

PEOPLE'S EDUCATION SOCIETY'S
ADV. BALASAHEB APTE COLLEGE OF LAW

Prin. N.M.Kale Marg, Off. Gokhale Road (S), Dadar (W), Mumbai- 400 028.

Notice No.: ABACL/EXAM./26-27/18

Date: 7th September, 2026

NOTICE
PRACTICAL TRAINING (PT-III) EXAMINATION
THIRD YEAR GEN. LL.B.
&
FIFTH YEAR B.A. LL. B
A.Y. 2026-27

**Students are required to complete the following components for PT-III
(Total Marks 100)**

Component No.01: Moot Court (30 marks)

- 1) Written Memorial (15 Marks): Students should write in a Journal the Facts of the Case, Issues, Arguments (Petitioner or Respondent, as the case may be), and Prayers.
- 2) Oral Submission (15 Marks): 5 mins for Petitioner, 5 mins for Respondent, 5 mins for Rebuttal, if any.

Component No. 02: Observance of Trial Proceedings (30 marks)

1. Court Visit (15 Marks):
 - Students should attend the court visit as per the schedule.
 - Students should write a detailed report in the Journal on One Civil/Criminal case that they have attended in Court.
2. Police Station Visit (15 Marks):
 - Students should attend the Police Station visit as per the schedule.
 - Students should write a detailed report on the Police Station visit in the Journal.

Component No. 03: Internship at Lawyer's Office (20 marks)

- Students should write in the journal a detailed report on their internship at a Lawyer's office and the functioning of the office, pre-trial preparations, client counselling, etc.
- Students should attach photocopies of all the Internship Certificates of all five/ three years, along with the Internship Report.

Component No. 04: 20 marks

The examiner will conduct a Viva based on the above 3 components.

Instructions:

- Journals shall be collected from the college office from Wednesday, 9th September 2026 to 12th September 2026 between 11:40 am to 01:30 pm (Rs. 100/- per journal)
- The schedule of Court Visit, Police Station Visit, Moot Court, and Viva shall be conducted between **13th and 24th October 2026.**
- The detailed schedule of Court Visit, Police Station Visit, Moot Court, and Viva will be published later.
- The journal shall consist of:
 1. Moot Court Memorial.
 2. Court Visit Report.
 3. Police Station Visit Report.
 4. Internship report and copies of certificates
- All components in the journal shall be hand-written in blue or black ink with ball-point pen only.
- The dress code shall be Black and White Formals (I-card Compulsory).
- There will be no written Examination for PT-III

Important:

As per University Rules, it is compulsory to pass the Practical Training Examinations. No request for absence or adjustment in another slot will be considered under any circumstances. The college will not be responsible for any academic loss in case any student remains absent for any component.


Prof. Bhagyashree Patil
Faculty-in-Charge
Practical Training III
Third Year Gen. LL. B.




Prof. Neha Bhatt
Faculty- in- Charge
Practical Training III
Fifth Year B.A.LL.B.


Dr. Vaishali Gurav

I/C Principal
IN-CHARGE PRINCIPAL
ADV. BALASAHEB APTE COLLEGE OF LAW

PRACTICAL TRAINING III
(TY.GEN.LLB & 5th YEAR BA.LLB)

Allocation of Moot Court Propositions

The moot propositions for TY Gen. LL.B. and Fifth Year B.A. LL.B. students have been allotted as follows:

- **Roll Nos. 1 to 40: Proposition No. 1**
- **Roll Nos. 41 to 80: Proposition No. 2**
- **Roll Nos. 81 onwards: Proposition No. 3**

For each proposition:

- Students having odd roll numbers (1, 3, 5....) shall represent the Petitioner/Complainant/Appellant, as applicable.
- Students having even roll numbers(2, 4, 6,...) shall represent the Respondent/Opposite Party/Defendant, as applicable.

This allocation shall apply separately to both TY Gen. LL.B. and Fifth Year B.A. LL.B. students.

All students are required to prepare written submissions and oral arguments from the side allotted to them.

