



IPR FACILITATION & RESEARCH CENTRE
at
**DR. B. R. AMBEDKAR NATIONAL LAW UNIVERSITY,
SONEPAT**

organizes the

**NATIONAL IPR JUDGEMENT WRITING
COMPETITION, 2025**

in commemoration of

**75 YEARS OF INDIA'S CONSTITUTIONAL JOURNEY,
REFLECTING ON ITS LEGAL EVOLUTION AND THE VISION OF
VIKSIT BHARAT @2047**

knowledge partners

**THE INDIAN SINGERS' AND MUSICIANS'
RIGHTS ASSOCIATION
&
INDIA SME FORUM**

ABOUT DBRANLU



Dr. B.R. Ambedkar National Law University, Sonapat, established by the State Government of Haryana in 2019 through State Legislature Act No. 15, stands as a premier institution reflecting India's commitment to justice and constitutional values. Strategically located with excellent connectivity to Delhi, the University offers B.A. LL.B. (Hons.), LL.M., and Ph.D. programmes, providing a comprehensive legal education that combines academic rigour with ethical and social awareness.

The University houses eleven specialised research centres, three dedicated cells, and a Legal Aid Clinic, fostering holistic legal education and community engagement. Its modern, eco-friendly campus integrates advanced facilities with inclusive design, embodying Dr. B.R. Ambedkar's vision of law as a means of social transformation

Through MoUs with institutions like V.V. Giri National Labour Institute, Institute of Constitutional and Parliamentary Studies, and the University of Waikato, New Zealand, the University promotes collaboration and global exposure. Guided by Hon'ble Chancellor Prof. Ashim Kumar Ghosh, Hon'ble Governor of Haryana, and Hon'ble Visitor Mr. Justice Bhushan Ramkrishna Gavai, Hon'ble Chief Justice of India, the University continues its pursuit of academic excellence and social relevance, offering aspiring legal scholars an ideal platform to shape a just and equitable society.

INSTITUTIONAL GOVERNANCE



**HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE
BHUSHAN RAMKRISHNA GAVAI**

**Hon'ble Chief Justice of India
& Hon'ble Visitor
Dr. B.R. Ambedkar National Law University,
Sonapat**



**HON'BLE CHANCELLOR
PROF. ASHIM KUMAR GHOSH**

**Hon'ble Governor of Haryana
& Hon'ble Chancellor
Dr. B.R. Ambedkar National Law University,
Sonapat**



PROF. (DR.) DEVINDER SINGH

**Hon'ble Vice-Chancellor
Dr. B.R. Ambedkar National Law University,
Sonapat**



PROF. (DR.) ASHUTOSH MISHRA

**Worthy Registrar
Dr. B.R. Ambedkar National Law University,
Sonapat**

LEGAL LUMINARIES ASSOCIATED WITH DBRANLU



**HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE
R.K. AGGARWAL**

**Former Judge, Supreme Court of India
Former President, NCDRC
&
Patron in Chief,
Centre For Public Policy And Good
Governance**



**HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE
RAVINDRA BHATT**

**Former Judge, Supreme Court of
India
&
Honorary Distinguished Professor,
DBRANLU**



**HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE
KRISHNA MURARI**

**Former Judge, Supreme Court of
India
&
Patron in Chief,
IPR Facilitation Centre**



**HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE
V.R. SUBRAMANIAN**

**Former Judge, Supreme Court of India
&
Patron in Chief
Centre For Conflict Management &
Dispute Resolution**



**HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE
RAVI SHANKAR JHA**

**Former Chief Justice,
Punjab & Haryana High Court**



**HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE
RAJENDRA MENON**

**Chairperson, Armed Forces Tribunal
&
Honorary Distinguished Professor,
DBRANLU**

MESSAGE FROM THE VICE-CHANCELLOR



VICE-CHANCELLOR

Prof. (Dr.) Devinder Singh

Hon'ble Vice-Chancellor

**Dr. B.R. Ambedkar National Law University,
Sonapat**

It gives me immense pleasure to extend my heartfelt greetings to all participants, scholars, and distinguished guests engaging in this academic initiative focused on Intellectual Property Rights (IPR) and their growing significance in shaping India's innovation-driven future and the vision of Viksit Bharat @2047. This initiative marks an important step toward understanding the transformative role of IPR in fostering creativity, technological advancement, and economic development.

