**MOOT COURT-1**

Mukul Saikia& Ors ...,.,.., Petitioners

 **Vs**

State of Assam & Ors ………Respondents.

Facts of the case: The Assam Public Service commission [hereafter referred to as APSC] had issued an advertisement dated 19-8-1997 for filling up 27 posts of child Development Project Officer [hereinafter referred to as “CDPOs”]. Pursuant whereupon a selection process was held, Finally , a select list dated 17-7-2000 containing the names of 64 candidates for in excess of the notified vacancies was prepared and published by the APSC. Accordingly 27 candidates have been appointed. As many as 13 members of selection list of 64 wants challenge the selection process of the APSC. However, APSC said mere inclusion of names in the selection list does not amount to appointment of candidates and commission is permitted to fill up vacancies of 27 posts. However, the petitioner asked to be appointed in vacant/newly created posts as the same was refused.

**MOOT COURT – 2**

Khanapuram Gandaiah …. Petitioner

**Vs**

The Administrative Officer,

Ranga Reddy District Court & Ors, …. Respondent

**Facts of the case:** Petitioner claimed to be in exclusive possession of Ac. 8.35 of land bearing Survey No, 284 of Puppalaguda Village, Rajendernagar Mandal, Ranga Ruddy District as a Khouldar [cultivator) thereof. In the year 2002. one Dr. P. Mallikarjuna Rao filed a suit vide O.S.No.854 of 2002 before Additional Junior Civil Judge (west & south) Ranga Reddy District praying for perpetual injunction against the petitioner and another from entering into the above land. An interlocutory application for interim injunction tiled along with the said suit was dismissed by the Junior Civil Judge on the ground that the petitioner as in possession of the suit property and the said order, Dr. P. Mallikarjuna Rao filed C.M.A No 185 of 2002 and the same was dismissed whereby the order of the Junior Civil Judge was confirmed. It was the case of the petitioner that during the pendency of the above suit, the mother daughter and son-in-law of Dr. P. Mallikarjuua Rao had tiled three suits viz. O.S.Nos.805, 875 and 877 of 2003 before the 1st Additional Senor Civil Judge, Ranga Reddy District and the petitioner hrein was defendant in O.S.No.875 of 2003 and in the said suit, the trial court granted interim injection, against which the petitioner has preferred C.M.A.No.67 of 2005, which had been dismissed by respondent no,4 on 10-8-2006. The petitioner herein appears to be aggrieved by the order passed by respondent No.4 in the said CMA but he did not challenge the said order.

**MOOT COURT-3**

Mohammed Said & Others … **Appellant**

**Vs**

Dr. Sheik Mahfooz & Others … **Respondent**

**Facts of the case**: In a dispute between plaintiff and defendant over a property, the plaintiff in C.S. NO 131 of 2005 which was one the declaration under Order, 39 rule 142 of C.P.C. praying for interim injunction. The trial court restrained the defendant by way afar, as interim injunction.

Being aggrieved by the said order defendant no. I had preferred F.A.O. N.O. 298 of 2005 before the single bench High-court. Thu learned single judge disposed of the F.A.O. partly confirming the order of the trial court and making certain observations.

Being aggrieved by the judgment of the learned single judge a Letter Patent Appeal was filed before the division bench.

Brief facts your honour. The brief facts of the case as follows: