**MOOT COURT-1**

**Smt. Mula Dcvi & Anr.** … Petitioner

**vs**

**State of Uttarakhand** … Respondent

**Criminal Appeal No 1722 of 2008**

 **Facts of the case:** Puola Devi (hereinafter called deceased) daughter of PW 3 Amar Singh was married to Kamal Singh. Son of accused Dayal Singh in village Jaikot, District Tehri Garhwal. Accused Mula Devi is mother-in-law and accused Rajmati is sister-in-law of the deceased Puola Devi, always complained about the harassment being made to her by the accused whenever she visited her parental house. She often told that her in-laws used to ask her to give her jewellery to them else they would kill her. On 30-05-l990. Amar Singh [P.W.3][father of the deceased]. Who used to work in Delhi received a message there that his daughter Puola Devi has died. On the nest day at about 5P.M. he proceeded for his home village Kulpi. District Tehri (Jarhwal. and reached there on 01-06-1990. He went to the patwart and came to know that dead body of his daughter has already been taken to Narendra Nagar, It needs to be noted that in the interior hills of Uttaarkhand, certain Revenue Officials are given the police powers. Meanwhile, Lal Singh [P.W. I]. uncle of the deceased, had already lodged the first information report on 3o’ of May 1990. After he received information that Puola Devi had died n her in laws house. In the first information report.[Ext. A1] , Lal Singh in Village Jalkot, where she used to get harassment at the hands of her in-laws. He had also stated in his report that whenever Puola Devi used to come to her parental village she complained of the harassment meted out to her by the accused . She had apprehended that she would be killed in her in-laws house. Lal Singh [PW.1] at the end of the first information : report expressed suspicion that after committing murder of his niece Puoola Devi, kerosern oil was poured over her body and it was set on fire to conceal the fact of murder. On the basis of first information, crime No.02 of 1990 was registered against all the three accused persons under section 302 and 201 of IPC by Patti Patwari, Baman Gaon. The dead body of the deceased was taken into possession by Kapur Singh Payal [PW5] , Patwari, who initially investigated the crime He prepared the check report [Ext.A-3] on the basis of the first information report received from Lal Singh and made necessary entry in the general diary, copy of extract of which is Ext. A-A. He inspected the spot, took the dead body in his possession. prepared the inquest report [Ext. A-2] and other necessary papers including sketch of the dead body [Ext.A-6] POLICE FORM No 13 [Ext. A 7] sample of seal [Ext.A-8). He also prepared the site plan [Ext. A 5]. The dead body was sent for post mortem examination. Dr. P.R Raturi [P.W.7] Medical officer, Narendra Nagar conducted the autopsy on the dead body of Puola Devi on 1-6-90. at 10 AM., and prepared the post-mortem examination report [Ext. A-11]. The cause of death in the opinion of the Medical officer was asphyxia as a result of ante mortem strangulation. He also found postmortem burn injuries. Subsequently the investigation was taken up by, Bachan Singh [P.W.6). Patwari, who further interrogated the witnesses and arrested the accused persons,. After completion of the investigation, he submitted charge sheet [Extra -10] against all the three accused for their trial in respect of the offences punishable under section 302 and 201 IPC.

Your honor the brief facts of the case as follows :

**Brief Facts of the case:**

• Puola Devi, deceased, was married one Kamal Singh son accused Dayal Singh.

• Accused Mula Devi is mother-in-law and accused Rajmati is sister-in- law of the deceased.

• Puola Devi always complained about the harassment being made to her by the accused whenever she visited her parental house.

• She often told that her-in-laws used to ask her to give her jeweler to them else.

• She was killed on 30.5 1990

• Lal Singh uncle of the deceased had lodged the first information report on 30th of May 1990

• Crime no 02 of 1990 was registered against all the three accused persons under sections 302 and 201 of [PC by Patti Patwar, Baman Gaon.

Your honor, in this case the following Issues is involved.

