

Decoding Aarushi – Hemraj Unsolved Murder Case Through Forensic Linguistics

Ayushi Soni

Independent Researcher, Dept of language and literature, Pandit Ravishankar Shukla University, Raipur (C.G), India

ARTICLE INFO

Article history:

Received 25 May 2026
Accepted 30 May 2026
Available online 07 June 2026

Keywords:

Forensic Linguistic, murder, unsolved, linguistic profiling, Arushi Talwar

Indexed in:



and in major libraries

ABSTRACT

The infamous Double Murder case aka Arushi Talwar and Hemraj case which remains controversial criminal investigation due to its complicating narratives, gaps in the timeline, the evidences that never could conclude anything. This research study aims to reanalyze the unsolved murder via forensic linguistic approach, directing how language can help in interpreting and reconstructing events. Using qualitative case study approach and linguistic marker such as deceptions, vagueness, hedging, contradiction and so on. After reconstructing the timeline, the study will analyses the statements made by the suspects via interviews and through official statements. The research paper does not seek to establish guilty and innocence but to reexamine the case through Forensic linguistic lens and to give the observations on narrative reliability and demonstrates how language can function as analytical tool in complex murder cases like this.

© 2026 International Journal of Advanced Research in Science and Technology (IJARST).

All rights reserved.

1.1 INTRODUCTION

In 2008 Noida, a double murder case of Arushi Talwar (14) and domestic helper Hemraj (35) were brutally killed on 15-16 May at Talwar Residence. Due to lack of evidences against the suspects, the case remains unsolved despite being well known for its contentious criminal investigation. The case gained the media attention around the nation for its complicated timelines and narratives that leads to lots of misinterpretation and loss of crucial details in the case. The central issue of this case was not able to draw conclusions and coherent observations as CBI, Media narrative and suspects statements were found contradicting to each other. The inconsistency has contributed in fragmented timelines which not only made the case complicated but it distracted the prominent proofs that could have solved the case.

Traditionally the cases are solved investigated through physical and Forensic science techniques. The role of forensic linguistic is underrated and something this case lacks. By using language as a tool to investigate, it shades light on statements, the linguistic markers of interviews like linguistic profiling of the suspects to match the evidence, rule out any deceptions, hedging and understanding the psych behind the murder. The research reexamines the Arushi Murder case in order to observe through the forensic lens and emphasis on reconstruction of timeline and statements analysis in order to draw observations which might have

been overlooked during investigation or unseen. The research does not aim to prove guilty but to solve the case through language with available resources like media trials, suspects interviews and reported statements, as to identify the pattern that can help to build sequence of events.

1.2 FORENSIC LINGUISTIC

Forensic linguistic is a branch of applied linguistic which examines the role of language in legal and forensic. It focuses on the analysis of spoken and written discourses in legal proceedings, criminal investigation questioned documents and so on. By studying language as a structured, used interpreted and used in multidisciplinary helps to decipher the patterns and behavior of the victims.

Language as evidence plays a major role while investigating phonetics of a sound recording, their lexical choices, tone, syntax structure and evaluating questioned document to understand the handwriting style, sentence structure, vocabulary to rule out any deceptions during crime investigations. Language is one of the underrated weapons to analyses cognitive and psychological process in the investigations.

Talking about in criminal investigation, forensic linguistics plays a significant role in analyzing statements, identifying inconsistency and reconstruction sequence of events. It also

examines the witness testimonies, suspect interviews, ransom notes, suicides notes, analyzing voice notes and speaker phonetics. The linguistics markers help to identify underlying observations that is not visible via conventional methods.

1.3 FORENSIC LINGUISTIC THEORIES

DISCOURSE ANALYSIS

Discourse analysis is the study of language beyond sentences in text and conversation. It analyses how sentences and words are connected during conversations. The theory originated in early 1960s by American Linguist Zelling Harris. The discourse focuses on the statements by suspects words and sentences if they make any sequencing, coherence and how the speaker is conversing during interrogation and testimonies.

1.4 PRAGMATICS ANALYSIS

Pragmatic, in literal terms of linguistic refers to studying the context and content beyond the literal meaning and decipher the decoding of the speaker narrative. The theory was founded by philosopher Paul Grice in 1975. He introduced four maxims that are important in communication or conversation. The first maxim of quantity means right amount of information to be exchanged. The maxim of quality refers to the given information should truthfulness and avoidance of false narrative, the maxims of relation refers to be relevant according to the given context of information and, last maxims of manner which refers to info should consist clarity and brevity, in order to reduce any ambiguous during communication.

