

TIMELINE

21.03.2022 – 24.03.2022	<i>Registrations</i>
25.03.2022	<i>Release of the moot Problem</i>
26.03.2022	<i>Last date for seeking clarifications</i>
30.03.2022 – 31.03.2022	<i>Submission of Memorials (Online)</i> <i>Oral Rounds</i>
Email for all Communication and Queries	bs.bhanusambyal@gmail.com

RULES AND REGULATIONS

I. Dress code

1. Males: Western formals, i.e., white shirt, black trousers and tie.
2. Females: Indian formals, i.e., white sari or salwar-kurta, or Western formals, i.e., white shirt, black trousers.

II. Language

The language of the competition will be English.

III. Team Composition

1. Each team shall consist of 3 members (2 Mooters and 1 Researcher). This number cannot be modified under any circumstances.
2. Each team shall allocate the role of speakers and researcher among themselves which will be followed during the entire competition. The team shall notify this arrangement prior to the beginning of the oral rounds.

IV. Rounds

1. There will be preliminary rounds and Finals.
2. Two teams with highest total marks [decided on the basis of total marks scored by a team during the rounds as well as memorial marks] will proceed to compete in the Finals.
3. **Certificate of Participation will be awarded to all the teams that will register and successfully submit the memorials on the due date.**

V. Memorials

1. The following requirements must be strictly met. Non-conformities will be penalized:

- a) Each team must prepare both the memorials, i.e., One for Petitioner and One for Respondent.
- b) Once the memorials are submitted, no revisions, supplements, or additions will be allowed.
- c) Memorials must be submitted online and must contain:

- I. Cover Page
- II. Table of Contents
- III. List of Abbreviations
- IV. Index of Authorities
- V. Table of Cases
- VI. Statement of Jurisdiction
- VII. Statement of Facts (*not exceeding 1 page*)
- VIII. Issues Framed
- IX. Summary of Arguments
- X. Arguments Advanced
- XI. Prayer

- d) Font size should be 12 with font Times New Roman and 1.5 paragraph spacing. Footnotes must be in font size 10 and single-spaced.
- e) Page numbering should be on the bottom middle side of each page.
- f) Covers must be placed on briefs as follows:
Appellant: Blue Colour
Respondent: Red Colour

VI. Oral Rounds

In each oral round a team will be represented by 2 speakers who will present arguments and do the rebuttals / sur-rebuttals – all within the prescribed time limit of that respective round.

1. The order of speaking must be strictly followed as follows:

- i. Speaker 1 - Appellant

- ii. Speaker 2 - Appellant
- iii. Speaker 1 - Respondent
- iv. Speaker 2 - Respondent
- v. Rebuttal
- vi. Sur-rebuttal

2. Each team will get total of 20 minutes to present their case. Every minutes of extra time will attract automatic penalties, unless allowed by the Judges. The time includes questioning by the judges.

VII. Scoring

Total marks will be a sum of the oral scores for that round and the memorial scores. Memorials shall be the original work of team members.

Each judge shall score as follows:

Knowledge of facts and identification of issues	15	15
Knowledge and understanding of legal principles directly applicable to issues	25	25
Logical reasoning, clarity, brevity and ingenuity of arguments	20	20
Presentation, court etiquette and advocacy skills	15	15
Management of time	10	10
Response to questions by the Judges	15	15

MOOT PROBLEM

Sukhdev (Appellant No. 1), an elderly farmer lived in Bharatpur with his family consisting of his wife (Rajni), son Milkha (Appellant No. 2) and daughter Babita. Sukhdev's brother Baldev (Appellant No. 3) also lived with them. Randhir, a boy who lived in the same village was in love with Babita. Sukhdev did not like Babita's closeness to Randhir and had publicly warned both Randhir and Babita to stay away from each other. On several occasions he publicly scolded Babita and asked her to refrain from meeting Randhir.

Baldev had borrowed INR 50,000/- from Randhir and though he had promised to pay him immediately, he kept asking Randhir for time to repay the INR 50,000/-.

On 15th January, 2022, Baldev invited Randhir to collect INR 50,000/-. Randhir reached Sukhdev's house around 9:15 pm, when the family had just finished their dinner, he saw Babita from the window and signalled her to come into the backyard. Sukhdev, Baldev and Milkha on hearing the whispers from the backyard went unarmed to investigate the matter. On seeing Randhir and Babita together Sukhdev lost his temper, asked Babita to return to the house and started abusing Randhir. Randhir replied back and there was a heated argument between them. During the course of the argument, Milkha went into the house and brought Sukhdev's walking stick and gave blows on Randhir's leg. Baldev grabbed the walking stick and started beating Randhir and gave blows on Randhir's head and chest.

Randhir was taken to the civil hospital by the villagers, where he died five days later. The Post-mortem report confirmed that Randhir died due to injuries suffered by him on his head and due to fracture of two ribs. However, none of the injuries independently were sufficient to cause Randhir's death while they cumulatively were sufficient in the ordinary course of nature, to cause his death.

The FIR was registered under Section 307 read with Section 34 of Indian Penal Code, 1860 and after the death of Randhir; the charges were altered to Section 302 read with Section 34 of Indian Penal Code, 1860. The Sessions Court convicted the three Appellants under Section 302 read with Section 34 & sentenced them to life imprisonment for having committed the murder of Randhir. Aggrieved and dissatisfied by the judgment of conviction passed by the learned Trial Judge, the Appellants have preferred the present appeal.

ISSUES RAISED

- A. Whether the Appellants can be prosecuted under section 302 read with Section 34 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860.
- B. Whether the nature of injuries and the nature of the weapon, was such as to cause death of a person.
- C. Whether the act of the deceased amounted to grave and sudden provocation.
- D. Whether the Sessions Court was justified in sentencing the Appellants with life imprisonment in connection with the act committed by them.

