



Marathwada Legal & General Education Society's
MANIKCHAND PAHADE LAW COLLEGE, AURANGABAD.

*NAAC Re-Accredited with **A** Grade (2013)*

Dr. Ch. N.V. Manikyala Rao,

B.Com, M.L. Ph.D.

Principal

Samarthnagar, Aurangabad – 431001 (MS)

☎ (O) 0240-2336621, (R)2357175

Fax: (0240) 2341146

Website : www.mplaw.org

E-mail ID : mplawcollege@gmail.com

Ref. No. MPLCA/2014-'15/

Date: 29/10/2014

To,

The Registrar /Director / HOD / Principal,

Respected Sir / Madam,

It gives me immense pleasure to invite your institution to participate in the **XV National Moot Court Competition -2015** to be held on **24th & 25th January 2015** at **M. P. Law College, Aurangabad, Maharashtra.**

May I kindly request you to confirm the participation of your institution by sending registration form duly filled at the earliest before the scheduled date.

May I kindly request you to advice your College team to read rules of the competition carefully.

With warm regards,

Ch. N.V. Manikyala Rao
Principal
Principal
M.P. Law College,
AURANGABAD



- Encl.:-** 1. Rules of the Moot Court Competition
2. Problem No. 1 & 2 for the preliminary and final round respectively
3. Registration Form & Travel Plan

Glimpses of XIV National Moot Court Competition - 2014





MARATHWADA LEGAL & GENERAL EDUCATION SOCIETY'S
Manikchand Pahade Law College, Aurangabad.

XV National Moot Court Competition-2015

24th & 25th January 2015

✍️ RULES FOR THE COMPETITION:

1. Each team shall comprise of 3 (Three) participants only (Mooter 1, Mooter 2 and Researcher)
2. Competition is restricted to bonafide regular students of Law School / College/ University. All participants must be students of LL.B. /B.L. and may be either from 3 years or 5 years course.
3. The participants will have to bear the travelling and all other incidental expenses.
4. Free lodging will be provided to the team of three participants only on the days of the competition i.e. **23rd Jan. 2015 from 9.00 pm to 25th Jan. 2015 up to 9.00 pm** and boarding will be provided on the days of Competition i.e. 24th & 25th Jan. 2014. The Participants should follow disciplinary rules at the Accommodation where they will be boarded.
5. Each participant Law School / College / University shall pay a notional entry fee of **Rs. 1000.00** (One Thousand Rupees only) by way of a Demand Draft drawn in favour of **The Principal, M.P. Law College, payable at Aurangabad, Maharashtra State.**
6. The dress code shall be as prescribed for Advocates.
7. The home team will be competing in this competition, as the moot problem is prepared by **VAISH ASSOCIAES ADVOCATES (CORPORATE LITIGATION TEAM, DELHI).**

✍️ PHASES OF THE COMPETITION

8. The competition will have **TWO** Rounds (i.e. Preliminary and Final), the preliminary round will be held on **24th Jan. 2015 from 9.00am** onwards and Final round will be held on **25th Jan. 2015 from 9.00 am** onwards.
9. The best **FIVE** teams from the preliminary round will be qualified for the FINAL round.
10. In both the rounds, one participant from each team shall argue on behalf of the petitioner, and the other on behalf of the respondent.
11. There will be direct performance of petitioner of a team against respondent of another team according to lots drawn.
E.g. Suppose five teams have been allotted in a Court hall No. 1 i.e. MP-1, MP-2, MP-3, MP-4 & MP-5. Then lots will be drawn in which suppose MP-1 P (Petitioner) will have to argue on behalf of Petitioner against MP-2 R (Respondent).
12. Problem No. 1 and 2 are for the preliminary and final rounds respectively.
13. In case of a tie, both the teams will be considered qualified.

✍️ MEMORIALS

14. All teams shall submit their written memorials / submission for both sides along with synopsis in English.
15. All teams shall submit typed / computerized memorials fulfilling the following specifications.
16. The memorials shall be typed on A - 4 size paper with prescribed margin on both sides in the "Times New Roman" font size 12 with double line spacing.
17. Memorials not following the above specifications will be penalized.

