
AEQUITAS
JURIS AEQUITAS
& Co.
LAW CHAMBERS
PRESENTS
NATIONAL ONLINE
MEMORIAL DRAFTING
COMPETITION
2026
PRIZE DETAILS
1st Prize — ₹3,000
2nd Prize — ₹2,000
3rd Prize — ₹1,000
4th Prize — ₹750
5th Prize — ₹500
Places 6 to 15 — ₹250 each
TOTAL PRIZE POOL:
₹10,000

ABOUT THE JURIS AEQUITAS & CO. LAW CHAMBERS

1. **Juris Aequitas & Co. Law Chambers is a premier legal institution founded on the dual pillars of traditional authority and modern equity. The firm's nomenclature encapsulates its core philosophy: "Juris" represents the absolute rigor and precision of statutory law, while "Aequitas" signifies the pursuit of equity, fairness, and justice under the rule of law. Designed to bridge the gap between high-level institutional governance and grassroots citizen accessibility, the firm advises a diverse clientele ranging from corporate entities and public policymakers to civil society organizations and marginalized individuals.**

2. **The practice specializes in a broad spectrum of contemporary legal domains, with particular emphasis on Constitutional Law, Public Interest Litigation (PIL), Administrative Governance, and Commercial Litigation. By integrating rigorous academic research with practical advocacy, the chambers actively engage in landmark appellate litigation, policy drafting, and complex institutional dispute resolution before apex judicial forums. The firm is widely recognized for its commitment to defending fundamental rights, maintaining fiscal and administrative accountability, and ensuring that the constitutional promise of equality reaches every strata of society.**

3. **Beyond core litigation, Juris Aequitas & Co. plays an active role in legal education, academic outreach, and fostering the next generation of legal scholars through national advocacy initiatives and rigorous drafting competitions. Characterized by its unwavering dedication to ethical practice and intellectual depth, the chambers continue to shape progressive jurisprudence while upholding the highest standards of professional integrity in the Indian legal landscape.**

ABOUT THE COMPETITION

1. **The National Online Memorial Drafting Competition (2026 – 2027) is a national-level legal research and advocacy initiative organized by Juris Aequitas & Co. Law Chambers scheduled between December 2026 and January 2027, the competition is designed to provide aspiring legal minds, law students, and researchers across the nation with an immersive platform to hone their persuasive writing, statutory analysis, and memorial drafting skills.**

2. **The competition centers on a contemporary, balanced constitutional law proposition set before the Supreme Court of Bharat. The problem dissects a high-stakes public interest challenge involving state welfare governance, fiscal responsibility, and fundamental rights specifically examining the constitutional validity of universal direct cash grant schemes financed through external public debt. Participants are tasked with navigating complex constitutional doctrines, including equality under Article 14, socio-economic entitlements under Article 21, directive principles under Articles 38 and 39, and state borrowing limits under Article 293.**

3. Open to undergraduate law students enrolled in 3-year and 5-year LL.B. programs, the event evaluates submissions through a rigorous, double-blind assessment process. Evaluators score memorials based on structural clarity, depth of legal research, logical coherence, and adherence to formal citation standards (such as Bluebook/OSCOLA). Beyond competing for prestige, cash prizes, and certificates of merit, participants gain valuable experience in constructing adversarial appellate briefs on pressing fiscal and constitutional controversies facing modern welfare states.

RULES OF THE COMETITION

Definition:

1. Competition refers to National Online Memorial Drafting Competition, 2026 - 27
2. Organizing Committee means the committee, including any authorized persons, appointed for the administration and conduct of the competition and of all events leading to the competition.
3. Moot Proposition means the official hypothetical problem which has been drafted and published for use in the Competition.

Mode and Language:

1. The competition will be held online, and all submissions must be in English

Eligibility:

1. Students currently enrolled in a three-year or five-year law degree course at any recognised University, Law college, or Institution may participate.
2. There is no limit on the number of entries from any one College or University

Team Composition:

1. A team may have one or two members, each meeting the eligibility criteria.
2. Institutions may register multiple teams, including from different Universities, Law Schools, Colleges, or Departments.

Registration:

Registration fee (non-refundable and non-transferable in all circumstances):

Team - Max upto 2 Participants Fee:

Individual : Rs. 500/-

Team of two : Rs. 800/-

Registration link: https://docs.google.com/forms/d/1GL6kwPJqwZ57dyh9-NpXpedeXL0Jr8Cf4IZN8j5r-0g/edit

Payment link: Scanner is inserted in the registration form

After paying, participants must upload a screenshot of the payment in the registration Google Form, False Payment Receipt will lead to non acceptance and the registration will not be accepted.

