

CLARIFICATIONS

Question 1. The following question has been mentioned in Issue 3 at Page no. 9: “*Or does the use of such outputs for knowledge distillation constitute copyright infringement?*” Whether the term “copyright infringement” used therein refers to the copyright lying in the work used in the LLM training or the outputs/functioning of ComputeAI?

Answer: This refers to the alleged use of ComputeGPT’s outputs for knowledge distillation, as reflected in the framing of Issue 3 and ComputeAI’s grievance against Sentinel.

Question 2. The proceedings will be in the month of March 2026, but the plea in the High Court of Aiko is in May 2026. This timeline reference has been in the whole proposition.

Answer: The timeline discrepancy is not relevant to the issues in dispute. Participants may proceed on the basis of the facts as stated.

Question 3. In issue 4 of the proposition, is it section 52(1)(a) of the original act or section 52(1) (ae)?

Answer: Any reference to Section 52(1)(a) in Issue 4 shall be read as Section 52(1)(ae).

Question 4. In paragraph 24(viii), is the research exemption under section 52(1)(a) of the original act or section 52(1) (ae)?

Answer: This stands clarified in Answer No. 3 above.

Question 5. Who is the Respondent in this petition, ComputeAI or the Union of Suvania?

Answer: The Union of Suvania is the Respondent. ComputeAI is a Respondent–Intervenor.

Question 6. What is the timeline in paragraph 13 of the proposition for the Gazetted Notification?

Answer: The sequence of events is sufficiently set out in the Moot Proposition. No further Answer is necessary.

Question 7. Can we go beyond the primary contentions that are raised, and do we need to include each primary contention in the memorial arguments?

Answer: No. Teams are required to confine their arguments to the primary contentions raised in the Moot Proposition.

Question 8. Is including the intervenor's applications in the statement of facts necessary? And do we have to reply to the intervenor's application in our arguments?

Answer: The role and status of intervenors are clearly set out in the Moot Proposition. No further Answer is required.

Question 9. The Sentinel Learning training on publicly available research. Do they have permission to train the AI tool on it or is it copyrighted research without permission?

Answer: The Moot Proposition states that Sentinel relies on publicly available research and follows an open-source approach. No further factual detail is provided.

Question 10. Does neuro symbolic AI rely on GPUs for its functioning and training?

Answer: The technical characteristics of neurosymbolic AI are already described in the Moot Proposition. No further assumptions should be made.

Question 11. Are all the members of Sentinel citizens of Suvania?

Answer: This information is not relevant for the determination of the issues in the present Moot Proposition.

Question 12. Is the research conducted by Sentinel undertaken for commercial purposes?

Answer: The Moot Proposition sufficiently sets out the nature and character of Sentinel Learning's activities. No further Answer is required.

Question 13. Does Issue 4 pertain specifically to the Suvania Institute of Sustainable Technologies as a private university, or does it extend to all private universities in general, including those that may not be engaged in AI-related research?

Answer: Issue 4 applies to research labs of private universities generally, and is not limited only to SIST.

Question 14. Under Issue 4, is the research being conducted primarily for the purpose of AI training?

Answer: The nature and scope of research under Issue 4 are sufficiently described in the Moot Proposition.

Question 15. On page 9 of the Moot Problem, Issue No. 4 specifies Section 51 (1)(a) of the Act, however the Problem specifies only two things in this regard; first, on page 4 paragraph 9, there is a reference to Section 51 (1) (ae), and second, on page 9 paragraph a. states that the laws are in *pari materia* to India, do we give meaning to Section 51 (1)(a) as per the latter?

Answer: This stands clarified in Answer No. 3 above.

Question 16. On page 9 of the Moot Problem, Issue No. 4 uses the phrase “wide research” does it simply take the layman English language meaning or do we assume it to be related with public interest research work, something similar to what Sentinel is doing?

Answer: The expression is not specially defined in the Moot Proposition and should be understood in its ordinary sense.

Question 17. On page 4 of the Moot Problem, paragraph 9 specifies Section 51 (1)(ae) and then defines it as “... copies of a work ... who has *lawful access*”, here will lawful mean licensing so that AI models can create adaptations of the works? Additionally, how is *computational analysis* defined?

Answer: These expressions are used as part of the statutory text reproduced in the Moot Proposition. The Proposition does not provide any further factual elaboration on these terms, and no additional Answer is warranted.

Question 18. On page 6 of the Moot Problem, paragraph 17, it reads “... Suvania Institute of Sustainable Technologies (*a private university*)...,” since it is a private university what kind of funding and or sponsorships do they get for projects or lab experiments like the Neurosymbolic AI?

Answer: The funding structure or sponsorship of Suvania Institute of Sustainable Technologies is not relevant for the determination of the issues in the present Moot Proposition.

Question 19. On page 6 of the Moot Problem, paragraph 19, it says that Sentinel Learning built the AI on 1/3rd of the computing cost. Was there any evidence on it and how did it arrive at this figure?

Answer: The basis or methodology for this claim is not relevant to the determination of the issues in the present Moot Proposition. Participants are advised to proceed on the facts as stated.

Question 20. On page 6 of the Moot Problem, paragraph 21, it mentions that ComputeGPT has a terms-of-service, when is the terms of services displayed to the users?

Answer: The existence and relevant contents of the Terms of Use are set out in the Moot Proposition. No further factual details are provided.

Question 21. On page 2 of the Moot Problem, paragraph 6, there is a mention of a study. Which institute has conducted such study and how reliable is it?

Answer: The identity and reliability of the study are not relevant for the determination of the issues in the present Moot Proposition. Participants are advised to rely solely on the facts as stated and not draw any additional assumptions.

Question 22. On page 3 of the Moot Problem, paragraph 7, the working group has recommended that the opt-outs can be in the form of, “*machine-readable means, contractual terms, or public notice issued by the authors...*” do we have any record of such opt-outs?

Answer: The existence or otherwise of specific opt-outs is not relevant for the determination of the issues in the present Moot Proposition.

Question 23. On page 3 of the Moot Problem, paragraph 8, the author D.D. Bowling argues that there is large scale theft as they might not always know what is being used. If there are licenses in place, how is this claim valid, and if such infringement is happening for works not licensed, what are the sanctions for such infringement?

Answer: This aspect is not relevant for the determination of the issues in the present Moot Proposition.