

## **SERVICE LEARNING UNDER CONSUMER PROTECTION ACT, 1986**

### **(3 YEARS LL. B SEMESTER II)**

#### **PART A**

**Subject Teacher : Ms. Swarnim Ghatani**

#### **OVERVIEW OF CONSUMER PROTECTION ACT, 1986**

- OBJECTIVES BEHIND THE ACT
- RIGHTS OF A CONSUMER
- CONSUMER PROTECTION COUNCILS IN INDIA
- IMPACT OF CONSUMERISM ON GLOBALIZATION

#### **SALE OF GOODS ACT, 1930**

- CONTRACT OF SALE: NATURE AND ESSENTIALS
- CAVEAT EMPTOR: EMERGING CHALLENGES AND IMPACT ON CONSUMER PROTECTION
- REMEDIES FOR BREACH OF CONDITION AND BREACH OF WARRANTIES

#### **PREVENTION OF FOOD ADULTERATION ACT, 1954**

- OBJECTIVE BEHIND THE ACT
- DEFINITION OF FOOD ADULTERATION

#### **THE DRUGS AND MAGIC REMEDIES (OBJECTIONABLE ADVERTISEMENTS) ACT, 1954**

- OBJECTIVES
- WHAT ADVERTISEMENTS AMOUNTS TO BE OBJECTIONABLE IN INDIA?
- PUNISHMENT UNDER THE ACT.

#### **PART B**

#### **SAMPLE QUESTIONS FOR DRAFTING:**

1. Ms. Disha Roy bought an Air-Conditioner from ECC Electronics, situated at Sevoke Road, Siliguri. However after one month of use, Disha noticed refrigerant leak in the machine as a result of which the air-conditioner was not functioning properly and fluctuations in the temperature was observed. After repeated complaints regarding this matter, no service engineer was sent by the party to rectify the problem. As a result

of such negligence, Disha has suffered loss and injury due to deprivation, harassment, mental agony for which she is entitled to compensation. ECC Electronics has also breached the terms of the guarantee that they provided at the time of purchase by such inattentive behavior. Draft a complaint on behalf of Disha in the District Forum under the Consumer Protection laws.

2. Mr. Avik Singh, recently purchased a flat from ABC Builders in the Horizon Apartments located in Whitefield, Bangalore in 2018. Soon after shifting to the newly constructed flat Mr. Singh found that the tiles on the living room wall are sticking out. However Mr. Singh complained to the builders regarding such shabby construction. Upon such complaint, they replaced only 8 tiles to fix the state of the living room and resolve the issue quickly. Now after 6 months from the date of their replacement, another set of tiles are sticking out of the wall. The block where the flat is located is under the maintenance of ABC Builders for 3 years, which has not elapsed. However, after repeated complaints to the builders, no action is taken from their end to repair such a tattered construction. As, a vigilant consumer file a complaint against such bad condition of the recent purchase made by Mr. Singh in the appropriate forum.

3. Barry Allen purchased a mobile phone during the Giant Million Sale by Clipkart, an online platform. The phone was newly launched by Starlabs Company, a subsidiary company owned by Clipkart Group. However, after receiving the phone, she realized that speakers installed within the phone is completely dysfunctional. When he tried to contact the customer care of Clipkart, to report about this issue they kept him in wait for nearly one month and gave various excuses to avoid replacement or refund for such faulty product causing not only great loss but also mental hazard to Barry in the process. File a complaint on behalf of Barry against such abandoning behavior of Clipkart under Consumer Protection laws, praying for replacement or refund for the online purchase made by him in the appropriate forum.

**PRACTICAL PROJECT WORK**  
**3 YRS, SEMESTER IV , LLB**  
**SUBJECT: LEGAL AID IN SORROUNDING VILLAGES**  
**Subject Teacher: Mrs Arpita Mitra Roy**

**CONTENTS -**

**PART A (THEORITICAL ASPECT)**

**CHAPTER I**

***Introduction***

**CHAPTER II**

***Meaning, Objective and Significance of Legal Aid***

**CHPATER III**

***Provisions relating to Legal Aid under the Constitution of India***

**CHAPTER IV**

***The Legal Services Authorities Act, 1987***

- I. Historical Background
- II. Aims and Objectives
- III. Significance
- IV. Composition, powers and functions of the Act
- V. Persons eligible for Free Legal Aid
- VI. Lok Adalat and Permanent Lok Adalat

**CHAPTER IV**

***Client Counselling***

- I. Meaning Objective
- II. Significance and need of Client Counselling

**Chapter V**

**PART B (PRACTICAL ASPECT)**

- 1. Landmark Judicial Pronouncements of Supreme Court on Legal Aid.  
(Any Five)

**Chapter VI**

## **Conclusion**

## **Bibliography**

### **PART B (PRACTICAL ASPECT)**

<b>VII SEM , BA.LLB – SECTION – A</b>	
<b>ROLL NOS</b>	<b>ASSIGNMENT TOPIC</b>
ROLL NO 1 TO 10	<ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. <b>Hussainara Khatoon (I) v. State of Bihar</b> (AIR 1979 SC 1369)</li><li>2. Khatri vs. State of Bihar (The Bhagalpur Blinding case) Citation: <b>1981 SCR (2) 408</b>, 1981 SCC (1) 627</li><li>3. The students are directed to visit any two schools for witnessing legal awareness session and make a report on the same.</li></ol>
ROLL NO 11 TO 20	<ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. Suk Das v. Union Territory of Arunachal Pradesh, <b>(1986) 2 SCC 401</b></li><li>2. M.H.Hoskta v. State of Maharashtra AIR 1978 SCC 1548, (1978) 3 SCC 544.</li><li>3. The students are directed to visit any two schools for witnessing legal awareness session and make a report on the same.</li></ol>
ROLL NO 21 TO 30	<ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. Madhav Hayawadanrao Hoskot vs State Of Maharashtra on 17 August, 1978</li><li>2. State Of Maharashtra vs Manubhai Pragaji Vashi &amp; Ors on 16 August, 1995</li></ol>

	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>3. The students are directed to visit any two legal awareness programs in village for witnessing and make a report on the same.</li> </ol>
ROLL NO 31 TO 40	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Sheela Barse vs State Of Maharashtra on 15 February, 1983</li> <li>2. Mohd. Hussain @ Julfikar Ali vs The State (Govt. Of Nct) Delhi on 11 January, 2012</li> <li>3. The students are directed to visit any two legal awareness programs in village for witnessing and make a report on the same.</li> </ol>
ROLL NO 41 TO 50	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Bhoopesh vs M/S.New India Assurance Co.Ltd. on 10 August, 2009</li> <li>2. M/S.Afcons Infrastructure ... vs M/S.Churian Varkey Construction ... on 11 October, 2006.</li> <li>3. The students are directed to visit any two schools for witnessing legal awareness session and make a report on the same.</li> </ol>
ROLL NO 51 TO 60	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Punjab National Bank vs Laxmichand Rai And Ors. on 27 January, 2000 : AIR 2000 MP 301, 2000 (2) MPHT 25</li> <li>2. M.H. Hoskot v State of Maharashtra, Special Leave Petition (Criminal) No. 408 of (1978).</li> <li>3. The students are directed to visit any two schools for witnessing legal awareness</li> </ol>