1.5 THE SPEECH ACT THEORY

The speech act theory was invented by J.L Austin which focus language as action rather than expression. According to this utterance operates on three levels: the locutionary act which refers on making meaningful expression on what being said. The illocutionary act refers to performed action in saying something like questioning, warning, explaining and so on. While the last one is perlocutionary act refers to the effect on the listener, it could be either persuading or influencing.

1.6 RESEARCH GAP AND LIMITATION

The research gap in this case study follows limited forensic linguistic analysis as investigation focused more on physical evidence, DNA, etc. there was a limitation in analysis from forensic linguistic approach. Previous research studies stress on who is right and wrong rather what than the possibilities from different perspective. Lack of attention were given on suspects discourse markers, deception and narrative shifts in the interviews and interrogation statements. The limited research on forensic psychology approach of the suspects creates lack to see from different interdisciplinary lens rather than dependent on limited resources.

2.0 ANALYSIS AND DISCUSSION

Timeline Reconstruction

Based on the available data, the sequence of events in Arushi Talwar Double Murder Case can be tentatively

reconstructed. On the night of 15 may 2008, as per the timelines on the Talwar Couple gave *SONY DSC DIGI CAM* to her as her pre-birthday gift. The family clicked pictures and the last picture was recorded at 10:10pm. They retired to their respective room. Around 11pm, Rajesh asked Nupur to switch on the internet router which is located in the Arushi room. she went to her room, where Arushi was reading a book and after switching on, she left the room. Rajesh Talwar used the internet around 11:41pm. The next morning on 16 may 2008, the victim body was found lying on the bed and the parents suspected Hemraj for the murderer of their daughter. However, in the same day, his body was discovered by the CBI team on terrace inside the cooler where he was brutally killed. It is observed that reconstructed the timeline shows prominent narrative inconsistency. Following the last documented photograph, the family, it is reported that the family members went to their respective room. however, there is no clear reference of dinner or any subsequent activities happen after that, resulting in time gap. Similarly, the suspect reportedly returned to her room and after switching on the router. There is an absence of information what the suspect did in forty-five minutes while one was engaged. The lack of detail introduced temporal gap in the sequence of events. Further observation highlights the absence of second victim Hemraj, the housekeeper from the fragments of the timelines, raising questions his movements and role during the particular timeline. Additionally, the certain reported events, such as landline call was received by Rajesh but there is temporal gap in the timeline causing the chronological ambiguity.

One more prominent event that was overlooked was call records recorded Arushi's friend Anmol attempted to call her around 12:10 am which remain unanswered. When align with the other elements, its shows that certain critical events occurred during this timeslot, however due to lack of narrative coherent in the statements, it is uncertain to rule out the exact timing. The post mortem examination estimated that murders happened between 12- 1 am. on the other hand, as per the reconstructed timeline and associated events raises questions regarding precise timing. Considering Certain details like call records and narrative gaps, the murders may indicate occurred slightly before the actual timing.

For instance, the unanswered call records of 12:10am may hint that critical events already occurred by that time. This unravel the possibility of the events leading to deaths began prior to midnight and progressed over a short duration of time or may be more. Another importance uncanny lies in the causality in the timeless as to showcase that nothing happened and two murders happened suspiciously. The timeline also suggests internet router being used around 3 am and followed by till morning. Regarding the pictures in the camera were never investigated properly in order to rule out how many pictures were taken on that night and how many were deleted. The timeline also record presence of Hemraj around 7:30pm where he was last seen in the house, according to the driver Umesh.

2.1 CRIME SCENE ANALYSIS

The physical evidence in crime investigation plays a major role in deciphering the reconstructed time line. For instance, bloodstains, body positions and conditions of the rooms in

the case to determine the sequence of events. In Arushi's case, the bloodstains on the walls appears to be scattered or splatter kind of pattern, indicating the use of force in the incident. Meanwhile the bloodstains on the right side of pillow appear to have oozed out, suggesting the bloodshed after the attack.