Important Dates:

1.	**Registration Opens**	**20.11.2026**
2.	**Late date for registration**	**20.01.2027**
3.	**Team code Allocation**	**22.01.2027**
4.	**Last date to seek Clarification**	**23.01.2027**
5.	**Memorial Submission Deadline**	**25.01.2027**
6.	**Announcement of Results**	**31.01.2027**

Submission of Memorials:

1. **Each participant or team must prepare one memorial, on behalf of both the Petitioner/Appellant and the Respondent.**
2. **Memorials must be submitted through the designated G-form: https://docs.google.com/forms/d/e/1FAIpQLSdPgnLGv_ayPj6QRO1tEMoVyGhMkcv1tOxANPaE-5KcUMYaig/viewform?usp=publish-editor**
3. **Late submissions will not be accepted under any circumstances.**

Formatting Guidelines:

1. **Submit the memorial in PDF (.pdf) format.**
2. **Body text: A4 page, Times New Roman, size 12, 1.5-line spacing, 1-inch margins on all sides justified.**
3. **Footnotes: Times New Roman, size 10, single spacing, justified.**
4. **Citations: Every source or authority must be cited in accordance with the Bluebook Citation (20 ed)**
5. **Required components, in order:**

   A. Cover Page

   B. Table of Contents

   C. List of Abbreviations

   D. Index of Authorities

   E. Statement of Jurisdiction

   F. Statement of Facts

   G. Issues Raised

H. Summary of Arguments

I. Arguments Advanced

J. Prayer

K. Annexures (optional)

6. **Length: The memorial must not exceed 40 pages, and the Arguments Advanced must not exceed 25 pages.**
7. **Cover page colour: Blue for the Petitioner and Red for the Respondent.**
8. **The Team Code must appear in the upper right corner of the cover page.**
9. **The cover page must also state: (a) Team Code, (b) Name of the Court/Forum, (c) Jurisdiction, (d) Cause Title, and (e) the party on whose behalf the memorial is filed.**
10. **The List of Abbreviations may include only abbreviations actually used in the memorial. Each unused abbreviation attracts a penalty of 1 mark. The Index of Authorities must give the page number(s) where each authority is cited.**
11. **Memorials will be accepted only through the G-form:**
12. **Any identifying information about the participants anywhere in the memorial will result in immediate disqualification.**
13. **Penalties for violation of the rules and regulations of the competition will be decided by the organizing committee.**
14. **The submission must maintain a plagiarism and AI detection score of less than 10%**

<u>Evaluation</u>: Memorials will be marked out of 100

Criterion	Marks
Knowledge of law and facts	10 Marks
Jurisdiction	20 Marks
Identification and Interpretation of application of law	20 Marks
Research and use of relevant precedent	20 Marks
Clarity and organisation	20 Marks
Structure, Drafting, Citation, and overall presentation of the memorial	10 Marks
Total	100 Marks

<u>General Rules</u>:

1. **The Judges' decision on results is final.**
2. **No additional documentation will be permitted.**
3. **In any situation not covered by these rules, the organisers' decision is final and binding.**
4. **The organisers may amend the rules, but participating teams will be given due notice.**

5. **Participants must comply with all rules set by the Organising Committee. Non compliance may result in a deduction of marks.**

6. **All certificates will be digital, digitally signed, and emailed to the address given in the registration form.**

7. **Participants should check their email regularly for updates.**

Prizes:

Winner	**Rs. 3,000/- + Certificate of Merit**
First Runner Up	**Rs. 2,000/- + Certificate of Merit**
Sccond Runner Up	**Rs. 1,000/- + Certificate of Merit**
Thrid Runner Up	**Rs. 750/- + Certificate of Merit**
Fourth Runner Up	**Rs. 500/- + Certificate of Merit**
Best Performance	**Rs. 250/-(Top 10 positions) + Certificate of Merit**

All participants shall be given a certificate of participation

Contact of any quries: jurisaequitasco@gmail.com

JURIS AEQUITAS & Co. LAW CHAMBERS

MOOT PROPOSITION

BEFORE THE HON'BLE SUPREME COURT OF BHARAT

WRIT PETITION (CIVIL) NO. _____OF 2026

(UNDER ARTICLE 32 OF THE CONSTITUTION OF BHARAT)

JAN HITAISHI FOUNDATION (NGO) ... PETITIONER

VERSUS

UNION OF BHARAT & STATE OF DRAVIDAPURAM ... RESPONDENTS

¶ 1. The Union of Bharat is a democratic, sovereign republic committed to the ideals of a welfare state as enshrined under the Directive Principles of State Policy in Part IV of its Constitution. Over the last decade, the socio-economic landscape of Bharat has witnessed rapid transformation, marked by accelerated digitization, targeted poverty alleviation programs, and expanding social safety nets. However, fiscal governance across several constituent States has increasingly come under public scrutiny. Questions have arisen regarding the sustainability of large-scale universal welfare initiatives balanced against long-term capital expenditure, national debt ceilings, and fiscal discipline principles mandated under constitutional and statutory frameworks.