	session and make a report on the same.
ROLL NO 61 TO 70	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Sheela Barse v State of Maharashtra, (1983) 2 SCC 96</li> <li>2. Rajoo @ Ramakant v State of Madhya Pradesh, (2012) 8 SCC 553</li> <li>3. The students are directed to visit any two legal awareness programs in village for witnessing and make a report on the same.</li> </ol>
ROLL NO 71 TO 80	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Hussainara Khatoo v Home Secretary, State of Bihar, (1980) 1 SCC 98</li> <li>2. Khatri and Ors. v State of Bihar and Ors, (1981) 1 SCC 627.</li> <li>3. The students are directed to visit any two legal awareness programs in village for witnessing and make a report on the same.</li> </ol>
ROLL NO 81 TO 90	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Indian Council Of Legal Aid &amp; ... vs Bar Council Of India &amp; Anr on 17 January, 1995</li> <li>2. K.Swaminathan vs M. Visalakshi on 14 November, 2019.</li> <li>3. The students are directed to visit any two schools for witnessing legal awareness session and make a report on the same.</li> </ol>
ROLL NO 91 TO 100	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. V. C. Rangadurai vs D. Gopalan And Ors on 4 October, 1978</li> <li>2. The Deputy Commissioner vs M/S Kushal Enterprises on 3</li> </ol>

	<p>August, 2020.</p> <p>3. The students are directed to visit any two schools for witnessing legal awareness session and make a report on the same.</p>
ROLL NO 101 TO 113	<p>1. K.N. Govindan Kutty Menon vs C.D. Shaji on 28 November, 2011</p> <p>2. Anam Padmaja vs The Lok Adalath Bench At Nellore on 18 September, 2019.</p> <p>3. The students are directed to visit any two schools for witnessing legal awareness session and make a report on the same.</p>

**\*Note** – The students are required to do five case studies altogether in the assignment under PART - B. However, the cases that are provided in PART – B, along with those three more cases are required to be identified and finalized by the individual students after final consultation with their respective subject teacher. The cases studies should not be similar amongst any students under any circumstances.

Also it is mandatory for every student to witness the awareness program for the purpose of making a report on the same, failure of which shall directly impact the evaluation system of the practical accordingly.

## **ALTERNATIVE DISPUTE RESOLUTION**

### **(PRACTICAL PAPER)**

### **3 YEAR LLB IV SEM**

**Subject Teacher: Ms. Sufia Seikh**

- **ACKNOWLEDGMENT**
- **TABLE OF CASES**
- **ABBREVIATIONS**

<b>Chapter</b>	<b>TOPIC (PART-A)</b>
<b>I</b>	INTRODUCTION
<b>II</b>	MEANING, OBJECTIVES, HISTORICAL BACKGROUND, MERITS AND DEMERITS OF ADR MECHANISMS
<b>III</b>	ADR MECHANISMS IN INDIA
<b>IV</b>	VARIOUS KINDS OF ADR MECHANISMS
<b>V</b>	<p><b>A. ARBITRATION AND CONCILIATION ACT,1996</b></p> <p>I. AIMS &amp; OBJECTIVES OF THE ACT</p> <p>II. PROVISIONS RELATING TO ARBITRATION, ARBITRATION AGREEMENT, INTERNATIONAL COMMERCIAL ARBITRATION, ARBITRAL TRIBUNAL, PROCEEDING AND AWARD(OVERVIEW)</p> <p><b>B. NEGOTIATION, CONCILIATION AND MEDIATION</b> (Meaning, characteristics, significance, and differences)</p>

<b>VI</b>	<b>PART B</b>
	<p>I. TWO LEADING CASE LAWS OF INTERNATIONAL ARBITRATION</p> <p>II. 05 CASES ATTACHED BELOW AND CASES DECIDED IN LOK ADALAT ORGANISED BY SUB DIVISIONAL/DISTRICT LEGAL SERVICE AUTHORITY.</p>
<b>VII</b>	CONCLUSION
<b>VIII</b>	BIBLIOGRAPHY

**(PART-B)**  
**CASE LAWS**

<b>ROLL NO.</b>	<b>NAM E OF THE STU</b>	<b>Case laws</b>



	<b>DEN TS</b>	
1 2 3 4 5	FIROZ HOSSAI N AKASH ALI MUHAM MAD YUSUF SHAHIL RAI LUCKY TAMANG	1. BCCI v. Kochi Cricket, (2018) 6 SCC 287 2. TRF Ltd. v. Energo Engineering Projects Ltd., (2017) 8 SCC 377. 3. ONGC v. Saw Pipes, (2003) 5 SCC 705 4. SBP & Co. v. Patel Engineering Ltd., (2005) 8 SCC 618 5. Indian Oil Corporation Ltd. v. NCC Ltd., 2022 SCC OnLine SC 896
6 7 8 9 10	LUCKY SINGH MAIMUN A ALI ANAMIK A DAS GHAZAL A PERWEE N AVRAJIT SANYAL	1. Bharat Aluminum Company v. Kaiser 2. Aluminum Technical Service - (2012) 9 SC 552 3. Enercon (India) Ltd. and Others v. Enercon GmbH - (2014) 5 SCC 1 4. Yukos Universal Limited v. Russian Federation PCA Case No. AA 227 5. Indian Oil Corporation Ltd. v. M/s Shree Ganesh Petroleum Rajgurunagar., 2022) 4 SCC 463
11 12 13 14 15	<b>SIMA ROY DIPITA GUHA NEOGI TAPASHI ROY KRISHM ITA CHETTR I ANKITT A ADHIKA</b>	1. Konkan Railways Corp Ltd Vs Mehul Construction Co, AIR 2000 SC 2821. 2. ,M.V.Baltic Confidence and another vs. State Trading Corporation of India Ltd. and another, (2001) 7 SCC 473. 3. Skypak Couriers Ltd vs. Tata Chemicals Ltd, (2000) 5 SCC 294 4. P. AnandGajapathiRaju and others vs. P.V.G. Raju and others, (2000) 4 SCC 539 5. Mutha Construction v. Strategic Brand Solutions (I) Pvt. Ltd., SLP(C) 1105 of 2022.

