



BBS Institute of Law

PHAPHAMAU, PRAYAGRAJ (U.P.)

Approved by the Bar Council of India (BCI), New Delhi

Affiliated to Prof. Rajendra Singh (Rajju Bhaiya) University, Prayagraj



MOOT COURT SOCIETY
Presents

1st INTRA-CITY MOOT COURT COMPETITION 2026

March 13th-14th



KEY DATES:

- | | |
|---|---|
| ➤ Last Date of Registration
1st March, 2026 | ➤ Last Date of Memorial Submission
7th March, 2026 |
| ➤ Last Date of Seeking Clarification
3rd March, 2026 | ➤ Moot Court Competition Dates
13th – 14th March, 2026 |

FACULTY CONVENERS:

Mrs. Yashi M. Tripathi (Convenor)
Ms. Divya Raj (Co-Convenor)

STUDENT CONVENERS:

Mr. Shreyans – +91 9794201302
Ms. Avantika Avadh – +91 9696843352



**Scan to get the complete
detailed brochure**

www.bbsil.in @BBSIL_MCS

bbsmootcourt@gmail.com

KNOWLEDGE PARTNER

Chamber of P.C. Srivastava

Senior Advocate Allahabad High Court,
Judicature at Allahabad
Former Additional Advocate General (AAG)

JUDICIARYGOLD

MEDIA PARTNER

LEGAL CHARIOT
www.legalchariot.com

Patron-in-Chief



Prof B.P Singh
Director, BBSIL



Mr. Manas Tripathi
Head of Department,
BBSIL



Yashi M Tripathi
Faculty Convenor,
Moot Court Society, BBSIL



Divya Raj
Faculty Co-Convenor,
Moot Court Society, BBSIL

STUDENT CONVENERS



MR. SHREYANS
Convenor



MS. AVANTIKA AVADH
Co-Convenor

About BBS Group of Institutions, Prayagraj

Established in 2002 by the esteemed social worker and MLA Sri Babu Bhola Singh ji, BBS Group of Institutions, Prayagraj stands as a premier hub of quality education and holistic development. Located on the Prayagraj–Lucknow National Highway at Phaphamau, the institution offers a 27-acre, state-of-the-art campus designed to foster academic excellence. The Group offers 15 undergraduate and postgraduate programs across engineering, management, pharmacy, science, and legal education, delivered through 8 constituent institutions. All programs are duly approved and accredited by statutory bodies including AICTE, BCI, PCI, AKTU, BTE, ASU, and UGC, ensuring the highest academic and professional standards.

With a diverse student community drawn from across Uttar Pradesh and beyond, BBS promotes a vibrant academic culture rooted in discipline, integrity, and intellectual rigor. The institution emphasizes practical legal training, research orientation, and advocacy skills, making it an ideal host for academic competitions of national and regional importance.

With over 22 years of excellence in education, BBS Group of Institutions remains committed to nurturing future legal professionals and leaders through quality education, ethical values, and experiential learning—perfectly aligned with the spirit and objectives of a Moot Court Competition.



BBS INSTITUTE OF LAW

Phaphamau, Prayagraj (U.P.)

Approved by the Bar Council of India (BCI), New Delhi

Affiliated to Prof. Rajendra Singh (Rajju Bhaiya) University, Prayagraj



BBS Institute of Law (BBSIL), a constituent institution of the BBS Group of Institutions, is committed to excellence in legal education through academic rigor, ethical grounding, and professional training. The Institute aims to nurture competent legal professionals equipped with strong doctrinal foundations, analytical abilities, & practical advocacy skills.

With a focus on quality teaching, structured mentoring, and experiential learning, BBSIL provides an environment conducive to intellectual growth and professional development in law.



ABOUT THE COMPETITION

The BBSIL Intra-City Moot Court Competition, Prayagraj is a flagship academic initiative of the BBS Institute of Law, designed to provide law students with a rigorous and immersive advocacy experience. The competition seeks to cultivate courtroom competence by strengthening students' skills in legal research, drafting, oral advocacy, and structured legal reasoning.

Through a simulated court environment, the competition enables participants to engage with complex legal issues, apply substantive and procedural law, and present persuasive arguments before experienced academicians and legal professionals. It also serves as a platform for peer learning, healthy competition, and professional growth within the legal academic community of Prayagraj.

The Moot Court Competition aims to bridge the gap between theoretical legal education and practical courtroom application, preparing students to meet the demands of contemporary legal practice with confidence and clarity.



