The Indian Journal for Research in Law and Management

Open Access Law Journal – Copyright © 2026

Editor-in-Chief – Dr. Muktai Deb Chavan; Publisher – Alden Vas; ISSN: 2583-9896

This is an Open Access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution-Non-Commercial-Share Alike 4.0 International (CC-BY-NC-SA 4.0) License, which permits unrestricted non-commercial use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium provided the original work is properly cited.

OPERATIONALIZING NATIONAL EDUCATION POLICY (NEP) 2020 IN STATE-AFFILIATED LAW SCHOOLS: STRATEGIC RESOURCE ALLOCATION, BILINGUAL PEDAGOGY, AND DIGITAL GOVERNANCE GAPS

~ Mr. Tilak Ram Patel & Dr. Kiran Chouhan

Abstract

Paragraph 20.4 of the National Education Policy (NEP) 2020 envisions a holistic restructuring of Indian legal education anchored in constitutional values, multidisciplinary inquiry, bilingual instruction in English and regional languages, and technological integration. While policy discourse frequently centers on autonomous National Law Universities, the numerical majority of Indian law students pursue three-year or five-year integrated law degrees within colleges affiliated with state public universities. This article investigates the institutional gap between NEP 2020's normative aspirations and the operational capacity of state-affiliated law schools across three interdependent dimensions: strategic resource allocation, bilingual pedagogy, and digital governance. Employing a qualitative methodology combining doctrinal legal analysis of the Advocates Act 1961, the Bar Council of India (BCI) Rules of Legal Education 2008, the BCI's May 2024 reform circular, and the Digital Personal Data Protection (DPDP) Act 2023 and Rules 2025 with comparative policy and documentary analysis—using

affiliated law colleges under Pt. Ravishankar Shukla University in Chhattisgarh as a contextual illustration—the study demonstrates that regulatory mandates outpace institutional fiscal and administrative autonomy. Affiliated colleges face structural trade-offs between statutory compliance and pedagogical innovation, linguistic disconnects between regional-language instruction and English-dominated appellate practice, and unaddressed fiduciary obligations under data protection and disability statutes. To reconcile these tensions, the article proposes the Integrated Legal Education Implementation Framework (ILEIF), a phased hub-and-spoke governance model.

Keywords: National Education Policy 2020; State-Affiliated Law Colleges; Bar Council of India; Bilingual Legal Pedagogy; Digital Personal Data Protection Act 2023; Institutional Governance.

1. Introduction

Legal education in India operates across a sharply stratified institutional architecture. At the apex stand twenty-four autonomous National Law Universities (NLUs) created by state statutes and a select tier of well-endowed private universities, which command disproportionate attention in academic scholarship and policy deliberation.[1] Yet the structural foundation of Indian legal training resides elsewhere. Across India's nearly 1,700 approved Centres of Legal Education (CLEs), the vast majority are government-managed or privately managed colleges affiliated with state public universities.[2] According to the All India Survey on Higher Education (AISHE) 2021–22, India's higher education system comprises 45,473 affiliated colleges operating under 328 affiliating universities, absorbing the bulk of undergraduate enrolment, including first-generation learners and students from Scheduled Caste, Scheduled Tribe, and

Other Backward Class communities.[3] When the Government of India adopted the National Education Policy (NEP) 2020, Paragraph 20.4 articulated an ambitious blueprint to make legal education globally competitive, multidisciplinary, grounded in constitutional values, technologically integrated, and accessible through bilingual instruction in English and regional languages.[4]