	<b>RI</b>	
16 17 18 19 20	<b>NAMRAT A SAHA SRABAN I RANI DAE DEBAJY OTI DEB TANIA SAHA HIMANG SHU SINHA</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Konkan Railways Corp Ltd Vs Mehul Construction Co, AIR 2000 SC 2821</li> <li>2. Olympus Super Structures Pvt. Ltd. v. Meena Vijay Khetan, AIR 1999 SC 2102</li> <li>3. Skypak Couriers Ltd vs. Tata Chemicals Ltd, (2000) 5 SCC 294</li> <li>4. M.V.Baltic Confidence and another vs. State Trading Corporation of India Ltd. and another, (2001) 7 SCC 473,</li> <li>5. National Highways Authority of India v. P. Nagaraju, 2022 SCC OnLine SC 864.</li> </ol>
21 22 23 24 25	<b>BEDIKA PODDAR PAYEL SARKAR NABANK UR NANDY LAXMI DAS BINAYA K SEN</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Union of India v. Delhi state consumer co-operative federation limited[ 2022 (5) TMI 975-Delhi High Court.</li> <li>2. OM Prakash Kumawat and Renu Kumawat V. Hero Housing Finance Ltd - 2022 (5) TMI 1079 Rajasthan High Court</li> <li>3. Delhi Airport Metro Express pvt. Ltd. V. Delhi Metro Rail Corporation [2022 (5) TMI 977 - Supreme Court.</li> <li>4. M/S Morden Construction Company V. State of Jharkhand - 2022 (5) TMI 1109 - Jharkhand High Court.</li> <li>5. Tantia Constructions v. Union of India, Special Leave to Appeal (C) No. 10722/2022</li> </ol>
26 27 28 29 30	<b>MD SOHEL HOSSAI N MITALI ROY JAYDEB BASAK PRASEN</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Ellora Paper Mills Ltd. v. State of Madhya Pradesh, (2022) 3 SCC 1</li> <li>2. Oil and Natural Gas Corporation Ltd. v. AfconsGunanusa JV, 2022 SCC OnLine SC 1122.</li> <li>3. National Highways Authority of India v. P. Nagaraju, 2022 SCC OnLine SC 864.</li> <li>4. Indian Oil Corporation Ltd. v. NCC Ltd., 2022 SCC OnLine SC 896.</li> </ol>

	<b>JIT DAS RANJITA ROY</b>	5. Essar House Pvt. Ltd. v. Arcellor Mittal Nippon Steel India Ltd., 2022 SCC OnLine SC 1219
31 32 33 34 35	<b>PUTUL CHOUBA Y PUJA SINGH MOUMIT A CHAKRA BORTY ANITA KUMARI YADAV ANANYA MISHRA</b>	1. Indian Oil Corporation Ltd. v. NCC Ltd., 2022 SCC OnLine SC 896. 2. Indian Oil Corporation Ltd. v. M/s Shree Ganesh Petroleum Rajgurunagar, (2022) 4 SCC 463. 3. SsangyongEngg. & Construction Co. Ltd. v. NHAI, (2019) 15 SCC 131. 4. NHAI v. M. Hakeem, (2021) 9 SCC 1. 5. Oil and Natural Gas Corporation Ltd. v. AfconsGunanusa JV, 2022 SCC OnLine SC 1122
36 37 38 39 40	<b>SHRESH THA TRIPATH I ABHISH EK TIWARI GOURAB NATH NABANIT A SAHA ANKONA CHAKRA BORTY</b>	1. Bar Council of India v. A.K. Balaji, (2018) 5 SCC 379. 2. M.P. Rural Road Development Authority v. L.G. Chaudhary Engineers and Contractors, (2018) 10 SCC 826. 3. BGS SGS SOMA JV v. NHPC Ltd., (2020) 4 SCC 234. 4. Mankastu Impex (P) Ltd. v. Airvisual Ltd., (2020) 5 SCC 399 5. Ellora Paper Mills Ltd. v. State of Madhya Pradesh, (2022) 3 SCC 1
41 42 43 44 45	<b>ARIJIT SAHA ARUN TAMANG SANKAL PA BASU SIMRAN</b>	1. Wellington Associates Ltd. v. Kirit Mehta and Other(1996) 5 SCC 125 2. M/s. Deepak Cables (India) Ltd vs Karnataka Power Transmission Corporation Ltd. (2017) 10 SCC 740 3. M/s. Afcons Infrastructure Ltd. & Anr. v. M/s Cherian VarkeyConstn. Co. (P) Ltd. & Ors. 8 SCC

	<b>SINGH ARKADE EP KANTA BHOWMI K</b>	24 4. Konkan Railways Corp Ltd V Mehul Construction Co, AIR 2000 SC 2821 5. Cox and Kings Ltd. v. SAP India, (2022) 8 SCC 1
46 47 48 49 50	<b>ESHA GHOSH HIMANG SHU BARMAN ANIKET BHUIMA LI RITIK SINGHA TANMOY SINHA</b>	1. Satish Kumar vs. Surinder Kumar, AIR 1970 SC 833 2. Renusagar power Co. Ltd vs General Electric AIR 1985 3. Puri Construction Company v Union Of India, AIR 1986 SC 777 4. Sundaram Finance Ltd. v. N.E.P.C. India Ltd., AIR 1999 SC 565. 5. BBR (India) Pvt. Ltd. v. S.P. Singla Constructions, 2022 SCC OnLine SC 642.
51 52 53 54 55	<b>TWINKL E AGARWA L PALAK AGARWA L MEHUL MISHRA SURAJ PRASAD YADAV HARSHI T ATRI</b>	1. Avantha Holdings Limited Vs. CG Power and Industrial Solutions Limited. <b>(Judgment dated 06.12.2021 in ARB. P. 361/2020)</b> 2. DLF LTD. VS. LEIGHTON INDIA CONTRACTORS PRIVATE LTD. & ANR., FAO(OS) (COMM) 63/2020 & CM No.11090/2020 3. Datar Switchgears Ltd vs. Tata Finance Ltd., 2000 (3) RAJ\ 4. National Highways Authority of India v. P. Nagaraju , 2022 SCC Online SC 864. 5. TRF Ltd. v. EnergoEngg. Projects Ltd., (2017) 8 SCC 377
56 57 58 59 60	<b>D.B.NEE LOTPAL JOYOT CHATTO PADHYA Y RAJNISH</b>	1. Brahmani River Pellets Ltd. v. Kamachi Industries Ltd. SLP(C) NO. 15672,2019 2. DharamvirKhosla v. Asian Hotels (North) Limited, CS(COMM) 184/2020 3. Hero Wind Energy Limited v. Inox Renewables Limited, O.M.P.(I) (COMM.) 429/2019 4. AshwaniMinda and M/s Jay Ushin Limited v. M/s

	KUMAR MD ZISHAN MD JAMSHE D	U-Shin Limited and M/s Minebea Mitsumi IncorporatedFAO(OS)(COMM) 65/2020 5. PSA SICAL Terminals Pvt. Ltd. v. Board of Trustees of V.O. Chidambaranar Port Trust Tuticorin, (2021) 18 SCC 716.
61 62 63 64 65	SAHAJA N MIA TANUSH REE PRAMANI K SHAKYA SINHA SAIKAT RAM NIGAM BARMAN	1. M/S MODERN CONSTRUCTION COMPANY VERSUS STATE OF JHARKHAND - 2022 (5) TMI 1109 - JHARKHAND HIGH COURT 2. SWADESH KUMAR AGARWAL VERSUS DINESH KUMAR AGARWAL & ORS, ETC. - 2022 (5) TMI 306 - SUPREME COURT 3. N.N. GLOBAL MERCANTILE PVT. LTD. VERSUS INDO UNIQUE FLAME LTD. AND ORS. - 2021 (1) TMI 1121 - SUPREME COURT 4. AMWAY INDIA ENTERPRISES PVT. LTD. VERSUS RAVINDRANATH RAO SINDHIA & ANR. – 2021 (3) TMI 245 – SUPREME COURT 5. Ssangyong Engg. & Construction Co. Ltd. v. NHAI, (2019) 15 SCC 131.
66 67 68 69 70	DISHA SARKAR PRAMOD MAHATO APARNA BARMAN IRIN PERVIN ROHIT OLI SHARMA	1. Bhatia International v Bulk Trading SA, AIR 2002 SC 1432, 2. J&K State Forest Conservation vs. Abdul Karim Wani, AIR 1989 SC 1498 3. Skypak Couriers Ltd vs. Tata Chemicals Ltd, (2000) 5 SCC 294 4. K.K Modi v K.N Modi AIR 1998 SC 1297 5. Jaipur ZilaDugdhUtpadakSahkariSangh Limited, (2021) 17 SCC 248.
71 72 73 74 75	CHETAN AHIRE BISWADI P PAUL SUDIPTA PAUL TUHINA PARVIN	1. BBR( India ) Pvt.Ltd v. S.P. Singola Constructions, 2022 SCC Online SC 642. 2. Jaipur ZilaDugdhUtpadakSahkariSangh Limited, (2021) 17 SCC 248. 3. Oil and Natural Gas Corporation Ltd v. AfconsGunanusa JV, 2022 SCC Online SC 1122. 4. National Highways Authority of India v. P.Nagaraju , 2022 SCC Online SC 864.

