



Shri Vile Parle Kelavani Mandal's

JITENDRA CHAUHAN COLLEGE OF LAW

(Affiliated to University of Mumbai and Recognized by Bar Council of India, New Delhi)

Mithibai College Building, 8th Floor, Bhaktivedanta Swami Marg, Vile Parle (W), Mumbai-400056.

Tel: 022 4233 1401 / 2 / 3 / 4 • E-mail : jcclooffice@gmail.com • Website : www.jccl.ac.in



Date: 19th August, 2026

NOTICE

III LL.B. (SEM.-V) (A.Y. 2026-2027)

Practical Training III Moot Court Exercise and Internship.

As part of their curriculum, students of III LL.B. (Sem.-V) are required to successfully complete and pass in the Practical Training III Moot Court Exercise and Internship.

Practical Training - III consists of the following four components:

Sr. No.	COMPONENT	MAXIMUM MARKS
I	Moot Court	50 Marks
II	Observance of trial proceedings	20 Marks
III	Internship at Lawyer's Office	10 Marks
IV	Viva-Voce	20 Marks
TOTAL MARKS		100 Marks

Component – I (50 marks)

Moot Court

Students have to submit 3 Moot Court Memorials as part of the Practical Training Component. The memorials should be drafted on all the 3 problems attached as **Annexure-I** to this notice. The memorials have to be submitted from the sides allotted to them for all the three problems. All students are required to prepare themselves for Oral Presentations on all the problems at the time of the Viva-voce. The Schedule for the Viva-voce shall be informed later.

Guidelines for Submitting Moot Court Memorial.

1. The memorials must be submitted on typed A-4 size paper printed on one side and must contain:
 - i. Cover Page
 - ii. Table of Contents
 - iii. Index of Authorities
 - iv. Statement of Jurisdiction
 - v. Statement of Facts
 - vi. Statement of Issues
 - vii. Summary of Arguments
 - viii. Arguments Advanced
 - ix. Conclusion and Prayer
2. ILI style citation needs to be followed.
3. The memorial must have a margin measuring one inch on all sides of each page.
4. The page numbering should be on the top right side of each page.
5. The Arguments Advanced should not exceed 20 pages and the memorial as a whole should not exceed 40 pages including the cover page.
6. For every moot problem, a minimum of 10 cases should be referred in total. The font type should be in Times New Roman and the font size should be 12 (1.5 line space) and for footnotes it should be Times New Roman size 10 (single space)

Component – II (20 Marks)

Observance of trial proceedings

The students shall compulsorily attend at least four court proceeding, two criminal trials and two civil proceedings and record the various steps observed during their attendance. They are required to note the details of the court, the parties

involved in the matter, the lawyers, and the date on which they attended the court proceedings. A geo-tagged image of the court, with the date visible, must also be included. Additionally, the students must provide a brief gist of the case and their observations in the journal.

Component- III (10 Marks)

Internship at Lawyer's Office

Students must maintain an Internship Diary during their internship. The diary must be duly signed by the lawyer or law office where the internship is undertaken. Upon completion of the internship, students must submit the signed Internship Diary to the college at the time of Viva. The format for the same is annexed as **Annexure –II**. The internship certificate must also be attached to the Internship Diary. Any law internships completed over the course of three years will be considered for Component III.

Guidelines for Submitting Component –II

1. Any A/4 size (8.3 x 11.7 inches) paper must be used for the purpose of entering the Component –II of Practical Training -III.
2. The written submission must be hand written and should compulsorily contain the following particulars:
 - i. Cover Page
 - ii. Acknowledgment
 - iii. Table of Contents
 - iv. Numbering of Pages
 - v. Roll no. of student must be mentioned on the top right-hand side of each page with pen.

The Cover Page of Written Submission of Component-II contain the following details:

- i. College Name
- ii. Subject: Practical Training –III
- iii. Name of Student
- iv. Roll number & Division
- v. Faculty In-charge

Component –IV (20 Marks)

Viva-Voce

1. The viva shall be held on **21st, 22nd, 23rd and 24th of October 2026**. The detailed schedule for the Viva-voce will be informed in due course.
2. The Viva-Voce shall be based on all the above three components.

Submission of Journal – Practical Training III

1. All TY students are requested to join the Practical Training III Teams group using the following team code:

Team Code: xzlc1xs

The journal submission link will be provided on Microsoft Teams.