There is a difference on the walls bloodstains and on the pillows. The bloodstains on the wall contains dots like patterns, indicating that a heavy object was applied forcefully. In contrast, the bloodstains on the right side of the pillow appear more passive and flowing in nature. When considered together, it raises the questions regarding differences in bloodstains patterns around the victims' body. The body position of the Arushi lying on the bed appears calm and resembles a sleeping position, without any signs of disturbance. It can be observed that the murder might have taken place while she was half- awake state, or someone may have intruded her privacy before attacking and killing her on the spot without much struggle. It is also noted that both CBI teams observed that Aarushi's room was heavily dressed up. According to reports, both the parents' room and her victim were close to each other, and the walls contained plywood as well. Any noise could potentially be heard to some extent in other room. The bloodstains were found only in the walls and not on her belongings, such as bag which placed nearby, toys and even on the bedsheet beyond the area where she is laying. No bloodstains were found on the locks or on the floor of Arushi room and the keys of Arushi room was missing too during the investigation. It raises question on the crime scene inquiry done by the experts. In some reports by forensics, it was mentioned that Arushi Pajama was dress up loose, it was seen as someone has try to pull down her pajama intentionally and the string of the pajama were not in knots. Suspects were not documented whether the room of Arushi was open or close in the morning.

Whereas in Hemraj case, the bloodstains of him on the terrace was flowing like a brutally murdered that involves movement followed by bloodstains in the entrance walls and stairs which was overlooked in the investigation by the CBI. The body was discovering in an open terrace suggesting that Hemraj ran to the terrace in order to hide or rescue from the suspects but ended up killed by them. According to the investigators, on their way to investigate the terrace, they found the bloodstains on the lock as well as the dragging faint stains on the staircase that goes from Talwar flat to terrace. It is noted that he was forcefully dragged in the terrace, he tried fight with the murder. Another observation, the police found his body concealed under the cooler heavy mattress covering the body. The murderer tried their best to hide the body and they keep brutally attacking him until he was dead.

2.2 THE POST MORTEM REPORT

In Aarushi's post mortem report, it was observed that there was a deep cut above the left eyebrow, which was severe enough to extent into the skull. Another smaller cut on the left eyebrow was also present. Additionally, a large tear was observed on the left side of the head, suggesting a strong impact or blunt force trauma. There was a deep cut across the neck, above the throat region which slit the windpipe and

carotid artery. The injury was extensive and serious, extending across a significant portion of the neck.

In Hemraj Post Mortem report, it was observed that a scrape behind the elbow, bruised behind the left elbow, a long deep cut across the neck (30cm), bruised area on the left side of the forehead. Two deep wounds at the back of the head.

The injuries of both victims appear same yet different in terms of angles. It is noticed that both victims endured head and neck injuries. For instances, Hemraj has multiple injuries, especially on the back of the head. Which suggest that he was fighting back and been on conscious while Arushi was taken down by the attacker. There is a difference in the neck wounds, in Arushi's case the neck injury is less severe indicating the attacker was quick to killed her without giving any time to defense. While in case of Hemraj the attacker tries to hit him multiple blows in the back of the head in order to make him unconscious and his neck injury is noted to be 30cm. The ambiguity in the injuries which might be noted as difference in the murder timings of the victims.

The autopsy report suggested that the injuries inflicted on both the victims were intentionally and precisely. This may indicate the involvement of an individual who possessed knowledge of handling sharp objects. Second, several media reports attempted to create a narrative suggesting that Aarushi had been sexually abused by Hemraj. However, post mortem findings and forensic experts later confirmed that no biological evidence was found to support such claims. Third, contradiction in the statements provided by the couple regarding Aarushi's food consumption raised further questions. Rajesh Talwar stated that Aarushi had consumed kebabs, whereas nupur talwar claimed that she had only tea. However, the autopsy report indicated the presence of partially digested food, creating inconsistencies between the statements and forensic findings.

2.4 STATEMENTS ANALYSIS

This section focuses on the statements and interviews analysis associated with this case using forensic linguistic approach. The focus is on hedging, vagueness, deception, contradictions, gap and to decipher how the statements of the suspects influence the timeline. This section is focusing on one of the controversial Nupur Talwar NDTV interview in 2008. The following exchanges between the media interviewer and Nupur Talwar. The questions asked by the interviewer are:

1. The interviewer introduces the case and invites the Nupur Talwar to share her personal story.
2. The interviewer asked about Rajesh Talwar personality aligns with allegations against him.
3. The interviewer asked her to comment on rumors and present her views on it.
4. The interviewer questions about family being blamed for cover up the evidence.
5. The interviewer asked what she thinks what may have happened.
6. The interviewer asked for clarification regarding Hemraj and Arushi relationship.
7. The interviewer claimed about the strained Father and Daughter relationship.