	ABHISH EK RAM	5. TRF Ltd. v. EnergoEngg. Projects Ltd., (2017) 8 SCC 377
76 77 78 79 80	AKASH GUPTA PRASEN JIT SEN RAVI RAJ ANKUR CHAUHAN PALLAVE E SUMAN	1. Mutha Construction v. Strategic Brand Solutions (I) Pvt. Ltd., SLP(C) 1105 of 2022.  2. Essar House Pvt. Ltd. v. Arcellor Mittal Nippon Steel India Ltd., 2022 SCC OnLine SC 1219. 3. Cox and Kings Ltd. v. SAP India, (2022) 8 SCC 1. 4. BBR (India) Pvt. Ltd. v. S.P. Singla Constructions, 2022 SCC OnLine SC 642 5. Tata Capita Finance Ltd. Vs. Shri Chand Construction and Apartment Pvt.
81 82 83 84 85	SAURAV DATTA AVIRUP ROY ARUNDH ATI PAUL AAFAQU E HUSSAIN SHANTA M BASU	1. Renusagar Power Co Ltd vs. General Electric, AIR 1985 SC 1156 2. National Thermal Power Corporation vs. Singer company, 1992 SCR (3) 106. 3. Venture Global Engineering v Satyam Computer Services Ltd (2008) 4 SCC 190 4. Datar Switchgears Ltd vs. Tata Finance Ltd., 2000 (3) RAJ 5. ARUN SRIVASTAVA VS. M/S LARSEN & TOUBRO LTD. CM(M) 1520/2018
86 87 88 89 90	SONU KUMAR SHARMA SAHELI GHOSH BISHAL SAHA POOJA SINGH SAHAJAN MAHAM MAD	1. NHAI v. M. Hakeem, (2021) 9 SCC 1 2. Jaipur ZilaDugdhUtpadakSahkariSangh Limited, (2021) 17 SCC 248. 3. TRF Ltd. v. EnergoEngg. Projects Ltd., (2017) 8 SCC 377 4. Tata Capita Finance Ltd. Vs. Shri Chand Construction and Apartment Pvt. Ltd.(Judgment dated 24.11.2021 in FAO(OS) 40/2020)

91 92 93 94 95	KHEYA BAIDYA RAMZAN ALI RAMA MANDAL RIMJHIM PRASAD KINSHU K ROY	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Government of Maharashtra v. Borse Brothers Engineers &amp; Contractors Pvt. Ltd., March 2021</li> <li>2. Indus Biotech Pvt. Ltd. v. Kotak India Venture (Offshore) Fund, March 2021</li> <li>3. Cox and Kings Ltd. v. SAP India, (2022) 8 SCC 1.</li> <li>4. BBR (India) Pvt. Ltd. v. S.P. Singla Constructions, 2022 SCC OnLine SC 642.</li> <li>5. <b>Avantha Holdings Limited Vs. CG Power and Industrial Solutions Limited. (Judgment dated 06.12.2021 in ARB. P. 361/2020)</b></li> </ol>
96 97 98 99 100	DHRITAB RATA SARKAR ADREEJ A BAGCHI POOJA MANDAL SABIR ALI ABHANTI KA KHAWAS	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Bharat Aluminium Co. v. Kaiser Aluminium Technical Service Inc., (2012) 9 SCC 552</li> <li>2. Bhatia International v. Bulk Trading S.A., (2002) 4 SCC</li> <li>3. Venture Global Engineering LLC v. Tech Mahindra Ltd., (2021) SCC Online SC 366</li> <li>4. Chloro Controls India Pvt. Ltd. v. Severn Trent Water Purification Inc., (2013) 1 SCC 641</li> <li>5. <b>Swastik Pipe Ltd. V. Shri Ram Autotech Pvt. Ltd.</b> (Judgment dated 05.07.2021 in ARB.P. 241/2021)</li> </ol>
101 102 103 104 105	PRAGYA CHHETR I RANA GUHA ANUPAM ROY SUCHITR A ROY LIPIKA BARMAN	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. ONGC v. Saw Pipes Ltd. (2003) 5 SCC 705</li> <li>2. BCCI v. Kochi Cricket Pvt. Ltd. (2018) 6 SCC</li> <li>3. National Insurance Co. Ltd. v. BogharaPolyfab Pvt. Ltd. (2009) 1 SCC 267</li> <li>4. associated construction v.pawanhans helicopter ltd ,2008 16 SCC 128</li> <li>5. Uttarakhand Purva Sainik Kalyan Nigam Ltd. Vs. Northern Coal Field Ltd., Special Leave Petition (C) No. 11476 of 201</li> </ol>
106 107	SUBARN A	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. National Board of Examination v. Prometric Testing Pvt. Ltd (2020 SCC ONLINE DEL 505)</li> </ol>

108 109 110	BARMAN ISHA RAI PUJA RAJAK ADHIRAJ ROY AYAN PAUL	2. Union of India v. Bharat Biotech International Ltd. (MANU/DE/0858/2020) 3. Guru Gobind Singh Indraprastha University v. Engineers India Ltd. (MANU/DE/0855/2020) 4. Steel Authority of India Ltd v. Primetals Technologies India Pvt. Ltd.(MANU/DE/0808/2020) 5. Raza Vs. Sadaf Akhtar, Judgment dated 04 September 2019 in Civil Appeal No. 7005 of 2019
111 112 113	SOMDUT TA SARKAR UMA BARMAN JYOTIRM OY CHOUDH URY	1. ONGC Ltd. v. Western Geco International Ltd., (2014) 9 SCC 263 2. BCCI v. Kochi Cricket Pvt. Ltd., (2018) 6 SCC 287 3. Afcons Infrastructure Ltd. v. Cherian Varkey Construction Co. (P) Ltd., (2010) 8 SCC 24 4. A. Ayyasamy v. A Paramasivam, (2016) 10 SCC 386 5. Hindustan Construction Company Limited & Anr. Vs. Union of India & Ors., Judgment dated 27 November 2019 in Writ Petition (Civil) No. 1074 of 2019