2. Hard copies of the journal should be submitted at the time of the viva-voce. The typed memorials for **Component I** and the written submissions for **Component II** should be spiral-bound together and submitted on the date of the viva-voce. **Component III, i.e., the Internship Diary**, must be spiral-bound separately and submitted at the time of the viva-voce.

3. **Soft copies of each component should be submitted on or before 20th October 2026 through the assignment link created on Microsoft Teams.**
4. All students are requested to join the Teams group at the earliest and ensure timely submission.

In case of any difficulty, students may approach Dr. Navanitha Warriar



Dr. Priya J. Shah
(I/c Principal)

ANNEXURE -1

MOOT PROPOSITIONS

Instructions

Moot Problem 1: All odd roll numbers shall prepare from the Plaintiff/Petitioner's side. All even roll numbers shall prepare from the Defendant/ Respondent's side.

Moot Problem 2: All even roll numbers shall prepare from the Plaintiff/Petitioner's side. All odd roll numbers shall prepare from the Defendant/ Respondent's side.

Moot Problem 3: All even roll numbers from 1–120 shall prepare from the Plaintiff/Petitioner's side, and all odd roll numbers from 1–120 shall prepare from the Defendant/Respondent's side. All odd roll numbers from 111–240 shall prepare from the Plaintiff/Petitioner's side, and all even roll numbers from 111–240 shall prepare from the Defendant/Respondent's side.

MOOT PROPOSITION NO. 1.

Sonia Mehta and Rahit Patel met in 2020 at a college event in Mumbai. Their friendship gradually developed into a romantic relationship. By late 2021, they were often seen together at social events, group studies, and casual outings. In mid-2022, Sonia moved into Rahit's rented apartment, and they began living together. Though never legally married, they presented themselves socially as partners, introducing each other to friends and relatives.

In the initial phase, the relationship appeared affectionate. Sonia recalls Rahit as caring and attentive, helping her with college work and attending social functions together. Rahit describes those times as happy, with mutual support and long conversations about life goals. Friends remember them as a close, loving couple.

However, cracks began appearing in 2023. Sonia claims that Rahit started controlling her movements, questioning her social interactions, and discouraging her from applying for higher studies abroad. She alleges that Rahit frequently insulted her privately and sometimes publicly, leaving her humiliated. Sonia also claims that he subjected her to physical violence and forced sexual acts without her consent. She states she endured these episodes silently, hoping the relationship would improve.

Rahit, on the other hand, presents a contrasting account. He maintains that disagreements were mutual and never escalated beyond typical arguments. He asserts that Sonia's educational and social decisions were always her own and denies any sexual assault,

emphasizing that all sexual activity was consensual. He also contends that Sonia sometimes exaggerated conflicts due to her emotional temperament.

The tension peaked in early 2024. Sonia alleges that during a particularly violent quarrel, Rahit assaulted her physically and forced sexual relations. Feeling unsafe and emotionally distressed, she left his apartment permanently. Rahit claims that Sonia left voluntarily after a heated disagreement and that the allegations were exaggerated due to post-breakup resentment.

Following her departure, Sonia filed complaints with the Andheri Police Station alleging:

1. Cruelty by her partner under Section 498A IPC/Section 85 BNS
2. Non-consensual sexual acts under Section 376 IPC/ Section 65 BNS
3. Seeking relief under the Protection of Women from Domestic Violence Act, 2005 (DV Act), including protection rights and compensation.

Acting on these complaints, the Andheri Police arrested Rahit under Section 41(1) CrPC/ Section 35 BNSS, in connection with the cognizable offenses under Sections 498A and 376 IPC, and produced him before the Metropolitan Magistrate, Andheri. During the lower court proceedings, multiple friends, relatives, and neighbours of both parties were examined. Some testified observing arguments or emotional distress in the couple, while others recalled the couple appearing happy and affectionate. Conflicting testimonies created ambiguity about the nature and frequency of alleged abuse. There is no digital evidence, and much of the case hinges on oral testimonies.

The Metropolitan Magistrate, Andheri, while analyzing the evidence, refused to quash the complaints, holding that prima facie allegations under Sections 498A/Section 85 BNS and 376 IPC/Section 65 BNS, as well as claims under the DV Act, warranted further judicial examination.

Rahit has now filed a petition in the Bombay High Court under Section 482 CrPC/Section 528 BNSS, challenging the maintainability of the complaints and seeking quashing of the proceedings.