Issues:

\* Whether circumstantial evidence reliable

\* Whether conviction can be made purely relying on circumstances

evidence.

Arguments:

**Arguments on behalf of Respondent**

Your honor my submission on 1 issue is.

**1st Issue :**  Whether circumstantial evidence reliable

Your honor, the circumstantial evidence is reliable to punish the accused as the following circumstances clearly support the guilty.

• It is established on record that Puola Devi, deceased, was daughter-in law of Mula Devi and sister-in-law of Rajmati and she used to live with them.

• It is established on record from the statement of P.W. 1 Lal Singh. uncle of the deceased and P.W.3.Amar Singh, father of the deceased that accused Mula Devi and Rajmati used to harass Puola Devi decease, and whenever she visited her parental house she always expressed apprehension that she might be killed on any day by them.

• It is established on the record from the medical evidence that cause of the death of Puola Devi was asphyxra as a result of antemortem strangulation.

• It is established from the oral evidence that there were burn unjuries on the body of the deceased and from the medical evidence it is also established that the burn injuries were post-mortem.

• It is also established on the record that incident had occurred Mula Devi and Rajmati used to live. It is not the case of the defence that anyone else was there in the house at that juncture.

• No FIR was lodged regarding death of Puola Devi from the side of the accused.

Your honor from the above circumstances it can be safely inferred that the accused persons intentionally killed the deceased Puola Devi.

Your honor it is well settled law that circumstantial evidence is reliable to punish the accused in the absence of direct evidence

Your honor in support of my case the provision of law is also very clear.

**Provision of law**: Sec. 3 of Indian Evidence Act, l872 says that all incriminating facts and circumstances found to be incompatible with innocence of accused, inference of guilt can be justified.

Inference of guilty, circumstances have to be proved beyond reasonable doubt and have to be shown to be closely connected with principal fact sought to be inferred there from.

Sec. 3 of Evidence Act says that regarding murder case, circumstantial evidence is sufficient as conviction can be made based solely on circumstantial evidence. But it should be tested by touchstone of law relating to circumstantial evidence laid down by Supreme court in various decisions. According to Section 300 of IPC with regard to murder case, the circumstantial evidence that the appellants allegedly committed murder of deceased for not fulfilling demand of jewellery and the circumstances that deceased mentioned to her parents that appellants used to harass her and further circumstance that the alleged incident occurred inside house where appellants used to live and no FIR was lodged by appellants clearly justified the conviction of accused.

**Prayer**: Your honor, my humble prayer is that, taking the facts and all relevant circumstances, evidence of witnesses and available evidence on the record into consideration, the court may be pleased to pass necessary judgment to convict the accused.

**MOOT COURT - 2**

Jagannath Misra …. Petitioner

 Vs.

State of Orissa …. Respondent

**Act :**

Defence of India Act and rules, 1962, Rule 30(1)(b)--Order under-Grounds of detention- Application of mind by detaining authority-Necessity of-.

**HEADNOTE**:

The petitioner was detained by an order issued under r. 30(1)0)) of the Defense of India Rules. He challenged the detention order in a petition under Art. 32 of the Constitution mainly on the ground that the order enumerated six out of eight possible grounds of detention which showed that the detaining authority had not really applied its mind to the matter. The affidavit filed by the Home Minister stated that the detention order was made on his personal satisfaction that it was necessary to detain the petitioner under the Rules “with a view to prevent him from acting in a manner prejudicial to the safety of India and maintenance of public order etc.”