18. Each team shall send four copies of memorials for each side mentioning name of the participant and College/ University on the covering letter **within due time**. **Neither the name of student nor the name of the Institution shall reflect on the memorials.** The cover page shall be coloured differently i.e. *Gray for Petitioner* and *Blue for the Respondent*. **Use of chart paper instead of plastic sheets or transparencies, would be highly appreciated. For binding use staples or cotton thread stitches instead of spiral binding.**
19. Participants shall send the Registration form, Travel plans, Demand Draft of Rs. **1000.00** and Memorials so as to reach the organizing college on the following address as per the scheduled prescribed at the end.
- The Principal, M.P. Law College,
Samarth Nagar, Aurangabad - 431 001 (M.S.)**
20. Participants shall send the soft copies Registration form, Travel plans and Memorials on the following e-mail id :
- mplcmootproblem@gmail.com
21. Participants should carry their personal copies of memorials for their own use. The Copies of the memorials submitted to the organizing college, will not be returned.
22. Each participant shall have time of 15 minutes to present their oral submission and 05 minutes for **rebuttal. Rebuttal is mandatory for each Mooter.** No Mooter will be allowed to address the court for more than the prescribed time without permission of the Court. The oral submission and Rebuttal shall be in English.
23. Five minutes before the completion of the allotted time, for each participant, a warning bell will be given and at the completion of the allotted time there will be a final bell.
24. All teams are expected to carry with them the case laws and authorities which they intend to refer.

MARKING CRITERIA

25. The following will be the marking criteria

Knowledge and application of law	25
Presentation and perusal of facts	10
Answer to court queries	15
Advocacy / Court Etiquettes	25
Written Memorials / Drafting	15
Rebuttal	10
TOTAL MARKS:	<hr style="width: 100%; border: 0.5px solid black; margin-bottom: 2px;"/> 100 <hr style="width: 100%; border: 0.5px solid black; margin-top: 2px;"/>

26. All the participants are expected to maintain the decorum of the court during the competition and are expected to conduct themselves in a manner befitting the legal profession.
27. The organizers reserve the right to take appropriate action for any unethical, unprofessional and immoral conduct.
28. The organizer's decision as regards the interpretation of rules or any other matter relating to the competition shall be final.
29. If there is any situation, which is not contemplated in the rules, the organizers decision shall be final.

 **PRIZES**

30. There shall be cash prizes as follows along with trophies

I) **Winner Team cash prize of Rs. 7000/- from college alongwith Late Adv. Shri. Sudhakar Rao Deshmukh Trophy.**


II) **Runner Up Team cash prize of Rs. 5000/- from college alongwith Late Adv. Shri. Sudhakar Rao Deshmukh Trophy.**

III) **Individual Prizes & Trophies.**

- ❖ **Late Adv. Shri L. N. Sirsamkar- Best Petitioner from final round cash prize of Rs. 2000/- alongwith Trophy.**
- ❖ **Best Respondent from final round cash prize of Rs. 2000/- alongwith Trophy from college.**
- ❖ **Late Adv. Shri. Sudhakar Rao Deshmukh Trophy for Best Mooter in both rounds.**
- ❖ **Ghate Foundation, Aurangabad - Best Mooter Trophy for Preliminary Round.**

☺ **DATES TO REMEMBER – SCHEDULE OF COMPETITION**

31. Submission of registration form along with travel plans and demand draft.	1 st Jan. 2015
32. Submission of memorials	15 th Jan. 2015
33. Date of Preliminary Round.	24 th Jan. 2015
34. Date of Final Round.	25 th Jan. 2015

 **For any queries participants is Welcome to Call**

Prof. Dinesh B. Kolte	09423160612
Prof. Abhay Jadhav	09404202278
Prof. Amol D. Chavhan	09420706040

Dr. C. M. Rao
Principal
M. P. Law College
Aurangabad.



MARATHWADA LEGAL & GENERAL EDUCATION SOCIETY'S
Manikchand Pahade Law College, Aurangabad.

