



UTTARANCHAL
UNIVERSITY
DEHRADUN

NAAC
GRADE **A+**



LAW COLLEGE DEHRADUN

FACULTY OF UTTARANCHAL UNIVERSITY
presents



CLARIFICATIONS

10th INTER UNIVERSITY MOOT COURT COMPETITION

on

CONSTITUTIONAL LAW

under the aegis of

MOOT COURT SOCIETY,
LAW COLLEGE DEHRADUN



9th October,
2026
to
11th October,
2026



lcdmcs@uumail.in



www.lcdmcs.in



lcdmcs@uumail.in



www.lcdmcs.in



/ lcdmcs



10th Inter-University Moot Court Competition, 2026
Clarifications

Sr. No.	Clarifications	Answers
1.	Whether the State of Suryavarta has a federal or a quasi-federal system?	No Clarification is required. All the rules are Pari Materia to the laws of India.
2.	Whether Mr. Namgyal was sent to the advisory committee after preventive detention?	No clarification is required.
3.	Whether the IT Rules of 2009 are applicable to blocking directions or the IT Rules of 2021?	No Clarification is required.
4.	Whether the LJP administrators were given an opportunity of hearing under the IT Rules when their content was blocked?	No Clarification is required.
5.	Whether the LJP administrators have raised an appeal against the blocking directions through IT rules under grievance committee?	No Clarification is required.
6.	Whether the LJP-operated digital platform, which was blocked, is an intermediary or are the LJP digital platforms their official accounts only who published their content on digital platforms?	No Clarification is required.
7.	Clarification is sought as to whether the neutral citation of a judgment (such as the INSC citation) may be cited alongside, or in the absence of, its corresponding SCC/AIR citation, in conformity with the citation format prescribed in the Competition Brochure/Rules.	No Factual Clarification is required. This is governed by the Competition's memorial/ Citation rules as prescribed in the brochure.



8.	Has the Supreme Court admitted the anonymously circulated "unsigned internal governmental note" and "digital materials circulated by LJP which have explicit contradictions" as evidence for the final hearing, or is its admissibility and evidentiary value still an open question to be argued?	No Clarification is required.
9.	Were the blocking directions against the Locust Janata Party (LJP) issued specifically under Section 69A of the Information Technology Act, 2000? Additionally, it should be clarified whether the Review Committee mechanism, mandated under the IT Blocking Rules, was convened to review these directions.	No Clarification is required.
10.	The exact charges/offences on which criminal proceedings have been initiated against the administrators of LJP, as referred to in Issue No. 3 of the Moot Proposition, including the specific provisions of law under which such charges have been framed.	No Clarification is required.
11.	Did the District Magistrate impose the prohibitory orders (such as under Section 163 of the BNSS) before the Ladhara march commenced, or were they promulgated only after the isolated incidents of violence began?	No Clarification is required.
12.	Whether all the committees mentioned under Para 8 were expert?	No Clarification is required.
13.	Whether the ban mentioned under para 23 was under section 163 of BNSS, and when, by whom, and how was it imposed?	No Clarification is required.
14.	Who all were the members of the high-level fact-finding committee mentioned under para 26?	No Clarification is required.



15.	Was Mr. Namgyal arrested or detained, as the word arrested has been used under para 29?	It is a typographical error. Kindly substitute “Arrest” with “Preventive Detention”.
16.	Which authority, and under what law the internet restrictions mentioned under para 35?	No Clarification is required.
17.	Were the blocking directions oral or written?	No Clarification is required.
18.	Under which specific statutory provision(s) were the criminal proceedings against LJP's administrators initiated?	The consequential criminal proceedings initiated against the administrators of LJP are under the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita (BNS), 2023.