Over the years, India's IPR framework has evolved from a developing legal structure to a robust system that balances the rights of creators and innovators with the larger public interest. Through progressive legislation, judicial interpretation, and active policy measures, India has strengthened its commitment to protecting intellectual property while promoting accessibility, innovation, and sustainable growth.

This platform provides an invaluable opportunity for meaningful dialogue, research exchange, and interdisciplinary engagement on the evolving landscape of IPR in India. I am confident that the discussions and analyses will yield enriching insights into contemporary challenges such as digital innovation, AI-generated works, and global IP harmonization thereby inspiring thoughtful contributions toward India's growth as a knowledge-based economy.

I congratulate the organisers, faculty, and student community for their initiative and intellectual commitment in organizing this event. I extend my best wishes for its grand success and hope that it will deepen our collective understanding of the crucial role of Intellectual Property Rights in driving creativity, innovation, and national development in the pursuit of Viksit Bharat @2047.

MESSAGE FROM THE REGISTRAR



REGISTRAR

Prof. (Dr.) Ashutosh Mishra

Hon'ble Registrar

**Dr. B.R. Ambedkar National Law University,
Sonapat**

It gives me great pleasure to extend my warm greetings to all participants, scholars, and distinguished guests engaging in this academic initiative on Intellectual Property Rights (IPR) and their pivotal role in fostering innovation, creativity, and economic growth in pursuit of Viksit Bharat @2047. This initiative exemplifies our University's commitment to advancing academic excellence and providing a meaningful platform to explore the evolution and impact of IPR in shaping India's developmental and technological progress.

As Registrar, I take pride in our institution's ongoing efforts to promote scholarly research, interdisciplinary dialogue, and constructive engagement with emerging legal and policy issues. Over the years, India's IPR framework has evolved into a dynamic and balanced system that safeguards the rights of creators and innovators while supporting accessibility, fair competition, and national growth. By organizing this academic endeavour, we reaffirm our dedication to fostering an environment where innovation, research, and collaboration drive the vision of a knowledge-based and forward-looking India.

I am confident that the discussions and interactions emerging from this initiative will offer valuable insights into the strengthening of India's intellectual property ecosystem, inspiring participants to contribute meaningfully to the nation's innovation landscape and its journey toward Viksit Bharat @2047. I congratulate the organisers, faculty, and students for their commitment and diligent efforts in bringing this initiative to fruition, and I extend my best wishes for a successful and intellectually enriching event.

ABOUT IPRFRC



The IPR Facilitation and Research Centre at Dr. B.R. Ambedkar National Law University, Sonapat, is aimed at promoting innovative ideas for enriching research in unexplored and novel areas in the sphere of Intellectual Property Laws, and to provide a platform to students and researchers to engage in meaningful discourse and contribute to the evolving landscape of the IP regime.

The Centre endeavours not only to spread awareness about Intellectual Property Rights but also to actively facilitate individuals, communities, and organisations in protecting their intellectual creations.

It envisions fostering a culture of innovation and creativity by organising capacity-building programmes, workshops, and training sessions on various aspects of Intellectual Property Law. It also aims to engage in collaborative research with government bodies, academic institutions, and industry stakeholders to bridge the gaps between academic theory and practical enforcement of IPR.

The Centre remains committed to fostering a nuanced understanding of Intellectual Property Rights and their role in shaping the contours of innovations and public interest.

ABOUT THE JUDGEMENT WRITING COMPETITION

The Judgement Writing Competition, organised by the IPR Facilitation and Research Centre, which is to be held in online mode, seeks to nurture the art of judicial reasoning and writing among budding legal minds.

The competition invites participants to step into the role of a judge and engage with pressing constitutional challenges in Intellectual Property Laws shaped by the rapid advancement of technology. Participants will analyse a factual matrix, interpret and apply the law, and deliver a reasoned judgment that balances innovation with constitutional safeguards. coherent and authoritative manner.

A judgment writing competition serves as a dynamic platform for law students to blend analytical precision with creative reasoning. It encourages them to frame legal issues, evaluate arguments, interpret statutes and precedents, and articulate decisions in a coherent and authoritative manner.

This initiative aims to foster judicial temperament, strengthen adherence to the rule of law, and promote clarity in legal expression. By simulating the real-world process of adjudication, the competition aspires to equip students with critical thinking, legal research, writing skills and essential tools for a principled and balanced approach to justice in the digital era.