XV National Moot Court Competition-2015

24th Jan. 2015

Moot Problem for Preliminary Round

IN THE HON'BLE SUPREME COURT OF DELIA,

A. *Fazer Delia Ltd. v. State of Energia and Anr., SLP 121/2014*

B. *Chalu Chit Fund Company v. State of Energia, R.P. No. 111/2014*

1. Fazer Delia Ltd. ("**Fazer**") is a private company incorporated and registered under the laws of Union of Delia ("**Delia**"), and having its registered office at Mimani (Capital of Delia). The Fazer is primarily engaged in the business of Sugar production and supply of sugar in various parts of Delia. For manufacturing of Sugar, Fazer procures raw material from different suppliers. Generally, the payment of raw material suppliers is done after the raw material is received, by way of cheques drawn from State Bank of Delia branch at Mimani.

2. Pulsar Delia Ltd. ("**Pulsar**") is a private company incorporated and registered under the laws of Union of Delia, and having its registered office at Krotova. Krotova is the capital of State Energia located within the territories of Delia. Pulsar is primarily engaged in the business of supply of sugarcane to Sugar manufacturing companies.

3. In the month of December, 2013, a contract was entered between the Fazer and Pulsar for supply of Sugarcane worth Rs. 200, 000/-. Pulsar Delia duly supplied the agreed quantity of sugarcane to Fazer and accordingly a cheque was drawn in favour of Pulsar Delia by Fazer from its bank account in State Bank of Delia at Mimani branch payable at all branches. The cheque so issued by Fazer got dishonoured due to insufficiency of funds. Aggrieved by the dishonour of cheque, Pulsar served a legal notice to Fazer as per Section 138 of the Negotiable Instrument Act, 1881 ("**NIA**"). As the payment was not received even during the statutory time period, thus a criminal complaint was filed before Magistrate of Krotova by Pulsar. Pursuant to the complaint, notices were issued in the matter and Fazer was summoned before the Court.

4. Fazer challenged the complaint filed by Pulsar in a petition before the High Court of Energia (*Fazer Delia Ltd. v. State of Energia and Anr.*), on the ground that the Magistrate of Krotova is not having jurisdiction to proceed with the complaint and only Court at Mimani is having jurisdiction to take cognizance of the present complaint. Fazer further argued that the cause of action arose in Mimani because cheque was drawn from Mimani. Arguments were heard and judgment was reserved by the High Court.

5. On 1st August, 2014, a three judge bench of the Supreme Court of Delia in the case of *DashrathRathod v. State of Energia*, 2014 (9) SCALE 97 held that a complaint under section 138 of the NIA for dishonour of cheque, can be filed only in the court within whose local jurisdiction the bank that dishonoured the cheque (where the offence is committed) is situated. The Court clarified that the Complainant is statutorily bound to comply with provisions of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973 and therefore, the place or situs where the Section 138 Complaint is to be filed is not of his choice. As per the specific observations made by the Supreme Court, the position in so far as territorial jurisdiction of courts qua complaints under section 138 is as follows:

- a. Prosecution can be launched against the drawer of the cheque only before the court within whose jurisdiction the dishonour takes place
- b. The cases where the complaint is not filed within the jurisdiction of the court where the bank that dishonoured the cheque is situated, the same will be returned to the complainant for filing a fresh complaint.
- c. All those cases where, the proceedings have reached to the stage of recording evidences as under section 145(2) of NIA will continue in the courts where they are pending now.

6. On 14th August 2014, High Court of Energia in *Fazer Delia Ltd. v. State of Energia and Anr.* held that "AT PAR" Cheque cases can be filed in the Court within whose local jurisdiction the nearest available branch of bank of the drawer situated. Based on this reasoning, High Court held that complaint was maintainable in Krotova because the cheque issued by Fazer to Pulsar was payable at all branches and it was therefore considered as "AT PAR" cheque. In the judgment of High Court no reference was made to the Supreme Court judgment in *DashrathRathod v. State of Energia*.

