

RCOM bank fraud case: ED attaches Rs 3,034-cr assets

Express News Service
New Delhi, April 28

THE ENFORCEMENT Directorate (ED) on Tuesday said it has provisionally attached assets worth Rs 3,034.90 crore in the Reliance Communications Ltd (RCOM) bank fraud case, pushing the total attachments in cases linked to the Reliance Anil Ambani Group (RAAG) beyond Rs 19,344 crore.

The attached properties include a premium flat in Mumbai's Usha Kiran Building, a farmhouse in Khandala near Pune, and a land parcel in Sanand, Ahmedabad.

"Besides the above, Rs 7.71 crore shares of Reliance Infrastructure Ltd., held by M/S Risee Infinity Pvt Ltd. - a group entity of Anil Ambani under the RiseE Trust umbrella, which is a Private Family Trust of the members of Anil Ambani's family - were also attached," an ED spokesperson stated on Tuesday.

The agency said that the RiseE Trust was set up to ensure wealth preservation and resource generation by aggregation of properties in RiseE Trust and shield it from the personal liabilities of Anil Ambani in the form of Personal Guarantees extended by him to lender banks against the loans sanctioned to RCOM. "The properties were intended to be beneficially used and owned by the Anil Ambani family and not for the distressed public banks whose loans turned NPA," the spokesperson alleged.

When contacted, the spokesperson for Ambani's family said,

"The Usha Kiran property is a legacy family asset, acquired 41 years ago. The Khandala property is also a legacy family asset, acquired over four decades ago. MICA is an AICTE-recognised charitable educational institution that has operated independently since 1991. The shareholding of Risee Infinity Pvt Ltd. in Reliance Infrastructure Ltd. has been publicly disclosed on the stock exchanges since 2021. A provisional attachment is not a finding of guilt. The affected parties will respond on the record before the Adjudicating Authority within the time prescribed by law. Some of the properties attached by the ED belong to Kokilaben D Ambani."

The ED's move comes as a Special Investigation Team, constituted on Supreme Court directions, is probing allegations of diversion and laundering of bank and public funds by RAAG entities.

According to the ED, it has provisionally attached assets valued at Rs 3034.90 crore under Section 5 of the Prevention of Money Laundering Act (PMLA), 2002, in the RCOM bank fraud case. "The provisional attachment under PMLA has been made to prevent dissipation of assets and to protect the interests of banks and the public," the spokesperson said.

The ED's probe stems from multiple CBI cases filed on complaints from the SBI, PNB, Bank of Baroda, and LIC against RCOM, Anil Ambani, and others. "RCOM and its group firms owe Rs 40,185 crore to domestic and foreign lenders," the spokesperson alleged.

1 PERSON KILLED IN EXPLOSION ON RAILWAY FREIGHT CORRIDOR IN PATIALA

Pro-Khalistan terror module behind Patiala blast: Police

Raakhi Jagga
Ludhiana, April 28

A LATE-NIGHT blast on a freight corridor railway track near Shambhu in Patiala, in which one person was killed, was carried out by a pro-Khalistan terror module backed by Pakistan's ISI, police Tuesday said, adding they have arrested four of its members. Police had initially described the explosion on the Shambhu-Ambala track on Monday night as a low-intensity blast. However, an investigation later determined it was an attempt to blow up the track, police said.

Deputy Inspector General, Patiala Range, Kuldeep Chahal said, "The module responsible for the attempted detonation has been unearthed with the arrest of four highly radicalised habitual criminals".

Chahal said the person who was trying to carry out the detonation and died in the attempt has been identified as Jagrup Singh, a resident of Panjwar village in Tam Taran, and part of a terror module, which was being run from Malaysia. Jagrup Singh's body had been blown into pieces with parts found strewn around 200 feet from the explosion spot. Jagrup was wearing the dress of a 'Nihang' (loose blue robe) Singh said the DIG.

It is suspected that one more person might have accompanied Jagrup, the hunt for whom is underway, the DIG said.

SSP Varun Sharma identified the arrested accused as Pardeep Singh Khalsa, Kulwinder Singh alias Bagga (both



At the blast site near Shambhu in Patiala on Tuesday. HARMET SOOHI

of Mansa), and Satnam Singh alias Satta, and Gurpreet Singh alias Gopi (both Tam Taran). Satnam is the younger brother of Jagrup Singh. Police recovered a hand grenade, two pistols, ammunition, other sophisticated communication devices intended for future detonations, and laptops from their possession, he said, adding they were planning further attacks on public infrastructure and properties.