**HELD**: (i) The order of detention under r. 30(1) (b) of the Rules deprives a citizen of this country of his personal liberty and in view of the suspension of some of the fundamental rights by the President on account of the emergency, a citizen has very limited opportunity of challenging an order of detention properly passed under the Rules. Section44 of the Defence of India Act says that there should be as little interference with the ordinary avocations of life and the enjoyment of property as may be consonant with the ensuring of the public safety and interest and the Defence of India and Civil Defence. If in ‘Any case it appears that the detaining authority did not apply its mind properly before making the order of detention the order in question would not be an order under the Rules and the person detained would be entitled to release. [137 F-138 C]

(ii) Of the eight grounds of detention in s. 3(2)(15) of the Defence of India Act one refers to foreigners i.e. of being of hostile origin. An Indian Citizen can thus be detained on seven possible grounds and the detention order in the present case mentioned six of them. However in the affidavit filed by the Minister only two of these grounds namely safety of India and the maintenance of public order were mentioned. In these circumstances there could be little doubt that the authority concerned did not apply its mind properly before the order in question was passed in the present case. Such a discrepancy between the grounds mentioned in the order and the grounds stated in the affidavit of the authority concerned can only show an amount of casualness in passing the order of detention against the provisions of S. 44 of the Act. [138 D-H] Casualness was also apparent from the conjunctive ‘or’ used in the order showing that it was more or less a copy of S. 3(2) (15). The use of the word ‘etc.’ in the affidavit was another example of casualness. This casualness showed that the mind of the authority concerned was really not applied to the question of detention of the petitioner. The order of detention passed without application of mind was no order under the Rules and the petitioners was entitled to release. (139C)

(iii) The fact that the order of detention was not written by the Minister himself but by his subordinates was irrelevant. It is the duty of the Minister to see that the order issued is in accordance with his satisfaction and carries out his directions. [139 G]

**JUDGMENT**:

ORIGINAL JURISDICTION : Writ Petition No. 97 of 1965. Petition under Art. 32 of the Constitution of India for the enforcement of fundamental rights.

R. K. Garg for the petitioner.

N. S. Bindra and R. N. Sachthey for the respondent. The Judgment of the Court was delivered by Wanchoo, J. This petition for a writ of habeas corpus under Art. 32 of the Constitution was heard by us on December 7, i965. We then directed the release of the petitioner and indicated that reasons will follow later. We proceed to do so now.

The petitioner was detained by an order issued under r. 30- (i) (b) of the Defence of India Rules (hereinafter referred to as the Rules) by the Government of Orissa on December 29, 1964. He raised a number of grounds challenging his detention. It is unnecessary to refer to all the grounds raised by the petitioner. It is enough to say that one of the grounds raised by him was, that the order of detention passed by the State Government was not based upon the satisfaction of the Government. The order was in these terms :-

“Order No. 8583/C, Bhubaneswar, the 29th December, 1964.

“WHEREAS the State Government is satisfied that with a view to preventing Shri Jagannath Misra, son of Biswanath Misra, viii. Bhandarisahi, P. S. Parlakemedi, District Ganjam, from acting in any manner prejudicial to the defence of India and civil defence, the public safety, the maintenance of public order, India’s relations with foreign powers, the maintenance of peaceful conditions in any part of India or the efficient conduct of military operations, it is necessary so to do, the Governor of Orissa in exercise of the powers conferred by rule 30(1) (b) of the Defence of India Rules, 1962, is pleased to direct that the said
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Shri Jagannath Misra shall be detained until further orders.

By order of the Governor, Sd. Secretary to Government.”

It will be noticed that the order mentions six grounds on the basis of which the petitioner was ordered to be detained, namely, acting in any manner prejudicial to (i) the defence of India and civil defence, (ii) the public safety, (iii) the maintenance of public order, (iv) India’s relations with foreign powers, (v) the maintenance of peaceful conditions in any part of India, and (vi) the efficient conduct of military operations. As the petitioner had raised the contention that the order had not been passed on the satisfaction of the State Government we ordered the Minister concerned to file an affidavit in this behalf. Consequently, the Home Minister of the Government of Orissa who deals with matters of detention, has filed an affidavit to show that the order in question was passed after the State Government was satisfied of the necessity thereof. It is stated in this affidavit that the petitioner was ordered to be detained on December 29, 1964, by the order in question and was actually detained on December 30, 1964. The affidavit then goes on to say that after the outbreak of hostilities between China and India and the declaration of emergency by the President a close watch was set on the movements and activities of persons who either individually or as a part of an Organisation were acting or were likely to act in a manner prejudicial to the safety of India and maintenance of public order, and in this connection particular attention was paid to the activities of the members of that section of the Communist Party which came to be known as the pro-Peking faction of the Party. The petitioner was a member of the pro-Peking faction and was under close and constant watch. From the reports received regarding the activities of the petitioner the Home Minister stated in the affidavit that he was personally satisfied that it was necessary to detain the petitioner under the Rules ‘with a view to prevent him from acting in a manner prejudicial to the safety of India and maintenance of public order, etc.” The affidavit goes on to say that the decision to detain the petitioner was made on the personal satisfaction of the Minister and that the satisfaction was based on several reports placed before the Minister with respect to the activities of the petitioner. 137