7. Aggrieved by the judgment of High Court of Energia, Fazer filed a special leave petition under Article 136 of the Constitution of Delia before the Supreme Court of Delia (*Fazer Delia Ltd. v. State of Energia and Anr.*, SLP 121/2014). Fazer primarily raised the ground that judgment of Energia High Court failed to take note of the Supreme Court judgment in *DashrathRathod v. State of Energia*. On the other hand,

Pulsar argued that even though reference is not made to Supreme Court judgment, still the judgment of High Court is not contradicting the Supreme Court judgment and it is clearly based on different set of facts pertaining to “AT PAR” cheques.

8. At the same time, Chalu Chit Fund Company (a company incorporated and registered under the laws of Union of Delia) filed a Review Petition before the Supreme Court seeking review of its judgment passed in DashrathRathod v. State of Energia. In the Review Petition (*Chalu Chit Fund Company v. State of Energia*, R.P. No. 111/2014), Chalu Chit Fund Company argued that they have around fifty thousand cases pending under Section 138 of NIA before different Courts in the country and thus it will cause them severe hardship to transfer these cases to appropriate jurisdiction as per the judgment in DashrathRathod v. State of Energia. In the review petition they challenged the correctness of judgment in DashrathRathod v. State of Energia and in the alternative requested the Court to give this judgment a prospective pertinence, i.e. applicability to Complaints that may be filed after its pronouncement. On the other hand, it was contended by the Respondent (State of Energia) that Chalu Chit Fund Company was not a party to the original case and thus it is not having sufficient *locus standi* to file the present Review Petition.

9. Chief Justice of Delia considering the similar and substantial questions of law involved in the above two matters constituted a five judge bench to dispose the above two matters together. Broad issues framed by the Court are:

- a) Whether the judgment of Supreme Court in DashrathRathod v. State of Energia is correct or it needs to be reviewed?
- b) Considering the judgment of Supreme Court in DashrathRathod v. State of Energia as correct, whether there is a need to give this judgment prospective pertinence?
- c) Considering the judgment of Supreme Court in DashrathRathod v. State of Energia as correct, whether the judgment of High Court of Energia in Fazer Delia Ltd. v. State of Energia and Anr. is correct or it needs to be set aside?

10. In the order passed by Chief Justice constituting five Judge Bench, it was mentioned that the arguments relating to maintainability of both the matters are kept open and both parties are at liberty to frame issues of their choice in addition to the issues framed by the Court. After initial adjournments, the matter has been posted for final hearing on 23/10/2014.

Note:

- The laws of Delia are in *parimateriawith* the laws of India. All laws applicable to Delia as on 20.09.2014 are allowed in the Moot Competition.

- The moot problem is, the way it is. No queries or request for clarifications will be entertained.
- Participants are free to frame additional issues on their own, which they can support with above facts and legal principles.
- Participants are free to adopt or devise a litigation strategy which will serve their interests best.
- Cause title is mentioned at the top of the moot problem and participants must adhere with it. Memorials are to be prepared on the basis of the given cause title.

Disclaimer:

1. **The above Moot Proposition is based on hypothetical facts and circumstances. Further, the moot problem is based on the legal position prevailing as on the date of release of the Moot Proposition and any further legal developments have to be ignored for the purpose of the present Competition.**
2. **Vaish Associates, its partners, associates, employees or staff and M. P. Law College, Aurangabad shall not be held liable for any action/ consequence for view(s) taken in the above Moot Proposition.**
3. **The copyright over the above Moot Proposition vests with Vaish Associates Advocates. Without our prior written consent, this Moot Proposition may not be quoted in whole or in part or otherwise referred to in any document.**



MARATHWADA LEGAL & GENERAL EDUCATION SOCIETY'S
Manikchand Pahade Law College, Aurangabad.

