



विधि केंद्र – II
LAW CENTRE – II
विधि संकाय, दिल्ली विश्वविद्यालय
(FACULTY OF LAW, UNIVERSITY OF DELHI)



NOTICE

Date: 5th May 2026

CALL FOR INDUCTION TO THE EDITORIAL BOARD (2026-27)

The Editorial Board of the student's journal of Law Centre-II i.e. **Delhi Journal for Law and Justice (DJLJ)** is pleased to announce the commencement of the induction process for new student members to join the Editorial Board. This is a prestigious opportunity for students to contribute to the academic excellence of Law Centre-II and develop high-level skills in legal research, citation, and editorial management.

I. ELIGIBILITY CRITERIA

- A. The induction is open to all LL.B. students of the Law Centre-II, Faculty of Law, University of Delhi.
- B. **Eligible Batches:** All current batches (including the prospective freshers of the Batch of 2026-2029) are encouraged to apply.
- C. **Exclusion:** Students from the graduating Batch of 2026 are not eligible to apply for this cycle.

II. SCHEME OF EXAMINATION

The selection process will consist of a written examination followed by a personal interview.

A. Written Test (Total: 70 Marks)

1. **Duration:** 1 Hour
2. **Structure:**
 - (i) *Part A (Objective Type):* 20 Multiple Choice Questions (2 Marks each = 40 Marks).
 - (ii) *Part B (Subjective Type):* 3 Analytical/Reviewing Questions (10 Marks each = 30 Marks).
3. **Syllabus:**
 - (i) *Reading Comprehension / Critical Reasoning*
 - (ii) *Bluebook 21st Edition*
 - (iii) *Publication Policy of DJLJ*
 - (iv) *Submission Guidelines of DJLJ*
 - (v) *Style Guide of DJLJ*
 - (vi) *Legal Research Methodology*
 - (vii) *Reviewing Skills*

B. Personal Interview (Total: 30 Marks) Candidates who qualify the written test based on the merit list will be called for an interview with the Editorial Board to assess their legal temperament and commitment.

Note: The qualified candidature for interview consists of 4 times the requisite vacancy.

III. IMPORTANT DATES & VENUE

- A. **Test Date:** Scheduled for the Third Week of August 2026 (Exact date and room numbers will be notified via email).
- B. **Application Deadline:** Candidates must fill out the Google Form at the earliest. Last date to register is 10th August 2026.

IV. ANNEXURE**

A Sample Test Paper following the aforementioned pattern is annexed to this notice to help candidates familiarize themselves with the difficulty level and nature of questions. This Sample Test Paper is not a comprehensive test.

V. APPLICATION LINK

Interested students are required to apply through the link provided below:

<https://forms.gle/j5Mpa96duWLRU5y17>



Prof.(Dr.) Pinki Sharma
Faculty Editor
Delhi Journal For Law And Justice

DELHI JOURNAL FOR LAW AND JUSTICE

****Sample Test for Editorial Board Induction**

TIME: 1 HOUR

PART-A [OBJECTIVE QUESTIONS] 20Q x 2 = 40 Marks | -0.5 Negative marking

READING COMPREHENSION (QUESTION 1-5 Type: Assumption, Strengthening, Weakening, Boldface Arguments, Inference)

Patriarchal forestalling also names and theorises the patterned ways in which patriarchal structures pre-empt, obstruct or deflect survivors' pathways towards justice and redress. Where Dembroff argues that patriarchy constitutes a structurally unjust system, maintained through formal and informal institutions that naturalise gender hierarchies, the framework captures a more dynamic, anticipatory dimension of this system. It elucidates how patriarchal institutions actively neutralise potential disruptions and foreclose transformative outcomes through the social, institutional and procedural reabsorption of survivor agency, through which women's efforts to resist violence or claim justice are not openly rejected but instead absorbed back into normative systems that maintain patriarchal control. Socially, this occurs through moralising discourses of adjustment, sacrifice and family honour that pressure survivors to reinterpret resistance as deviance and endurance as virtue. Procedurally, the legal system enacts a subtler form of containment, through delays, evidentiary burdens and non-enforcement, that deters women from pursuing their claims. This dynamic reflects a broader logic of anticipatory governance, whereby legal institutions are structured not merely to adjudicate claims after harm has occurred, but to manage and pre-empt perceived disruptions to the normative social order, particularly those posed by survivor resistance to patriarchal authority. In each case, survivor agency is not extinguished but strategically redirected into channels that reaffirm the very hierarchies' survivors seek to escape. This reabsorption exemplifies the anticipatory logic of patriarchal forestalling: systems are pre-emptively structured to manage and neutralise dissent, ensuring that efforts to transform injustice are repackaged as conformity, endurance or private reconciliation. In this sense, it is a system of recursive containment, where each step survivors take towards liberation is absorbed and redirected in ways that preserve existing gender hierarchies.