¶ 2. The State of Dravidapuram, situated in the southern peninsular region of Bharat, is recognized as one of the most industrialized and urbanized States in the country. Despite its strong economic performance, Dravidapuram has consistently grappled with structural fiscal stress, characterized by growing revenue deficits and an expanding public debt portfolio. In June 2025, the newly elected State Government of Dravidapuram fulfilled its key electoral promise by announcing the launch of a flagship social welfare scheme titled the "Magalir Urimai Thogai Scheme" (Women's Financial Rights Scheme, hereinafter referred to as "MUT Scheme").

¶ 3. Under the executive notification establishing the MUT Scheme, the State Government promised an unencumbered monthly financial transfer of ₹1,200 directly into the bank

accounts of every adult woman residing in Dravidapuram who had attained the age of eighteen years. Unlike traditional social safety net programs that employ strict proxy-means testing, poverty-line thresholds, or income categorization, the MUT Scheme was rolled out with near-universal eligibility, barring minor automatic exclusions for institutional tax-filers and high-ranking public officials. The declared objective was to recognize women's unpaid care work, enhance financial autonomy, and elevate gender equity across socio-economic strata.

¶ **4.** Within six months of implementation, the MUT Scheme enrolled over 12 million female beneficiaries across the State, resulting in an annual fiscal commitment exceeding ₹17,000 Crores for the Dravidapuram State Exchequer. To finance this unprecedented recurring outlay, the State Finance Department resorted to off-budget borrowings, restructured ongoing infrastructure allocations, and raised market loans through specialized state-owned financial vehicles. Reports from state financial audits indicated that capital expenditure on primary education infrastructure, public healthcare modernization, and rural road networks suffered a budgetary contraction of nearly 22% during the same financial year.

¶ **5.** To meet immediate liquidity requirements and stabilize its balance sheet, the State Government of Dravidapuram entered into bilateral loan agreements with external institutional lenders, including international development finance organizations. These loans, negotiated under state guarantees, carried variable interest rates and stringent repayment schedules. Financial analysts and civil society groups expressed deep alarm over the State's escalating debt-to-GSDP ratio, which breached the benchmark threshold of 28% prescribed under the Dravidapuram Fiscal Responsibility and Budget Management (FRBM) Act, 2003, raising structural concerns regarding long-term fiscal solvency.

¶ **6.** Public opinion within Dravidapuram became sharply divided over the execution of the scheme. Proponents of the MUT Scheme, including feminist economists, grassroots activists, and beneficiary groups, lauded the initiative as a revolutionary step toward economic emancipation. Field surveys demonstrated that for millions of marginalized and low-income women, the monthly disbursement provided crucial relief against inflationary

pressures, enabling independent spending on nutrition, child healthcare, sanitation, and micro-savings, thereby fostering gender empowerment at the household level.

¶ **7.** Conversely, a substantial section of economists, tax-paying citizens, and policy researchers voiced strong opposition, arguing that universal disbursements to affluent and middle-class households represented an inefficient allocation of scarce public resources. Opponents highlighted that distributing unconditional financial handouts without strict poverty-based targeting degraded the fiscal capacity of the State to deliver essential public goods, incentivized economic dependency, and burdened future generations with unserviceable public debt accrued primarily to fund non-developmental revenue expenditure.

¶ **8.** Jan Hitaishi Foundation, a prominent non-governmental organization registered under the laws of Bharat, committed to promoting public financial accountability and constitutional governance, initiated a comprehensive evaluation of the MUT Scheme. Relying on official audit disclosures and socio-economic data obtained through public filings, the Foundation compiled a detailed empirical report. The report concluded that while direct cash transfers to vulnerable populations living below the poverty line were vital, universal coverage without means-testing led to extensive resource misallocation and systemic fiscal instability.

¶ **9.** The Petitioner NGO submitted formal representations to both the State Government of Dravidapuram and the Ministry of Finance, Union of Bharat, urging an immediate structural restructuring of the scheme. The Petitioner advocated for transitioning the MUT Scheme from a near-universal benefit to a targeted socio-economic safety net focused exclusively on households falling below the revised multidimensional poverty index. The representations further highlighted that funding un-renewable consumer spending through foreign debt obligations undermined national macroeconomic stability and violated the public trust doctrine in fiscal management.