XV National Moot Court Competition-2015

25th Jan. 2015

Moot Problem for Final Round

IN THE HON'BLE SUPREME COURT OF SHAZIA

Tripson Technologies Inc. v. Competition Commission of Shazia and

Jugaad Mobiles Limited, W.P. (C) 121/2014

1. Tripson Technologies Inc. ("**Tripson**") is a Company incorporated and registered under the laws of Sweden. Tripson is primarily engaged in developing and providing equipment services to enterprises in the Information and Communication Technology sector. Due to the extensive investments and continuous Research and Development ("**R&D**"), Tripson owns a large patent portfolio pertaining to the telecom sector.
2. In the year 2002, Tripson entered the Shazian (a country situated in Asian Continent) Market by establishing a Manufacturing Unit, a global service organization and state-of-the-art R&D facilities in Shazia. Since the year 2002, Tripson has provided, maintained and serviced networks of several major Government and private operators in Shazia. Tripson is having major presence in Shazia with around 20,000 employees and 25 offices across the nation.
3. Tripson is a renowned member of European Telecommunication Standards Institute ("**ETSI**"), which is officially recognised by the European Union. As per the declarations made to ETPI by Tripson, it has patents over 2G, 3G and EDTGE Technology and these patents are Standard Essential Patent ("**SEP**"). SEPs owned by Tripson are in respect of the 2G, 3G and 4G technology patents for smart phones, tablets, etc. Tripson is having almost 33,000 patents worldwide to its credit, with 400 of these patents granted in Shazia.
4. In the year 2008, Tripson first came to know about a Company called Jugaad Mobiles Limited ("**Jugaad**"), which was using the same technology to

manufacture smart phones as was used by Tripson. On enquiry, Tripson was made aware that Jugaad is a Company incorporated and registered under the provisions of Companies Act, 1956, and it manufactures smart phones and sells the same at a lesser price than the price at which Tripson sells the smart phones in Shazia.

5. Towards the end of year 2008, Tripson intimated Jugaad about potential infringement of its SEPs and requested for taking a patent licence agreement to use the same. Jugaad replied in affirmative and initial negotiations started between the two companies. One of the major point of discussion between the two Companies was signing of a Non-Disclosure Agreement (“**NDA**”). Negotiations continued for next 3 years and the two Companies could not reach a consensus with regard to signing of NDA. Further, Jugaad also blamed Tripson for not agreeing at **Fair, Reasonable, and Non-Discriminatory Terms** (“**FRAND**”).
6. In the later part of year 2012, Tripson filed a Civil Suit in Hon’ble Malaya High Court (Malaya is a state in the country Shazia) against Jugaad seeking *ex parte* ad interim injunction restraining Jugaad from selling smart phones in Shazia, as the same were manufactured using SEPs of Tripson without paying any royalty. The Hon’ble Malaya High Court found a *prima facie* exiting in favour of Tripson, and thereby granted an *ex parte* ad interim injunction restraining Jugaad from selling smart phones using SEPs of Tripson in Shazia.
7. In the early 2013, Jugaad entered appearance before the Hon’ble Malaya High Court and contested that Tripson is not agreeing to grant patent license at FRAND terms. Further, Jugaad contended that Tripson is delaying the negotiations and restricting market entry of new entrants like Jugaad under the garb of its SEPs rights. Considering the submissions made by Jugaad and willingness to pay royalty to Tripson, the Hon’ble High Court passed a consent order, without prejudice to respective rights and contentions of the parties, recording and directing that pending a final determination of the royalties payable to Patent holder, Jugaad will deposit interim payments with the court in accordance with the terms demanded by Tripson in its initial negotiations. The *ad interim* arrangement was temporary in nature and was entered into between the Companies so that Jugaad is able to sell its smart phones in the country.