[SOURCE: Shazia Choudhry, Patriarchal Forestalling—the Anticipatory Structure of Legal Failure on Violence against Women, *Oxford Journal of Legal Studies*, 2026,, qqag014, <https://doi.org/10.1093/ojls/gqag014>]

QUESTION: Which of the following, if true, most seriously weakens the author's claim regarding the anticipatory nature of legal systems in patriarchal forestalling?

- (A) Legal institutions frequently struggle to respond to new forms of gender-based violence because their statutes are primarily reactive and based on historical precedent.

- (B) The use of non-disclosure agreements has increased, effectively privatizing settlements and keeping survivor narratives out of the public record.
- (C) Most legal delays are caused by underfunding and administrative backlogs rather than a conscious effort to deter claimants.
- (D) A small percentage of survivors successfully navigate the legal system to achieve transformative legislative changes.

Correct Answer: (A)

Justification: The author argues that the system is anticipatory; meaning it is pre-emptively structured to handle threats. Option A suggests the system is actually reactive and tethered to the past (precedent). If the system is primarily reactive and fails to account for new forms of disruption, the anticipatory logic claim is directly undermined.

QUESTION: The framework of ‘Patriarchal Forestalling’ relies on which of the following underlying assumptions?

- (A) Survivors of patriarchal violence always prioritize systemic transformation over personal reconciliation or private peace.
- (B) Patriarchal institutions view the exercise of survivor agency as a potential threat to the stability of the existing social hierarchy.
- (C) Formal legal institutions are more effective at maintaining gender hierarchies than informal social discourses.
- (D) Gender hierarchies would naturally dissolve if institutions stopped actively managing survivor resistance.

Correct Answer: (B)

Justification: For a system to ‘actively neutralize potential disruptions’ and ‘pre-empt dissent’, it must first view that dissent (survivor agency) as a disruption. If the system did not view agency as a threat, there would be no logical need for the complex ‘forestalling’ or ‘reabsorption’ mechanisms described.

QUESTION: Boldface Analysis (Fact/Issue/Judgement)

Consider the following two segments from the text:

- (1) the framework captures a more dynamic, anticipatory dimension of this system**
- (2) survivor agency is not extinguished but strategically redirected into channels that reaffirm the very hierarchies’ survivors seek to escape.**

Which of the following best describes the roles of these boldface segments?

- (A) The first is a judgment that defines the author’s primary thesis; the second is a factual observation that illustrates the mechanism of that thesis.
- (B) The first is a summary of an opposing view; the second is the author’s primary conclusion used to refute it.
- (C) The first is an evidence-based finding; the second is a hypothetical outcome that the author warns against.

- (D) The first is a premise for a broader sociological claim; the second is a specific issue the author intends to solve.

Correct Answer: (A)

Justification: Segment (1) is a qualitative assessment/judgment; it claims the theory is 'more dynamic' and 'anticipatory' than previous views. Segment (2) describes the actual phenomenon or 'fact' occurring within the system (the redirection of agency), providing the substantive ground for the theoretical judgment made in (1).

QUESTION: When citing a case for the first time in a footnote, which of the following represents the correct order of components according to Rule 10?

- (A) Case Name, Reporter Volume no., Reporter Abbreviation, First page of the case, Span of specific pages referred to, Deciding Court, Year of Decision, (parenthetical phrase describing decision of Fourth Circuit)
- (B) Case Name, (Court Abbreviation Year), Reporter Volume, Reporter Abbreviation, First Page.
- (C) Case Name, Reporter Abbreviation, Reporter Volume, First Page, (Year).
- (D) Case Name, First Page, Reporter Abbreviation, Volume, (Court Year).

