

28th BAR COUNCIL OF INDIA INTER UNIVERSITY MOOT COURT

COMPETITION, 2012

CLARIFICATIONS No. II

MOOT PROBLEM – I

- 1. Query:** Why is there a sudden mention of ‘repudiation’ in para9 of the First Problem? When and why was the repudiation proposed by VEX?
Response: No clarification is required; please read the contents of the problem as sufficient.
- 2. Query:** Did VEX have any independent transaction with any retailer?
Response: No clarification is required; please read the contents of the problem as sufficient.
- 3. Query:** What is the practice related to FAQs? Do consultancy firms generally put up the contact details?
Response: No clarification is required; please read the contents of the problem as sufficient.
- 4. Query:** Whether all the retailers whose identities and details have been published are the retailers of SUESS?
Response: No clarification is required; please read the contents of the problem as sufficient.
- 5. Query:** Whether it is an appeal by VEX in the light of the fact that the HC decided in favor of them and set aside the decree for damages? Should not it be an appeal preferred by SUESS?
Response: Refer to the clarifications tendered previously

MOOT PROBLEM - IV

- 1. Query:** In Problem 4, what are the functions of All Resources Management Company Ltd.? What is the nature of the company?
Response: No clarification is required; please read the contents of the problem as sufficient.
- 2. Query:** Para9 of the **Problem 4** mention about the permission of the government to clean the Temple. Why did TSI require the government’s permission to clean up the Temple?
Response: For entrustment of any archaeological site in the state of Vanar, to a party unconnected with the affairs of the site, prior permission of the government of Vanar is a mandatory prerequisite