8. Pursuant to above order of the Hon'ble High Court, Jugaad again started negotiations in mid of year 2013. Although, royalty to use patent could not be decided between the Companies, but a consensus was reached between the two Companies to sign a NDA. Accordingly, NDA was executed between the parties on 12.05.2013. As regards the royalty rates, Jugaad was of the view that the same are not based on FRAND terms. Simultaneously, Jugaad kept on paying the royalty to Tripson in accordance with the order passed by the Hon'ble Malaya High Court. As of September, 2014, the total royalty paid by Jugaad to Tripson is Rs. 140 crores, which is exceeding the actual damages claimed by Tripson in the Civil Suit filed before the Hon'ble High Court.
9. Towards the end of the year 2013, Companies still could not reach a consensus regarding royalty rates and started blaming each other in the media. Main accusation made by Jugaad was that Tripson is trying to delay the negotiations and thereby abusing its dominant position in the market. On the other hand, Tripson claimed that Jugaad is severely infringing its Patent rights granted under the Patents Act, 1970 by not concluding a patent license agreement. One of the major reason for inconclusive negotiations between the two Companies was the subject matter for charging royalties. Tripson insisted that royalties be charged on the price of mobile handsets as opposed to the Jugaad's proposal that royalties be charges on the price of chipset, in which the Tripson's technology fairly resides. Tripson reasoned that smart phones are useless without chipset technology derived from its SEPs, hence the royalties must be paid on the measure of the sale price of mobile handsets as opposed to the price of the chipset. Due to these differences, negotiations between the two Companies could not be concluded.
10. In the year 2014, Jugaad filed an information with the Competition Commission of Shazia ("CCS") under the Competition Act, 2002 ("2002 Act") praying for an investigation in relation to the abuse of dominant position by Tripson in terms of Section 4 of the 2002 Act. It was informed that Tripson enjoys a position of dominance in the relevant market by virtue of its ownership of SEPs relating to standards in the GSM technology and that the Tripson was abusing the said dominant position by not concluding patent licensing agreement at FRANDS terms, while simultaneously filing patent infringement suits.

11. CCS based on the above information filed by Jugaad and further *suo moto* investigations, passed a *prima facie* order dated 12.04.2014 under Section 26(1) of the 2002 Act, directing the Director General (“**DG**”) to initiate an investigation into the alleged abusive conduct of Tripson and submit a report to the CCS. The operating para of the *prima facie* order is as follows:

“8. In view of the above discussion, the Commission is of the opinion that it was a fit case for thorough investigation by the DG into the allegations made by the Informant, and violation, if any, of the provisions of Competition Act, 2002.

9. The Secretary is directed to send a copy of this direction passed under Section 26(1) to the office of DG. DG shall investigate the matter about violation of the provisions of the 2002 Act. In case, the DG finds opposite parties/companies in violation of the provisions of 2002 Act, it shall investigate the role of the persons who at the time of such contravention were in-charge of and responsible for the conduct of the OPs so as to fix the responsibility of such persons under Section 48 of the Act. The report of the DG shall be submitted within 90 days from receipt of this order.

10. Nothing stated in this order shall tantamount to a final expression of opinion on merit of the case and the DG shall conduct the investigation without being swayed in any manner whatsoever by the observations made therein.”

12. Interestingly, prior to passing of the *prima facie* order dated 12.04.2014 by CCS, an objection was filed by the Tripson before CCS challenging its jurisdiction to investigate the matter as the same falls within the exclusive domain of Patents Act, 1970 and authorities constituted thereunder. However, the CCS rejected the said objection on the ground that there is no legal obligation on the CCS under the 2002 Act or Rules thereunder to hear Tripson before forming a *prima facie* opinion under Section 26(1) of the 2002 Act. Further, CCS also rejected the Tripson’s request to keep the sensitive information confidential during the course of investigation.

13. Pending the enquiry by CCS, two Companies continued with negotiations, however they could not conclude the final terms of agreement. At the same time,

Tripson accused Jugaad of violating the NDA dated 12.05.2013 by providing confidential information to CCS to investigate antitrust violations alleged to have been committed by Tripson. On the other hand, Jugaad replied that the confidential information was disclosed only to the statutory body (CCS) for a limited purpose of promoting the provisions of 2002 Act. Despite the justifications, Tripson remained dissatisfied and started exploring legal options available against the *prima facie* order of the CCS.