The principal contention on behalf of the petitioner in relation to and against the affidavit of the Home Minister is that it is clear from a perusal of the affidavit that the Minister did not apply his mind in the matter of the detention of the petitioner. it is urged that the order in question contains six grounds of detention. These six grounds practically cover all the grounds. specified in s. 3(2) (15) of the Defence of India Act (hereinafter referred to as the Act) except two, namely-(i) the security of the State and (ii) of being of a hostile origin. it is therefore urged that the order was made copying out practically all the grounds specified in s. 3 (2) (1.5) of the Act without the application of the mind of the Minister whether those grounds were made out in this case. Reliance in this connection is placed on the affidavit of the Home Minister where he has stated that he was personally satisfied that it was necessary to detain the petitioner in order to prevent him from acting in a manner prejudicial to the safety of India and maintenance of public order, etc. It is: urged that the affidavit shows that the Minister did not really apply his mind to the question of the detention of the petitioner and the grounds for doing so and acted in a casual manner in approving the detention of the petitioner. it is urged that while the grounds specified in the order are six in number, the Minister when speaking of his satisfaction has mentioned only two, namely, safety of India (which may be assumed to be the same as the public safety) and maintenance of public sector. There is in our opinion force in this contention on behalf of the petitioner. The order of detention under r. 30 (i) (b) of the Rules deprives a citizen of this country of his personal liberty and in view of the suspension of some of the fundamental rights by the President on account of the emergency, a citizen has very limited opportunity of challenging an order of detention properly passed under the Rules. It seems to us therefore necessary where detention is made under the Rules that the authority ordering detention should act with a full sense of responsibility keeping in mind on the one hand the interests of the country in the present emergency and on the other hand the importance of the liberty of the citizen in a democratic society. That this is so is also emphasised by s. 44 of the Act which lays down that “any authority or person acting in pursuance of this Act shall interfere with the ordinary avocations of life and the enjoyment of property as little as may be consonant with the purpose of ensuring the public safety and interest and the defence of India and civil defence.” In view of this specific provision in the Act

**MOOT COURT PROBLEM – 3**

Sujatha ………… Petitioner

Vs.

Rajender ……….. Respondent

**Facts of the Case :**

 Sujatha, a young girl about 18 years of age, was staying with her parents in village Kothi, district Bilaspur, (H.P.). the accused, Rajinder @ Raju, resident of village Duhak, district Bilasur, had taken contract for laying G.I. pipelines in village Kothi near the residence of the victim, in that connection, he used to store his material in the house of victim parents. On January 16, 1996, Sujatha, had some throat pain. When the accused came to the house of the victim and came to know that the victim has been suffering from throat pain, he suggested to the mother of the victim that his cousin at Ghumarwin was a doctor and if permitted, he could show the victim to his cousin. The mother of the victim agreed. The accused took the victim on his scooter at about 3.00 p.m. Instead of taking the victim to Ghumarwin he took her to jablu stating that he had to collect the rent from his tenants. From Jablu the accused took victim to Berthin. The accused reached Bertain at about 8.00 – 8.30 p.m. along with the victim. At Berthin, the accused bought some sweets and told the victim that he would take her 0 his house as it was dark. The accused instead of taking her to his house, took the scooter to some kachha road and made her to get down from the scooter. After spreading his pattu on the ground and gagging the victim mouth made her lie down; un-tied her salwar and committed the sexual intercourse with her foreibly. The accused then left her leaving behind his pattu and torch. After the accused had left the victim saw some light from a house down the road. She walked up to that house and told the lady Smt. Bimla Devi, residing there, of the incident. The victim stayed overnight in the house of smt. Bimala Devi told the whole incident to her husband. In the morning her husband called villagers; the statement of Victim was recorded by one of the villager viz. Roop Singh. The FIR was then registered at the Ghumarwin police station the Victim and the accused were got medically examined. The investing officer took the apparel of the ‘victim in his possession and the same was sent for chemical analysis along with agina1 slide and underwear of the accused. During the investigation it also transpired that the victim belonged to scheduled Caste.