AUTHORS OF THE MOOT PROPOSITION

The moot proposition for this competition has been carefully drafted by **Mrs. Yashi M Tripathi** and **Ms. Divya Raj** Assistant Professor of Law at BBS Institute of Law, Prayagraj.

THE MOOT COURT SOCIETY (MCS)

The The Moot Court Society (MCS) of BBS Institute of Law (BBSIL) is entrusted with the responsibility of promoting, regulating, and strengthening mooting culture within the institution. The Society functions under the guidance of the **Faculty Convenors**, with active support from a committed team of student members.

The MCS plays a central role in developing students' advocacy skills by providing structured exposure to courtroom practices, legal research, memorial drafting, and oral submissions. It works consistently to inculcate professional ethics, critical legal reasoning, and effective advocacy among law students.

The Society is responsible for organizing **intra-institutional and intra-city moot court competitions, conducting training sessions, workshops, and practice moots**, & mentoring students for participation in **external moot court competitions**. In addition, the MCS facilitates academic engagement through legal seminars, guest lectures, & advocacy-oriented activities.

Through continuous evaluation, guidance, and competitive simulations, the Moot Court Society aims to bridge the gap between theoretical legal education and practical courtroom experience, thereby nurturing competent, confident, and professionally prepared future advocates.



RULES AND REGULATIONS

1. STRUCTURE OF THE COMPETITION

The Competition shall comprise four (4) rounds, conducted in the following manner:

- Round I – Preliminary Rounds
- Round II – Quarter-Final Rounds
- Round III – Semi-Final Rounds
- Round IV – Final Round

All rounds shall be conducted at the BBS Institute of Law Campus.

2. GOVERNING AUTHORITY

- The Competition shall be governed by the Moot Court Committee, BBS Institute of Law.
 - The Organising Committee shall have complete authority to interpret, amend, or modify the Rules.
 - All decisions of the Organising Committee shall be final and binding.
 - Non-compliance with the Rules may result in penalty or disqualification.
-

3. ELIGIBILITY & PARTICIPATION

- Open to students pursuing 3-year LL.B., 5-year integrated LL.B. programmes during the current academic year.
 - A maximum of two teams per institution shall be permitted on a first-come-first-served basis.
 - No participant may register in more than one team.
-

4. TEAM COMPOSITION

- Each team shall consist of two or three members:
 - Two Speakers; or
 - Two Speakers and one Researcher.
- In a two-member team, a participant may act as both Speaker and Researcher.
- Each team shall be allotted a Team Code for anonymity.
- Disclosure of institutional identity in memorials or during oral rounds is strictly prohibited.

6. DRESS CODE & COURT ETIQUETTE

- › Teams may carry their own study and reference materials.
- › Use of electronic devices is strictly prohibited during offline rounds.
- › Any attempt to influence judges, organisers, or officials shall result in immediate disqualification.
- › Teams are not permitted to observe proceedings in other courtrooms.

7. STRUCTURE OF THE COMPETITION

› Preliminary Rounds

- Each team shall argue for both sides.
- Total time: 20 minutes per team.
- Each speaker: 8–12 minutes.
- Rebuttal/Sur-rebuttal: Maximum 2 minutes.

› Quarter-Final Rounds

- Top 8 teams on knockout basis.
- Time limits same as Octa-Finals.

› Semi-Final Rounds

- Top 4 teams qualify.
- Total time: 35 minutes per team.
- Each speaker: 13–22 minutes.
- Rebuttal/Sur-rebuttal: Maximum 5 minutes.

› Final Round

- Winners of Semi-Finals compete.
- Total time: 45 minutes per team.
- Each speaker: 20–25 minutes.



8. EX-PARTE PROCEEDINGS

Criteria	Marks	
Knowledge of Law & Facts	20	If a team fails to appear within 10 minutes of the scheduled time, the round may proceed ex parte against the defaulting team.
Ability to Answer Questions	20	
Court Manner & Demeanor	20	
Organisation & Clarity	20	
Use of Memorial	20	In case of a tie, the team scoring higher in Knowledge of Law & Facts shall advance.
Total	100	

