

INTRA MOOT COURT COMPETITION, 2026

Organized by:

**MOOT COURT SOCIETY, INDIAN INSTITUTE OF LEGAL
STUDIES, SILIGURI**

(Jul-Dec Session, 2026)



BROCHURE

SENIOR SESSION

SL. NO.	EVENT	DATE
1.	Release of Moot Problem	4 th August, 2026
2.	Oral Round I (5 Years LLB Semester VII, IX & 3 years Semester V)	21 st August, 2026
3.	Oral Round II (5 Years LLB Semester III, V & 3 years Semester III)	29 th August, 2026
4.	Quarter Final Round	11 th September, 2026
4.	Semi Final Round	20 th November
5.	Final Round	10 th December

JUNIOR SESSION

SL. NO.	EVENT	DATE
1.	Release of Moot Problem	4 th August, 2026
2.	Oral Round	3 rd October, 2026
4.	Quarter Final Round	9 th October, 2026
4.	Semi Final Round	21 st November, 2026
6.	Final Round	5 th December, 2026

DETAILED SCHEDULE AND MOOT PROBLEMS:

SCHEDULE - I

SL. NO.	EVENT	DATE
1.	Release of Moot Problem	4 th August, 2026
2.	Last date of team Registration Students can register by filling the Google form through the following link: https://forms.gle/mhfiSBoDp7H6T3FYA	12 th August, 2026
3.	Last date of memorial Submission, Draw of Lots and Memorial Exchange	20 th August, 2026
4.	Oral Rounds-I	21 st August, 2026

MOOT PROBLEM FOR 1ST INTRA MOOT COURT COMPETITION, 2026

[5 years B.A/B.B.A/B.COM LL.B. (HONS.) Semester VII, IX & 3 years LL.B.

Semester VI]

Date of the Competition: 21st August, 2026

MOOT PROPOSITION - I

**IN THE HON'BLE SUPREME COURT OF ARYAVARTA
CIVIL ORIGINAL JURISDICTION
WRIT PETITION (CIVIL) NO. 312 OF 2026**

In the matter of:

Collective for Ecological Justice & Ors.

...Petitioners

versus

Union of Aryavarta & Ors.

...Respondents

1. The Union of Aryavarta is a rapidly developing federal democracy that has, in recent years, undertaken aggressive policy measures to promote clean energy transition and reduce dependence on fossil fuels. As part of its international climate commitments, the Government introduced the “National Critical Minerals Mission, 2024,” aimed at accelerating the extraction of lithium and rare earth minerals. These minerals are considered essential for manufacturing batteries, electric vehicles, and renewable energy infrastructure.
2. The State of Vindhya Pradesh, located in the north-western region of Aryavarta, is home to the Suryavan Highlands, a centuries-old forested mountain system known for its ecological sensitivity. The region plays a crucial role in groundwater recharge, acts as a natural barrier against desertification, and supports diverse flora and fauna. It is also inhabited by indigenous communities including the Kora and Veda tribes, many of whom are classified as Particularly Vulnerable Tribal Groups, whose lives, culture, and livelihood are intrinsically linked to forest resources.
3. In January 2025, the Union Government, in coordination with the State of Vindhya Pradesh, granted a composite environmental and mining clearance for a large-scale lithium

extraction project in the Suryavan Highlands to Orion Metals India Pvt. Ltd. (“OMIPL”), a subsidiary of Apex Minerals Global PLC, a multinational corporation headquartered in a foreign jurisdiction. The project was approved under a fast-track “Strategic Green Energy Corridor” framework, which allowed simultaneous processing of forest clearance, environmental clearance, and land acquisition approvals.

4. The approval process, however, soon came under scrutiny. It was alleged that the Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) report submitted by OMIPL was prepared by a consultancy firm that had prior commercial engagements with Apex Minerals Global PLC. The report concluded that the environmental impact of the project would be “minimal and manageable,” despite the project involving deforestation across a significant portion of the highland forest area and large-scale excavation near key water recharge zones.
5. Further concerns arose regarding compliance with the Forest Rights Act, 2006. The statute mandates that the Free, Prior and Informed Consent of Gram Sabhas must be obtained before diversion of forest land. Several villagers alleged that Gram Sabha meetings were either conducted without proper notice or that consent was recorded through signatures obtained without adequate disclosure. In certain instances, it was claimed that consent documents were prepared in advance and merely endorsed under pressure from local authorities.
6. By mid-2025, mining operations commenced in phases. Within months, multiple reports surfaced indicating contamination of local water sources, decline in agricultural productivity, and health issues among residents, including respiratory problems and skin ailments. Several families reported displacement due to land acquisition, claiming that compensation packages were inadequate and rehabilitation measures were poorly implemented. Traditional forest-based occupations such as collection of minor forest produce were significantly disrupted.
7. A civil society organization named “Collective for Ecological Justice,” along with affected residents, conducted independent field studies and released a report documenting alleged violations of environmental norms and human rights standards. The report also highlighted that the project area overlapped with critical wildlife corridors and groundwater recharge zones, raising concerns of irreversible ecological damage.