**Brief Facts:**

I, The victim Sujaiha is 18 years of age.

2. The accused Rajendra is a contractor of pipeline.

3. The accused was staying near the house of victim and have close relationships with victims parents and used to go victims house often,

4. When victim was suffering from throat pain, the accused took her with consent of her mother saying that he knew the doctor and the doctor was his relative

5. The accused instead of taking her to the doctor, he took her to the alone place and committed rape forcibly.

6. During the examination, the accused deposed that she has consented for sexual intercourse.

7. There were no injuries on the private parts.

8. In the medical examination, it was revealed that hymen was ruptured.

**Issues**:

I. Whether absence of injuries on victim head to an inference that she consented for sexual intercourse.

2. Whether testimony of victim is sufficient to base conviction.

**Arguments**:

Your honor, the first issue for the consideration of this honorable court is, whether absence of injuries on victim leads to any inference that she consented for sexual intercourse.

Your honor, it is submitted that in the con1est of Indian culture, a woman victim of sexual aggression would rather suffer silently than to falsely implicate somebody. Any statement of rape is an extremely humiliating experience tot a woman ad until she is a victim of sex crime, she could not blame anyone but the real culprit. While appreciating the evidence of the proscutrix, the courts must always keep in mind that no self respecting woman would put her honour at stake by falsely alleging commission of raps on her and, therefore, ordinarily a look for corroboration of her testimony is unnecessary and uncalled for. But for high improbability in the prosecution case, the conviction in the case of sex crime may be based on the sold testimony of the prosecutrix.

Your honor, it is submitted that the victim in her deposition has been categorical, clear and unequivocal that the accused committed foreible sexual intercourse with her, she testified.

Your honour, it is submitted that the accused had threatened her with a dagger before jablu when she refused to go with him.

Your honor, it is clear from the medical report that her private part was injured and her hay men was ruptured.

Your honor, it is submitted that absence of injuries either on her body or private parts rules out the prosecution case of forcible sexual intercourse.

Your honor, in support of my case, I adduce one citation,

**Provision of law :**

In the case of State Of Rajasthan vs. N.K. the court held that the victim of rape stating on oath that she was forcibly subjected to sexual intercourse of that the act was done without her consent has to be believed and accepted like any another testimony unless there is material available to draw an inference as to her consent or else the testimony of victim is such as would he inherently improbable.

In the case of Gurmit Singh the court held that the court must, while evaluating evidence, remain alive to the fact that in a case or raps. no self-respecting women would come forward in a court just to make a humiliating statement against her honor such as I involved in the commission of rape on her.

**Prayer**: Your honor, my humble prayer is that, taking the evidence and available material into consideration into, the court may be pleased to punish the accused with rigorous imprisonment otherwise the value of the woman would be defeated.

**EXECRISE-4**

**INTERVIEWING TECHINQUES AND PRE-TRTAL PREPARATIONS**

……06-07-2015

I went to the chamber of the advocate introduced my self to him and said him that as final year student of law. I have to observe pre-trial preparation for a month as part of my course and also requested to allow to sit on observed in his office.