9. MEMORANDUM SPECIFICATIONS

- Each team participating in the competition must prepare one memorial on behalf of the Petitioner(s) and one on behalf of the Respondent(s).
- Each team must submit the soft copies of each side for evaluation by uploading it on the designated Google form 5th March, 2025 11:59 p.m IST. The teams have to submit the soft copies in two formats – one in Word document (.docx) and one in PDF (.pdf) file format. It shall be submitted to : <https://forms.gle/wyTyYoYg9zCMTDHT9>
- The file names of the soft copies of the Memorials must contain only the team code and the side which it represents in the following format: e.g., for Team Code 10 the name of the files should be 10-P and 10-R, 'P' being for 'Petitioner' and 'R' being for 'Respondent' and so forth.
- Soft copies submitted beyond the deadline shall incur a penalty of 1 mark per day for the first two days and then it shall incur a penalty of 3 marks per day for the next 3 days after which any team that fails to submit the memorials shall be disqualified.
- Further, each team is required to submit three (3) hard copies of the Petitioner Memorial and three (3) hard copies of the Respondent Memorial at the venue of the Competition on the day of the competition itself.
- The Memorial shall not contain any form of identification, except for the Team Code. If any such identification or mark, symbol, etc., which has the effect of identifying the team is found on the Memorial, then it shall result in instant disqualification of the participating team.
- The contents of the hard copies must be identical to the soft copies previously submitted. Any discrepancy shall invite penalties or disqualification at the discretion of the Organizers.
- The memorial shall be a maximum of 40 pages with the Pleadings/Arguments not exceeding 20 pages.



10. MEMORIAL STRUCTURE

The Memorial must contain the following contents in the exact order stated below:

- 1. Cover Page-** The Cover Page must be BLUE for the Petitioner and RED for the Respondent. A penalty of 1 mark per side shall be imposed if the incorrect cover colour is used. The Cover Page must clearly contain:
 - a. Team Code in the top right corner
 - b. The Name and Year of the Competition.
 - c. The Case Title
 - d. The Side for which the Memorial has been prepared.
 - e. The Forum adjudicating the dispute.
- 2. List of Abbreviations**
- 3. Index of Authorities**
- 4. Statement of Jurisdiction**
- 5. Statement of Facts:** It shall not exceed 2 pages.
[Penalty: 1 mark per exceeded page]
- 6. Issues Raised**
- 7. Summary of Arguments:** It shall not exceed 2 pages.
[Penalty: 1 mark per exceeded page]
- 8. Pleadings / Arguments Advanced:** This section shall not exceed 20 pages. [Penalty: 2 marks per exceeded page]
- 9. Prayer**



11. FORMATTING OF THE MEMORIAL

1. Margin: The Memorial must maintain a 1-inch margin on all sides.
2. Basic Formatting Requirements
[Penalty: 2 marks for non-compliance per side]:
 - a. Paper size: A4
 - b. Font type: Times New Roman
 - c. Font size: 12
 - d. Line spacing: 1.5
 - e. Alignment: Justified
3. Footnotes [Penalty: 1 mark per non-compliant page]:
 - a. Font type: Times New Roman
 - b. Font size: 10
 - c. Line spacing: 1.0
 - d. No extra spacing between footnotes and body text
 - e. Alignment: Justified
 - f. Uniform citation style: Bluebook, 20th Edition
4. Header and Footer: If used, Headers and Footers must be in Times New Roman, size 10, single spacing.

12. MARKING CRITERIA

Sr No.	Criteria	Marks
1.	Evidence of original thought	20
2.	Knowledge of law and facts	20
3.	Proper and articulate analysis	20
4.	Structure, language, and grammar	15
5.	Extent and use of research	15
6.	Correct format and citation	10
TOTAL		100

13. COMPENDIUM

- All relevant case laws, statutory material, and other evidence on which the participants are going to present and substantiate their arguments may be submitted in the form of a 'Compendium'.
 - Submission of 'Compendium' is at the discretion of the teams; it is not compulsory for all participating teams to submit.
 - The cover page of the compendium should have the same credentials as that of the memorial. The teams will retain them and may present to the Judges during the rounds.
 - Any identifying marks/seal of the College/University may result in disqualification from the competition.
-

14. DRAW OF LOTS AND EXCHANGE OF MEMORIALS

The draw of lots will take place online. After the lots have been drawn, the soft copies of the memorials shall be exchanged via email one day prior to the competition. Participants in need of the hard copies of the exchanged memorial shall ask for the same on the day of the competition.

15. PLAGIARISM

If plagiarism is detected in any memorial, the participating institution accused of committing plagiarism shall be issued a show-cause notice by the Organizing Committee. Upon being found guilty, the Organizing Committee may impose any penalty it considers appropriate, including disqualification from the moot.

16. PENALTIES & AUTHORITIES

- A maximum of 20 marks may be deducted for violations.
- Serious or repeated violations may result in disqualification.
- Only authentic legal authorities may be relied upon.
- Compendium of authorities may be submitted with prior permission of the Bench.