Note: The schedule for the oral rounds of the Moot Court and viva-voce will be between 13th and 24th October, 2026. Details time-table shall be shared in due course.



MOOT PROPOSITION I

Sahyadri Environment Protection Group v/s State of Maharashtra & Others

The village of Devgaon is situated near the Sahyadri hills in Raigad District, Maharashtra. A natural stream known as the Devkund Stream flows through the village and ultimately joins the Kundalika River. The stream is used by villagers for irrigation, fishing and other domestic purposes. The surrounding area also contains dense vegetation and serves as a habitat for several species of birds and small animals.

On 15th January 2025, the Maharashtra Industrial Development Corporation issued a notification proposing the establishment of the Devgaon Industrial and Logistics Park over approximately 75 hectares of land. The proposed project was intended to provide storage, packaging and transportation facilities to industries operating in Raigad District. On 10th March 2025, the State Environment Impact Assessment Authority granted environmental clearance to Western Logistics Private Limited, the company selected to develop the project. The clearance was granted subject to conditions relating to waste management, water conservation, plantation of trees and protection of the nearby stream.

The company began clearing the project site on 2nd June 2025. Several trees and bushes were removed. The company stated that the vegetation removed consisted mainly of shrubs and commercially planted trees and that no part of a protected forest was affected. During the monsoon in July 2025, the residents of Devgaon noticed muddy water and construction debris flowing into the Devkund Stream. A group of villagers also alleged that a temporary access road constructed by the company had partially blocked the natural flow of rainwater, resulting in waterlogging in nearby agricultural fields.

On 12th August 2025, the Sahyadri Environment Protection Group, a registered environmental organisation, submitted complaints to the Maharashtra Pollution Control Board and the District Collector, Raigad. The organisation alleged that the environmental clearance had been granted without properly considering the cumulative environmental impact of the project. It further claimed that the public consultation was inadequate because information regarding the project had not been made available in Marathi to the affected villagers.

The Maharashtra Pollution Control Board inspected the site on 25th August 2025. Its report stated that construction debris had been found near the stream but that no permanent obstruction had been created. The Board directed the company to remove the debris and construct protective barriers before continuing further work.

The company complied with the directions on 5th September 2025. It also submitted a report stating that more than 2,000 saplings would be planted around the project and that a modern rainwater-management system would be constructed. The company claimed that it had already invested 80 Crore (Eighty Crore) in the project and provided temporary employment to approximately 250 local workers.



On 18th September 2025, the organisation obtained an independent report from an environmental researcher. The report stated that continued construction could affect the natural drainage system and increase the risk of flooding. However, it also mentioned that a detailed study covering all seasons would be necessary to arrive at a final conclusion.

On 1st October 2025, the Sahyadri Environment Protection Group filed a writ petition in the High Court of Judicature at Bombay under Article 226 of the Constitution. It sought cancellation of the environmental clearance and an immediate stay on construction. The petitioner contended that the project violated Articles 14 and 21 of the Constitution, the Environment (Protection) Act, 1986, and the principles of sustainable development, precautionary principle and public trust doctrine.

The State Government and the company opposed the petition. They argued that all necessary permissions had been obtained, corrective measures had been undertaken and the petition was based on apprehensions rather than conclusive scientific evidence. They further contended that cancellation of the project would affect regional development, employment and substantial public and private investment.

The matter is pending before the Bombay High Court.

Issues for Consideration

1. Whether the Sahyadri Environment Protection Group has locus standi to file the present writ petition?
2. Whether the alleged inadequacy of public consultation and non-availability of information in Marathi violated the rights of the affected villagers?
3. Whether the construction activities violate the right to a clean and healthy environment under Article 21 of the Constitution?
4. Whether the precautionary principle requires suspension of the project despite the absence of conclusive scientific evidence of permanent environmental damage?

Note for students: All three propositions are fictional and prepared for academic purposes. Although the disputes are inspired by legal principles and contemporary issues, students should not assume that any allegation has already been proved. Both sides must identify the material facts, applicable laws, maintainability requirements, burden of proof and appropriate remedies.