DIG Chahal identified Pardeep Khalsa as the kingpin of the module. "He has close ties with Malaysia-based pro-Khalistan handlers and maintained links with Pakistan-based arms suppliers. He used to send radicalised youth to Malaysia for terror training and then assign them tasks for carrying out ter-

ror activities," the DIG said. He said that Pardeep, who had 4-5 cases registered against him in Mansa, was also running a radical outfit in the name of 'Chalda Vaheer Chakarwari, Attariye.'

In 2019, Jagrup had visited Malaysia from where the module was being run, said Chahal.

Panjwar village sarpanch Manjit Singh said Jagrup was one of the supporters of Waris Punjab De chief and jailed Khador Sahib MP Amritpal Singh. During the 2024 Lok Sabha elections, he had campaigned for Amritpal, the Sarpanch said.

The DIG said he could comment on this only after the probe. He, however, added that Jagrup also had a case registered against him in Tam Taran in 2024. Special Director General of Police (Railway) Shashi

Prabha Dwivedi, who visited the site, said the incident occurred between 8.30 pm and 8.45 pm.

"Some anti-social elements are against the progress of the country... This is the second such incident on the freight corridor in less than four months. A similar blast had occurred near Sirhind railway station," she said.

Dwivedi added that crucial evidence has been recovered. "We found a body, a SIM card, and a motorcycle. After identifying the person, it was found that he had parked the motorcycle in Amritsar before travelling via train or bus to Sirhind and then moving towards Rajpura. A ticket was also recovered from his pocket," she said.

3 MONTHS AFTER AJIT PAWAR DEATH

Parth Pawar flies by VSR aircraft, calls it 'unintentional error'

Manoj More
Pune, April 28

PARTH PAWAR, the son of former Maharashtra Deputy Chief Minister Ajit Pawar, on Tuesday said he "had no idea about the plane's ownership" and called it an "unintentional mistake" on his part after it was pointed out that he had flown in an aircraft owned by VSR Aviation.

Ajit Pawar was flying on a VSR Aviation aircraft, which crashed while attempting to land at Baramati airport on January 28, killing him.

In a social media post, activist Anjali Damania said, "His father died in a VSR Company plane crash three months ago, and the son travels in the same aircraft? Instead of demanding an inquiry into that VSR Company, Parth Pawar flies in it without any hesitation?"

Along with the post, Damania attached a passenger manifest sheet. According to the sheet, the aircraft took off from Mumbai on Tuesday and landed in Pune. The names listed on this flight include MP Parth Pawar and four others. Additionally, there was a three-member crew, all of whom were male.

Incidentally, Ajit Pawar died on January 28 and on April 28, his son flew in the same company aircraft, said a Congress leader.

In his clarification, Parth said, "Since I needed to reach Modibag, Pune urgently to meet Pavar saheb, I had asked my office to arrange a flight.



Parth Pawar said that "he had no idea about the plane's ownership". FILE

Due to the last-minute arrangements, a plane from VSR Aviation was inadvertently booked for me. I had no idea that the aircraft belonged to VSR Aviation until I reached the airport and boarded the plane."

Asking his staff to be more vigilant, Parth said, "This was purely an administrative error. I have taken serious note of this, and we are immediately cancelling our contract with the agent who booked the flight. Furthermore, I have given clear instructions to my staff and colleagues to be more vigilant to ensure such mistakes do not happen again."

He added, "Our previous stance regarding VSR Aviation remains unchanged—we strongly oppose them, and we will continue to do so in the future."

Parth's cousin Rohit Pawar has been targeting the firm and its owner for the past two-three months, holding it responsible for Ajit Pawar's death. He also got an FIR filed in the case with Karnataka police.

IISER Pune allows default use of AI for assignments, research papers

Soham Shah
Pune, April 28

INDIAN INSTITUTE of Science Education and Research (IISER) Pune has allowed the default use of generative artificial intelligence (AI). Through guidelines adopted in March, the institute stipulated that if AI use is to be disallowed for any assignments or research papers, it must be specified beforehand.

IISER Pune constituted an AI committee under the chairmanship of professor Suthir Day to develop guidelines for generative AI usage in July 2025. Formed after consultations with students and staff, the guidelines apply to all assignments, theses, scientific articles submitted to peer-reviewed journals, and any other documented output at the institute.

What do the guidelines say?

The most important point laid out in the guidelines is that, unless explicitly forbidden by the competent authority, the use of generative AI is permitted by default in all documented outputs and activities by students and staff. This means that course assignments, research papers, and other documents can be prepared with the help of AI tools.