8. Aggrieved by these developments, the Petitioners filed a writ petition under Article 32 of the Constitution of Aryavarta before the Hon'ble Supreme Court, alleging violations of fundamental rights, including the right to life, livelihood, and a healthy environment. The Petitioners further relied upon international standards such as the United Nations Guiding Principles on Business and Human Rights, arguing that the State has a duty to regulate corporate conduct and prevent human rights abuses by private entities.
9. During the pendency of the petition, it came to light that Apex Minerals Global PLC exercised significant operational control over OMIPL, including decision-making authority in project design, environmental compliance strategy, and financial approvals. Internal documents, accessed through investigative reports, suggested that cost-cutting measures were prioritized over environmental safeguards.
10. Parallely, a group of affected individuals initiated civil proceedings before the courts of the parent company's home jurisdiction, alleging negligence and failure to conduct adequate human rights due diligence. Apex Minerals Global PLC challenged the maintainability of such proceedings, arguing that OMIPL is an independent legal entity and that the appropriate forum for adjudication is within Aryavarta.
11. The Union of Aryavarta, in its counter-affidavit, defended the project as a matter of national importance. It emphasized that lithium extraction is critical for achieving climate goals, promoting sustainable development, and ensuring energy security. The State argued that all statutory procedures were duly followed and that the project represents a balanced approach between environmental protection and developmental needs.
12. The Respondent company, OMIPL, contended that it had complied with all applicable environmental and social regulations and that the allegations were exaggerated. It further argued that disruptions, if any, were temporary and part of the inevitable cost of development. Apex Minerals Global PLC denied any direct liability, asserting the principle of separate corporate personality.
13. The Petitioners, however, argued that the present case reflects a systemic pattern of regulatory dilution, where environmental safeguards and indigenous rights are compromised in favor of corporate and economic interests. They contended that the State has failed in its constitutional duty to act as a trustee of natural resources and to protect vulnerable communities from exploitation.

14. In light of the complex questions involving constitutional rights, environmental governance, indigenous protections, and transnational corporate accountability, the matter has been placed before bench of the Hon'ble Supreme Court of Aryavarta.

- i. *Whether the grant of environmental and forest clearances to the impugned mining project is arbitrary, unconstitutional, and in violation of the Forest Rights Act, 2006 and other applicable laws.*
- ii. *Whether the alleged non-compliance with the requirement of Free, Prior and Informed Consent of Gram Sabhas renders the project illegal.*
- iii. *Whether Apex Minerals Global PLC can be held liable for the acts of its subsidiary under principles of corporate accountability and duty of care.*
- iv. *Whether the State's justification of the project on grounds of sustainable development, climate commitments, and national interest is legally tenable.*

15. It is clarified that the laws of Aryavarta are in *pari materia* with the laws of India, and the scope of arguments shall be limited to the issues framed above.

Semester III]

Date of the Competition: 29TH AUGUST ,2026

SCHEDULE - II

SL. NO.	EVENT	DATE
1.	Release of Moot Problem	4 th August, 2026
2.	Last date of team Registration Students can register by filling the Google form through the following link: https://forms.gle/mhfiSBoDp7H6T3FYA	12 th August, 2026
3.	Last date of the memorial Submission, Draw of Lots and Memorial Exchange	27 th August, 2026
4.	Oral Rounds-II	29 th August, 2026

MOOT PROBLEM FOR 2ND INTRA MOOT COURT COMPETITION, 2026

MOOT PROPOSITION – II

Before the Hon'ble High Court of Talicutta

Pema Lhamo v. Tenzin Dorjee, C.A. No. ___ of 2026, High Court of Talicutta (Pending)

FACT OF THE CASE

1. Pema Lhamo, a woman belonging to a Scheduled Tribe community practicing Buddhism, resides in the quiet hill town of Kursung under the State of East Jungle. Married to Tenzin Dorjee for over two decades, she once shared a stable family life, blessed with a young daughter who is now ten years old.
2. However, the harmony of the household began to deteriorate after thirteen years of marriage, when Pema discovered that her husband had become involved in an illicit relationship with

another woman. Alongside this betrayal, Tenzin gradually withdrew from his responsibilities, failing to provide emotional and financial support to Pema and their child. The strain of neglect and indignity compelled Pema to seek legal recourse.

