



NATIONAL MOOT COURT

COMPETITION 2023

**21-23
JULY
2023**

Theme

CONSTITUTIONAL LAW

Last Date for Provisional Registration | 21st May
(with early bird discount)

“ ABOUT IFIM SCHOOL OF LAW

Established in 2014 and based out of the silicon valley of India, today the IFIM School of Law is recognized as the 2nd most outstanding Law School of Excellence by the Global Human Resource Development Centre (GHRDC) survey, 2021 and 9th Best Private Law School in India by Outlook Magazine Ranking 2021. IFIM aims to impart quality legal education using executed by a meritorious team of faculty.

The unique strengths of IFIM School of Law are its Research Centric approach, Corporate Mentorship, Social Immersion Program, Personality Enhancement Program, and International Collaborations. IFIM brings together exceptionally talented people from diverse backgrounds and ideologies, who are ambitious and bring innovative methodologies and perspectives to the table.

“ ABOUT MOOT COURT COMMITTEE

Moot court is like the laboratories of Law schools where theoretical knowledge is tested in real life situations. The School of Law has a vibrant mooting culture and promotes mooting as an essential activity amongst its students. The IFIM School of Law's Moot Court Committee (MCC) organizes two Annual Ranking Moot Court Competitions (ARMCC) every year as an intra-moot court competition of the law school. ARMCC-Minor is for the first-year students and is aimed at induction of the students to the world of mooting. ARMCC-Major is for all the students of the IFIM School of Law and is aimed at selecting the best group of students to represent the school at various Tier I and Tier II moots across India and the world. ARMCCs are organized with the objective of selecting the speakers and researchers who would later be representing IFIM School of Law in external national and international moot court competitions.

In the year 2022, the MCC launched the IFIM National Moot Court Competition (NMCC). The NMCC 2022 was the first ever attempt made by the Moot Court Committee of the IFIM School of Law to provide its young and dynamic law students a visibility for themselves as well as for the law school and to carve a niche in the realm of business and commercial laws. The theme for NMCC 2022 was cryptocurrency and smart contracts. The competition saw participation from about 30 teams from all over India.

“ ABOUT NATIONAL MOOT COURT COMPETITION 2023




After the massive success of NMCC-2022, the IFIM School of Law's Moot Court Committee is proud to bring the next edition of its moot. This year the theme is Constitutional Law. The Moot Problem is drafted by Mr. Gautam Bhatia, who is a D.Phil. (Law) Candidate at the University of Oxford. This year, the NMCC has made a special facility for provisional registration. Teams who register by 21 May 2023 will be required to pay a sum of INR 4000/- only for the registration. Other teams registering by 10 June 2023 (last date of registration) will be required to pay a sum of INR 5000/- for registration. Post payments, teams should email the screenshot of payments to nmcc@ifim.edu.in immediately. Payments can be made to the following account.



BANK DETAILS

Bank Name: Axis Bank
Account Name: IFIM LAW SCHOOL
Account No: 922010033169523
Customer ID: 102021460
Branch: Koramangala
IFSC Code: UTIB0000194



ORGANISING COMMITTEE:

Mr. Naman Shukla
Assistant Professor of Law
Contact No: 9560216858
Ms. Sharu Anna John
Assistant Professor of Law
Contact No: 8921213189



CONTACT DETAILS:

Mr. Tarun S
(Student Convenor, MCC)
Contact No: 9481808542
Email ID: nmcc@ifim.edu.in

IMPORTANT DATES

Release of Moot Proposition	21 March 2023
Last Date for Provisional Registration	21 May 2023
Last Date for Regular Registration	15 June 2023
Last Date for seeking Clarifications	20 June 2023
Release of Clarifications	30 June 2023
Last Date for Submission of soft copy of Memorials	10 July 2023
Formal Registration at IFIM School of Law's campus	21 July 2023
Date of Researchers' Test	21 July 2023
Date of the Competition (Oral Rounds)	21-23 July 2023



MOOT COURT PRIZE MONEY

Winner	60000 INR
Runner-Up	40000 INR
Best Speaker – Male	10000 INR
Best Speaker – Female	10000 INR
Best Researcher – Male	10000 INR
Best Researcher – Female	10000 INR
Best Memorial	10000 INR