Prof Dey told The Indian Express, "The implementation of a ban on generative AI is going to be very, very difficult. Theoretically, we do not have any strong method to figure out if some text has or has not been generated using generative AI. It's not even that the method theoretically exists and nobody has been able to put it into software. The method itself is not there."

According to the guidelines, if generative AI is used, the user will bear full responsibility and accountability for the output.

Viva-voce verification

If a competent authority wants to prevent the use of generative AI for any output, they must state this beforehand in writing.

The authority must also state how such a ban will be implemented; examples could include using a viva-voce or an honour-based system, where students are expected to act honestly and uphold codes of conduct.

Giving an example of a verification system, Prof Dey explained, "In maths or in physics, after the assignments have been submitted, you can make the students sit in a room and

then essentially give them some small subset of the assignment questions. Then, if they can solve the question in class, it means they have not used AI and will get the marks. If they cannot solve it, it means that they have used AI, and even though their submission is correct, they won't get the marks."

AI attribution

If generative AI is used in a way that its output does not form part of the final output, no attribution to AI is required. This includes literature research, understanding concepts, brainstorming, grammar checks, and copy editing using AI.

For use cases that go beyond the limit of the previous category—like generating substantial computer code, complete sentences or paragraphs, tables or figures, proofs or derivations—the user must acknowledge the use of AI in the output.

Data privacy

Any data uploaded to generative AI platforms can potentially be used by the company to train its model. Anything uploaded to such platforms must therefore be treated as if it has been posted on the internet, the guidelines say.

pared with the help of AI tools.

Prof Dey told The Indian Express, "The implementation of a ban on generative AI is going to be very, very difficult. Theoretically, we do not have any strong method to figure out if some text has or has not been generated using generative AI. It's not even that the method theoretically exists and nobody has been able to put it into software. The method itself is not there."

According to the guidelines, if generative AI is used, the user will bear full responsibility and accountability for the output.

Viva-voce verification

If a competent authority wants to prevent the use of generative AI for any output, they must state this beforehand in writing.

The authority must also state how such a ban will be implemented; examples could include using a viva-voce or an honour-based system, where students are expected to act honestly and uphold codes of conduct.

Giving an example of a verification system, Prof Dey explained, "In maths or in physics, after the assignments have been submitted, you can make the students sit in a room and

then essentially give them some small subset of the assignment questions. Then, if they can solve the question in class, it means they have not used AI and will get the marks. If they cannot solve it, it means that they have used AI, and even though their submission is correct, they won't get the marks."

AI attribution

If generative AI is used in a way that its output does not form part of the final output, no attribution to AI is required. This includes literature research, understanding concepts, brainstorming, grammar checks, and copy editing using AI.

For use cases that go beyond the limit of the previous category—like generating substantial computer code, complete sentences or paragraphs, tables or figures, proofs or derivations—the user must acknowledge the use of AI in the output.

Data privacy

Any data uploaded to generative AI platforms can potentially be used by the company to train its model. Anything uploaded to such platforms must therefore be treated as if it has been posted on the internet, the guidelines say.

pared with the help of AI tools.

Prof Dey told The Indian Express, "The implementation of a ban on generative AI is going to be very, very difficult. Theoretically, we do not have any strong method to figure out if some text has or has not been generated using generative AI. It's not even that the method theoretically exists and nobody has been able to put it into software. The method itself is not there."

According to the guidelines, if generative AI is used, the user will bear full responsibility and accountability for the output.

Viva-voce verification

If a competent authority wants to prevent the use of generative AI for any output, they must state this beforehand in writing.

The authority must also state how such a ban will be implemented; examples could include using a viva-voce or an honour-based system, where students are expected to act honestly and uphold codes of conduct.

Giving an example of a verification system, Prof Dey explained, "In maths or in physics, after the assignments have been submitted, you can make the students sit in a room and

then essentially give them some small subset of the assignment questions. Then, if they can solve the question in class, it means they have not used AI and will get the marks. If they cannot solve it, it means that they have used AI, and even though their submission is correct, they won't get the marks."

AI attribution

If generative AI is used in a way that its output does not form part of the final output, no attribution to AI is required. This includes literature research, understanding concepts, brainstorming, grammar checks, and copy editing using AI.

For use cases that go beyond the limit of the previous category—like generating substantial computer code, complete sentences or paragraphs, tables or figures, proofs or derivations—the user must acknowledge the use of AI in the output.

Data privacy

Any data uploaded to generative AI platforms can potentially be used by the company to train its model. Anything uploaded to such platforms must therefore be treated as if it has been posted on the internet, the guidelines say.

pared with the help of AI tools.