MOOT PROPOSITION II

Meera Kulkarni v. QuickCart India Private Limited & Others

Meera Kulkarni, a schoolteacher residing in Pune, intended to purchase a laptop for conducting online classes and preparing educational material. On 5th June, 2025, she visited the website of QuickCart India Private Limited, an online marketplace.

QuickCart advertised a TechPro Vision Laptop manufactured by TechPro Electronics Limited. The advertisement described the laptop as suitable for professional work, video conferencing and continuous use for up to ten hours on a single charge. It also stated, "Two-year comprehensive manufacturer's warranty."

Relying upon the advertisement, Meera purchased the laptop for Rs.78,000/- on 6th June, 2025. The invoice mentioned TechPro Electronics Limited as the manufacturer and Digital World Enterprises as the authorised seller. The laptop was delivered to Meera on 9th June, 2025.

On 20th June, 2025, the laptop suddenly switched off during an online class. Similar incidents occurred on three subsequent occasions. Meera also found that the battery lasted only three to four hours even after being fully charged.

On 25th June, 2025, Meera raised a complaint through QuickCart's customer-support portal. QuickCart informed her that the fifteen-day replacement period had expired on 24th June, 2025, calculated from the date of delivery. It advised her to approach an authorised service centre of the manufacturer.

Meera deposited the laptop at the TechPro authorised service centre on 28th June, 2025. The service centre returned it on 5th July, 2025, stating that the operating system had been updated and that no hardware defect had been found.

The laptop again switched off unexpectedly on 8th July, 2025. On 10th July, 2025, Meera returned it to the service centre. After examining the laptop, the service centre informed her that liquid had entered the internal components and that such damage was not covered by the warranty.

Meera denied spilling any liquid on the laptop. She obtained a report from an independent computer technician on 15th July, 2025. The report stated that corrosion was found near the battery connector, but it could not conclusively determine whether it had resulted from liquid spillage, moisture during storage or a manufacturing defect.

On 18th July, 2025, Meera requested a replacement or refund from QuickCart, TechPro Electronics and Digital World Enterprises. QuickCart stated that it was merely an online intermediary connecting buyers and sellers. Digital World Enterprises stated that the sealed product had been delivered in good condition. TechPro Electronics relied on the service-centre report and rejected the warranty claim.

On 1st August, 2025, Meera purchased another laptop for Rs.65,000/- because she needed one for her employment. She claimed that the defective laptop had caused disruption of her classes, loss of professional reputation, mental harassment and additional financial expenditure.



On 20th August, 2025, Meera filed a consumer complaint before the District Consumer Disputes Redressal Commission, Pune, against QuickCart India Private Limited, TechPro Electronics Limited and Digital World Enterprises. She sought a refund of Rs. 78,000/-, reimbursement of Rs. 65,000/- spent on the second laptop and compensation of Rs. 2,00,000/- for mental agony and loss suffered by her.

The opposite parties denied liability. They contended that Meera had failed to establish a manufacturing defect through a qualified laboratory report. They also argued that the compensation claimed was excessive and that the cost of the second laptop could not be recovered because Meera continued to possess the first laptop.

The matter is pending before the District Commission.

Issues for Consideration

1. Whether the description of the laptop's battery life and warranty amounted to a misleading advertisement or an unfair trade practice?
2. Whether QuickCart India Private Limited can avoid liability by claiming that it is merely an online marketplace or intermediary.
3. Whether TechPro Electronics Limited and Digital World Enterprises are liable for defect in goods or deficiency in service?
4. Whether Meera is entitled to a refund, replacement, reimbursement of the cost of the second laptop and compensation?

Note for students: All three propositions are fictional and prepared for academic purposes. Although the disputes are inspired by legal principles and contemporary issues, students should not assume that any allegation has already been proved. Both sides must identify the material facts, applicable laws, maintainability requirements, burden of proof and appropriate remedies.



MOOT PROPOSITION III

Ananya Sharma v. Kabir Sharma

Ananya Sharma and Kabir Sharma, both Hindus, were married according to Hindu rites and ceremonies in Pune on 12th December, 2018. After their marriage, they resided in Mumbai. Ananya worked as a graphic designer and Kabir worked as a senior manager in a private company.