**NATIONAL IPR
JUDGMENT WRITING
COMPETITION
(COPYRIGHT LAW)**

Conference Days
Nov 22, 2025 - Dec 06, 2025
(Detailed timeline to be shared shortly)

PROPOSITION

Background

In early 2025, ClipLink Pvt. Ltd., one of the Himavant's largest short-video and creative content platforms, introduced an advanced AI-powered Copyright Compliance and Content Integrity System (CCIS). The system automatically scans, flags, and removes videos suspected of containing copyrighted or objectionable material before or shortly after publication.

This development came in response to an advisory issued by the Ministry of Information and Broadcasting (MIB) following a surge of complaints from film studios, music producers, and copyright societies. These entities alleged rampant misuse of songs, movie dialogues, and visual content across digital platforms, leading to significant economic losses.

The advisory, while officially non-binding, urged all major intermediaries to “proactively prevent the circulation of infringing or unauthorized copyrighted material” and “ensure strict compliance” with the Copyright Act, 1957, Information Technology Act, 2000, and Information Technology (Intermediary Guidelines and Digital Media Ethics Code) Rules, 2021. It further cautioned that failure to take adequate measures could affect a platform's intermediary status under Section 79(3)(b) of the IT Act.

Although the advisory did not carry the force of law, a leaked internal memorandum suggested close governmental monitoring of platforms' compliance and included keywords such as “national integrity,” “public order,” and “cultural sensitivity.” Critics interpreted this as a form of indirect governmental pressure to over-regulate digital content.

In compliance with the advisory, ClipLink updated its Terms of Service and user agreements, explicitly incorporating AI-based copyright detection. All users, upon uploading content, agreed to these updated terms.

PROPOSITION

The terms and conditions are as follows:

- Content uploaded by the user is subject to automatic scanning and review by the AI-powered Copyright Compliance and Content Integrity System (CCIS).
- User explicitly consents to the automatic flagging and removal of any content determined by the CCIS to be infringing or in violation of platform policies.
- Automated removal decisions made by the CCIS may not be subject to manual review.

The company conducted internal testing and reported a 90% accuracy rate for its AI moderation system. However, independent digital rights groups claimed the system disproportionately flagged Hindi and regional-language content while allowing similar English-language material to remain online, raising concerns of algorithmic bias.

Among the affected users was Mr. Shekhar Dvivedi, a 21-year-old digital creator and law student who produced videos combining film clips, soundtracks, and animations to critique public policies, discuss constitutional principles, and satirise popular culture. Mr. Shekhar contended that his use of short clips fell under “fair dealing” for the purposes of criticism, review, and education under Section 52(1)(a) of the Copyright Act.

Several of Shekhar’s videos, including one critiquing government data localization measures, were taken down automatically by ClipLink’s AI system. The removal notice read:

“Your content violates ClipLink’s Copyright Integrity Policy. This decision was made automatically and cannot be appealed or manually reviewed.”

Following multiple user reports of similar experiences, a digital rights organisation leaked the training documentation of the CCIS, revealing that the AI model had been trained using public user videos without explicit consent.

PROPOSITION

In response, Mr. Shekhar Dvivedi and other affected creators filed a Public Interest Litigation (PIL) before the Supreme Court of Himavant under Article 32, Constitution of Republic of Himavant, challenging both the MIB advisory and ClipLink's compliance policy. The petition alleged that the indirect state pressure and opaque use of AI violated their fundamental rights.

The Republic of Himavant, Ministry of Information and Broadcasting, and ClipLink Pvt. Ltd. were impleaded as respondents.

Petitioners' Contentions

- The automated removal of content without notice or hearing violates Articles 14, 19(1)(a), and 21 by being arbitrary, disproportionate, and lacking the observance of procedure established by law.
- Although framed as an advisory, the MIB's communication operates as coercive state action, converting a private compliance mechanism into state-backed censorship, making the PIL maintainable under Article 32.
- The use of user-generated videos to train the AI moderation model, without informed consent, constitutes a violation of privacy rights recognized in Justice K.S. Puttaswamy v. Union of India (2017).
- The algorithmic bias against Hindi and regional content violates Article 14 (right to equality) and undermines cultural diversity.
- By automatically removing content involving fair dealing and transformative use, ClipLink infringes upon freedom of expression and academic creativity under Article 19(1)(a).
- The overbroad and pre-emptive use of AI for enforcement fails the proportionality test laid down in Puttaswamy judgment (Privacy) and Modern Dental College v. State of Madhya Pradesh.