He permitted me to sit in his chamber observe preparations. I went the office regular at every working days at 9am.

While we were sitting in the office the advocate was verifying the case diary then one came to the office and told to the advocate that his brother was arrested by police while he was returning to home from the temple and kept him in the custody.

The advocate enquired about the arrest and asked him in which police station he was kept in custody. He said that his brother was kept in the west police station of Tirupati.

The advocate made a telephone to the police station and asked about the arrest of karunakaran brother of Karthi keyan and he told to him that he was arrested for theft. We have to move hail for his release and get on the details of the arrested person and prepared o move bail.

06-07-2015………………….

On this day a client Sudhakar came to the chamber and gave a promissory note down for sum of Rs. 1 0000 by Anil a co-employee of the client . He also said that Kumar did nor repay the promissory note amount though he had demanded him for many times. He requested him [advocate] make ways to get the amount from Krishnan.

The counsel advised him that a legal note should be served to Krishnan for the recovery of the amount concerned with an advised to give to reply we would take necessary action according to the reply otherwise may file a case on him. He gathered all details of the debtor Krishnan.

06-07-2015………………..

On this day a person came to the lawyer chamber and told him that his son was arrested by police last night while returning from the theater after watching the second show while the police enquiring he gave no reply to them because of the fear so on the suspicious ground police arrested him so he wanted to take his son out of the custody of the police. The advocate asked him in which police station his son was arrested and the client said that the west police station nagery.

The advocate sent his junior with that person to know the reason for

the arrest and take necessary steps to relieve him from the police custody.

07-07-2015

On this day a person came to the chamber and seeking advice on his matrimonial life. He told that his marriage was taken place at Padmavathi Kalyana Mandapam Tirupati on With Sujatha wife they lived happily for two years. One day she went her parents house to take test for some days and she did not feel well.

But after that she did not came back . He went there asked her to come back, but there is no reply on part of the his wife.

In meantime he sent his family members to her and they advised and her asked her family members also to make her to come with them. They also got no proper reply. After telling all the factors, he requested the advocate to what do and hat relief he is entitled by law.

The advocate asked him whether he wants to live with her or not. He replied yes and then the counsel advised him that he has a right to file a petition against his wife. After giving the legal notice they have to give legal notice in reply to that. In that reply he nut know the reasons for not coming to his house.

07-07-2015

…………….

Today a person came to his office and told that he borrowed a sum of Rs. 1000 from X a promissory note also made by him to the creditor. I am paying the monthly interest regularly. While so the creditor z sent him a legal notice for recovery of the amount without asking anything Z from him.

The advocate advised him that the creditor’s act is correct because the period of limitation will expire in this month. He sent also suggested to him to sent a legal notice to him on the point of the promissory note amount . He agreed and the advocate prepared to send legal notice to the creditor.

07-07-2015

………………..

On this day a person X came to the office and said to the advocate that he was the owner of the house in Gnddi Nagar, Tirupati. He let the house for monthly rent for a period of 6 months and monthly rent of Rs. 600. The tenant did not paid the monthly rent and also agree to evict the house so he wanted to evict that tenant from the house and to recover the rent due of Rs.3600.

The advocate advised him to send a legal notice to him to evict and pay the rent amount within 15 days. If he did so there was no need to take any citron otherwise we have to file a case on him in the court for the eviction and collection of the amount.

08-07-2015

…………………

Today a person came to his office to apply for an injunction. He told that in the vacant land situated in Srinivasa Nagapuram village his neighbor is trying to occupy it or his own. But he is the real owner of the land, so the neighbor has no right to occupy his property. So he wants to file a petition for grant of an injunction order against the encroachment of the neighbors. He gave documents to the property concerned. The advocate scrutinized and prepared to file an injunction petition as the prima facio evidence of the documents given by the client.

Today a lady came to the office and told to the advocate, she was married with one M. Suresh S/O Chengaiah on ……………………her husband left her alone and went to Bangalore, She went there and asked him to provide maintenance and to live with him. But the husband sent her out of his house, scolded her if she come to him with the relationship of wife he will kill her. She asked advice and remedy through court.