Correct Answer: (A)

Justification: Rule 10 establishes the standard address for a case: Name of the case, followed by the source (Volume, Reporter, Page), then the pinpoint (the specific page cited), and finally the parenthetical containing the court of decision and the year.

QUESTION: Under Rule 4.1, when is it appropriate to use *Id.* in a footnote?

- (A) When citing to the same authority as the immediately preceding footnote, provided that footnote cited only one authority. Internal cross-references are excepted.
- (B) When citing to the same authority cited three footnotes ago.
- (C) When the previous footnote contains multiple authorities and you wish to refer to the first one listed.
- (D) Only when citing to a different page of the same book cited previously.

Correct Answer: (A)

Justification: Rule 4.1 states that *Id.* can only be used when the preceding footnote contains exactly one authority. If the previous footnote cited two different cases, *Id.* cannot be used because the reader would not know which case is being referenced. It also requires that there are no intervening citations between the current *Id.* and the original source.

QUESTION: Upon the successful publication of a manuscript in the Delhi Journal for Law and Justice, which of the following statements accurately reflects the status of the work's ownership and usage rights?

- (A) The author retains sole copyright ownership but grants DJLJ a one-time use license.
- (B) The author and Law Centre-II become joint owners of the copyright for the full term.
- (C) Law Centre-II becomes the sole copyright owner of the published submission.

(D) The work enters the public domain immediately because DJLJ is an Open Access journal.

Correct Answer: (C)

Justification: Under the head of General Policies, the terms states that, 'Law Centre-II shall be the sole copyright owner of all published submissions.' While the journal provides Open Access (meaning it is free for the public to read), the legal ownership of the copyright rests entirely with the institution, and any reproduction or adaptation requires compliance with their strict no-copying rule.

QUESTION: An editor is reviewing a manuscript and finds a "Second Level Heading" formatted as:

1. legal scrutiny of the case law (aligned to the left and bolded).

According to the DJLJ Style Guide, which two specific errors have been committed?

- (A) The heading should be centred and symbolized with a capital Roman numeral (I).
- (B) The heading must be symbolized with a capital letter (A) and the first letter of each word must be in Uppercase.
- (C) The heading must be in italics and symbolized with a lower-case Roman numeral in parentheses (i).
- (D) The heading must be in Small Caps and aligned to the right margin.

Correct Answer: (B)

Justification: According to the Style Guide for Second Level Headings, the heading must be preceded by a capital letter (e.g., A, B, C) rather than an Arabic numeral, and have the First Letter Of Each Word In Uppercase (Title Case). In the example provided, the author used '1.' instead of 'A.' and failed to capitalize the first letters of the words in the heading.

QUESTION: An editor is reviewing a sentence that includes a direct quotation and two footnotes. Which of the following versions adheres strictly to the DJLJ rules for punctuation and footnote numbering?

- (A) He stated, 'The rule of law is absolute'¹. Furthermore, the court held that, 'justice must be seen to be done,'² although many disagreed.
- (B) He stated, 'The rule of law is absolute.'¹ Furthermore, the court held that, 'justice must be seen to be done',² although many disagreed.
- (C) He stated, 'The rule of law is absolute'¹. Furthermore, the court held that, 'justice must be seen to be done'², although many disagreed.
- (D) He stated, 'The rule of law is absolute.'¹ Furthermore, the court held that, 'justice must be seen to be done,'² although many disagreed.

Correct Answer: (D)

Justification: Style Guide Rule J(1) states that punctuation (like commas) must fall *within* quotation marks unless it is a full stop that is not part of the quoted sentence. Rule J(2) mandates that footnote numbers must be placed *after* the punctuation. In Option D, the comma is correctly inside the quote, and both footnote numbers follow the punctuation (the full stop and the comma).

Instruction: Read the following excerpt from a mock submission. Identify how many distinct violations of the DJLJ Style Guide (including British English, Punctuation, Dates, and Cross-referencing) are present in the text.