MOOT PROBLEM

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED FEDERATION OF PLANETS AT CORSUCANT

Petitioner State of Annares & Ors

Respondent The United Federation of Planets

Part I: Overview

- 1) The United Federation of Planets [**“the Federation”**] is a union of planets, satellites, and mining asteroids, located in the Alpha Quadrant of the Milky Way Galaxy.
- 2) The Federation arose out of the collapse of the Borg Empire, a highly centralised Galactic Empire that ultimately fell apart after one military misadventure too many. The centralised nature of the Borg Empire was one of its most criticised features, leading to inefficiencies in governance, resentment from planets that were culturally and ideologically distinct from the ruling class, and frequent rebellions in the outer arms of the Quadrant. As a result, when the Borg Empire collapsed, its successors opted for a federal governance structure. Article 1 of the Federation's Constitution therefore states that “the United Federation of Planets shall be a union of planets.”
- 3) The widespread violence accompanying the fall of the Borg Empire, however, also triggered demands for stability. Consequently, when framing their Constitution, the Federation's founders looked for a model that would allow for a certain degree of residuary central control within the federal framework. After studying various historical examples in the Federation's database, they found that the Constitution of India (**extant as of the year 2020**) provided the most suitable model. The Federation thus copied many of the provisions from the Indian Constitution into the Federation's Constitution. A federal legislative assembly [**“the Union”**] made laws for the Federation. Within the Federation, there were several states [**“the States”**], which could be individual planets, combinations of planets, or satellites. The division of powers between the Union and the States copied the division found in the Indian Constitution. In particular, **Articles 3, 4, 356, and 357** of the Indian Constitution were copied into the Federation's Constitution, with necessary terminological modifications, and with one significant difference: a change under Article 3 required not just consultation with the state's assembly, but also its consent.
- 4) Over the years, the Federation's Courts – in particular, the Galactic Court with its seat in the planet of Corsucant – has held that the judgments of the courts of India are highly persuasive in interpreting the federal provisions of the Federation's Constitution.

- 5) The Borg Empire controlled several mining asteroids, which served its need for natural resources and dilithium fuel for its spaceships. On the dissolution of the Borg Empire, these mining asteroids passed into the hands of the Federation. Initially, these mining asteroids were ruled in the same fashion as that of the Borg Empire. However, increasing clamour for representative governance from the asteroids forced the Federation to fit them into the Federation's Constitution. The Federation once again found a solution within the Indian Constitution: mining asteroids were classed as "Union Territories", and the provisions with respect to union territories were incorporated into the Constitution.
- 6) The relevant constitutional framework was completed by the provisions on amendment. The founders of the Federation's Constitution adopted Article 368 of the Indian Constitution (the parliamentary method of amending the Constitution). However, they felt that this was insufficient, as it had no involvement of the People. On looking further through the databases, they found inspiration in the Kenyan Constitution (**extant as of 2020**), and, in particular, amendment through popular initiative. **Article 368A** of the Federation Constitution – with appropriate modifications – therefore reads as follows:
- 1 An amendment to this Constitution may be proposed by a popular initiative signed by at least one million registered voters.
 - 2 A popular initiative for an amendment to this Constitution may be in the form of a general suggestion or a formulated draft Bill.
 - 3 If a popular initiative is in the form of a general suggestion, the promoters of that popular initiative shall formulate it into a draft Bill.
 - 4 The promoters of a popular initiative shall deliver the draft Bill and the supporting signatures to the Independent Electoral and Boundaries Commission, which shall verify that the initiative is supported by at least one million registered voters.
 - 5 If the Independent Electoral and Boundaries Commission is satisfied that the initiative meets the requirements of this Article, the Commission shall submit the draft Bill to each state assembly for consideration within three months after the date it was submitted by the Commission.
 - 6 If a state assembly approves the draft Bill within three months after the date it was submitted by the Commission, the speaker of the state assembly shall deliver a copy of the draft Bill jointly to the Speakers of the two Houses of Parliament, with a certificate that the state assembly has approved it.
 - 7 If a draft Bill has been approved by a majority of the state assemblies, it shall be introduced in Parliament without delay.
 - 8 A Bill under this Article is passed by Parliament if supported by a majority of the members of each House.
 - 9 If Parliament passes the Bill, it shall be submitted to the President for assent.
 - 10 If the Bill relates to an aspect of the basic structure¹ of the Constitution, the proposed amendment shall be submitted to the people in a referendum.
- 7) In interpreting the amendment provision, the courts of the Federation have found Kenyan decisions (**extant upto 2020**) to be of great persuasive value.
- 8) Federation courts have also been known to consider – and rely upon – judgments from contemporaneous jurisdictions, such as the United Kingdom Supreme Court, the South African Constitutional Court, and others, on the basis that ideas and legal debates frequently cross-pollinated during the relevant time.

