X Amity National Moot Court Competition, 2017
Clarifications

Question regarding whether the students have approached the public-spirited advocate body, AUVP or he, on his own volition, agreed to file an appeal. Does this make it a case of an appeal or a case of PIL?	Student body approached the public-spirited advocate. The starting words used in the paragraphs 8 and 9 use the words petitioner and respondent respectively.
Question regarding the ambiguity on the position of the party who has filed the appeal?	There is no ambiguity on who has filed the appeal. It is very much clear and evident from the facts of the case.

Since a part of the case depends on the cartoon that allegedly defames the parliament, the prime minister and the national flag, a description or picture of the cartoon is deemed as necessary to judge whether the cartoon was, in fact, defamatory or not. So, if a description or an image of the cartoon can be made available, or an explanation regarding the absence of such description.	We can't provide for a picture. The teams may perceive the situation on creative grounds.
If it is an appeal, then why the word 'petitioner' has been used in para 8?	Participants are advised to consider the word 'petitioner' as 'appellant' mentioned in paragraph 8 of the moot problem.

The paragraph 6 of the moot problem talks about the High Court's verdict about the matter. One sentence in particular says the charge was upheld'. Could it be clarified that which charges, apart from the explicitly mentioned 124A and Ban on Press, in reference to the FIR filed by the police were upheld, since there is an ambiguity regarding the same.	All the charges mentioned In the First Information Report.
Did the policies and schemes of Indian government are in pari materia to that of indistan government	Clearly mentioned in the problem.
Did the High Court of Awadh gave a fitness certificate after its verdict against the petitioners? Whether the language mentioned in the slogans is one of the languages in India?	The teams are requested to understand the jurisdiction on their own and infer from the problem understanding the language issue.

Question regarding the Article under which the appellants have approached the Hon'ble Supreme Court. whether they have been given a certificate of High Court to approach Supreme Court under Art. 134A or not.	Upon the teams to infer the jurisdiction
Whether the arguments which are to be framed should only be focused on the *mens rea*. part of section 124 A or other sections including 153,121,505 IPC should also be.	It is upon the teams to work according to their understanding of the problem.
Jurisdiction is an issue and if yes whether it was admitted by Supreme court or in the process of admission under article 136(Special Leave Petition) of Indian Constitution.	Jurisdiction issue to be interpreted by teams
1. Who has imposed the ban on the Times of Indistan? Is it the central or state government? 2. Is the ban an indefinite ban?	To be inferred by the teams according to their understanding of the moot problem

3. Is the ban only on publishing cartoons or on the publishing of the newspaper as a whole?	To be inferred by the teams according to their understanding of the moot problem
1. The factsheet mentions that "Krishna, Waseem and their three other friends...", who were the three friends and what did they do?	
2. Awadh is a province. Is that to be considered equivalent to a state? That is to say will the respondent side be the "State of Awadh" or the "Province of Awadh".	
3. Can the names of all the parties to the sessions case which was later taken cognizance of by the HC of Awadh be told?	
4. What were the charges of which Krishna, Waseen, Omar and others convicted of by the HC?	
5. The fact sheet mentions that the petitioners are challenging the arrest in the SC. Does it mean that they are challenging the conviction or are they challenging the procedural aspect of arrest? (para 7)	