<b>3 YEAR LL.B - SEMESTER - VI</b>
<b>SESSION - 2024-25 -</b>
EXPERIENTIAL LEARNING AND FIELD WORK
<b>SUBJECT TEACHER - Rupendra Tamang</b>

ROLL No.	NAME	Topics
1	SUPRADHA CHETTRI MANISHA MINJ SUSHANT MOTHAY	A STUDY ON THE IMPACT OF COVID-19 ON THE GOVERNMENT AND GOVERNMENT AIDED PRIMARY



	ANJALI GUPTA SUDHIKCHYA CHETTRI	SCHOOLS IN SILIGURI SUB-DIVISION.
2	MD MUBARAK ALI SUDHIR DAS SRIJA BHOWMIK PANKAJ ROY SAYANTONY LAHIRI	ROLE OF NON-GOVERNMENTAL ORGANISATIONS IN THE PROTECTION OF ANIMAL RIGHTS: A FIELD STUDY WITHIN SILIGURI MUNICIPAL CORPORATION.
3	MADHUMITA ROY AYAN DAS SAYAN BANERJEE LAWRENCE RAI VISHAKA JINDAL	RIGHTS OF THE LABOURERS: A FIELD STUDY ON THE TEA PLANTATION WORKERS IN THE KURSEONG SUB-DIVISION.
16	ANUP MONDAL PRIYANKA ROY SWASTIKA ROY NIKITA SIGCHI AJOY MONDAL	CRITICAL ANALYSIS OF JUVENILE DELINQUENCY IN SILIGURI SUB-DIVISION: A STUDY WITH SPECIAL REFERENCE TO IMPLEMENTATION OF JUVENILE JUSTICE (CARE AND PROTECTION OF CHILDREN) ACT, 2015.
22	ROHIT DEY PARNILA SAHA SONIA SARKAR SONIYA SARKAR MOUMITA ROY	A STUDY RELATING TO IMPLEMENTATION AND IMPACT OF SOCIO-ECONOMIC SCHEME OF LAKSHMIR BHANDAR SCHEME WITH SPECIAL REFERENCE TO SILIGURI MUNICIPAL CORPORATION.
26	RAJNI KUMARI ANJALI JAISWAL SANGHAMITRA GHOSH NANDITA SARKAR ANINDITA DEY	ANALYSIS OF RIGHT OF CITIZENS TO MOVE FREELY THROUGHOUT THE TERRITORY OF INDIA: A STUDY WITH SPECIAL EMPHASIS ON THE PARKING PROBLEMS IN SILIGURI MUNICIPAL CORPORATION.
32	MILI AKHTER SHAMIK DUTTA PRIYANKA NIRMAL MARINA PALIT PRIYANKA DAS	A STUDY RELATING TO IMPLEMENTATION OF NATIONAL EDUCATION POLICY, 2020 ON THE GOVERNMENT AND GOVERNMENT AIDED SCHOOLS IN MATIGARA BLOCK OF SILIGURI SUB-DIVISION.
37	PRITAM ROY BIPTI ADHIKARI AKASH SARKAR NIPA PAUL VISHAL KUMAR GUPTA	RIGHTS OF THE LABOURERS: A FIELD STUDY ON THE TEA PLANTATION WORKERS IN THE KURSEONG SUB-DIVISION.
38	DIBYENDU BHATTACHARJEE MD NABUL HUSSAIN RENUKA SINGH	CONSTITUTIONALITY OF RELIGIOUS PERFORMANCES IN THE PREMISES OF GOVERNMENT OFFICES: A STUDY WITH SPECIAL REFERENCE TO GOVERNMENT

	NILOY CHANDRA ROY RAHUL GHOSH	OFFICES IN SILIGURI MUNICIPAL CORPORATION.
47	AVAY PRASAD PRITI GOYAL KAJAL GUPTA SARASWATI KUMARI JHA ABHISHEK MISHRA	IMPLEMENTATION OF RIGHT TO FAIR COMPENSATION AND TRANSPARENCY IN LAND ACQUISITION, REHABILITATION AND RESETTLEMENT ACT, 2013: A STUDY WITH SPECIAL REFERENCE TO PROJECT OF ASIAN HIGHWAY II FROM BAGDOGRA TO DARJEELING MORE.
52	HEENA CHOUDHARY VIVEK UPADHYAYA ANNIE PAUL SAHELEE BOSE SWARNAYU GOPE	A STUDY RELATING TO SOCIO-ECONOMIC RIGHTS OF ZOMATO AND SWIGGY FOOD DELIVERY PARTNERS WORKING WITHIN SILIGURI MUNICIPAL CORPORATION.
56	SUPRODIP MAZUMDER SPANDAN BAISHNAB PUJA SARKAR MOUSHUMI ROY KOYANA PAUL	AN EMPIRICAL STUDY RELATING TO SCOPE AND OPPORTUNITIES OF ECO-FEMINISM VIS-A-VIS TOURISM IN HILLY AREAS OF DARJEELING.
62	RAHUL ROY MAMATA SARKAR CHINKEY AGARWAL SUSHAMA SARKAR SHAMRAGGY DEWAN	BALANCING THE INTEREST OF DEVELOPMENT AND ENVIRONMENT: AN ENVIRO-LEGAL STUDY FOR ASSESSING THE ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT OF CONSTRUCTING THE SEVOKE-RANGPO RAILWAY LINE.
67	ABHIJIT KUMAR SINGH SAGAR BHAGAT DIPAK KUMAR AGARWAL JONI SABJI PRAKIRTI SINHA	A STUDY RELATING TO THE IMPLEMENTATION OF WILD LIFE (PROTECTION) ACT, 1972 IN MAHANANDA WILDLIFE SANCTUARY.
71	SHREYA PANJA SUBHAM CHOWDHURY TENZING ONGMU SAYANTANI GHOSH SAGARNIL DAS	A STUDY RELATING TO IMPLEMENTATION OF NATIONAL EDUCATION POLICY, 2020 ON THE GOVERNMENT AND GOVERNMENT AIDED SCHOOLS IN MATIGARA BLOCK OF SILIGURI SUB-DIVISION.
76	SUKANTA CHATTERJEE SUJAY BARMAN SUMIT DAS YASMIN ARA SAIFUL ALAM	Mental Health Awareness: Examining stigma and accessibility to mental health services in your local areas.