ISSUES FOR CONSIDERATION

1. Whether the Metropolitan Magistrate, Andheri, erred in refusing to quash the proceedings, making the complaint maintainable despite apparent ambiguities in witness credibility and conflicting testimonies?
2. Whether the absence of a legal marriage bars the application of Section 498A IPC/Section 85 BNS in cases of alleged cruelty?
3. Whether non-consensual sexual acts within a live-in relationship can amount to **rape under Section 376 IPC/**Section 65 BNS?
4. Whether Sonia and Rahit's relationship, though non-marital, entitles her to relief under the DV Act?

MOOT PROPOSITION NO. 2

Arya is a very well-recognized local author and public speaker on lifestyle and self-improvement. He works for the publishing company "Blue Book LLC," which has helped Arya publish multiple books pertaining to self-help, teenage parenting, and marriage counselling, specifically in the city of Mumbai. Arya has always been considered satirical and controversial due to his views on traditional social norms. This has particularly made him and his books popular among the younger generation, specifically those between the ages of 18 and 25.

Arya's latest publication was going to be an easy-to-read and informal book on sex education for adults, which made sure that the book was going to be distributed with an 18+ warning. The contents of this book were going to include chapters on consent, basic sex education taught in foreign countries, along with the vital role it plays in relationships and marriages. The book had an early release in the State of Maharashtra on 17 April 2025. On 18 April

2025, a notification was released by the Maharashtra State Government issuing warrants to seize all copies of Arya's latest book and banning the distribution and sale of the book within the State under Section 98 of the BNSS.

The Notification stated that the reason for the use of this provision was that the published book was in violation of Sections 152 and 294 of the BNS. The Notification highlighted that the book's content was obscene due to the vulgar language and the discussion of reproductive anatomy in a very crass and uncultured manner.

Further, the book was also seen to be highly critical of the government's abstinence from including sex education in the curriculum, as it compared the Indian educational system to foreign educational systems, citing lines like, "The kind of education Indians are deprived of." Further, in the Author's Note, Arya had added the following paragraph:

"I wrote this book after seeing the lack of awareness of sex education in India. Despite the continuous rants and pleas, our incompetent government has yet again failed to help our country's citizens, especially the youth, hiding behind traditional norms and covering their 'small' mindsets. I urge people to use this book to understand and be inspired to learn more about sex and understand that it is okay to talk about the same."

Aggrieved by the Notification, Arya approached the High Court under Section 99 of the BNSS and filed an application to challenge the ban on the distribution of his latest book.

ISSUES FOR CONSIDERATION

Issue 1: Whether the content of the book qualifies to meet the standards of obscenity and is punishable under Section 294 of the BNS?

Issue 2: Whether the ban on the sale of the book is a violation of Article 19(1) of the Constitution or falls under the reasonable restrictions under Article 19(2)?

Issue 3: Whether the criticism of the government's actions in not including sex education in the educational curriculum amounts to an offence under Section 152 of the BNS?

MOOT PROPOSITION NO. 3

On 23rd July 2024, Mrs. Sushila Gupta received a call from her neighbours informing her that her 16-year-old daughter, Meera, a state-level hockey player, had attempted suicide by overdosing on sleeping pills. The neighbours rushed Meera to Global Health Hospital. Mrs. Sushila, who was at work, immediately hurried to the hospital with two colleagues. Upon arrival, she learned that Meera had been taken to the emergency room. Distressed and agitated, Mrs. Sushila attempted to enter the operating theatre despite being restrained by hospital staff. Her anxiety escalated, leading to a confrontation with her husband, Mihir Gupta, who had also arrived. They had a heated argument, further compounding Mrs. Sushila's distress. After some time, the doctors informed them that Meera had not survived. Overcome with grief, Sushila lost consciousness.

Subsequent investigation by police officials revealed that Meera had been suffering from depression, of which her parents were unaware. Friends of Meera indicated that her depression was exacerbated by her parents' ongoing divorce and custody proceedings. They also disclosed that Meera had recently come to terms with her sexual orientation as a lesbian—a fact she had not shared with her conservative parents due to their intolerance towards LGBTQ+ issues. Meera had made attempts to communicate her feelings, but her parents dismissed these attempts.

On 18th August 2024, Mrs. Sushila read an article in the *Local Times* titled “Navigating New Paths: The Importance of Family Counseling for LGBTQ+ Acceptance.” The article, authored by Mr. Gautam Godbole, included anonymized case studies. One example, strikingly similar to Meera's situation, discussed conservative parents, mental health issues, and the impact of a troubled marriage on children. The article also noted symptoms of hysterical tendencies and offensive language used by a mother.