PROPOSITION

Respondents' Contentions

- The Republic of Himavant argues that the advisory is purely recommendatory, aimed at ensuring compliance with statutory duties under the Copyright Act and IT Act, 2000 and carries no coercive legal force. Therefore, a PIL under Article 32 against a private platform is not maintainable.
- The government maintains that protecting copyright holders from large-scale infringement is a reasonable restriction under Article 19(2), balancing the fundamental right to expression with intellectual property rights recognised as property under Article 300A Constitution of the Republic of Himavant.
- ClipLink Pvt. Ltd. asserts its status as an intermediary under Section 79 of the IT Act, 2000, with a legal obligation to remove infringing content upon detection or notice.
- The platform emphasizes that the updated Terms of Service were voluntarily accepted by users, who consented to automated moderation as a condition of participation.
- The company cites the volume of daily uploads (over 4 million videos), arguing that manual review of every takedown is technologically infeasible. Automation is, therefore, a necessary and proportionate tool for compliance.
- The AI system's 90% accuracy rate demonstrates a reasonable level of reliability; occasional errors cannot amount to a constitutional violation.
- The respondents deny any government interference or political filtering, asserting that the platform's algorithms are designed to prevent infringement, not to suppress political expression.
- The Republic of Himavant further contends that user privacy was not violated, as all data used for AI training was publicly available content, consistent with the platform's terms and privacy policy.

PROPOSITION

Issues for Adjudication

- Whether a Public Interest Litigation under Article 32 of the Constitution of the Republic of Himavant is maintainable against a private intermediary acting pursuant to a government advisory that allegedly exerts coercive state influence?
- Whether the issuance of the MIB advisory and its implementation through automated copyright compliance mechanisms violates the petitioners' fundamental rights under Articles 14, 19(1)(a), and 21 of the Constitution of the Republic of Himavant?
- Whether the use of AI-based automated content moderation systems for copyright enforcement satisfy constitutional requirements of fairness, proportionality, transparency, and procedure established by law?

**Note: All laws of the Republic of Himavant are pari materia to the laws of India.*



NATIONAL IPR JUDGMENT WRITING COMPETITION (TRADEMARK LAW)



Conference Days
Nov 22, 2025 - Dec 06, 2025
(Detailed timeline to be shared shortly)

PROPOSITION

Spice-Up Foods Pvt. Ltd. v. The Registrar of Trade Marks

(Before the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India)

Background

Spice-Up Foods Pvt. Ltd. ('Spice-Up') is a fast-growing, premium manufacturer of instant spice mixes (Class 30). For ten years, Spice-Up has consistently used two non-traditional marks exclusively in conjunction with its popular 'Masala Magic' range:

1. **Color Combination Mark:** A specific, dual-color combination (a unique shade of deep crimson red covering the top 30% of the packaging, and a highly distinct, matte saffron yellow on the remaining 70%), used consistently across all product lines.
2. **Scent Mark:** A unique, registered spicy, citrus aroma infused into the cardboard packaging itself, noticeable upon handling.

Spice-Up applied to register these two non-traditional marks under the Trade Marks Act, 1999.

The Registrar of Trade Marks ('Registrar') refused both applications primarily under Section 9(1)(a) and (b) of the Act (Absolute Grounds for Refusal), arguing:

1. **Color Combination:** The colors are not inherently distinctive and are merely descriptive or customary in the food and spice trade, failing to distinguish the goods from those of other traders.
2. **Scent Mark:** While Section 2(1)(m) defines 'mark' broadly to include the 'combination of colours,' the Act and its accompanying Rules do not specifically provide a mechanism for the graphical representation and objective assessment of a smell mark, making it non-registrable.

Spice-Up appealed the refusal directly to the Supreme Court, arguing that the marks have acquired 'secondary meaning' due to massive, continuous, and exclusive use, transforming them into distinctive source identifiers.

PROPOSITION

Petitioners' Contentions (Spice-Up Foods Pvt. Ltd.)

