

Name:
Enrolment No:



UNIVERSITY OF PETROLEUM AND ENERGY STUDIES
End Semester Examination, May 2020

Course: Internet Regulation
Program: LL.M. Law & Technology Law 2019

Semester: II

Course Code: CLLT7008

Max. Marks: 100

Instructions: All questions are compulsory

SECTION A

S. No.		Marks	Word limit
Q 1	Write short note on how internet can be considered as a human right.	5	30-50
Q 2	Briefly explain the concept of digital signature and its relevancy in e-contracts	5	30-50
Q 3	Write a short note on prevalent cybercrimes in India.	5	30-50
Q4	Discuss the various approaches of law to regulate internet.	5	30-50
Q5	Explain the Zippo test laid down in <i>Zippo Mfg. Co. v. Zippo Dot Com Inc.</i>	5	30-50
Q6	Discuss the composition of Cyber Appellate Tribunal under Information Technology Act, 2000.	5	30-50

SECTION B

Q 6	Information and Technology Act, 2000 is based on UNCITRAL Model Law, 1998. Comment on the above statement and Critically analyze the relevancy of this Act to combat the challenges of internet.	10	100-150
Q 7	Critically analyze the Right to Privacy guaranteed under Indian Constitution in context of cyberspace with the help of case laws.	10	100-150
Q 8	Discuss the Copyright issues in Cyber space with the help of Indian Statutory provisions.	10	100-150
Q 9	Critically analyze the freedom of speech and expression in the era of internet.	10	100-150

Q 10	Critically analyze and compare the European Union model and USA's model to regulate cyberspace.	10	100-150
SECTION-C			
Q 11.	<p>The plaintiff is a spiritual guide, renowned as Nirmal baba and regularly conducts assemblies called Samagams, which was telecasted by over 30 television channels daily. He claims that he has lakhs of followers in India and abroad and the plaintiff's website, www.nirmalbaba.com is visited by over one million followers in a month.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The defendant no. 1 is a hubber on the defendant no. 2's website, www.hubpages.com. There is a commercial arrangement of earning on the website between defendant no.1 and the defendant no. 2 through online advertising. • As per the case of the plaintiff, the defendant no. 1 has deliberately written defamatory articles about the plaintiff on the website with malafide intent of attracting followers of the plaintiff on the website and making unlawful earnings through online advertising, thereby, causing serious damage to plaintiff's reputation. • The plaintiff served a cease and desist legal notice on defendant no. 2 on 29.11.2011 calling upon to remove the defamatory articles and provide contact details and name of the defendant no. 1. Through reply dated 01.12.2011, the defendant no. 2 declined to remove the said articles on ground that the articles merely project a difference of opinion about a public figure. <p>Decide the case with relevant grounds/provisions.</p>	20	300-500