3. With no effective community-based mechanism to resolve such disputes, Pema approached the Civil Court at Kursung, seeking dissolution of her marriage. What followed was a prolonged and arduous legal battle lasting nearly a decade, during which the respondent persistently resisted the divorce. Ultimately, the parties agreed to dissolve their marriage by mutual consent, and the Civil Court granted a decree of divorce, incorporating provisions for maintenance of Pema and their minor daughter.
4. Yet, the relief proved short-lived. Despite the decree, Tenzin failed to honour his obligations, leaving Pema and the child in financial distress. Left with no alternative, Pema approached the Hon'ble High Court of Talicutta, seeking enforcement of the maintenance order and appropriate relief.
5. During the course of these proceedings, an important legal issue emerged. It was brought to the attention of the Court that the parties belonged to a Scheduled Tribe community, and under Section 2(2) of the Hindu Marriage Act, 1955, the provisions of the Act do not apply to Scheduled Tribes unless specifically notified by the Central Government. In the present case, no such notification existed.
6. This raised a fundamental question regarding the very basis of the Civil Court's jurisdiction. The constitutional framework, particularly Article 14, Article 15, and Article 21, along with Article 366(25) and Article 342, became central to determining whether access to justice and equality before law could be ensured in the absence of a governing personal law.
7. Complicating matters further, the region lacked any codified customary law or a dedicated customary court to adjudicate matrimonial disputes within the Buddhist Scheduled Tribe community. Faced with this legal vacuum, the Civil Court at Kursung had proceeded by applying general principles of law, equity, and justice, drawing guidance from the framework of the Hindu Marriage Act, 1955.
8. The legitimacy of this approach, and the competence of the Civil Court to assume jurisdiction in such circumstances, is now under challenge before the Hon'ble High Court of Talicutta, raising significant questions at the intersection of personal law, tribal autonomy, and constitutional guarantees.

Issues for Adjudication

1. Whether the Civil Court at Kursung had jurisdiction in light of Section 2(2) of the Hindu Marriage Act, 1955?
2. Whether Civil Courts can apply general principles in absence of codified law?
3. Whether such jurisdiction upholds constitutional guarantees under Articles 14, 15, and 21?
4. Whether denial of Civil Court access violates fundamental rights?
5. Whether reliance on Hindu Marriage Act principles is legally sustainable?
6. Whether the petitioner is entitled to enforcement of maintenance?



MOOT PROBLEM FOR 3RD INTRA MOOT COURT COMPETITION, 2026

**[5 years B.A./B.B.A/B.COM LL.B. (HONS) Semester I & 3 years
LL.B. (Hons) Semester I]**

Date of Competition: 3rd October, 2026

SL. NO.	EVENT	DATE
1.	Release of Moot Problem	4 th August, 2026
2.	Last date of team Registration Students can register by filling the Google form through the following link: https://forms.gle/mhfiSBoDp7H6T3FYA	10 th September, 2026
3.	Last date of the memorial Submission, Draw of Lots and Memorial Exchange	1 st October, 2026
4.	Oral Rounds-III	3 rd October, 2026

MOOT PROPOSITION - III

1. Ms. Deepa Nayak, aged about 32 years old, was an elementary school teacher. Despite being independent, she was tired of hearing the stereotypical views of society about being an unmarried woman. She was not getting any marriage proposals from any suitors, and even if a few proposals came, the marriage broke off eventually for one reason or another. Hence, on 5th September 2024, Ms. Deepa contacted a professional astrologer, named Tara Mata for marriage consultation, through an app called “astroworld”.

2. Tara Mata was a renowned astrologer in the State of Maharana, which is a part of the Union of Indira. She was well-known for her strong aura and accurate predictions. On 7th September 2024, Ms. Deepa had an appointment in person with Tara Mata at noon. Ms. Deepa reached the chamber and met Tara Mata. Upon reading her horoscope, Tara Mata made a definitive professional guarantee that upon subscribing to her specialized intervention services, Ms. Deepa would secure a successful marriage proposal by the end of November.