8. The interviewer asked how she will manage to cope with the loss and handle the situation.
1. In response to the interviewer request to share her accounts on the case, Nupur Talwar provides a narrative that focus on primarily emotional experience rather than factual narrative. The opening statement “All I can say is that my life has come to an end” reflects her ongoing grief and establish an affective tone. She also addresses the interviewer with her name in order to maintain the interview more conversation to avoid any hesitation. She does not provide any specific detail while continuing her statement and uses again an emotional intensifier line “I lost Arushi eight days ago in a brutal way.”

The statement shifts to defense her husband where she uses intensifier phrases like “100 per cent Rajesh dotted on his daughter” and “*totally untrue*” emphasize on her personal claim. the next line “this could, it couldn’t be the way they are suggesting” here the speaker is facing the difficulties in forming sentences or trying to self-repair the phrase cautiously in order to avoid any hedging. The line makes no coherent and shows internal contradiction in the process while speaking.

A significant portion is dedicated to being happy family and planning birthday celebration, the narrative shifts to normalcy and the speaker trying to red herring the conversation to what happened as per the question asked by the interviewer to describing the birthday plan and family stability. It shows that the speaker is diverging the central topic. She uses first person narration a lot to let the focus on what they planned rather than what happened.

The speaker once again calls the name of the interviewer to response on the question by saying “*I don’t what to say. I, all I can say, is that I have faith in god*”, she concluded the response by putting belief-based language, not explaining the events of the timeline.

2. In response to the question whether Rajesh personality aligns with the allegation against him, the speaker responded by an absolute expression statement that “*Rajesh never uttered a word to her ...tell her that*”, it creates over generalization of the character of him and it raises question if father daughter relation were not in good terms and the speaker was the mediator. Later she contradicted the statement that he was the one who would always, its not possible” there is a lack of coherence in the speaker statements. She uses discourse marker like I mean as a tool of rectifying the previous statement for clarity and shows the signs of hesitation.
The next lines like gentle soul was noted as character-based strategy to defense Rajesh Talwar, where the speaker seeks external validation to emphasis the character of him. The speaker uses gentle soul as a word to defense her husband and she again uses repetition word like Unimaginable

twice as an emotional intensifier and later she concluded the statement by saying she don’t think so. Another important aspect to be noted that the narrative shift on from the events to general personality traits. The overall statement does not imply on any timeline or any evidence but strong claims without any supporting details.

3. When asked if the speaker will back him completely, she responded with strong certainty and emotional commitment for her husband. However, the next line “*isn’t it possible*” reflects lack of elaboration on what impossible she is emphasizing and create ambiguous expression. Then the speaker says “*there is someone out there. And I hope the person is caught*” now the blame is shifted and the speaker introduces external attribution without any event specific details or evidence. The speaker is using high certainty language without justification that why she feels there was someone when the question was asked in yes or no perspective. It raises question if the speaker is trying create a storyline as per the convenience.
4. In response to the interviewer’s question regarding rumors and speculations surrounding the case, Nupur Talwar initiated the conversation by narrating the routine and harmony within the family, which emphasis normalcy construction even though the question is was direct about the rumors. The conversation commenced with assertion phrases such “*I was there with Arushi*” and “*I was*”, showing repetition regarding her presence with the daughter. However, it does not reveal any specific details. The speaker repeatedly uses normalcy construction to portray a normal routine and stable family environment, and the narration continuously shifts from allegation to family routines.
The response is frequently use of discourse marker of *I mean*, the speaker shows hesitation and cognitive processing while forming answer and another observation is the speaker over emphasis or explain the previous statements. Another feature is rhetorical questions like “*do you think any mother could sit through or sit through sleep through that night ...*” and “*can any think it’s possible?*” shift the response from factual clarification toward emotional persuasion. The speaker didn’t clarify the statements and instead keeps changing the narration by avoiding discussing on evidences or specific observations. She uses appeal to identity phrases like “*mothers out there can you ever think...*” and leaves the conclusion vague rather than clarification in regards to the speculations are true or false
5. In response to the interviewer question regarding her understanding of what might have happened on the night of the incident, Nupur Talwar response commenced with the statement like “*I have no idea*”, which reflects a lack of knowledge and explicit uncertainty. It is observed that in previous responses, she displayed strong certainty and confidence claims while defending her husband; however, when asked about the daughter, her