81	UDAY KUMAR CHHETRI RINSHU KUMAR BOSAK PRITHIRAJ DAS SHREYASHI ROY SUBEKCHA CHETTRI	Plastic Waste Management: Evaluating Siliguri's waste disposal policies and their implementation and their effects on the locals.
87	SOHAIB HASMI SUSHANTA MANDAL APETO ASSUMI KOUSHAL SAHA SANJUMA KHATUN	Eco-tourism and Sustainability: A legal analysis of tourism laws in Darjeeling and Siliguri and their implementation as well as development.
91	MD. SAYEED AFRIDI ASRAF HOSSAIN JUDHISTHIR SAHU SHARMILA GUPTA PARTHA RAY	Special Education Needs and Rights: Challenges that are faced by children with disabilities in Siliguri schools and other sectors, following with all the steps taken by the government regarding the same.
97	MEHETAB MIDDE RAM KUMAR SINGH SONALI BARMAN HEMANT AGARWAL DEVJYOTI RAJ	Cyber Crimes Against Children: Awareness and legal response regarding the increase in cyber crimes against children in North Bengal.
101	BAISHAKHI SAHA SHIVESH KUMAR SINGH PIYA BISWAS KABITA GUHA ROY SIMRAN AGARWAL	Child Labor in the Informal Sector: Examine the legal loopholes and enforcement challenges despite schemes concerning eradicating child labor.
106	SUSHANTA BARMAN SANJAY KUMAR PRACHI GARG MOON SAHA CHINMOY BARMAN	Legal Frameworks for Sustainable Development: Evaluate Siliguri's expansion projects and its compliance with environmental laws.
107	MADHURIMA DUTTA MOUMITA ROY RIYA ROY CHOWDHURY DHIRAJ KUMAR CHOUDHURY NUSRAT JAHAN	Plastic Waste Management: Evaluate how Siliguri's waste disposal policies are implemented and executed in your local areas, including its effect on people's lifestyle.
117	NIKHIL MAHARAJ SAYONI BHATTACHARJEE  SUMITA ROY MUKESH KUMAR SAHANI	Deforestation and its Adverse Impact on Biodiversity: A study in and around Mahananda Wildlife Sanctuary.
122	ANAMIKA DAS ANITA MAHATO NIKITA DAS SUCHITRA CHOWDHURY	Maternal and Child Healthcare in North Bengal: Assessing the effectiveness of government schemes in your local areas and whether those schemes are implemented.

127	MANOJ KUMAR ROY RITU HALDER RIYA DAS SUDEB KUMAR SINGHA	Urbanization and basic housing rights: Research on the legal implications of slum development in Siliguri and whether any steps are proposed by the government.
-----	--	--

### **3 YEAR LL.B.**

**NAME OF THE SUBJECT: Moot Court Exercise**

**SEMESTER: VI**

**NAME OF THE SUBJECT TEACHER: Rituraj Bhowal**

### **CRIMINAL LAW MOOT PROPOSITION**

1. The Democratic Republic of Jotunheim, also known as Jatindham by the majority of its citizens, became an independent country in 1947 after being colonised for over 2 centuries by the British. During this period of colonial rule, the British introduced Jotunheim's first penal code in 1860, which came to be known as the Jotunheim Penal Code, which became operative on 1st January 1860. Along with the Jotunheim Penal Code, the British enacted two other key criminal laws, the Criminal Procedure Code and the Jotunheim Evidence Act, passed in 1862 and 1872 respectively.

2. After the Jotunheimian independence, the Constituent Assembly of Jotunheim adopted its constitution on 26th November 1949. This new constitutional framework had a profound impact on the interpretation of the existing Criminal Procedure Code. Subsequently, the code was thoroughly revised in 1973, to align with the principles enshrined in the Constitution.

3. In response to evolving legal needs and as Jotunheim entered the 21st century, the government realized that the existing criminal laws, largely inherited from the colonial era, lacked a distinctly indigenous character. In response to this, the government introduced three new laws, namely, Jatindham Nyaya Sanhita (JNS) (2023), Jatindham Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita (JNSS) (2023) and Jatindham Sakshya Adhiniyam (JSA) (2023), replacing the previous laws. These new laws came into effect on 1st July 2024.

4. Jamie, a 32-year-old entrepreneur and owner of a successful tech startup, is a citizen of Jotunheim residing in Argos. In one of the social events organised for the investors on 15th May 2023, Jamie met Oliver, a

30-year-old banker. Impressed with Oliver's qualifications and socialising skills, Jamie offered her a well-paying job at the startup which she gladly accepted.

5. Over the next few months, the two developed a close relationship, during which Jamie expressed his intention to marry Oliver. Jamie also started saving a substantial sum of money by depositing it in fixed deposits in the bank branch where Oliver previously worked, stating to her that he would be using it for the marriage. Additionally, Oliver has also contributed a substantial share to the deposit.

6. Oliver would frequently make personal purchases using Jamie's accounts and use his credit and debit cards without informing him or obtaining his permission.

7. Although they were in a relationship, Jamie and Oliver maintained a strictly professional demeanor in public, consciously avoiding any displays of affection. Jamie specially made sure that they should maintain professionalism at the workplace so as to prevent any unnecessary rumors.

8. Eventually, they bought a house on loan in Jamie's name, the payments of which were jointly made by the two. Subsequently, they moved in and started living together in October 2023.

9. On 20th November 2023, Jamie saw Oliver talking to one of their startup's funders, Rishi, at a restaurant. Upon returning home, Jamie began questioning her association with Rishi. Oliver asserted that their relationship was strictly professional, but an argument ensued and Jamie ended up slapping Oliver. He later apologised for his acts, realising his mistake and the two moved past the incident.

10. On December 1st 2023, Jamie proposed to Oliver, promising they would marry by the end of 2024 or in the beginning of 2025. Trusting his intentions and the commitment shown over time, Oliver agreed to enter into a sexual relationship with Jamie, only upon the belief and promise that they would eventually get married.

11. However, in May 2024, Oliver began to notice changes in Jamie's behaviour. He grew distant, avoiding every discussion about marriage, and frequently made excuses to postpone setting a wedding date. Despite her repeated inquiries, Jamie reassured Oliver that he was committed to their future together but was reluctant to finalize any plans for the wedding.

12. Growing suspicious of him, Oliver discreetly gained access to Jamie's social media accounts, including Facebook, WhatsApp, and LinkedIn, logging in through her devices to monitor his activity without his knowledge.

13. Upon being met with unclear and vague responses, Oliver became suspicious of his intentions and also started recording their intimate moments and clicked multiple pictures of them in compromised positions.

14. Around the same time, Jamie realised that his financial accounts had unauthorised transactions. And while checking his social media accounts, he noticed multiple log-ins and realised that Oliver had been discreetly accessing his social media accounts. This led to a mistrust in him, and he started to contemplate whether Oliver is in-fact a right partner for marriage or not.

15. Meanwhile, Jamie's parents had been pressuring him to get married and he told his parents to look for a suitable partner.

16. On 2nd June 2024, Jamie withdrew the money that was deposited for the wedding

without telling Oliver. She was made aware of Jamie's actions through her ex-colleagues. When she confronted Jamie about the withdrawal, he stated that it was necessary to make up for the startup's losses. However, upon further inquiry into the situation, Oliver learned that the business was running in profits and the money withdrawn was deposited into a joint account Jamie held with someone named Alexa.

17. On 10th July 2024, Jamie and Oliver went on a business trip to Nagoa for a week, where they ended up having sexual intercourse on multiple occasions. However, on the last day of the trip, Oliver started discussing about fixing the date of the wedding when Jamie snapped and decided to end their relationship soon and not to talk to Oliver ever again. After returning to Argos, they also started living separately.

18. By the end of August 2024, Jamie had completely severed all personal contact with Oliver. When she confronted Jamie, he said that his parents were not ready for their marriage and that they had already arranged his marriage with Alexa. He even showed text messages and call logs in a bid to explain that he had made extensive efforts to convince his family members.

