for 124 seconds.
- 2.25 p.m.: Tandon calls Pande and speaks for 51 seconds.
- 2.52 p.m.: Tandon calls Patel and speaks for 145 seconds.
- 2.57 p.m.: Tandon receives a call from the police control room.
- 3.01 p.m.: Tandon receives a fourth call from the police control room.
- 3.30 p.m.: Tandon calls Pande and speaks for 72 seconds.
- 3.39 p.m.: Tandon receives a fifth call from the police control room.
- 3.40 p.m.: Tandon calls his office number at the police commissionerate.
- 4.12 p.m.: Tandon reaches the commissionerate.
- 4.28 p.m.: Tandon reaches the Meghaninagar area.

DCP PB Gondia

- 11.52 a.m.: Gondia receives a call from VHP general secretary and riot accused, Jaideep Patel and speaks for 107 seconds.
 - 11.56 a.m.: Gondia calls JCP MK Tandon, moves to Naroda area.
 - 12.20 p.m.: Jaideep Patel calls again and speaks to him for 42 seconds.
 - 12.35 p.m.: Gondia is in Meghaninagar area, returns to Naroda by 12.53 p.m.
 - 12.59 p.m.: Gondia calls the police control room.
 - Gondia remains in Naroda area till 1.44 p.m.
- At 1.53 p.m., Gondia is in Meghaninagar but returns to Naroda almost immediately. On the way, at 1.57 p.m., he receives a call from Tandon.
- 2.13 p.m.: Gondia is back in Meghaninagar from where he calls Nimesh Patel, an accused in the Naroda killings. Fifteen minutes later, Gondia is in Naroda.

- 2.46 p.m.: Gondia returns to Meghaninagar, calls ACP Rana. Within five minutes, he leaves for the police commissionerate, reaches by 2.55 p.m.
- 3.01 p.m.: Nimesh Patel calls Gondia.
- 3.11 p.m.: Leaves the police commissionerate but heads for Revdi Bazaar from where little violence has been reported.
- 3.16 p.m.: Gondia receives a call from the CP, PC Pande.
- Gondia remains at Revdi Bazaar till 4.03 and at 4.12 p.m. reaches Meghaninagar area