- responses shifted toward uncertainty-based narration. The responses further contain speculative expression like “probably”, “it could be anything and must have been”. Here, the speaker appears to construct the possibilities rather than provide factual information. The responses appear more hypothetical and assumptions and it does not show prominent details. Another noticeable observation is the change in narrative. For instance, she initially suspects the servant after seeing her daughter’s body. However, after Hemraj body was discovered, she changed the narrative by suggesting that the servant might have had enemies and that Aarushi may have become the witness. This appears to be a very strong claim, as the speaker is indirectly introducing alternative possibilities. According to Hemraj Wife’s statement during the interrogation, he had told her that his life was in danger. If the speaker had knowledge about the enemies, questions arise as to why she didn’t state this during the interrogation and why her response initially reflected uncertainty. The speaker is continuously using the discourse marker “I mean” again and again, that indicates ongoing processing.
6. In response to the interviewer’s question regarding the relationship between Hemraj and Aarushi, Nupur Talwar began her response with a resume or character-based description of Hemraj and his relationship with the family. Instead of directly responding to the claim, she shifted the narrative from allegation toward character construction, as well as discussing related food. Another noticeable feature was the inclusion of unnecessary details like Aarushi eating Palak Paneer for the first time. While the speaker may have been recalling memories of her daughter, she didn’t directly answer the particular question; rather, she focused on describing the Hemraj character. She also uses “I mean” as a discourse marker, as observed in her previous responses.
 7. In response to the interviewer’s question regarding whether she would protect her husband if she suspected his involvement, she didn’t answer the question directly. Instead, she uses rhetorical questions directed at the interviewer, such as “would any mother do that”, “would any mother sleep there through the night?”, “Even if a father killed a child, the father going to do that and keep sleeping there till morning?” This may be interpreted as a shift from personal response to generalization. Another prominent feature is the repeated use of the phrase “any mother” rather than “I”, which reflects that the speaker is generalizing her statement and avoiding an individual perspective. Her response in this answer also demonstrates emotional intensifiers and moral framing. The speaker uses hypothetical scenarios towards the end rather than discussing factual events, the timeline, or what happened on that night.
 8. In the response to the interviewer’s question regarding her emotional experience during the eight days following the incident, she begins her answer with the repeated phrase “it has been hell.” The

repetition acts as a strong emotional intensifier, reflecting a state filled with grief and distress. The speaker continues by using affective framing phrases in the continuation of the answer like “god’s biggest punishment and I don’t think anyone gets a worse punishment than this.” These phrases can be interpreted as intense emotional and religiously oriented language. She then shifts the narration toward her husband, where she again attempts to defend him. Here, character reinforcement can be observed in her linguistic profiling, as she appears more outspoken and comfortable discussing her husband’s character than providing the factual information or details related to the investigation. Furthermore, she introduces others’ opinions and discusses coping with grief and recovery rather than describing the present situation.

3. FINDINGS AND EVIDENCE ANALYSIS

In the Aarushi Murder Case, several observations that appeared to be overlooked by the CBI. One of the foremost pieces of evidence involved the terrace keys, which were never recovered by the investigating team. It was reported that when the police questioned the Talwars regarding the terrace keys during the investigation, the keys were found to be missing. Additionally, a neighbor stated that the terrace was generally kept open; however, on the day of the incident, it was reportedly found locked. Similarly, the victim’s mobile phones were also reported missing and were later discovered at different locations. This raises questions regarding whether the keys and mobile phones were intentionally lost, or deliberately removed to conceal evidence related to the incident. Another observation involved the statements of Bharti Mandal, the domestic worker, who stated that when she arrived at the flat in the morning, the front door was locked and Nupur Talwar asked her to fetch the keys from downstairs. However, upon returning, she reportedly found the front door unlocked. This inconsistency raised further questions regarding the sequence of events; however, the CBI was unable to verify the statement.