19. Oliver later found out that Jamie had already sold the house they had purchased jointly and transferred the proceeds to his joint account with Alexa.

20. Oliver was heartbroken and felt completely betrayed. On 26th August, she posted their intimate pictures and videos across various social media platforms, making them accessible to the public. On 29th August 2024, she lodged an FIR against Jamie with the local police station in Argos, accusing him of exploiting her under false pretences.

21. The police conducted a preliminary enquiry and finally arrested Jamie on 14th September 2024, initially charging him under Section 69 of the JNS. The police tried to get him to confess the alleged offence by torturing him. On the evening of 16th September, the police produced Jamie in the court of the local judicial magistrate, seeking a police remand, which was granted by the magistrate till 30th September 2024.

22. On 1st October, the police moved another application for extending the police remand, stating that more time is needed to complete the investigation. The police remand was again granted until 15th October. Similarly, the police filed another application on 16th October for extending the remand, stating the same reason. This request was approved, extending the remand until 30th October. During this period, he was tortured and coerced by the police to confess to the alleged offence on multiple occasions.

23. The remand was extended till 14th December, in a cyclic manner. Finally, Jamie filed for bail on 16th December claiming the right to default bail. The police failed in filing the chargesheet in the due course of time and thus the default bail was granted to Jamie.

24. The police however, completed the investigation by the end of December and the final chargesheet contained the offence under Section 375 r/w

Section 376 of the Jotunheimian Penal Code. The Judicial magistrate took the chargesheet on file and issued summons to the accused Jamie but he failed to appear before the court. The court issued a warrant against Jamie. However, when the police attempted to execute the warrant on 1st January 2025, Jamie was nowhere to be found. On 28th January 2025, a consecutive warrant was issued by the court, which again could not be executed by the police on account of Jamie absconding.

25. After following the requisite procedure under JNSS, the court declared him to be a proclaimed offender. Subsequently, in April 2025 the case was committed to the Court of Session, where a trial was conducted in absentia and a conviction was procured under Section 376, sentencing Jamie to life imprisonment.

26. An appeal was preferred by the accused through his advocate before the High Court challenging the trial, the handling of the remand proceedings and the conviction.

**The following issues shall be considered before the High Court in the present matter:**

- 1. Whether the appeal in the present case is maintainable before the High Court?**
- 2. Whether the trial in absentia adhered to the provisions and principles of due process?**
- 3. Whether the lower court's application of substantive and procedural laws in the given factual context was correct?**
- 4. Whether any offence in the instant case has been committed, if so, under which laws?**
- 5. Whether the repeated authorisation of police remand by the lower court till 14th December was in accordance with the provisions of**



**criminal procedure and the principles enshrined under the Constitution of Jotunheim?**

NOTE:

1. All facts mentioned and the references made are fictional.
2. The laws of India apply mutatis mutandis.
3. Issues and sub-issues can be added and modified provided they do not alter the fundamental premise.
4. For the purposes of this proposition, the appeal before the High Court is considered to be filed in May 2025.

**CONSTITUTIONAL MOOT PROPOSITION**

1. Indiana is a country in Asian continent. It is a Democratic, Republic and Secular Nation with a population over 100 billion. The country has the largest written Constitution in the world. The country follows a federal structure of governance with a Union Government at the Centre and State Governments at state level for each 29 states with capital at Selhi. The VII Schedule of the Constitution of Indiana contains Three Lists which catalogues the legislative competency between Union and State legislatures.
2. On 15th July, 2021 the Union Parliament passed the Citizenship (Amendment) Act, 2021 governing citizenship. The Act was heavily criticized by the opposition as it contains certain provisions which could tamper with the Secular nature of Indiana. The Government anticipating nationwide protest and agitation resorted to preemptory measures to handle the adverse situations which could arise in the context.
3. The Country witnessed massive protest and dharnas and movements against this law following its notification. Many prominent leaders from the opposition, various political organizations, and social

activists took part in the protest. On 25th July, 2021 the Controller of Certifying Authorities issued an order to intercept information through any computer resource of some high level politicians, activists and journalists in consonance with Sec. 69 of the IT Act, 2000. Similar orders were issued by the telegraph authority to intercept information through telegraph devices also.

4. The order of the Controller of the Certifying Authorities dated 25th July, 2021 directed J K Technologies to intercept the information with aid of spyware named “spygaus” which is used to spy on users of Facebook’s messaging platform, Whatsapp etc.. Accordingly, the company proceeded with the process of interception of communication of people as per the list forwarded by the Controller.
5. On 27th July, 2021 Mr. Jameer Ali, the editor in chief of People Today, a national daily and publishers of various magazines scheduled an interview with a notable Constitutional Law expert and social activist Dr. Sameer Chowdhary, discussing the constitutional aspects of the sensational enactment. Since, it was to be published the very next day Mr. Ali sent the questions to Dr. Chowdhary via Whatsapp, to which he responded in the form of voice messages. Both Mr. Ali and Dr. Chowdhary were supporters of the protest and found the Act, as an instrument for subscribing to the ideology of ruling party throughout the Nation. On the very next day at about 2:00 AM the local police arrested Dr. Chowdhary from his house and Mr. Ali from his office at South Selhi, which is in the National Capital Territory of New Selhi.
6. Both of them were detained in judicial custody without giving any information as to why they were arrested. After a long time it was informed that, in the interview Dr. Chowdhary has allegedly criticized the Prime Minister and the Home Minister, citing instances of maladministration and the way in which the chaos in the country is been handled. Further, the statements given by Mr. Ali that “the master brains are trying to achieve their agenda of transforming the nation in accordance with their political agenda, and if the people remain silent today, they will achieve what our forefathers never wanted for this country” and that “They will erase the history” were found fault with as allegedly having a content of incitement. Both of them were charged under Sec. 124 A of Indian Penal Code, 1860 and were produced before the Magistrate.

7. The Judicial First Class Magistrate of South Selhi, under Sec. 311A of Indiana Criminal Procedure Code, 1973, issued an order to collect voice samples of both the accused for digital analysis and accordingly their voice samples were collected. They were released on conditional bail. Both Mr. Ali and Dr. Chowdhary approached the High Court of New Selhi under Art. 226 of the Constitution of Indiana challenging the constitutionality of the order of interception issued by the Controller under Sec. 124A of the Indiana Penal Code and also the order of the Magistrate under Sec. 311A of Criminal Procedure Code. At the same time they filed a complaint before the Data Protection Authority of Indiana alleging that the interception of their data by the State was in violation of rights protected under The Protection of Personal Data Act, 2019. The Authority dismissed the complaint stating that the Whatsapp chat that was alleged to have been intercepted does not come within the meaning of Personal Data as defined under Sec. 2(29) of the Act. Further the Authority observed that even if considered otherwise the said interception is exempted under Sec. 42 and 43 of the Act. The Appellate Tribunal confirmed the order of the Authority.
8. The High Court of New Selhi upheld the constitutionality of the proceedings initiated by the Controller against the petitioner/Appellants and also the Order of the Magistrate under Section 311 A. In the same proceedings the High Court by invoking Sec. 482 of the Indiana Criminal Procedure Code formed a Special Investigation Team to probe into the data interception using spygaur by J K technologies and the involvement of the Union Government in this regard. Aggrieved by the order of the High Court and the Appellate Tribunal, Mr. Ali and Dr. Chowdhary filed appeal before the Hon'ble Supreme Court of Indiana. The State also filed an appeal against the Order of the High Court forming SIT. All the three appeals came to be admitted by the Supreme Court, which decided to hear all the matters together and framed the following questions for its consideration:
  - A. Whether the Appellate Tribunal erred in not interfering with the decision of the Data Protection Authority justifying the interception of data and hence whether the same is sustainable in law?