1. Acquired Distinctiveness (Secondary Meaning) under Section 9(3):

- The Trade Marks Act, 1999, explicitly allows for the registration of marks that lack inherent distinctiveness if they have acquired distinctiveness through use prior to the date of application.
- Spice-Up's ten years of exclusive, continuous, and prominent use of the color combination mark, supported by market surveys and over ₹500 Crores in sales, has established the 'secondary meaning' necessary to distinguish its products. The consumer no longer sees the colors as merely ornamental or descriptive but as an indicator of source, thus overcoming the bar of Section 9(1).
- Denying registration despite an established public association violates the commercial interest of the business protected under Article 19(1)(g) of the Constitution.

2. Registrability of Non-Traditional Marks and Statutory Interpretation:

- The definition of a 'mark' in Section 2(1)(m) is inclusive, and the requirement for 'graphical representation' should be interpreted in a modern, expansive manner to include objective descriptions and chemical formulas for scent marks, as accepted internationally.
- The failure of the Registrar to adapt its rules for non-traditional marks amounts to a failure to exercise its statutory duty to keep the register current, denying Spice-Up protection for valuable commercial assets, which is a deprivation of property under Article 300A.

3. Arbitrariness and Violation of Equality (Article 14):

- To deny registration simply because the Registrar's internal rules have not kept pace with global trademark trends, while granting protection to other forms of non-traditional marks (like shapes), is arbitrary and violates the principle of equality under Article 14 by treating similar forms of commercial goodwill differently.

PROPOSITION

Respondent's Contentions (The Registrar of Trade Marks)

1. Strict Interpretation of Absolute Grounds for Refusal (Section 9):

- The color combination is not a 'mark' but a feature necessary to the goods or commonly used in the trade (e.g., yellow for turmeric/spice, red for chilli/flavour), and therefore falls under Section 9(1)(b). Granting a monopoly over common color elements would unjustly deplete the public domain and disadvantage competitors, which is contrary to the public interest.
- The burden of proof for 'acquired distinctiveness' is very high, and the evidence provided by Spice-Up does not overwhelmingly demonstrate that the color combination, rather than the wordmark, is the primary source identifier.

2. Scent Marks and the Requirement of Graphical Representation:

- Section 2(1)(zb) and Section 2(1)(m) require a mark to be capable of graphical representation and capable of distinguishing the goods. Scent marks, being inherently subjective and mutable, fail the graphical representation test in the absence of clear statutory guidance and objective olfactory standards.
- The Registrar cannot register a mark based on a chemical formula alone, as this would not be readily comprehensible to the public, thus failing the purpose of public notice inherent in the register. The current statutory framework does not permit the registration of smell marks.

3. Reasonable Restriction on Trade (Article 19(1)(g) read with 19(2)):

- The Registrar's actions are a reasonable restriction on the Petitioners' right to trade (Article 19(1)(g)) in the interests of the general public and to prevent unfair competition (Article 19(2)).
- Allowing a monopoly on common colors or non-objective scents would stifle competition and deny other traders the ability to use necessary or customary packaging features, thereby protecting the overall integrity of the trademark system.

PROPOSITION

Issues for Adjudication

- Whether the Registrar erred in refusing the registration of the specific color combination mark despite the Petitioner providing sufficient evidence of acquired distinctiveness (secondary meaning) through exclusive and continuous use under Section 9 of the Trade Marks Act, 1999.
- Whether a smell mark is registrable under the current statutory definition of 'mark' in Section 2(1)(m), and if the requirement for 'graphical representation' should be expansively interpreted to include objective chemical descriptions to comply with modern commercial realities and the right to property under Article 300A.
- Whether the strict application of Section 9 to non-traditional marks, leading to a denial of protection, constitutes an unreasonable restriction on the fundamental right to carry on a trade or business guaranteed by Article 19(1)(g) of the Constitution.

GENERAL RULES OF THE COMPETITION

DEFINITIONS

- **“Judgement”** shall refer to the written legal opinion or ruling issued by a judge, embodying the analysis, rationale, and conclusion regarding a given legal issue.
- **“Judging Panel”** shall refer to the body of judges appointed to evaluate and assess the judgments submitted by participants.
- **“Organising Committee” (OC)** refers to the body of individuals appointed to oversee the planning, execution, and regulation of the debate.
- **“Participant”** shall refer to any individual or team of 2 persons duly registered for the Competition.
- **“Submission”** shall refer to the judgement provided by participants in accordance with the stipulated format and structure.

MODE OF COMPETITION

- The Competition shall be conducted entirely in online mode.
- All communications, and submissions shall be carried out through electronic means as prescribed by the OC.
- No physical rounds or in-person participation shall be conducted.

