ACE/LAW/NO/25-26/027

Date:-29.09.2025

CORRIGENDUM NOTICE

It is to be informed to all students of BALLB X Semester that as per PAPER 10.5 MOOT COURT EXERCISE AND INTERNSHIP of your syllabus, it is mandatory for every student to attend three moot courts which shall carry 30 marks for which Moot Court Problem 1, 2, 3 are as Follows:

MOOT PROBLEM 1

In the High Court of Aryavarta

Between

Pixelate Studios Pvt. Ltd. … ………………**Petitioner**

v.

NovaTech Innovations Pvt. Ltd. ………… **Respondent**

Facts of the Case

1. Pixelate Studios Pvt. Ltd. ("Pixelate") is a start-up company engaged in the development of AI-based image enhancement software called "ClearView". The software uses a unique algorithm capable of restoring blurred images with exceptional accuracy. Pixelate filed a patent application for its algorithm in January 2023, claiming it to be a novel and non-obvious technological process.

2. In June 2023, NovaTech Innovations Pvt. Ltd. ("NovaTech"), a leading tech corporation, launched a competing software named "VisionMax" with similar image-enhancement capabilities. Pixelate alleges that NovaTech illegally reverse-engineered ClearView's code after obtaining a trial version and that VisionMax infringes Pixelate's patent as well as its copyright in the source code.

NovaTech contends that:

1. Pixelate's algorithm is not patentable under Section 3(k) of the Indian Patents Act, 1970, as it is a mere computer program per se.
2. The algorithm used in VisionMax was developed independently by its in-house team, and similarities are coincidental.
3. Pixelate's copyright claim is baseless as functional elements of a program cannot be copyrighted.
4. Pixelate seeks a permanent injunction restraining NovaTech from using the alleged technology, damages for infringement, and an order directing the Indian Patent Office to expedite the grant of its patent.

The High Court of Aryavarta has admitted the case for hearing.

Issues for Consideration

1. Whether Pixelate's AI-based algorithm qualifies for patent protection under the Patents Act, 1970.
2. Whether NovaTech's software constitutes copyright infringement of Pixelate's source code.
3. Whether independent development of a similar algorithm can be a valid defense against IPR infringement claims.

Applicable Laws

1. The Patents Act, 1970 (Sections 2, 48)
2. The Patents Act, 1970 (Sections , 3(k) - exception)
3. The Copyright Act, 1957 (Sections 13, 14)

3. 10.3

MOOT PROBLEM 2

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF BHARAT

Between

The State of Aryavarta … …………….**Petitioner**

v.

Zypher Network &Ors. ……………**Respondents**

Facts of the Case

1. On 12 January 2025, the Aryavarta Cyber Cell reported a coordinated cyber-attack on the Central Power Grid of Bharat, resulting in a nationwide blackout for six hours. The attack disabled critical infrastructure, disrupted hospital services, and caused economic losses estimated at ₹2,000 crores.

2. Preliminary investigations traced the source of the attack to a dark web forum operated by an anonymous group called Zypher Network. Through surveillance and digital forensics, the Cyber Cell arrested Rohan Mehta, a 23-year-old ethical hacking student, alleging that he was the lead coder of the malware "BlackOut-X" used in the attack.

3. Rohan denies any involvement and claims that his open-source security tools were misused by unknown third parties. He argues that his arrest violates his fundamental right to free speech and privacy, as his communications were intercepted without a valid warrant.

4. The State contends that Rohan's tools were specifically designed to cripple critical infrastructure and that he knowingly aided a terrorist act, thereby committing cyber terrorism under Section 66F of the Information Technology Act, 2000 and Sections 16 & 18 of the Unlawful Activities (Prevention) Act, 1967 (UAPA).

5.

Issues for Consideration

1. Whether the creation and distribution of open-source security tools, later misused for a cyber-attack, constitutes "cyber terrorism" under Section 66F of the IT Act, 2000.

2. Whether the interception of Rohan's online communications without a prior judicial warrant violates his fundamental rights under Articles 19(1)(a) and 21 of the Constitution of India.

3. Whether the State can invoke UAPA provisions in cases of cyber terrorism where the perpetrator's intent is disputed.

Applicable Laws

1. Information Technology Act, 2000 (Section 66F)
2. Unlawful Activities (Prevention) Act, 1967 (Sections 15, 16, 18)
3. Indian Constitution (Articles 19(1)(a), 21)
4. Relevant international conventions on cybercrime and terrorism.

Note to Participants

Arguments may be advanced on behalf of both the State and the Respondent, focusing on cybercrime jurisprudence, constitutional safeguards, and the balance between national security and individual rights.

3.10.25

MOOT PROBLEM 3

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PRAVASHTA

Between

State of Pravashta ....Petitioner

Versus

Arjun Kapoor ....Respondent

Facts of the Case

1. On 15 February 2025, a complaint was filed by the parents of Riya Sharma, a 16-year-old school student, alleging that Arjun Kapoor, a 19-year-old college freshman, engaged in a consensual romantic relationship with Riya. The complaint states that Arjun and Riya exchanged private messages and met several times outside school, during which Arjun allegedly kissed and hugged Riya.
2. The police registered an FIR under:
3. Section 7 & 8 of the Protection of Children from Sexual Offences Act, 2012 (POCSO) (sexual assault), and
4. Section 376 of the Indian Penal Code (IPC) (rape), on the basis that Riya is a minor and therefore cannot legally consent to any sexual activity.

Arjun contends that:

1. Their relationship was mutual and affectionate, with no coercion or exploitation.
2. Criminalizing consensual teenage relationships under POCSO violates Articles 14, 19, and 21 of the Constitution, especially the right to privacy and choice.
3. The inclusion of non-penetrative acts such as kissing within the ambit of "sexual assault" is an overbroad interpretation of the statute.

The State argues that:

1. The age of consent under POCSO is 18 years, making Riya's consent immaterial.
2. The law aims to protect minors from grooming and exploitation, regardless of the alleged affection between the parties.

Issues for Consideration

1. Whether consensual physical intimacy between adolescents constitutes "sexual assault" under Sections 7 & 8 of the POCSO Act.
2. Whether the strict liability nature of POCSO violates the right to equality, privacy, and personal liberty under the Constitution of India.
3. Whether courts can exercise discretion to read down POCSO in cases of romantic relationships between minors and young adults.

Applicable Laws

1. Protection of Children from Sexual Offences Act, 2012 (Sections 2(d), 7, 8, 29)
2. Indian Penal Code, 1860 (Section 375, 376)
3. Constitution of India (Articles 14, 19, 21)
4. Judicial precedents on age of consent and adolescent relationships.

Note to Participants

Arguments may be presented for both sides, balancing the protective intent of POCSO against the constitutional rights of young adults and minors in consensual relationships.

NOTE:

- The MOOT-COURT examination of concerned subject will be held at Auditorium, Aishwarya College of Education (LAW), jodhpur

- Students have to bring their MEMORIAL (BOTH SIDES) for the examination.

- Students should present adhere the proper formal dress code of the Moot Court Exercise.

- The students should observe the deadline strictly.

- No further opportunity will be given to students in respect of Moot Court.

- Kindly adhere to this notice in strict sense.

Dr. Neelima Arora
(Coordinator)

Copy to-
1. Notice board / Website
2. Students circulation
3. Office File