The media trials which became a hurdle in the investigations. Following the initiation of the police investigation, several reporters and journalists allegedly trespassed into the crime scene, resulting in disturbances to the investigative process. Additionally, multiple speculative narratives and unverified claims circulated through the media, creating further complications in statements analysis and public perception of the case. The CBI later reported that the presence of media personnel, combined with the negligence of the Noida Police in securing the crime scene and preserving evidence, leads to the loss of crucial evidence. Another important piece of evidence discussed during the investigation involved fingerprints found on a Ballantine. Reports suggested that the fingerprints recovered did not match those of the primary suspects; however, the bottle reportedly contained fingerprints belonging to both Aarushi and Hemraj. This raised questions regarding whether alcohol had been consumed on the night of the incident. It also raises questions regarding why procedures such as breathalyzer testing were not conducted on the suspects or accused individuals during the investigations.

Another set of evidence that comes from the statements of neighbors and friends who appeared as witnesses during court proceedings in the court. According to their observations, the Talwars' behavior appeared unusual throughout the investigations. Witnesses stated they observed limited visible signs of grief and rarely saw them displaying strong emotional reactions, especially Nupur Talwar, whose behavior was described as stoic and composed. Some experts further suggested the possibility that gloves may have been used during the commission of the crime to avoid leaving forensic traces, that clothes containing bloodstains may have been washed intentionally. Witnesses, particularly family friends present at the crime scene, also stated that the bloodstains on the staircase appeared partially washed and that the Talwars were wearing fresh clothes. This observation was viewed as unusual because it is often assumed that parents witnessing their child in such a condition may react impulsively and emotionally, potentially leading to physical contact with the deceased. Such reactions could result in transfer evidence, including bloodstains on clothing. However, according to witness accounts, their clothes appeared and undisturbed. This raises questions regarding whether a change of clothes had occurred or whether the observation was merely circumstantial.

Other overlooked evidences included the guard's statement in court, where he claimed that no outsider had entered the premises on the day of the incident. If no outsiders were present, it raises question regarding how the victims' mobile phones were later found in nearby areas. This creates ambiguity in the sequence of events and raises further questions regarding the movement and disposal of evidence. It may also be inferred that the phones were discarded due to the possibility that they contained information relevant to the investigation.

Lastly, if the suspects were innocents, questions arise regarding why they didn't actively assist in the investigation in seeking justice of both victims rather than focusing on one. Furthermore, concerns were raised regarding whether the Talwars avoided or diverted certain questions related to the events of the previous night. Additionally, evidences such as the cars, keys, landline records and golf related items were either reported missing or inadequately examined, raising questions regarding the possible concealment or mishandling of evidence.

The narco test of three servants Krishna, Rajkumar, and Vijay revealed similar statements claiming that they were present in the Talwar flat and each blamed others Hemraj murder. However, the tests didn't provide any justified timeline evidence, and their statements lacked coherent due to their unconscious state during the procedure. It was further noted that one of the servants allegedly assisted in erasing evidence from the crime scene, which raises questions regarding whether this aspect was investigated further or overlooked by the CBI team.

CONCLUSION

The present research paper examined the Aarushi -Hemraj murder case through an interdisciplinary approach involving of forensic linguistics, forensic psychology, statement

analysis and observations derived from available evidence. Through the examinations of interview transcripts, statements analysis, reconstruction of timeline, post mortem reports and crime scene observations, several recurring patterns and investigative gaps were identified that appeared to have been overlooked by the CBI. The reconstruction of timeline and evidence analysis raised questions regarding possible inconsistency and fabrication within the narratives provided by the suspects. Furthermore, the presence of loopholes within the timeline created uncertainty in interpretation the sequence of events.

References

- Dr. (Smt.) Nupur Talwar v. State of U.P. and Another. (2017, October 12). *Allahabad High Court*. Indian Kanoon.
- Jain, P., & Roy, T. (2019, October 15). Critical analysis of Arushi Talwar murder case. *Indian Legal Solution Journal of Criminal and Constitutional Law*
- Pareekh, K. U. (2016). Circumstantial evidence vis-à-vis Aarushi Talwar case. *International Journal for Legal Developments and Allied Issues*, 2(1), 94–101
- NDTV Correspondent. (2012, April 30). Full transcript of Nupur Talwar's 2008 interview to NDTV.