

B.A. MALLAL MOOT 2021 CLARIFICATIONS

Please see the responses to the clarifications in the table below.

	Clarification Requested	Response from Organisers
1	Could I check if there has been a typo on para 17 of the Moot Problem. Should the “not” be removed such that it is “...as Autobot is not a separate legal personality.”	No edits to paragraph 17 of the Moot Problem are required.
2	May I clarify if Otto Borg has been granted a patent or copyright for the Autobot system?	No clarification will be issued on this question.
3	I wanted to seek a clarification as to whether we are allowed to run new legal arguments that were not run at first instance (i.e. if we are allowed to go beyond what was argued by the parties at [17]-[18] of the Moot Problem). If I'm not mistaken, this generally would not be allowed under normal appeal circumstances (except with leave of Court), but there doesn't seem to be an explicit guideline on this in the Competition Rules. Thank you!	Participants are not bound by the arguments made in the Court below. Separately, you may want to have regard to Order 56A rule 9(5) of the Rules of Court (Cap 322, Section 80), and (a) <i>Grace Electrical Engineering Pte Ltd v Te Deum Engineering Pte Ltd</i> [2018] 1 SLR 76 at [36]; and (b) <i>Abhilash s/o Kunchian Krishnan v Yeo Hock Huat and another</i> [2019] 1 SLR 873 at [37] to [43]

Please also note the correction of the following typographical error:

[24] “SPAM must be registered in the sole name of Pam Wee, and Otto Borg PLC has no right to be recognized either as a co-inventor, nor as a joint owners~~hip~~ of SPAM.”