¶ **10.** Receiving no formal recourse or policy adjustment from the executive authorities, Jan Hitaishi Foundation filed a Public Interest Litigation (PIL) under Article 32 of the Constitution of Bharat before the Supreme Court of Bharat. The Petition impugned the executive notification governing the MUT Scheme in Dravidapuram, while also praying

for comprehensive judicial guidelines regulating the deployment of un-targeted revenue welfare expenditure and foreign debt accumulation by constituent States across Bharat.

¶ **11.** In its petition, the Petitioner contended that the practice of utilizing public funds and external borrowings to support universal financial handouts creates an unsustainable burden on the public exchequer, breaching Article 14 by treating unequal socio-economic classes equally through identical financial grants. The Petitioner argued that failure to restrict benefits to the genuinely underprivileged deprives the State of funds necessary to guarantee fundamental rights under Article 21, such as access to quality public healthcare, clean environment, and basic infrastructure, while imperiling the financial security of future citizens.

¶ **12.** The State of Dravidapuram filed a detailed counter-affidavit defending the constitutionality and policy wisdom of the MUT Scheme. The Respondent State argued that welfare policy design falls within the exclusive domain of the elected executive and legislature under the constitutional framework of democratic governance. The State asserted that recognizing women's unpaid household labor through universal financial entitlement fulfills the Directive Principles of State Policy, specifically Articles 38, 39(a), and 39(e), aimed at minimizing inequalities in income, status, and opportunity, and promoting the welfare of women.

¶ **13.** The Respondent State further submitted that universal schemes eliminate systemic administrative corruption, exclusion errors, and bureaucratic hurdles that historically plague targeted poverty programs in developing nations. On the issue of fiscal management, Dravidapuram maintained that state borrowing power is a legitimate sovereign function subject to statutory parliamentary limits, and that investments in direct citizen empowerment generate positive multiplier effects across the regional economy, boosting local demand and long-term tax revenues.

¶ **14.** The Union of Bharat, impleaded as Respondent No. 1, filed an independent submission emphasizing the necessity of national macroeconomic stability and structural financial balance among constituent units of the Union. The Union highlighted its constitutional role under Article 293 in regulating state borrowings to prevent macroeconomic

contagion, while reiterating the delicate balance between state fiscal autonomy and national economic integration.

¶ 15. Recognizing the far-reaching constitutional, economic, and policy questions raised in the petition including the intersection of fiscal discipline, fundamental rights, directive principles, and the limits of judicial review over economic policy the Supreme Court of Bharat admitted the Public Interest Litigation and listed the matter for final hearing on the following constitutional issues.

ISSUES RAISED FOR DETERMINATION

ISSUE 1: WHETHER THE PRESENT PUBLIC INTEREST LITIGATION FILED UNDER ARTICLE 32 OF THE CONSTITUTION OF BHARAT IS MAINTAINABLE, AND WHETHER THE SUBJECT MATTER OF FISCAL POLICY AND SOCIAL WELFARE SCHEMES IS JUSTICIABLE BEFORE THE SUPREME COURT?

ISSUE 2: WHETHER THE IMPLEMENTATION OF A NEAR-UNIVERSAL FINANCIAL GRANT SCHEME TO ALL WOMEN IRRESPECTIVE OF SOCIO-ECONOMIC STATUS VIOLATES ARTICLE 14 OF THE CONSTITUTION BY TREATING UNEQUALS EQUALLY AND DENYING TARGETED RELIEF TO THE POOR?

ISSUE 3: WHETHER FINANCING UNCONDITIONAL REVENUE EXPENDITURE THROUGH EXTERNAL BORROWINGS AND REDUCING CAPITAL ALLOCATIONS IMPAIRS THE STATE'S CAPACITY TO FULFILL FUNDAMENTAL RIGHTS UNDER ARTICLE 21 AND VIOLATES THE DOCTRINE OF PUBLIC TRUST IN FISCAL GOVERNANCE?

ISSUE 4: WHETHER THE MUT SCHEME IS A VALID EXECUTION OF STATE POLICY UNDER ARTICLES 38 AND 39 OF PART IV OF THE CONSTITUTION, AND WHERE DOES THE BALANCE LIE BETWEEN EXECUTIVE POLICY AUTONOMY AND JUDICIAL OVERSIGHT IN MATTERS OF STATE DEBT AND WELFARE SPENDING?