IMPORTANT INSTRUCTIONS

- Participants must select either the Copyright Law proposition OR the Trademark Law proposition.
- Participants are required to draft a judgment on only ONE proposition of their choice.
- Submission of judgments on both propositions by an individual participant or a team of two will result in disqualification of the candidate(s).
- Participants are required to clearly mention at the beginning of their submission, the proposition they have chosen.

ELIGIBILITY

- Open to students currently pursuing an undergraduate program in law (3-year LL.B. or 5-year integrated LL.B. program and LL.M. course) at any recognised institution in India.
- Entries may be individual or in teams of two (co-authorship). Only one submission per entry is permitted.
- There is no cap on the number of entries from any one institution.

ANONYMITY

- In order to ensure impartiality and fairness in the evaluation process, each participant or team shall be assigned a unique team code [NJWC-xx] by the OC prior to the submission of judgment.
- All communications, submissions, and references to participants or teams throughout the competition shall be conducted exclusively through the assigned team code. No names, institutions, or identifying information shall be used in any documentation or correspondence related to the competition.
- The OC and Judging Panel shall take all reasonable measures to maintain the confidentiality of the identity of participants until the conclusion of the competition, at which point the identities may be disclosed in a manner determined by the OC.
- Any violation of this anonymity clause, including but not limited to the unauthorised disclosure of names or institutional affiliations, may result in penalties as deemed appropriate by the OC, including disqualification from the competition.

FORMAT OF THE JUDGMENT

- **PRELIMINARY**

- **THE COVER PAGE:** This page should consist of the following essentials:

- Unique Team Code (top right corner)
- Name of the Competition
- Name of the Court
- Case Number
- Name of the Parties: (e.g., ABC v. Union of India)
- Advocates appearing on behalf of the Parties

**Note: that any hypothetical name, for this point, would suffice.*

Such fillers should not reveal the identity of the participants.

Such a revelation would lead to immediate disqualification.

- **INDEX OF CONTENTS:** A detailed index listing all sections of the Judgement with corresponding page numbers.

- **THE BODY**

- **Facts of the Case** - A clear and concise presentation of the relevant facts.
- **Issues** - The legal questions or issues that arise from the facts.
- **Applicable Law** - A discussion of the relevant statutory provisions and case law.
- **Analysis** - A reasoned examination of the issues in light of the applicable law.

- **CONCLUSION**

The final decision and reasoning thereof.

**Note : Elements of the format that are mentioned above are merely suggestive in nature. The participants may structure the document as they please in accordance with the format of the Judgements of the Supreme Court of India.*

SUBMISSION GUIDELINES

- The language of the judgment shall be English only.
- The Judgement shall have a maximum length of 14 pages.
- The word limit shall be 3,000-3,500 words (excluding footnotes and the cover page).
- The font used in all parts of the judgment must be Times New Roman.
- The font size for the main text must be 12 with 1.5 line spacing and justified.
- The font size for the footnotes must be 10 with 1.0 line spacing and left-aligned.
- Margins shall be 1 inch on all sides.
- Use The Bluebook citation style (21st edition) and apply it consistently throughout the document.
- The page number must be mentioned at the bottom center of each page.
- The judgment shall be written from the perspective of the adjudicating court or bench, based solely on the record of proceedings.
- The judgment shall constitute a single, composite opinion; no separate concurring or dissenting opinions shall be included.
- Neutral fillers (such as names of counsel or judges) may be employed, without revealing actual identities.
- Each submission must be accompanied by a plagiarism report and an AI content detection report (generated through reliable tools such as Turnitin, Grammarly, or any equivalent software). Failure to submit these reports or exceeding the specified limits may attract penalties (deduction of scores) or disqualification, at the discretion of the OC.
- The judgement should be submitted in the Microsoft Word file (doc./docx. format), titled as **“NJWC2025_[TEAM CODE].”**
- Each submission must be accompanied by a combined Plagiarism and AI Content Detection Report in PDF format, titled as **“Report-NJWC2025_[TEAM CODE]”**
- No entries shall be accepted after forty-eight hours from the prescribed deadline for submission, i.e., after **3rd December 2025.**

CLARIFICATIONS

- Requests for clarification must be emailed to iprfc@dbranlu.ac.in, using the subject **“Clarification – DBRANLU-NJWC2025 – [TEAM CODE].”**
- A consolidated clarification document binding on all participants will be released.