Mr. Godbole used to reside in the same building as Mrs. Sushila. She confronted him, but he denied that the example referred to her daughter. Upon resuming work on 19th August 2024, Mrs. Sushila's manager expressed concern about her well-being, suggesting that her emotional distress might affect her performance. The manager also referenced the article, inquiring whether it pertained to Mrs. Sushila's case. Initially denying the connection, Mrs. Sushila later learned from her colleagues that discussions about the article had increased her distress. She also discovered that her promotion and salary increment had been postponed by six months.

Sushila continued to work under significant emotional strain, with limited responsibilities assigned by her manager.

Sushila subsequently learned that Mr. Gautam Godbole had affiliations with the police station where Meera's case was registered. She filed a defamation suit against Mr. Godbole, seeking damages of Rs. 50 lakhs. The lower court ruled against her, arguing that the article did not disclose any identities and that any resemblance to her case was coincidental. Sushila has now appealed to the Bombay High Court.

ISSUES FOR CONSIDERATION

1. Whether the lower court erred in deciding that the defendant's act does not amount to defamation?
2. Whether the article violated Mrs. Sushila Gupta's right to privacy?
3. Whether Mr. Gautam can be held liable for defamation?

Annexure – I to Moot Proposition No. 3

The article excerpt reads:

“Navigating New Paths: The Importance of Family Counseling for LGBTQ+ Acceptance”

In recent years, we have seen an increasing number of cases where familial discord and conservative attitudes have had profound effects on the mental health of young individuals. One such anonymized case highlights the tragic impact of these factors.

The case involves a teenage girl from a conservative family residing in Alkapuri, who was also a talented state-level hockey player. Struggling with significant mental health issues and her own burgeoning sexual orientation as a lesbian, she faced severe challenges. Her parents, embroiled in a tumultuous divorce and exhibiting a lack of empathy, remained oblivious to the depth of her struggles. The girl's distress ultimately culminated in a tragic suicide attempt that led to her death.

The mother of this young athlete, already under severe emotional strain, displayed erratic and concerning behaviour in various situations. Reports indicate that she has a history of outbursts

and aggressive interactions with those around her, particularly her estranged husband. Such behaviour suggests underlying psychological issues that may contribute to the overall dysfunction within the family. This case underlines the critical need for understanding and addressing mental health issues within families and the importance of supportive counselling services.

These cases serve as stark reminders of the emotional toll that family disputes and societal intolerance can take on vulnerable individuals. They highlight the necessity for open dialogues and robust support systems to foster acceptance and mental well-being within families.”

ANNEXURE 2

INTERNSHIP DIARY

Name:	
College Name:	
Class	
Roll Number / Division:	
College SAP ID:	

INTERNSHIP DETAILS

Name of the Organization / Chamber: _____

Address: _____

Name of Supervisor / Advocate: _____

Internship Duration: From __ / __ / ____ To __ / __ / ____

Mode: Physical / Online / Hybrid

Area of Practice / Focus:

Internship Certificate

(Attach the same)

Declaration by the Student

I,, hereby declare that the work presented in this internship diary is the result of my own efforts and has been completed during my internship at [Organization Name] from [Start Date] to [End Date].

Date:

Place:

Signature of Student

Acknowledgement

DAILY WORK LOG

(To be filled for each day of the internship)

Date	Hours Worked	Tasks Assigned / Observations	Learnings / Reflections
DD/MM/YY	e.g. 10 AM – 5 PM		
DD/MM/YY	e.g. 10 AM – 5 PM		
DD/MM/YY	e.g. 10 AM – 5 PM		
DD/MM/YY	e.g. 10 AM – 5 PM		
DD/MM/YY	e.g. 10 AM – 5 PM		
DD/MM/YY	e.g. 10 AM – 5 PM		
DD/MM/YY	e.g. 10 AM – 5 PM		
DD/MM/YY	e.g. 10 AM – 5 PM		
DD/MM/YY	e.g. 10 AM – 5 PM		
DD/MM/YY	e.g. 10 AM – 5 PM		

SUMMARY REPORT (End of Internship)

1. Overview of Internship Experience:

(Brief description of the organization/chamber, nature of work, court visits, client interaction etc.)

2. Key Takeaways:

- Legal skills developed
- Exposure to procedures or systems
- Case laws or concepts strengthened
- Professionalism and ethics learned

3. Challenges Faced:

(Briefly mention any challenges, limitations, or improvements suggested)

4. Overall Reflection:

(Your thoughts on how the internship has shaped your understanding of legal practice)

ADVOCATES/ SUPERVISOR'S REMARKS AND SIGNATURE