Prof Dey told The Indian Express, "The implementation of a ban on generative AI is going to be very, very difficult. Theoretically, we do not have any strong method to figure out if some text has or has not been generated using generative AI. It's not even that the method theoretically exists and nobody has been able to put it into software. The method itself is not there."

According to the guidelines, if generative AI is used, the user will bear full responsibility and accountability for the output.

Viva-voce verification

If a competent authority wants to prevent the use of generative AI for any output, they must state this beforehand in writing.

The authority must also state how such a ban will be implemented; examples could include using a viva-voce or an honour-based system, where students are expected to act honestly and uphold codes of conduct.

Giving an example of a verification system, Prof Dey explained, "In maths or in physics, after the assignments have been submitted, you can make the students sit in a room and

then essentially give them some small subset of the assignment questions. Then, if they can solve the question in class, it means they have not used AI and will get the marks. If they cannot solve it, it means that they have used AI, and even though their submission is correct, they won't get the marks."

AI attribution

If generative AI is used in a way that its output does not form part of the final output, no attribution to AI is required. This includes literature research, understanding concepts, brainstorming, grammar checks, and copy editing using AI.

For use cases that go beyond the limit of the previous category—like generating substantial computer code, complete sentences or paragraphs, tables or figures, proofs or derivations—the user must acknowledge the use of AI in the output.

Data privacy

Any data uploaded to generative AI platforms can potentially be used by the company to train its model. Anything uploaded to such platforms must therefore be treated as if it has been posted on the internet, the guidelines say.

pared with the help of AI tools.

Prof Dey told The Indian Express, "The implementation of a ban on generative AI is going to be very, very difficult. Theoretically, we do not have any strong method to figure out if some text has or has not been generated using generative AI. It's not even that the method theoretically exists and nobody has been able to put it into software. The method itself is not there."

According to the guidelines, if generative AI is used, the user will bear full responsibility and accountability for the output.

Viva-voce verification

If a competent authority wants to prevent the use of generative AI for any output, they must state this beforehand in writing.

The authority must also state how such a ban will be implemented; examples could include using a viva-voce or an honour-based system, where students are expected to act honestly and uphold codes of conduct.

Giving an example of a verification system, Prof Dey explained, "In maths or in physics, after the assignments have been submitted, you can make the students sit in a room and

then essentially give them some small subset of the assignment questions. Then, if they can solve the question in class, it means they have not used AI and will get the marks. If they cannot solve it, it means that they have used AI, and even though their submission is correct, they won't get the marks."

AI attribution

If generative AI is used in a way that its output does not form part of the final output, no attribution to AI is required. This includes literature research, understanding concepts, brainstorming, grammar checks, and copy editing using AI.

For use cases that go beyond the limit of the previous category—like generating substantial computer code, complete sentences or paragraphs, tables or figures, proofs or derivations—the user must acknowledge the use of AI in the output.

Data privacy

Any data uploaded to generative AI platforms can potentially be used by the company to train its model. Anything uploaded to such platforms must therefore be treated as if it has been posted on the internet, the guidelines say.

pared with the help of AI tools.

Prof Dey told The Indian Express, "The implementation of a ban on generative AI is going to be very, very difficult. Theoretically, we do not have any strong method to figure out if some text has or has not been generated using generative AI. It's not even that the method theoretically exists and nobody has been able to put it into software. The method itself is not there."

According to the guidelines, if generative AI is used, the user will bear full responsibility and accountability for the output.

Viva-voce verification

If a competent authority wants to prevent the use of generative AI for any output, they must state this beforehand in writing.

The authority must also state how such a ban will be implemented; examples could include using a viva-voce or an honour-based system, where students are expected to act honestly and uphold codes of conduct.

Giving an example of a verification system, Prof Dey explained, "In maths or in physics, after the assignments have been submitted, you can make the students sit in a room and

then essentially give them some small subset of the assignment questions. Then, if they can solve the question in class, it means they have not used AI and will get the marks. If they cannot solve it, it means that they have used AI, and even though their submission is correct, they won't get the marks."

AI attribution

If generative AI is used in a way that its output does not form part of the final output, no attribution to AI is required. This includes literature research, understanding concepts, brainstorming, grammar checks, and copy editing using AI.

For use cases that go beyond the limit of the previous category—like generating substantial computer code, complete sentences or paragraphs, tables or figures, proofs or derivations—the user must acknowledge the use of AI in the output.

