Name:		
Enrolment No:		



UPES

End Semester Examination, May 2025

Course: Professional Ethics and Professional Accounting Semester: VI

Program: LL.B. Time: 03 hrs.

Course Code: CLCC3059 Max. Marks: 100

Instructions:

SECTION A

(5Qx2M=10Marks)

S. No.		Marks	CO
Q 1	State the definition of contempt of courts as laid down under the Contempt of Courts Act, 1971.	2	CO1
Q 2	Section 2 (1) (a) defines 'Advocate' as an advocate entered in any roll under the provisions of the Advocates Act, 1961. (TRUE/ FALSE)	2	CO1
Q 3	Advocates were called in the British Era during the evolution of legal system.	2	CO1
Q 4	Senior Advocates are designated under which section of the Advocates Act.	2	CO1
Q 5	In which section "Standards of Professional Conduct and Etiquette" is defined.	2	CO1

SECTION B

(4Qx5M= 20 Marks)

Q 6	Write an explanatory note on the significance of accountancy knowledge for		
	lawyers enabling them to interpret financial accounting statements in		CO3
	Advocacy.		
Q 7	Elucidate the duties of a lawyer towards his client.	5	CO3
Q 8	Discuss the defenses available in the case of Civil Contempt under the	_	G02
	Contempt of Courts Act, 1971.	5	CO3
Q 9	What is meant by Book-keeping and the objective of Book-keeping.	5	CO3
	SECTION-C		
	(2Qx10M=20 Marks)		
Q 10	Examine women's representation in the legal field.	10	CO4
Q 11	Explicate the liability of Lawyers under Consumer Protection Act, 1986/2019.	10	CO4
	SECTION-D		
	(2Qx25M=50 Marks)		
Q 12	Advocate Indira Thakur had been practicing in the Supreme Court for over 20		
	years, with a specialization in Arbitration and Aviation Law. She was fully		
	aware that advertising by advocates was prohibited under Rule 36 of the Bar		
	Council of India Rules, which aims to preserve the dignity and ethical		
	standards of the legal profession. However, after the landmark case of V.B.		
	Joshi v. Union of India (2004), the legal landscape saw a shift. Though the		
	Supreme Court did not strike down Rule 36, it recognized the changing		
	dynamics of the digital era. Consequently, the Bar Council of India introduced		
	an amendment in 2008, allowing advocates to publish limited professional	25	CO5
	information on their personal websites, such as:		
	• Name		
	Contact details		
	Enrolment number		
	Areas of practice		
	Academic qualifications		
	_		

Despite this relaxation, the core prohibition on solicitation, boastful claims, and comparative statements remained intact.

Relying on this amendment, Advocate Indira Thakur published herb professional details on an online app called "*Know your Surrounding*" This app functioned as a modern digital directory—similar to the traditional Yellow Pages—collecting and displaying information about professionals, including their fields of expertise and jurisdiction of practice.

However, the Bar Council took exception to his listing on a third-party platform rather than a personal website. It held that publishing professional information on "Know your Surrounding amounted to unauthorized advertisement, as the platform could be used for indirect solicitation. Accordingly, the Bar Council directed Advocate Indira Thakur to remove his profile from the app. It also issued a general notice cautioning all advocates that publishing professional information on commercial platforms or directories—digital or otherwise—would be considered a violation of Rule 36 and could attract disciplinary action.

In the light of the above facts discuss:

- 1. Analyse how the Bar Council rules (Rule 36) aim to regulate the ethical standards of the legal profession in India. (5Marks)
- 2. Illustrate specific instances where technology has challenged these standards of the Bar Council Rules of India. (5 Marks)
- 3. Should India reconsider its stringent advertising restrictions on advocates in light of the more liberal approach followed by countries like the United States? If so, what key principles and safeguards should the Bar Council and regulators adopt while reforming such laws?" (15 Marks)

Q 13	"X, a prominent journalist, published an article in a national daily accusing a		
\ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \			
	sitting High Court judge of accepting bribes in return for favorable		
	judgments. The article was published without any supporting evidence and		
	while a case concerning the same judge was sub judice. The judge initiates		
	contempt proceedings against X.		
	Based on the above facts, discuss the following:		
	(a) Whether X can be held liable for criminal contempt under the Contempt		
	of Courts Act, 1971. (5 Marks)	25	CO5
	of Courts Flet, 19, 11 (C Hamis)		
	(h) Critically, avaluate the assential elements that must be established to		
	(b) Critically evaluate the essential elements that must be established to		
	constitute criminal contempt in such a case? (10 Marks)		
	(c) Distinguish the balance between freedom of speech and expression		
	under Article 19(1)(a) and the power of courts to punish for contempt under		
	Article 129 and Article 215." (10 Marks)		
	,		