3. The astrologer directed her to perform specific rituals which involved lighting candles, wearing crystal chains and rings, and chanting mantras three times a day. For these services and materials,

Tara Mata charged an exorbitant professional consultation fee of ₹1,50,000, which included a highly overpriced crystal necklace. With immense faith, Ms. Deepa Nayak performed all the rituals suggested by the astrologer and wore the crystal necklace given to her by Tara Mata.

4. In the initial stage, everything was normal; however, a couple of days later, Ms. Deepa started experiencing insomnia, fatigue, and anxiety. It started affecting her day-to-day life resulting in weight loss. Getting concerned, she called Tara Mata to ask regarding this issue; however, Tara Mata dismissed the health concerns, stating that her other clients had faced the same situation, that it was just part of the process, and insisted she continue the paid rituals to avoid reversing the progress.

5. Subsequently, Ms. Deepa Nayak still had hope in Tara Mata and continuously performed the rituals for the last three months. However, months passed by but the predictions never came true as she got no proposals from any suitors, instead, it was only affecting her mental health and lifestyle. She also resigned from her job due to a lack of determination and focus. Ms. Deepa went for many doctor checkups to find the reason for her sickness but the doctor said there was no sign of illness and suggested that she should see a psychiatrist. She completely lost her faith and felt deceived.

6. Consequently, Ms. Deepa filed a suit against Tara Mata in the Civil Court of Maharana on 23rd December 2024, alleging fraud, deficiency of service, and seeking compensation.

7. On the chilly morning of 23rd December 2024, Tara Mata while reading a recognized newspaper, saw that a defamatory article was published against her by Ms. Deepa Nayak accusing Tara Mata of being a “fake astrologer”. Ms. Deepa also made allegations of practicing black magic against the astrologer. The article hit the reputation of Tara Mata and many questions were raised against her as she was a renowned female astrologer. In response to the article and the civil suit, Tara Mata filed a counterclaim against Ms. Deepa for defamation and the violation of her constitutional rights.

ISSUES RAISED:

Issue I: Whether the present suit filed by the plaintiff before the Civil Court of Maharana is maintainable, or if the matter strictly falls under the jurisdiction of the Consumer Disputes Redressal Commission?

Issue II: Whether the defendant is guilty of deficiency of service and deceiving the plaintiff by making false professional guarantees?

Issue III: Whether the defamatory article and statements regarding "black magic" published by the plaintiff violate the defendant's Right to Reputation under Article 21 and the Right to Practice any Profession under Article 19(1)(g) of the Constitution of India?

Issue IV: Whether compensation should be given to the plaintiff for the financial, physical, and mental damages caused by the defendant's services?

MOOT COURT SOCIETY RULES & PROCEDURE:

RULES:

1. The participating teams or any of its members are not allowed to back out later otherwise; strict actions will be taken by the Disciplinary Committee of the Institution.
2. The memorial exchange shall take place during the allotted time and date only.
3. The participating team or any of its members shall not be late on the date of the competition. Their entry into the premises is not the duty of the MCS. Their unpunctuality might lead to the cancellation of their participation as well.

TEAM COMPOSITION: -

1. Each team shall consist of three members, comprising two speakers and one researcher.
2. Students willing to participate can form their own team (MCS shall bear no responsibility for team formation).
3. Any alteration in the names of the team members shall be informed to any of the MCS member before the last date of registration. However, any such alteration shall be permitted only once.

PARTICIPATION AND REGISTRATION PROCEDURE: -

1. Interested teams shall register themselves by filing a google form. Each team shall fill a single google form.
2. Memorial submission is mandatory in order to appear for the oral rounds.
3. For further information of dates please refer to the Timeline/Schedule attached.

MEMORIAL SUBMISSION GUIDELINES & RULES: -

The following guidelines for the memorials must be strictly followed. Non-compliance will entail penalties as provided below: -

1. Teams have to prepare memorials for both sides.
2. Teams shall submit and exchange soft copies of the memorandum from the side that appears in their draw of lots to their opposite team and the Moot Court Society. Moreover, a hard copy of the memorial from their side has to be submitted to the

society by the date of the Competition.