14. In the month of May, 2014, Tripson filed a Writ Petition under Article 32 of the Constitution of Shazia, 1950 before the Hon'ble Supreme Court of Shazia (Tripson Technologies Inc. v. Competition Commission of Shazia and Jugaad Mobiles Limited, W.P. (C) 121/2014), whereby the jurisdiction of CCS to pass the *prima facie* order was challenged. Tripson argued that the matter deals with fixing of royalties under the patent license agreement, thus it falls within the exclusive domain of Patents Act, 1970 and authorities established thereunder. Also, Tripson argued that the patent license agreement was yet to be concluded between the parties and thus CCS was not empowered to start investigation.
15. In the initial response filed by the CCS and Jugaad, both raised arguments pertaining to maintainability of the Petition saying that the 2002 Act itself provides efficacious statutory remedy for such disputes. Further, CCS argued that the conduct of Tripson in not entering the patent license agreement with Jugaad and other such companies, and filing suits restraining new market entrants is *prima facie* abusive in nature and requires further investigations. CCS further argued that the present matter involves violation of the provisions of 2002 Act, thus it is having jurisdiction to investigate the same and Patents Act will have no application. Jugaad, while supporting the CCS, argued that Tripson was abusing its dominant position by imposing unfair conditions in patent license agreement.
16. The Hon'ble Supreme Court considering the gravity of matter and important questions of law involved in it, constituted a three judge bench to decide the same. The initial order passed by the three judge bench reads as follows:

“The present matter involves a substantial question of law with regard to the jurisdiction of CCS in matters involving a patent license agreement, which is also

covered under the Patents Act. Further, the abusive conduct of Petitioner is also in question that certainly requires further examination. We hereby clarify that arguments pertaining to maintainability of the Petition are kept open. The Petition be listed for arguments on 03/11/2014. Parties are directed to maintain status quo till the next date.”

Note:

- The laws of Shazia are in *parimateria* with the laws of India. All laws applicable to Shazia as on 20.09.2014 are allowed in the Moot Competition.
- The moot problem is, the way it is. No queries or request for clarifications will be entertained.
- Participants are free to frame issues on their own, which they can support with above facts and legal principles.
- Participants are free to adopt or devise a litigation strategy which will serve their interests best.
- Cause title is mentioned at the top of the moot problem and participants must adhere with it. Memorials are to be prepared on the basis of the given cause title.

Disclaimer:

1. **The above Moot Proposition is based on hypothetical facts and circumstances. Further, the moot problem is based on the legal position prevailing as on the date of release of the Moot Proposition and any further legal developments have to be ignored for the purpose of the present Competition.**
2. **Vaish Associates, its partners, associates, employees or staff and M. P. Law College, Aurangabad shall not be held liable for any action/ consequence for view(s) taken in the above Moot Proposition.**
3. **The copyright over the above Moot Proposition vests with Vaish Associates Advocates. Without our prior written consent, this Moot Proposition may not be quoted in whole or in part or otherwise referred to in any document.**



MARATHWADA LEGAL & GENERAL EDUCATION SOCIETY'S
Manikchand Pahade Law College, Aurangabad.

XV National Moot Court Competition-2015

24th & 25th Jan. 2015

Registration Form

Name & Address of Participating Institution:-

Phone No.

E-mail ID

Name of the Mooter - 1 :-

Class

Address

Mobile No.

E-mail ID

Passport

Size

Photograph

Name of the Mooter - 2 :-

Class

Address

Mobile No.

E-mail ID

Passport

Size

Photograph

Name of the Researcher :-

Class

Address

Mobile No.

E-mail ID

Passport

Size

Photograph

Particulars of Demand Draft

D.D. No. _____ **Date** _____

Bank Name _____ **Branch** _____

Mooter	Preliminary Round	Final Round
Mooter 1	Petitioner / Respondent	Petitioner / Respondent
Mooter 2	Petitioner / Respondent	Petitioner / Respondent

(Strike out unnecessary fields.)

**Signature and Seal of Head of
the Institution.**



MARATHWADA LEGAL & GENERAL EDUCATION SOCIETY'S
Manikchand Pahade Law College, Aurangabad.

XV National Moot Court Competition-2015

24th & 25th Jan. 2015



TRAVEL PLANS

Name of the participating Institution :- _____

☺ Arriving on date :-

Mode of travel : railways/airways/roadways _____

Train name : _____

Flight name : _____

Bus/travels name : _____

Reaching at time : _____

☹ Departure on date :-

Mode of travel : railways/airways/roadways _____

Train name : _____

Flight name : _____

Bus/travels name : _____

Reaching at time : _____

**Signature and Seal of Head of
the Institution**