ORIGINALITY, PLAGIARISM AND USE OF ARTIFICIAL RESOURCES

- All submissions shall be original works of the participants. Plagiarism, including unattributed paraphrasing or reproduction of another’s work, is strictly prohibited.
- A similarity index exceeding ten percent (10%) may attract penal consequences, including but not limited to disqualification.
- The use of generative artificial intelligence tools for the purposes of drafting, substantive editing, or content generation is strictly prohibited. However, the use of routine proofreading or formatting tools shall be permissible

DISCRETION TO BE EXERCISED BY THE ORGANISING COMMITTEE

- The OC shall have the exclusive authority to interpret these rules. Any circumstance not covered by these rules shall be decided by the OC. Decisions made by the OC in this regard will be made in the interests of fairness and equality.
- All such decisions of the OC shall be final and binding.

EVALUATION CRITERIA

- Submissions will be evaluated by an expert panel based on the following parameters:

Sr. No.	Criteria	Marks
1.	Understanding of Facts and Issues	15 Marks
2.	Application of Law	20 Marks
3.	Legal Reasoning and Analysis	20 Marks
4.	Structure and Organization	15 Marks
5.	Language, Clarity and Style	10 Marks
6.	Originality and Creativity	10 Marks
7.	Formatting and Adherence to Guidelines	10 Marks

EVALUATION CRITERIA

- The penalties shall be enforced as hereunder:

Sr. No.	Description	Range
1.	Incorrect line formatting & line spacing in the manuscript or footnotes	0.5 marks per instance, up to 2 marks.
2.	Absence of Page Number in a footer & Improper submission of Manuscript	2 marks each
3.	Exceeding Word/Page Limit	1 mark per page
4.	Plagiarism	Up to 10% – 0 marks, 11-20% – 2 marks, 20-45% – 5 marks, 45-50% – 7 marks.
5.	Delay in submission per hour [max. 48 hours]	0.5 marks per hour

- The penalties listed above shall be deducted from the overall score of the participant or team at the discretion of the judging panel or the OC.

TIE RESOLUTION

- In the event of a tie in the scores assigned to two or more participants, the following tie-breaking criteria shall be employed:
- The Judging Panel shall conduct a secondary evaluation of the tied submissions based on a comprehensive review of the legal reasoning and analysis.
- Should a tie persist, the judging panel shall deliberate collectively and render a final decision based on consensus.

MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS

- The implementation and interpretation of the rules regarding practice and procedures shall rest solely with the OC of the competition. The final decision on all matters shall be at the discretion of the OC.
- If any member of a team is notified or informed of any detail concerning the competition, it shall be deemed that the entire team has been duly notified or informed.
- The Proposition is neither intended to nor does it resemble any actual incident or individual, living or deceased. Any resemblance is purely coincidental. The Proposition is a fictitious factual account prepared solely for the purpose of this competition and does not attempt to influence or predict the outcome of any real-world matter.
- The copyright for the judgments submitted by the teams shall vest with the IPR Facilitation & Research Centre, DBRANLU, Sonapat. Acceptance of this copyright assignment is a precondition for participation in the competition.
- Participants are required to strictly adhere to the rules governing the conduct of the competition; any deviations may result in penalties or disqualification at the sole discretion of the OC. The OC reserves the right to amend, alter, vary, or change the rules governing the competition in any manner. Such amendments will be communicated to the participants within a reasonable timeframe.

IMPORTANT DATES



**Release of Problem &
Registration
13 November 2025**



**Last date of Registration
25 November 2025**



**Last day for
Submission of Clarification
25 November 2025**



**Release of Clarification
26 November 2025**



**Last day of Submission
1 December 2025
Before 23:59 Hours IST**



**Declaration of Result
6 December 2025**

REGISTRATION DETAILS

- Teams are required to complete their registration on or before **25th November 2025** (23:59 Hours IST)
- Participants must provide the date of payment along with a screenshot of the transaction in the registration form. Only upon receipt of this information will the registration be deemed complete.
- Registration fees once paid are neither refundable nor transferable.
- Any changes in authorship will not be entertained after the submission of the registration form.
- Submission link will be forwarded to the registered e-mail IDs of the participants after registration fee payment is confirmed.
- Registration for the Competition shall be conducted by filling out the google form via the link: **REGISTRATION LINK**