Translating Paragraph 20.4 from an executive policy vision into classroom practice within state-affiliated law colleges exposes deep structural friction. Unlike autonomous law universities empowered to design curricula, determine tuition structures, and recruit specialized faculty, an affiliated law college functions under a triadic regulatory hierarchy.[5] It must satisfy the professional recognition and inspection norms of the Bar Council of India (BCI) under the Advocates Act 1961 and the Rules of Legal Education 2008,[6] adhere to the statutory ordinances, centralized syllabi, and examination schedules of its affiliating state university,[7] and comply with state higher education department rules governing faculty posts, fee ceilings, and admission quotas. When the BCI issued Circular No. BCI:D:468/2024 (LE Circular-06/2024) on 20 May 2024 directing all CLEs to immediately integrate emerging technology subjects, compulsory mediation, the three 2023 criminal law enactments, and bilingual instruction, it superimposed demanding curricular and infrastructural obligations onto institutions that possess neither curricular autonomy nor dedicated capital grants.[8]

This article investigates the operational gap between NEP 2020's policy aspirations and the institutional capacity of state-affiliated law colleges, arguing that reform directives fail when they treat resource allocation, language medium, and digital adoption as isolated compliance checklists rather than interdependent governance variables. The paper addresses five research objectives: (RO1) to examine the legal and institutional framework governing NEP 2020 implementation in state-affiliated

law colleges; (RO2) to evaluate how strategic resource allocation and institutional capacity influence reform execution; (RO3) to examine the pedagogical, linguistic, and institutional challenges of bilingual legal education; (RO4) to identify digital infrastructure, data governance, accessibility, and accountability gaps; and (RO5) to develop an integrated institutional implementation framework linking these three dimensions. Correspondingly, five research questions guide the analysis: (RQ1) How do NEP 2020 and the BCI regulatory framework interact in shaping reforms in state-affiliated law colleges? (RQ2) What resource-allocation priorities are necessary for implementing NEP-aligned reforms within affiliated college constraints? (RQ3) What legal, pedagogical, and administrative barriers affect bilingual legal education? (RQ4) How do digital infrastructure limitations and governance practices affect institutional readiness, access, and accountability? (RQ5) What integrated, financially realistic, and legally compatible framework can guide phased implementation? Synthesizing doctrinal legal analysis with institutional management and documentary evidence from Pt. Ravishankar Shukla University (PRSU), Raipur, and its affiliated law colleges in Chhattisgarh, the article proposes the Integrated Legal Education Implementation Framework (ILEIF).

2. Regulatory and Institutional Framework

2.1 Legal Status of NEP 2020 Paragraph 20.4 and BCI Statutory Authority

Doctrinal clarity requires distinguishing executive policy from binding legislation. Approved by the Union Cabinet in July 2020, NEP 2020 is an executive policy framework outlining national priorities under Entry 66 of List I and Entry 25 of List III of the Seventh Schedule to the Constitution of India.[9] While Paragraph 18.3 proposes a single umbrella regulator—the Higher Education Commission of India

(HECI)—it explicitly excludes medical and legal education from HECI's jurisdiction.[10] Paragraph 20.4 directs that legal education curricula reflect socio-cultural contexts, incorporate constitutional values of social, economic, and political justice, adopt evidence-based practices, and require state institutions to consider offering bilingual education in English and the state's official language.[11] Because NEP 2020 is non-statutory, its prescriptions acquire binding force in legal education only when enacted through the Advocates Act 1961 or state university statutes.

Section 7(1)(h) of the Advocates Act 1961 empowers the BCI to promote legal education and lay down standards in consultation with Universities and State Bar Councils, while Section 7(1)(i) authorizes the BCI to recognize and inspect Universities whose law degrees qualify graduates for Bar enrolment.[12] Together with Section 10(2)(b) (constituting the Legal Education Committee) and Section 49(1)(af) and (d), these provisions sustain the BCI Rules of Legal Education 2008.[13] While the Supreme Court in *V Sudeer v Bar Council of India* invalidated the BCI's 1995 pre-enrolment training rules as exceeding Section 49,[14] it subsequently confirmed in *Bar Council of India v Board of Management, Dayanand College of Law* that Rule 17(1) validly requires prior BCI approval of affiliation for any college imparting legal instruction.[15] In *Bar Council of India v Bonnie Foi Law College*, a Constitution Bench overruled *V Sudeer*, upheld the All India Bar Examination (AIBE), and affirmed the BCI's comprehensive authority to regulate pre- and post-enrolment standards.[16]