- B. Whether the High Court erred in its decision approving the constitutionality of the proceedings initiated by the Controller of the Certifying Authorities under Sec. 69 of the IT Act, 2000?
- C. Whether the Order of the High Court endorsing the constitutionality of the decision of the Magistrate directing collection of voice samples of Dr. Chowdhary is legally sustainable in the backdrop of the right against self-incrimination guaranteed under Article 20(3) of the Constitution?
- D. Whether the decision of the High Court to suo motu invoke the inherent jurisdiction under Sec. 482 of the Criminal Procedure Code, 1973 to form a special investigation team to probe into a matter under investigation is sustainable in law and facts?

Note:

- The Constitution of Republic of India is pari materia to the Constitution of India.
- All the legislations of Republic of India are pari materia to the legislations of India.
- The Protection of Personal Data Act, 2019 of India is pari materia to The Protection of Personal Data Bill, 2019.
- The Counsels will be having liberty to identify and raise additional issues apart from the issues suggested above.

### **MOOT PROPOSITION ON CIVIL LAW**

1. The Republic of Shalvak is the third largest democratic country in the world with 27 Provinces and 3 Centrally Administered Units. The Constitution of the country indicates that the country has adopted Federalism. The Constitution of the Republic of Shalvak provides six Fundamental Rights including Right to Life under Article 21 of the Constitution and several other Human Rights and Statutory Rights which are at par with the International Documents including Universal Declaration

of Human Rights etc. The Constitution also offers remedial measures for human right violations.

2. The country has a rich tradition of ancient medical system which includes holistic healing of mind and body. Accordingly, the country also boasts of a strong Health Act which was enacted in 1956 and it was amended only in 1996 to include a provision related legalizing sex change operations for trans gender people. The significant chapters of this Act includes-

- (I) Right to holistic health as part of right to life,
- (II) Right against negligent behavior of the health service providers including the doctors, para medics, nurses, hospitals, and hospital managements,
- (III) Right against illegal abortions, against illegal organ trafficking,
- (IV) Right to access free medical aid provided by the government.

3. The country has also enacted Information Technology Act and other procedural laws which are similar as it is with Indian Information Technology Act, Indian Penal Code, Criminal procedure Code, Civil Procedure Code, Evidence Act etc.

4. The country has a beautiful and strong system of Separation of Power and has strong institutions to look after human right violation issues.

5. On 6th December 2022, the police in Chandrikapur district of Bhanu Pradesh, a province of the Republic of Shalvak received a complaint of unnatural death of 6 members in a family. The investigation results suggested that the head of the family Mr. Nandvan was suffering from heavy depression due to continuous harassment, pressure at workplace. He used to take 'Calioregamantle' tablet as anti-depressant. This was not a prescribed medicine. Nandvan searched on internet about best anti-depressant medicines that are available in the market without prescription, and he purchased the same online. He was always afraid that if he loses the job due to office politics his two minor children, his wife and his aged parents have to undergo tremendous hardship as he is the sole earner of his family.

6. On 4th December 2022 he had some altercations with his supervisor at office. He started shouting at the supervisor and threw his bag to him. The supervisor informed him that disciplinary action will be taken against him.

Nandvan came back, had dinner with his family and within 2 hours all the family members died due to heavy dose of Calioregamantle medicine.

7. A suicide note was recovered from the body of Nandvan where he stated that due to extreme pressure, he is taking this step, and no one is responsible for his death. As there were no suicide notes found from other family members, police assumed that Nandvan had secretly mixed the Calioregamantle medicine in the dinner food that was consumed by the rest of the family members.

8. Police registered the case of unnatural death. But the chargesheet included the names of the supervisor and some colleagues with whom the altercation happened and who came to stop Nandvan from physically assaulting the supervisor. The chargesheet also mentioned about the pharmaceutical company 'Moon Pharmaceutical Pvt. Ltd.' and the e-commerce platform 'Flipdeal' that was selling the Calioregamantle medicine.

9. The significant points are as follows:

a. Nandvan was subjected to mental harassment and workplace torture. There were no policies in the workplace regarding organisational behaviour related training and no counsellor was available to assess the psychological status of the employees.

b. Calioregamantle medicine is a restricted medicine in other jurisdictions as unprescribed doses could cause heart attack. But pharmaceutical company named 'Moon Pharmaceutical Pvt. Ltd.' that was manufacturing this medicine in the Republic of Shalvak did not carry out the necessary tests and hence it was made easily available for the market.

c. The e-commerce platform 'Flipdeal' that facilitated the sale of the medicine is hosted in the United States of America. The platform can be accessed from the Republic of Shalvak. The medicine is listed as 'available' when the investigation was being done. The information about the medicine on the web portal stated that this is the best antidepressant medicine. It will not have much side effects except that it may cause slight giddiness. It will not cause heavy effect on nerves. It also mentioned that the medicine can be taken after food twice in a day and will cause a calming and relaxing effect on the body.

d. But the e-commerce platform 'Flipdeal' does not have any nodal officer or grievance redressal officer/office situated in the said country. The availability of the medicine on the platform and the review of the medicine on the open platform may encourage people to buy it in large quantity without knowing any side effects of the same. The said company has to be made liable for selling

unprescribed medicines.

10. While the case got listed in the court, the media started airing about the peculiar nature of the death. This attracted the attention of an NGO named 'Centre for Therapeutic Legal Healing'. They filed a writ application in the High Court referring to the death of Nandvan and his family and wanted the High Court to consider directing (i) for a policy guideline for workplace mental health regulation and (ii) for making the e-commerce platform liable for misleading general consumers about the availability of the "dangerous" drug.

11. The High Court of Bhanu Pradesh has to decide on these 4 issues:

(i) Whether the present case is maintainable in the High Court of Bhanu Pradesh or not?

(ii) Whether the High Court of Bhanu Pradesh can direct for formulation of Mental Health Regulation related laws and policy guidelines?

(iii) Whether the US based E-commerce platform 'Flipdeal' is liable for facilitating the sale of unprescribed medicine?

(iv) Whether the pharmaceutical company 'Moon Pharmaceutical Pvt. Ltd.' is liable for manufacturing the drug which is contended to be dangerous for health?

Note: -

a. All the laws of the Republic of Shalvak are Pari-Materia to that of the Republic of India.

b. The parties are not allowed to frame/add any further issues.

c. The parties are allowed to frame sub-issues as per their own

discretion.

d. This is a work of fiction. Names, characters, business, events and incidents are the products of the drafter's imagination. Any resemblance to actual persons, living or dead, or actual events is purely coincidental.