“The court’s attempt to democratize the legal process was evident in its judgment dated 11/05/2021. In the words of Justice Singh, ‘The Constitution is a living document’,¹ which must be interpreted to protect the Respondent. However, some scholars argue that this approach leads to judicial overreach.² On this point, see also Article 21 (4) (a) of the Constitution. Further analysis of this doctrine can be found at pages 123-145 of the report cited in footnote 1.³ As noted earlier, the system remains recursive.⁴”

Footnotes:

1. *State v. Kumar*, AIR 2021 SC 44.
2. *Id.*
3. *Supra* note 1, p. 128.
4. *Ibid.*, at p. 9.

QUESTION: How many total style/formatting errors are contained in the text and footnotes above?

- (A) 5
- (B) 7
- (C) 9
- (D) 10 or more

Correct Answer: (D) (10 Errors)

Justification:

1. British English: ‘democratize’ should be ‘democratise’ (Rule L of Submission Guidelines).
2. Date Format: ‘11/05/2021’ should be ‘11 May 2021’ (Rule N of Style Guide).
3. Punctuation in Quotes: The comma after ‘document’ should be *inside* the single quotation mark i.e. ‘document,’ (Rule J.1).
4. Footnote Placement. Footnote 1 is placed *after* the comma but *before* the closing quote in some interpretations. However, Rule J.2 says after punctuation. Here, it is misplaced relative to the quote’s logic.
5. Capitalization. ‘Respondent’ should be lowercase ‘respondent’ as it is a generic reference to a party (Rule O.2 of Style Guide).
6. Acronyms/Parentheses. Article 21 (4) (a) should not have spaces. It should be Article 21(4)(a) according to Rule M of Style Guide.
7. Number Spans: ‘123-145’ should elide to the shortest form: 123-45 (Rule M).
8. Internal Cross-Reference: at pages 123-145 violates Rule Q, which says “Do not use page numbers for internal cross-references... refer to relevant (sub)sections.”
9. Supra/Note Format: Footnote 3 uses p. 128. Rule Q states that for ‘id.’, one uses ‘at p. 8’, but ‘supra’ references should follow the Bluebook or ‘note’ style without the ‘p.’ (Rule Q/Bluebook conflict check).

10. Ibid / Id. Footnote 4 uses *Ibid.*, at p. 9 to refer to a different page of the source in Footnote 3. Rule Q of Style Guide specifically mandates: use ‘ibid.’ for the same page... and ‘id.’ for the same source but a different page. Therefore, Footnote 4 should be Id., at p. 9.

QUESTION: A researcher is investigating the impact of the *Arbitration and Conciliation Act, 1996* on the ease of doing business in India. To do this, they collect and analyse data from the last five years of Delhi High Court filings to determine the average time taken to dispose of Section 34 petitions. Which research methodology is primarily being employed?

- (A) Doctrinal Research, because it focuses on the interpretation of specific sections of a legal statute.
- (B) Analytical Research, because it examines the historical evolution of the Arbitration Act.
- (C) Empirical/Socio-Legal Research, because it uses data and field-based evidence to study the functional impact of law on society/industry.
- (D) Comparative Research, because it evaluates the ease of doing business across different jurisdictions.

Correct Answer: (C)

Justification: Why Option C is correct: The study moves beyond the letter of the law (the text of Section 34) and looks at law in action by analysing court filings (data/field evidence). This is a characteristic of empirical and socio-legal inquiry, which the DJLJ specifically encourages.

- Why Option A is incorrect? Doctrinal research is library-based and focuses on legal principles, statutes, and case law analysis through pure reasoning, rather than statistical data from filings.
- Why Option B is incorrect? Analytical research generally focuses on the why and how of legal concepts through logic, not necessarily through the collection of new datasets.
- Why Option D is incorrect? While the ease of doing business is often a comparative metric, the specific methodology described (analysing Delhi High Court filings) is focused on a single jurisdiction’s data.

QUESTION: An author submits a paper to DJLJ titled “*The Impact of AI on Intellectual Property Rights in India.*” During the peer-review process, the Editorial Board discovers that the author recently published an article in another journal titled “*Copyright Challenges in the Age of Generative AI: An Indian Perspective*”. Upon comparison, 60% of the literature review and the core arguments regarding Section 51 of the Copyright Act are identical in both papers, though the DJLJ submission adds a new 5-page section on Patents. How should the Board categorize this, and what is the likely outcome?