¹The basic structure is expressly defined in the Federation Constitution but is not relevant to this moot problem.

Part II: Context

- 9) The State of Annares is a planet close to the centre of one of the spiral arms of the Galaxy, and one of the constituent states of the Federation.
- 10) The State of Annares is strategically located, as it borders the Alliance of Urras, another federation of planets that has been in a long-running cold (and sometimes, hot) conflict with the Federation. The State of Annares also has significant dilithium reserves, which are essential to the maintaining of the warp drive, which makes interstellar travel possible.
- 11) Because of its strategic location and vast dilithium reserves, and because of the chaos that accompanied the break-up of the Borg Empire, the State of Annares was able to negotiate particularly favourable terms for itself during the drafting of the Federation Constitution. These included extensive autonomy for itself, greater internal powers than those granted to other states, and the ability to veto union legislation.
- 12) Annares' "special status" – as it is known colloquially within the Federation – caused considerable resentment to the politicians negotiating and drafting the Federation Constitution. However, as they were unwilling to lose Annares to the Alliance of Urras, they ultimately agreed to all the demands, and encoded them in **Article 370** of the Federation Constitution.²
- 13) Annares' "special status" has long been a political football in the Federation, with several leaders vowing to "consign it to the debris of interstellar space." For various reasons, however, this has not been possible to accomplish – until it was.

Part III: The Facts

- 14) In the year 3645 Galactic Era (G.E.), after a bitterly contested general election, Hari Seldon – a former mathematician & the author of a set of famous predictions about the future of the Galaxy – was elected the Prime Minister of the United Federation of Planets.
- 15) Upon his accession, Seldon publicly stated that "the time had come" for widespread constitutional reform. To this end, he set up a taskforce called the Bridging Blackspace Initiative [**BBI**], which came up with a report that recommended multiple constitutional changes.
- 16) Soon after this, Janet Mahmoud and Dennis Waverly, two parliamentarians known to be closely affiliated to Prime Minister Seldon, proposed an amendment bill to the Constitution that replicated the BBI Report [**the BBI Amendment**]. This Amendment Bill proposed a package of seventy-four amendments to the Constitution, which included proposals as diverse as increasing funding to the states, bringing in a judicial ombudsperson, and – much to the shock and surprise of many, who had not been following the work of the taskforce – proposals to abolish the constitutional special status of Annares.
- 17) Janet Mahmoud and Dennis Waverly sought to portray the BBI Amendment Bill as a "popular initiative", and immediately set about the process of gathering the required signatures. There were howls of protest from Annares; however, as none of this made any difference, the State of Annares invoked the extraordinary jurisdiction of the Galactic Court at Coruscant, & asked the Court to declare the BBI Amendment Bill unconstitutional, and "null and void."
- 18) As proceedings commenced in the Galactic Court, Prime Minister Seldon announced that the Federation was facing a dilithium shortage, which threatened the possibility of interstellar flight and the future of the Federation itself. This news was greeted with much scepticism and some mockery, but Seldon moved quickly, and recommended to the Federation President to invoke Article 356 of the Federation Constitution, dismiss the government of Annares, and bring it under Union rule. Bound by his "aid and advice" under the Constitution, the President acquiesced.

19) Upon the dismissal of the government of Annares, the Federation's lawyers attempted to have the pending case dismissed, on the basis that the “State of Annares” was now represented by the Federation. The Galactic Court dismissed this application with heavy costs. It proceeded to pre-trial arguments, where it found – after contested proceedings – that Janet Mahmoud Dennis Waverly were proxies, and the real “initiator” of the BBI Amendment Process was Prime Minister Seldon. Consequently, the Galactic Court framed two issues for adjudication.