3. The memorials have to be submitted on A4 size paper and must contain the following sections.

- a. **COVER PAGE;**
- b. **TABLE OF CONTENTS;**
- c. **INDEX OF AUTHORITIES;**
- d. **STATEMENT OF JURISDICTION;**
- e. **STATEMENT OF FACTS;**
- f. **STATEMENT OF ISSUES;**
- g. **SUMMARY OF ARGUMENTS;**
- h. **ARGUMENTS ADVANCED;**
- i. **PRAYER**

4. The memorials must be drafted in **Times New Roman 12 font size** with **1.5 line spacing**. The **footnotes** must be in **Times New Roman 10 font size** with **1.0 line spacing**. And should contain the '**Team Code**' on the cover page. (**Top-Right Corner**)

5. The memorials should have a margin measuring one inch on all sides of each page.

6. The page numbering should be on the bottom of each page.

7. **The Petitioner/Complainant/ Appellant's memorial cover page shall be Blue Color A4 size, and Opponent/Respondent's memorial cover page of Red Color A4 size.**

8. The teams have to use the latest edition of Blue Book for citation format throughout the memorial.

9. **The maximum scores for the memorial shall be 100 marks. The memorials shall be evaluated on the following criteria** and any non-compliance with above criteria shall result in penalty of 2 marks per missing section.

<u><i>Particulars</i></u>	<u><i>Marks</i></u>
Knowledge of Facts & Law	25
Extent & Use of Research	25
Analysis	20
Clarity & Organization	10
Format & Citation	10
Grammar & Style	10
Total	100

ORAL ROUND:

1. Preliminary round:

- a. Each team will get a total of 20 minutes to present their case. This time will include rebuttal only. No sur-rebuttal is allowed however, it depends upon the discretion of the Judges. Any time exceeding the allotted time shall be penalized. The penalty shall be of 1 mark for every two minutes exceeded. However, extension of time is permissible at the discretion of the Judges.
- b. The division of time per speaker is left for the discretion of the team subject to a maximum of 12 minutes per speaker.
- c. The oral argument should be confined to the issues presented in the memorial.
- d. The participants shall be mandatorily abided by the dress code as prescribed by the Bar Council of India. Strict Adherence to Court Manners shall be observed by all the participants.

2. Semi-Final Round : -

- a. Each team will get a total of 30 minutes to present their case. This time will include

rebuttal and sur-rebuttal. Rebuttal and sur-rebuttal should not exceed 5 minutes. Any time exceeding the allotted time shall be penalized. The penalty shall be of 1 mark for every two minutes exceeded. However, extension of time is permissible at the discretion of the Judges.

- b. The division of time per speaker is left for the discretion of the team subject to a minimum of 12 minutes per speaker. However, per speaker should not exceed 18 minutes.
- c. The oral argument should be confined to the issues presented in memorial.
- d. The participants shall be mandatorily abiding by the dress code as per prescribed by the Bar Council of India. Strict Adherence to Court Manners shall be observed by all the participants.

3. Final Round : -

- a. Each team will get a total of 45 minutes to present their case. Any time exceeding the allotted time shall be penalized. The penalty shall be of 1 mark for every two minutes exceeded. However, an extension of time is permissible at the discretion of the Judges.
- b. The division of time per speaker is left for the discretion of the team subject to a minimum of 18 minutes per speaker. However, per speaker should not exceed 25 minutes.
- c. The oral argument should be confined to the issues presented in the memorial. d. The participants shall be mandatorily abiding by the dress code as prescribed by the Bar Council of India. Strict Adherence to Court Manners shall be observed by all the participants.

4. Maximum scores for the oral rounds shall be 50 points per speaker. *The oral rounds shall be judged on the following criteria:*

<u>PARTICULARS OF MARKS</u>	<u>MARKS</u>
Knowledge and Application of Laws & Facts	10
Ingenuity & Ability to Answer Questions	10
Style, Poise, Courtesy & Demeanour	10
Organization & Flow of Arguments	10
Time Management	10
TOTAL	50

STEP-BY-STEP GUIDE FOR YOU TO EXCEL AT YOUR ORAL ROUNDS

STEP 1: TAKE PERMISSION BEFORE BEGINNING

1. Speaker: The counsel seeks permission to approach the Dias.
2. Once the Judge nods/says in affirmation granting you the permission to approach the Dias then say “Much Obligated”
3. Nowadays, many competitions are held online and therefore you can leave the above step if the moot court competition you are participating in is held virtually.

STEP 2: GREET THE JUDGES

1. Speaker: Good Morning to the Hon’ble bench.
2. Now, if only male Judges or only lady Judges are present then you can use the following phrase:
3. Speaker: If it may please, the counsel seeks permission to address the bench as your Lordship/ Ladyship.
4. Then say: “Much Obligated your Lordship.”
2. When the bench consists of both male and female Judges:
3. Speaker: The counsel recognizes the gracious presence of your Ladyship, however, for the convenience of the proceedings, the counsel seeks permission to address the bench as your Lordship/Ladyship.