The advocate advised her that fist we had to sent a legal notice to him for the restitution of conjugal right. if there is no reply to the notice we will file a maintenance petition against her husband and prepared for the same.

08-07-2015……………..

Today a person came to the office with a summons to him from court. He said that he obtained a loan from SBI Tirupati but paid no dues because his Industry started with the loan amount is not functioning because of change of law. The Bank sent the summons through court for the recovery of the loan amount and requested the advocate to defend from case filed against him. The advocate advised him to arrange the amount to pay or he will arrange to pay the amount after an year on some due dates. But the client said he has no means to repay the amount so he asked the advocate to defend him from the loan.

The advocate prepared vakalat fro the defense of the client and received the summon sent to him by the court.

….08-07-2015………….

Today, a person who is a client already filed Vakalatnama for the defense. The advocate asked the documents for the purpose to prepare counter for the defense of the diem. F he client gave some documents and some details. The advocate prepared counter for the defense of the client by referring many books.

08-07-2015……………..

Today a group of persons came to the chamber and told to the advocate that there was a fight at last night. In this many persons were injured. The police came to the spot and arrested four persons and kept them in this custody and asked him o take them out of police custody.

The advocate made a telephone to the police station and enquired under which ground there were arrested. In the reply we came to know that all the four persons are arrested and charged under section 307 IPC attempt murder and other sections for hurt a grievous hurt.

The advocate told that the persons arrested are arrested under non boilable sections. The case is serious in nature.

So advice them to move bail for them. He gathered details of the persons arrested and also advised to arrange sureties of the bail.

….08-07-2015

……….

In this day a person came to the chamber and told to the advocate that he is a tenant in the house owner without giving any information and time try to assist him though there is an agreement between them so he requested the advocate to tile an injunction petition against the eviction of the house owners.

The advocate advised him that there are many grounds to protect the tenants from the house owner so need not worry and he will file an injunction petition against the eviction and collected the details of the case.

...09-07-2015

Today a person came to die chamber and asked the advocate to file a suit for specific performance against a contractor.

The advocate asked the details the agreement and the conduction before and obtained advance for the same. But he failed to do so The non performance of the contractor caused a lot of lose to him such as interest and so on.

So he requested the advocate to file a case against the contractor for the performance of the specific work and to recovery of the lose caused by the delay of the contractor.

The advocate received the agreement from the client and calculated the lose caused to the client ay the an performance of the contractor and he prepared to file a suit against the contractor tar specific performance.

….09-07-2015

……………..

On this day a woman came to the office of the advocate and asked him to file a divorce petitioner against her husband

The advocate asked the reasons and details of her contention.

She bandana her husband were married on She and her husband lived together for one year. After the (lay she came to know that her husband had illegal relationship with another woman who is working with her husband. So she decided to get divorce from her husband under the ground of bigamy or Adultery.

The advocate received the details concerned and prepared a divorce petition and advised her to come nest week and got signature of the lady.

10-07-2015

 ……………..

Today a man came to his office. He told that he gave a loan to a person A who is living in a living in a Hindu joint family A is ready to repay his loan amount. But he has no money in his hands. So he wants to give his share for the debt from the property of the Hindu joint family.

The other coparceners of the family reused to give share to him. So A as a coparcener is having right in that property of the joint family. He registered his shack to him for the repayment of debt. So he wants to get the share from the property.

The advocate scrutinizing a the documents and details related to the case told that told to the client that the client has the right to file a petition for general partition towards the joint family property.

10-07-2015

…………….

Today, a person came to the chamber and asked the advocate to defend him from the creditor who claims for the possession and ownership of the mortgaged property which he mortgaged for the debt and to get some more period to the repayment of the due.

The advocate received the mortgaged deed copy and other details. Then he advised him to file a written statement for the claim of the mortgages and also to file a petition for the extension of period for the repayment of the debt.