- **Registration Fee Details:**

Fee Individuals Participants:

- Non-DBRANLU Students: Rs. 300/-
- DBRANLU Students: Rs. 250/-

For a Team of Two Participants:

- Non-DBRANLU Students: Rs. 400/-
- DBRANLU Students: Rs. 350/-

- **Payment Details**

- Account Holder Name: REGISTRAR DBRANLU RAI
- Account Number: 50100156483861
- IFSC Code: HDFC0003433

PRIZES FOR THE COMPETITION

- The author/s of the Top 3 Judgements will receive a cash price as per the following scheme:

POSITION	PRIZES
WINNER	Rs. 3100/-
1 ST RUNNER UP	Rs. 2100/-
2 ND RUNNER UP	Rs. 1100/-

- Additionally, The author/s of the Top 5 Judgements will receive a Certificate of Merit.
- All the participants will receive aa Certificate of Participation.

**Note: In cases of where the winning entry is submitted by a team comprising two co-authors, the cash prize shall be awarded jointly to both authors as a team. In cases where the winning entry is submitted by a single participant, the entire cash prize shall be awarded to that individual author alone.*

**Note: All participants and winning teams shall be awarded e-certificates only, which shall be transmitted electronically to their registered email addresses. Np hard copies of certificates shall be issued under any circumstances.*

ORGANISING COMMITTEE



PATRON IN CHIEF

Prof. (Dr.) Devinder Singh
Hon'ble Vice Chancellor

Professor (Dr.) Devinder Singh has a distinguished career that spans over 25 years. It is marked by his significant contributions to both legal scholarship and international education. He was recently invited to speak at the Conference on Clinical Legal Education, organised by the Global Alliance for Justice Education (GAJE) at Lazarski University in Warsaw, Poland, in July 2025.

He also presented a paper titled "Students' Perspectives & Reflections on Clinical Legal Education" at the 2nd Asia CLE Conference, held in Chiang Mai, Thailand, from May 26-28, 2023. Additionally, his presentation titled "Imperial resonance: The colonial legacy's imprint on India's constitutional rule of law" at the IACL Roundtable in Rome showcased his expertise on a global platform, thereby enriching the international discourse on governance. Dr. Singh's memberships and global affiliations reflect his impactful contribution to legal academia worldwide.



PATRON

Prof. (Dr.) Ashutosh Mishra
Hon'ble Registrar

Prof. (Dr.) Ashutosh Mishra has expertise in law, mediation, and public policy and has been an educationist with over 12 years of experience at the University of Delhi and DBRANLU, Sonapat. Trained in Global Academic Administration at the London School of Economics, he has organized three International Conferences in association with the Mediation and Conciliation Project Committee, Supreme Court of India, and contributed to policymaking with key ministries in India. His work has earned him notable honors such as the Global Prestige Award 2024 and the Soul of India Award 2023, presented at the UK House of Lords and Commons. He has also been invited as a Keynote Speaker on Mediation at the Singapore International Mediation Centre and by the Ministry of Law, Government of Singapore.

Dr. Mishra holds leadership roles on governance boards under the Government of India, including the Ministry of Defence and the Ministry of IT. He is an All India Member of the Kendriya Sainik Board and also a Member of the Cybersecurity Task Force, NIELIT India. Additionally, he has served as an Officer on Special Duty at the Delhi School of Public Policy. His extensive research supervision spans mediation, tribal affairs, and women's development, and his work has significantly influenced key legislative developments, including the Mediation Bill.

CONTACT US



iprfc@dbranlu.ac.in

All communication(s), queries, and update(s) to be communicated through the official mail ID.

FACULTY COORDINATORS:

Prof. (Dr.) Ashutosh Mishra
Director, IPRFRC
DBRANLU, Sonapat

Dr. Puja Jaiswal,
Co-Director, IPRFRC
DBRANLU, Sonapat

Dr. Amit Guleria
Co-Director, IPRFRC,
DBRANLU, Sonapat

Mr. Aryan Khare,
Faculty Member, IPRFRC
DBRANLU, Sonapat

STUDENT COORDINATORS:

Ms. Khushi Vashisth
Student Convenor
+91 7339997876

Mr. R D Brahm Prakash Meena
Student Co-Convenor
+91 7982908898

Mr. Aravind Shaji
Student Co-Convenor
+91 8129195950