4. Then say: “Much obliged your Lordship/Ladyship”

STEP 3: BEGIN WITH THE NAME OF THE CASE AND JURISDICTION

1. Speaker: The counsel is appearing before the Hon’ble Court in the matter of ABC v. XYZ, on behalf of the Appellants/Petitioner under.....(whatever your jurisdiction is).
2. If you are the Respondent or Defendant, then you may say: The council is appearing before the Hon’ble Court in the matter of ABC v. XYZ, on behalf of the Respondents in response to the petition/appeal filed under (whatever your jurisdiction is).

STEP 4: LET THE JUDGE KNOW THE ISSUES INVOLVED

1. Speaker: Your Lordships, there are three (change it according to the number of issues present in your case) main issues involved in the present case.
2. The council will be dealing with the first and the second issue and will be speaking for mins, and the co-counsel will be dealing with the third issue and will speak for mins, respectfully reserving mins for the rebuttals. [The time limit for each speaker would be told to the team before the rounds. So, you need to make the changes accordingly.]

STEP 5: LET THE JUDGE KNOW THE FACTS OF THE CASE

1. Speaker: The counsel seeks permission to begin with the Statements of Facts.
2. Much Obligated your Lordship [You can state the statement of facts during the prelims. However, for the quarters/Semi-finals/Finals, the speaker can directly ask if your lordship is well versed with the facts, and the counsel seeks permission to proceed with the pleadings.]
3. Note: Make sure you state only relevant facts. Also, do not extend your facts for more than 30 seconds.

STEP 6: PROCEED WITH THE PLEADINGS

1. Speaker: The counsel seeks permission to proceed with the pleadings.
2. Your lordship, the first issue is....., which the counsel would be establishing on three grounds (grounds are your sub-issues). You first list down your grounds and then you say that, proceeding with the first Issue....
3. For Example: If your argument is that the new Law violates Article 14 of the Constitution of India, then the pleadings would be:

4. Your lordship, the first issue is that the new Law violates Article 14 of the Constitution of India, which the council would be established on three grounds:
 - a. Secondly, there is no rational nexus with the object of the new law.
 - b. Thirdly, the new law is not based on intelligible differentia.
5. Make sure to refer the Judges to your memorial and the moot problem to keep him/her engaged in between your speech.
6. After the first speaker is done, he/she will have to say your lordships, now the co-counsel would be dealing with the third issue.

**STEP 7: LET THE SECOND SPEAKER BEGIN AND CONCLUDE
WITH THE PRAYER**

1. Second Speaker: if your lordships are satisfied with the pleading submitted in the 1st and the 2nd issue, the counsel seeks permission to begin with the pleadings for the 3rd issue. [However, this can also act against you. If you feel the Judges are not getting convinced with the first speaker, don't even ask this, directly start with the 3rd issue]
2. And then take permission for prayer which should be absolutely memorized.
3. After you are done with your prayer, you may say, it was pleasure arguing before the court.

STEP 8: SOME TIPS TO KEEP IN MIND

1. Make sure the speech sounds natural.
2. Be clear with the basics on which the Judges may question you.
3. Say indeed your lordship and certainly not your lordship.
4. If there comes a situation where the Judges are questioning you for very long and you didn't have much time left to complete your arguments or issue, then ask the Judges for a minute or two to just sum up your arguments. Even if you have two minutes left you will have to speed up with only the most relevant points.

ORGANIZING COMMITTEE

SL. NO.	CONTACT PERSON	CONTACT NO.
1.	Ms. Tripti Yonzon Faculty Convenor, MCS (Assistant Professor of Law) Indian Institute of Legal Studies	+91 9332092535
2.	Mr Arkaparva Bhattacharjee Moot Court Research Committee Teacher in charge, MCS (Assistant Professor of Law) Indian Institute of Legal Studies	+91 9641869756
4.	Ms Sneha Suzanna Pradhan Student Convenor Indian Institute of Legal Studies	+91 9002839847
5.	Ms. Mithali Subba Student Co-Convenor Indian Institute of Legal Studies	+91 8436538523

“ALL ILS MOOT COURT SOCIETY FACULTY AND STUDENT MEMBERS”

For Regular Updates, please visit <https://www.iilsindia.com/moot-court-society>

ALL THE BEST!