A daughter, Tara, was born to them on 15th August, 2020. In January, 2021, Ananya resigned from her employment to take care of Tara. Kabir's work required him to travel frequently. Over time, disagreements arose between the spouses regarding household expenses, childcare responsibilities and interference by their families.

Ananya alleged that Kabir frequently insulted her for being financially dependent upon him and strictly controlled household expenses. She also alleged that during an argument on 25th May, 2024, Kabir pushed her and threatened to separate her from Tara. Kabir denied these allegations. He stated that the argument was verbal and that he had never physically harmed Ananya.

On 10th June, 2024, Ananya left the matrimonial home with Tara and began residing with her parents in Pune. She did not file a police complaint at that time. She stated that she avoided legal proceedings because she hoped that the dispute would be settled through family intervention.

Between July and December, 2024, Kabir transferred ₹25,000 per month to Ananya for Tara's expenses. Ananya returned the transfers made in November and December. She claimed that Kabir had attached messages to the transfers demanding that she immediately return to Mumbai if she wanted continued financial support. Kabir denied attaching any such condition.

Kabir also alleged that Ananya did not allow him to meet Tara. Ananya stated that she had never completely denied access but had objected to Kabir taking Tara to Mumbai overnight without her.

On 5th January, 2025, Kabir filed a petition under Section 9 of the Hindu Marriage Act, 1955, before the Family Court, Pune, seeking restitution of conjugal rights. He stated that he was willing to rent a separate residence in Pune or Mumbai and resume married life without interference from either family.

Ananya opposed the petition. She argued that Kabir's conduct gave her a reasonable excuse to live separately and that she could not be compelled to resume cohabitation merely because he was now offering a separate residence.

On 20th February 2025, Ananya filed applications seeking maintenance for herself and Tara. She stated that Kabir earned approximately Rs. 2,20,000 per month and that she did not have an independent source of income. Kabir agreed to provide reasonable maintenance for Tara but opposed Ananya's personal claim. He argued that she was professionally qualified and had voluntarily remained unemployed.



From 1st April, 2025, Ananya began undertaking freelance design assignments. Her monthly income varied between ₹15,000 and ₹35,000. She did not disclose this income in her first affidavit of assets and liabilities. However, on 30th June, 2025, she filed a supplementary affidavit disclosing the freelance work and produced her bank statements.

Kabir argued that the initial non-disclosure showed that Ananya had not approached the Court with clean hands. Ananya stated that her freelance income was irregular and that she had disclosed it voluntarily soon after receiving regular assignments.

Both parties also applied for custody of Tara. Ananya argued that she had been Tara's primary caregiver since birth and that Tara was settled in a school in Pune. Kabir contended that Ananya was alienating Tara from him. He stated that he had obtained flexible working arrangements and that his parents were willing to assist him in caring for the child.

A counsellor appointed by the Family Court submitted a report on 15th September, 2025. The report stated that Tara was emotionally attached to both parents. It recommended that she should not be suddenly removed from her present school but should be given regular and meaningful access to Kabir.

The Family Court consolidated the proceedings concerning restitution of conjugal rights, maintenance and child custody. The matter is pending for final hearing.

Issues for Consideration

1. Whether Ananya withdrew from Kabir's society without a reasonable excuse and whether Kabir is entitled to restitution of conjugal rights under Section 9 of the Hindu Marriage Act, 1955?
2. Whether granting restitution of conjugal rights would unjustifiably interfere with Ananya's dignity, privacy and personal autonomy under Article 21?
3. What amount of maintenance, if any, should be awarded to Ananya and Tara considering the income, needs and responsibilities of both parties?
4. Whether custody of Tara should remain with Ananya or be granted to Kabir?

Note for students: All three propositions are fictional and prepared for academic purposes. Although the disputes are inspired by legal principles and contemporary issues, students should not assume that any allegation has already been proved. Both sides must identify the material facts, applicable laws, maintainability requirements, burden of proof and appropriate remedies.