- (A) Acceptable Revision. It is considered an updated edition of previous research and is allowed as long as the new section on Patents is original.
- (B) Salami Slicing/Self-Plagiarism. It is a violation of the original and unpublished rule because the author is recycling a substantial portion of a previously published work to create a new submission.
- (C) Interdisciplinary Expansion. This is encouraged under the DJLJ policy as it builds upon existing scholarship to provide a broader view of AI.

(D) Fair Dealing. Since the author owns the copyright to their previous work, they are free to reuse it in subsequent submissions without restriction.

Correct Answer: (B)

Justification: Why B is correct? DJLJ Submission Guideline A states that all works must be 'original, unpublished and not under review elsewhere,' and explicitly notes that 'self-plagiarism results in immediate rejection.' 'Salami Slicing' (publishing small, overlapping segments of the same research across multiple journals) undermines the novelty and contribution to academia required in second stage of the Peer Review process.



PART-B [SUBJECTIVE QUESTIONS] (3Q x 10 = 30 Marks)

Instructions for the Candidate: Read the following 250-word excerpt from a mock submission titled “*The Necessity of Gender-Neutral Laws in India.*”

Task: Write a Reviewer’s Note (Maximum 200 words) for the author.

Even without knowing the specific sections of the law, evaluate the logic of the argument. Provide constructive feedback on the ‘scholarly rigor’; specifically, look for where the author makes a broad claim without providing evidence, or where their conclusion feels rushed.

The Excerpt for Appraisal:

“Equality is a fundamental right under the Indian Constitution, as seen in Article 14. This means that every law must treat every person exactly the same way regardless of their circumstances. Currently, many of our penal laws are gender-specific, focusing primarily on protecting women. This is clearly a violation of the Constitution because if the Constitution says we are equal, then having special protections for one group automatically makes the other group unequal.

Furthermore, because society is changing and more people are becoming aware of gender rights, the law must change immediately to be completely neutral. If we do not make every law gender-neutral by next year, the entire legal system will lose its internal logic and people will stop respecting the courts. Therefore, the legislature should stop looking at historical data about crimes against women and simply pass a single law that makes all crimes gender-neutral to solve the problem of inequality once and for all.”

GUIDELINES:

A strong candidate (even with only 1-2 months of law school) should be able to point out the following logical gaps:

1. **Over-simplification of Equality:** The author claims Article 14 means everyone must be treated “exactly the same.” A good editor will note that the author fails to consider the concept of “reasonable classification” or “substantive equality” (treating people differently to achieve true equality).
2. **The Slippery Slope Fallacy:** The author claims that if laws aren’t changed by “next year,” the “entire legal system will lose its logic.” This is a dramatic, unproven assertion that lacks scholarly tone.
3. **Ignoring Evidence:** The author suggests the legislature should “stop looking at historical data.” A good reviewer will point out that legal research *must* be grounded in data and that ignoring the history of a crime is a weakness in research methodology.
4. **Tone & Professionalism:** The conclusion (“solve the problem once and for all”) is idealistic and non-academic.

SAMPLE ANSWER:

Thank you for your submission on gender-neutral laws. While the topic is timely and engages with important constitutional principles like Article 14, there are a few areas where the scholarly rigour could be strengthened.

First, the argument relies on a very narrow definition of ‘equality.’ It would be beneficial to address the counter-argument: can ‘special provisions’ for certain groups actually be a way to achieve equality rather than a violation of it? Exploring this distinction would add much-needed depth to your analysis.

Second, avoid using ‘alarmist’ language, such as the claim that the legal system will collapse by next year. Academic writing is most persuasive when it is measured and supported by evidence rather than predictions of crisis.

Finally, your suggestion to ‘stop looking at historical data’ is a concern for an academic journal. Research is most effective when it acknowledges the social context of the law. We suggest you revise these sections to show how gender-neutrality can coexist with the reality of historical data, rather than dismissing the data entirely.

DJLJ

-----X-----X-----X-----X-----