17. GENERAL PROVISIONS

- The official language of the Competition shall be English.
- Memorials submitted shall remain the property of the Organising Committee.
- Any matter not covered in this Handbook shall be decided by the Organising Committee.
- All disputes shall be subject to the jurisdiction of Prayagraj, Uttar Pradesh.

18. Prize & Award Structure

Award Category	Cash Prize (₹)
• Winner Trophy & Prize	15,000
• Runner-Up Trophy & Prize	5,000
• Best Speaker Award	2,000
• Best Memorial Award	2,000
• Best Researcher Award	2,000
Participation Certificates to all the Participants.	



REGISTRATION

- Teams interested in participating in the BBSIL Inter-City Moot Court Competition shall confirm their participation by filling out the official Google Registration Form <https://forms.gle/V8ffMdhDyUfiaM8K7>
- The last date for registration shall be 1ST March, 2026.
- A confirmation email along with the allotted Team Code shall be sent to each registered team within one week of successful registration. Thereafter, all registered teams shall identify and refer to themselves only by the allotted Team Code in all future correspondence with the Organising Committee.
- REGISTRATION FEE: ₹2,500/- per team

- **Account Name: BBS Institute of Law**
- **Account Number: 0012002100512859**
- **IFSC Code: PUNB0001200**
- **Bank: Punjab National Bank**



Scan & Pay

- Details of payment, including the reference number and date of payment, along with a scanned copy of the payment receipt, must be filled in google form of the Organising Committee.
- All registration fees once paid shall be strictly non-refundable under any circumstances.

MOOT PROPOSITION



MOOT COURT PROPOSITION

1. The Union of Novaria is a sovereign, socialist, secular, democratic, and republic country. It has a written constitution that came into force on 26th January, 1950. In Novaria, the fundamental rights are embodied in Part III of the Constitution and are justiciable. The Novarian constitution guarantees the right to freedom of speech and expression under Article 19(1)(a), subject to reasonable restrictions under Article 19(2) in the interests of public order, morality, decency, sovereignty and integrity of the nation, national security, defamation, and incitement to an offence.

2. In recent years, the country has witnessed a significant increase in public discourse conducted through digital platforms, including social media, independent news portals, and online forums, on matters relating to governance, law-enforcement practices, and civil liberties. Such discourse has emerged as a primary means through which citizens and journalists engage with issues of public importance, critique State action, and seek accountability. While such platforms enable scrutiny of State action and democratic participation, they have also posed regulatory challenges relating to misinformation, mobilisation, and public order management.

3. Mr. Kunal Rao, a freelance digital journalist residing in the State of Veridia, has been publishing articles on online platforms addressing issues of governance, policing practices, and criminal justice administration. The content has primarily relied on publicly available records, interviews, and case studies, and has been accessible to the general public without subscription.

4. In June 2025, Mr. Rao published an article titled "Arrests, Power, and the Erosion of Liberty", critically analysing recent police arrests in Veridia. The article:

a. Referred to and discussed certain cases in which arrests were alleged to have been made without adequate justification or without adherence to procedural safeguards;

b. Questioned institutional accountability of law-enforcement agencies including the adequacy of internal oversight and remedial processes in cases of alleged misuse of arrest powers; and

c. Employed strong language in criticising what was characterised as a "culture of coercive policing", framing such practices as having implications for personal liberty and the relationship between the police and the public.

5.The article did not explicitly call for violence or disobedience of law but urged “collective civic resistance through democratic means” and “public mobilisation for reform”.

6.The article attracted extensive public engagement and was widely circulated across multiple digital platforms. The publication was shared, commented upon, and discussed by a large number of users. The article subsequently became the subject of extensive discussion, extending beyond the platform on which it was originally published and reaching a diverse audience. Several civil society groups and student organisations shared excerpts accompanied by commentary urging public debate.

7.Within a week, public gatherings and demonstrations took place in parts of Veridia. While many assemblies were peaceful, isolated incidents of slogan-shouting against the police were reported, and traffic disruption occurred in some areas. No large-scale violence was recorded.

8.State authorities, based on internal assessments and intelligence inputs, formed the view that:

a. The cumulative impact of the article and its circulation had contributed to heightened public distrust in law-enforcement institutions;

b. In light of the prevailing conditions, the authorities assessed that the continued circulation of similar content could carry a potential risk of escalation into public disorder if such circulation remained unchecked;

c. Review of online discussions and user interactions associated with the article indicated the presence of aggressive rhetoric in certain comment threads, prompting concerns regarding the tone and direction of the ongoing public engagement;

9.The intelligence inputs were treated as confidential on the ground that disclosure could compromise ongoing monitoring and preventive measures.