- 1 Is the Prime Minister entitled to initiate a popular initiative within the meaning of Article 368A of the Federation Constitution?
- 2 Can an “amendment bill” within the meaning of Article 368A include a “package” of proposed amendments that have absolutely no connection or unity of subject matter with each other, with a view to being presented to the People in a referendum in an up-down vote?

20) Meanwhile, Prime Minister Seldon was furious at his aborted attempt to have Annares' case dismissed at the Galactic Court. Accordingly – as the Galactic Court had declined to grant a stay on the BBI Bill, noting only that “the amendment would be subject to the outcome of these proceedings” – the amendment process gathered pace: it passed through the state assemblies (including the non-existent assembly of Annares), passed a referendum, and the Constitution thus stood formally amended. Annares' “special status” was thus abolished.

21) Immediately thereafter, Prime Minister Seldon took a step unprecedented in the history of the Federation: his government introduced – & passed via brute majority in Parliament – a law, ostensibly under Article 3 of the Constitution that converted Annares from a “state” into a “union territory” – i.e., on par with various centrally-ruled mining asteroids. As the government of Annares had been dismissed, there was nobody to veto the law. This step was popular with large swathes of the Federation, but naturally, was met–once again–with widespread protests in Annares. With Annares' government having been dismissed, a civil society group called the Katiba Institute initiated proceedings before the Galactic Court, challenging the constitutionality of the law. The Galactic Court admitted the case, & consolidated it with the existing proceedings that had been brought by the State of Annares. After pre-trial hearings, it framed two further questions for determination:

- 1 Does Article 3 of the Federation Constitution empower the Federation/union Parliament to downgrade a state to a union territory?
- 2 If the answer to (3) is yes, then can a permanent and irreversible alteration to the structure of a state be brought in *during* the period that an Emergency under Article 356 is in progress?

22) All other questions, issues, and contentions suggested by the parties were explicitly rejected by the Galactic Court. At the hearing for directions, the Court ordered the issues, *in seriatim*, as follows, and directed counsel to confine themselves *only* to the four issues, in the terms set out below:

- 1 Is the Prime Minister entitled to initiate a popular initiative within the meaning of Article 368A of the Federation Constitution?
- 2 Can an “amendment bill” within the meaning of Article 368A include a “package” of proposed amendments that have absolutely no connection or unity of subject matter with each other, with a view to being presented to the People in a referendum in an up-down vote?
- 3 Does Article 3 of the Federation Constitution empower the Federation/union Parliament to downgrade a state to a union territory?
- 4 If the answer to (3) is yes, then can a permanent and irreversible alteration to the structure of a state be brought in *during* the period that an Emergency under Article 356 is in progress?

²The text of Article 370 of the Federation Constitution is not in pari materia with the Constitution of India, and is not relevant to resolving this dispute.

“ IFIM MOOT COURT COMMITTEE

Chairman

Prof. (Dr.) Sunil George
Principal
IFIM School of Law, Bangalore

Vice-Chairman

Prof. Shagufta Anjum
Vice Principal & Associate Professor
IFIM School of Law, Bangalore

Faculty-Chair

Prof. Naman Shukla
Assistant Professor of Law

Faculty Member

Prof. Sharu Anna John
Assistant Professor of Law

Student Co-Ordinators

Mr. Tarun Sridharan
Student Convenor

Ms. Urrvi Chawla
Student Co-Convenor


Ms. Yosha M
Secretary

Mr. Pratham Dandotiya
Treasurer

Ms. Keerthana Sriram	- Member
Ms. Sahasra Raghuraman	- Member
Ms. Saloni Chaturvedi	- Member
Ms. Nanditha Kagalvadi Swamy	- Member
Mr. Parth Dwivedi	- Member
Ms Keerthi G	- Member
Ms. Vaishnavi Priya	- Member
Mr. Srivatsan	- Member
Ms. Jananni Babu	- Member
Ms. Tiya Jain	- Member



IFIM School of Law (Opp. Infosys Campus Gate # 4) # 8P & 9P,
KIADB Industrial Area Electronics City 1st Phase Bangalore - 560100

 nmcc@ifim.edu.in | +91-948 1808 542