


Name:			
Enrolment No:			
UPES End Semester Examination, May 2023			
Course: Digital Law and Cyber Crimes (Hons. 5)		Semester: X	
Program: B.Tech. LL.B. (H) Cyber Law		Time: 03 hrs.	
Course Code: CLCB5010		Max. Marks: 100	
Instructions: All Questions are Compulsory			
SECTION A (5Qx2M=10Marks)			
S. No.		Marks	CO
Q 1	State the penalty for failure to furnish information, return, etc under the IT Act, 2000	2	CO1
Q 2	Write a note on Cybercrime against Government	2	CO1
Q 3	Define IP spoofing	2	CO1
Q 4	State two examples of Cyber Stalking	2	CO1
Q 5	Name the member nations of Cyberbrics	2	CO1
SECTION B (4Qx5M= 20 Marks)			
Q 6	Elaborate the need for regulation of Cyber space in the 21 st Century	5	CO2
Q 7	Critically examine the applicability of IT Act, 2000 in regulating and governance of the Cyber space in India.	5	CO2
Q 8	Examine the functions of the Controller as a certifying authority under the IT Act, 2000.	5	CO2
Q 9	Discuss the laws and issues relating to the Cyber Defamation in India.	5	CO2
SECTION-C (2Qx10M=20 Marks)			
Q 10	Analyze the judgment given by the Apex Court in Shreya Singhal v. UOI, AIR 2015 SC 1523 vis-à-vis the Information Technology Act, 2000.	10	CO3

Q 11	<p>In 1996, The UN Commission adopted the United Nations Commission on International Trade Law (UNCITRAL), a model law on Electronic Commerce with the specific goal to eliminate all kinds of legal and technical hindrances to boost legal certainty for cyber domain.</p> <p>On this accord Analyze the principles laid down in UNCITRAL and its compliance in the national cyber laws of India and U.S.</p>	10	CO3
SECTION-D (2Qx25M=50 Marks)			
Q 12	<p>An article in the social networking site was written and edited in New York by Mr. Joseph, the article concerned a resident, Mr. Fernandis, in Florida and relied on sources in Florida. The intentional tortious act was expressly aimed at Florida.</p> <p>Apply the appropriate rule/test to resolve the conflict of jurisdiction in cyber space. Substantiate your viewpoints with the help of judicial pronouncements.</p>	25	CO4
Q 13	<p>Two election petitions were filed by the Respondents before the Bombay High Court under Sections 80 and 81 of the Representation of the People Act, 1951, challenging election of the Appellant on the ground that the nomination papers were filed after the stipulated time of 03.00 p.m. on 27.09.2014. Petitioners had relied upon electronic record of video-camera arrangements (CDs/VCDs), both inside and outside the office of the Returning Officer of the Election Commission, to prove that the nomination papers were offered only at 3.53 p.m. (i.e. beyond 3.00 p.m.the stipulated time for filing the nomination). Though there was no written certificate as required by Section 65B(4) of the Evidence Act, the statement given by the Returning Officer in her cross examination, was taken as a certificate u/s 65B(4).</p> <p>Based on the facts stated above critically examine the admissibility and evidentiary value of digital records (CDs/VCDs) as recently laid down by a three-judge bench of the Supreme Court. Substantiate your answers with relevant judicial pronouncements.</p>	25	CO4