10. On 2 July 2025, an FIR was registered against Mr. Rao under:

a. Section 196 of the Novarian Nyaya Sanhita, 2023, ('NNS')

b. Section 353(1)(b) of the Novarian Nyaya Sanhita, 2023,

c. Section 66F of the Information Technology Act, 2000. (IT Act)

11. The FIR alleged that the publication, when read in conjunction with its online amplification, had the tendency to promote disharmony, undermine public confidence in law-enforcement, encourage mobilisation capable of disturbing public order and security.

12. Mr. Rao was arrested without a warrant from his residence by officers of the State police during late-night hours. According to the police, immediate arrest was necessary to prevent further dissemination of the content, secure digital devices, and facilitate effective investigation.

13. At the time of arrest, Mr. Rao was orally informed of the broad nature of the allegations levelled against him. A written arrest memo was prepared by the arresting officers indicating compliance with the prescribed statutory formalities. However, the arrest memo did not expressly set out the specific reasons or circumstances necessitating custodial arrest.

14. No prior notice of appearance under Section 35(3) of the Novarian Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 ('NNSS') was issued.

15. Mr. Rao was taken into police custody for the purpose of interrogation in connection with the alleged offences. He asserts that his access to legal counsel was delayed during the initial period of detention and that his family members were informed of his arrest only after several hours had passed. The State disputes these assertions, maintaining that Mr. Rao was afforded reasonable access to legal assistance subject to operational and security considerations arising during the course of the investigation.

16. Mr. Rao was produced before the jurisdictional Magistrate after approximately 30 hours from the time of arrest. The State attributes the delay to logistical difficulties arising from law-and-order deployments and security arrangements.

17. Upon being produced before the Judicial Magistrate, the police sought authorisation for further detention of Mr. Rao under Section 187 of NNSS citing the seriousness of the offences, the need to analyse digital evidence, and the potential impact on public order.

18. The Magistrate authorised further police custody of Mr. Rao. The remand order briefly recorded the nature of the allegations and reflected upon the submissions made by the investigating officer. However, the order did not separately elaborate upon the extent of compliance with statutory and constitutional safeguards governing arrest, nor did it record an independent consideration of whether alternatives to custodial detention were examined.

19. Aggrieved, Mr. Rao filed a writ petition under Article 226 of the Constitution of Novaria before the High Court.

20. The petitioner, Mr. Rao, contends that the actions of the State authorities are illegal, unconstitutional, and violative of his fundamental rights, on the following grounds:

- a.** The impugned article constitutes protected speech under Article 19(1)(a) of the Constitution.
- b.** The restrictions imposed are not justified under Article 19(2) of the Constitution.
- c.** The invocation of the impugned penal provisions is legally unsustainable.
- d.** The arrest and detention violate statutory safeguards and the delayed production before the Magistrate violates Articles 21 & 22 of the Constitution.
- e.** He seeks public law compensation for alleged violation of fundamental rights.

21. The State of Veridia contests the writ petition and submits that the actions taken by the authorities are lawful, necessary, and constitutionally permissible, on the following grounds:

- a.** The impugned publication is subject to reasonable restrictions under Article 19(2) of the Constitution.
- b.** There was substantial compliance with constitutional safeguards.
- c.** The delay in production was justified and not mala fide.
- d.** There is no case for public law compensation.

Issues for Determination

- 1.** Whether the online publication by the petitioner constitutes protected speech under Article 19(1)(a), and whether the restrictions imposed are justified under Article 19(2).
- 2.** Whether the invocation of Section 196 and Section 353(1)(b) of the BNS and Section 66F of the IT Act is legally sustainable.
- 3.** Whether the arrest, detention, delayed production, and remand violate statutory safeguards and Articles 21 and 22 of the Constitution.
- 4.** Whether the State's reliance on subjective satisfaction in matters of public order and security is amenable to judicial review.
- 5.** Whether the petitioner is entitled to public law compensation.

Instructions

1. Laws of Novaria and Veridia are pari materia with the Constitution of India and the laws applicable in the State of Uttar Pradesh.
2. Facts are fictional and intended solely for academic purposes.
3. No additional issues may be framed; sub-issues are permitted.
4. No parallel proceedings are pending.
5. No facts beyond those stated may be assumed.