

# Mock First Information Report (FIR) — For LegalLens Testing

Police Station: Cyber Crime Branch, Central City

FIR No.: 2025/CYB/000123

Date of Report: 03/02/2025

Complainant:

Name: A. K. Sharma

Address: 12/4, Rosewood Apartments, Central City

Contact: +91-9876543210

Accused (Reported/Unknown):

Name: Unknown / 'John Doe' (possible alias)

Last known: IP-based host / mobile app (See logs)

Allegation Summary:

- 1) On or about 02/03/2025 at approximately 18:30 hours the complainant's social media account (CentralConnect ID: ak.sharma) was accessed without authorization and private messages were exfiltrated and published.
- 2) A mobile application ('QuickShare App') allegedly uploaded private messages and later removed them upon request from the complainant.
- 3) Complainant recorded a short video of a police constable at a local beat who refused to take immediate action, and was told 'you cannot record us' by the officer in plain sight.

Alleged Offences (as recorded by officer):

- Section 66 (Computer-related offences) — IT Act, 2000 (as amended)
- Section 66A (Offensive messages) — referenced (note: this section was struck down by the Supreme Court in *Shreya Singhal v. Union of India*, 2015)
- Section 72 (Breach of confidentiality) — IT Act provisions
- Section 354D (Stalking) — IPC (alleged online harassment)

Evidence listed:

- a) Screenshots of published messages (attachment: screenshots.zip)
- b) Server logs provided by complainant (attachment: logs\_ak.tar.gz)
- c) Short mobile video recorded by complainant (attachment: video\_clip.mp4)

Procedural notes (as filled by officer):

- Complainant informed of the process under Article 21 and rights to privacy.
- Immediate request for takedown served personally to app operator (verbal).
- No written takedown order recorded here.

Investigation steps suggested:

- Issue formal takedown under IT Act s.69A (if jurisdiction allows).
- Seek production orders for server logs via proper legal channels.
- Record witness statements of neighbor who saw posting at 02-03-2025.

Discrepancies / suspicious entries (intentional for testing):

- 1) FIR date (03/02/2025) and incident date (02/03/2025) have ambiguous day/month ordering and appear inconsistent.
- 2) Officer has written 'Section 66A' even though the complainant's facts suggest publication, and Section 66A is judicially invalid.
- 3) 'Verbal takedown' is claimed but no formal order logged — chain-of-custody gap.
- 4) Attachments list file names but no hashes, and filenames use inconsistent naming patterns (screenshots.zip vs logs\_ak.tar.gz).
- 5) Complainant phone number formatting differs in two places (country code omitted).

Officer in-charge:

Name: Inspector R. Verma

Badge No.: 0456

Signature: \_\_\_\_\_ Date signed: 03/02/2025

Notes for LegalLens testers:

- Expected red flags: inconsistent dates, reference to struck-down statutes, missing procedural takedown documentation, absent file integrity metadata, ambiguous party IDs, and claims of police discouraging lawful recording.
- Use this document to test: forged signature detection (blank signature), temporal consistency checks, statute validity lookups (e.g., 66A), and attachment-hash presence checks.

End of Mock FIR.