Data privacy

Any data uploaded to generative AI platforms can potentially be used by the company to train its model. Anything uploaded to such platforms must therefore be treated as if it has been posted on the internet, the guidelines say.

pared with the help of AI tools.

Prof Dey told The Indian Express, "The implementation of a ban on generative AI is going to be very, very difficult. Theoretically, we do not have any strong method to figure out if some text has or has not been generated using generative AI. It's not even that the method theoretically exists and nobody has been able to put it into software. The method itself is not there."

According to the guidelines, if generative AI is used, the user will bear full responsibility and accountability for the output.

Viva-voce verification

If a competent authority wants to prevent the use of generative AI for any output, they must state this beforehand in writing.

The authority must also state how such a ban will be implemented; examples could include using a viva-voce or an honour-based system, where students are expected to act honestly and uphold codes of conduct.

Giving an example of a verification system, Prof Dey explained, "In maths or in physics, after the assignments have been submitted, you can make the students sit in a room and

then essentially give them some small subset of the assignment questions. Then, if they can solve the question in class, it means they have not used AI and will get the marks. If they cannot solve it, it means that they have used AI, and even though their submission is correct, they won't get the marks."

AI attribution

If generative AI is used in a way that its output does not form part of the final output, no attribution to AI is required. This includes literature research, understanding concepts, brainstorming, grammar checks, and copy editing using AI.

For use cases that go beyond the limit of the previous category—like generating substantial computer code, complete sentences or paragraphs, tables or figures, proofs or derivations—the user must acknowledge the use of AI in the output.

Data privacy

Any data uploaded to generative AI platforms can potentially be used by the company to train its model. Anything uploaded to such platforms must therefore be treated as if it has been posted on the internet, the guidelines say.

pared with the help of AI tools.

Prof Dey told The Indian Express, "The implementation of a ban on generative AI is going to be very, very difficult. Theoretically, we do not have any strong method to figure out if some text has or has not been generated using generative AI. It's not even that the method theoretically exists and nobody has been able to put it into software. The method itself is not there."

According to the guidelines, if generative AI is used, the user will bear full responsibility and accountability for the output.

Viva-voce verification

If a competent authority wants to prevent the use of generative AI for any output, they must state this beforehand in writing.

The authority must also state how such a ban will be implemented; examples could include using a viva-voce or an honour-based system, where students are expected to act honestly and uphold codes of conduct.

Giving an example of a verification system, Prof Dey explained, "In maths or in physics, after the assignments have been submitted, you can make the students sit in a room and

then essentially give them some small subset of the assignment questions. Then, if they can solve the question in class, it means they have not used AI and will get the marks. If they cannot solve it, it means that they have used AI, and even though their submission is correct, they won't get the marks."

AI attribution

If generative AI is used in a way that its output does not form part of the final output, no attribution to AI is required. This includes literature research, understanding concepts, brainstorming, grammar checks, and copy editing using AI.

For use cases that go beyond the limit of the previous category—like generating substantial computer code, complete sentences or paragraphs, tables or figures, proofs or derivations—the user must acknowledge the use of AI in the output.

Data privacy

Any data uploaded to generative AI platforms can potentially be used by the company to train its model. Anything uploaded to such platforms must therefore be treated as if it has been posted on the internet, the guidelines say.

pared with the help of AI tools.

Prof Dey told The Indian Express, "The implementation of a ban on generative AI is going to be very, very difficult. Theoretically, we do not have any strong method to figure out if some text has or has not been generated using generative AI. It's not even that the method theoretically exists and nobody has been able to put it into software. The method itself is not there."

According to the guidelines, if generative AI is used, the user will bear full responsibility and accountability for the output.

Viva-voce verification

If a competent authority wants to prevent the use of generative AI for any output, they must state this beforehand in writing.

The authority must also state how such a ban will be implemented; examples could include using a viva-voce or an honour-based system, where students are expected to act honestly and uphold codes of conduct.

Giving an example of a verification system, Prof Dey explained, "In maths or in physics, after the assignments have been submitted, you can make the students sit in a room and

then essentially give them some small subset of the assignment questions. Then, if they can solve the question in class, it means they have not used AI and will get the marks. If they cannot solve it, it means that they have used AI, and even though their submission is correct, they won't get the marks."

AI attribution

If generative AI is used in a way that its output does not form part of the final output, no attribution to AI is required. This includes literature research, understanding concepts, brainstorming, grammar checks, and copy editing using AI.

For use cases that go beyond the limit of the previous category—like generating substantial computer code, complete sentences or paragraphs, tables or figures, proofs or derivations—the user must acknowledge the use of AI in the output.

Data privacy