2.2 The 2024 BCI Circulars, Parliamentary Critique, and State University Ordinances

In 2024, the BCI invoked NEP 2020 through two administrative circulars. Circular No. BCI:D:465/2024 (24 January 2024) mandated strict compliance with computer

education requirements under Schedules II and III of the 2008 Rules.[17] Circular No. BCI:D:468/2024 (LE Circular-06/2024, 20 May 2024) issued fourteen directives for immediate compliance, including: (1) adding emerging subjects (Blockchain, Electronic Discovery, Cybersecurity, Robotics, Artificial Intelligence, and Bio-Ethics); (2) emphasizing constitutional values; (3) socio-economic contextualization; (4) providing bilingual education in English and regional languages; (5) interdisciplinary thinking; (6) compulsory Mediation courses (aligning with the Mediation Act 2023);[18] (8) incorporating the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita 2023 (BNS), Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita 2023 (BNSS), and Bharatiya Sakshya Adhiniyam 2023 (BSA) from 2024–25;[19] (9) prohibiting online or distance LL.B., LL.M., or M.A. (Law) courses (consistent with *Odisha Lift Irrigation Corp Ltd v Ravi Shankar Patro*, *Vinit Garg v UGC*, and Regulation 4(A)(iv) of the UGC ODL and Online Regulations 2020);[20] (10) enforcing five-and-a-half-hour daytime schedules under Rule 2(xxiii); (11) prohibiting four-year LL.B. models; and (13) portal-based verification of sanctioned seat intake.[21]

Notably, Circular LE-06/2024 followed the 142nd Report of the Parliamentary Standing Committee on Personnel, Public Grievances, Law and Justice (7 February 2024), which echoed the Law Commission's 184th Report (2002) in observing that the BCI lacks the institutional expertise to regulate academic innovation and research beyond basic Bar eligibility, recommending a separate National Council for Legal Education and Research (NCLER).[22] At the state level, affiliated colleges are simultaneously bound by state university statutes, such as the Chhattisgarh Vishwavidyalaya Adhiniyam 1973 (Act No. 22 of 1973).[23] Under Sections 6(17), 24, and 37 of the 1973 Adhiniyam, syllabi, ordinances, and examinations are prescribed centrally by the affiliating university, leaving affiliated colleges—such as the Department of Law at Government J. Yoganandam Chhattisgarh College or

S.K.T.D. Law College under PRSU Raipur, Govind Sarang Government Law College in Bhatapara, or D.P. Vipra Law College under Atal Bihari Vajpayee Vishwavidyalaya (ABVV), Bilaspur—with zero unilateral curricular power.[24] Documentary inspection of PRSU's *Revised Ordinance No. 180* (approved 29 July 2024) reveals selective regulatory absorption: PRSU promptly integrated the BNS, BNSS, and BSA into Semesters III and IV, but retained a rigid 30-paper compulsory grid without AI, Blockchain, or standalone Mediation courses, while Clauses 4 and 12 explicitly prohibit simultaneous degree registration, lateral entry, multiple exit, and non-identical syllabus transfers—foreclosing the UGC Academic Bank of Credits (ABC) Regulations 2021.[25]

3. Review of Literature and Research Gap

Scholarship on Indian legal education and higher education management spans four thematic clusters. First, foundational critiques by Upendra Baxi and N.R. Madhava Menon diagnosed the colonial narrowness and 'narration sickness' of municipal law teaching.[26] While Menon pioneered the five-year integrated NLU model to foster clinical and socially relevant training, his 2012 Harvard Blue Paper acknowledged that NLUs remained 'islands of excellence' while over 90 percent of law students studied in resource-starved university departments and affiliated colleges.[27] Sociological studies by Jayanth K. Krishnan, Jonathan Gingerich, Vikramaditya Khanna, Aditya Singh, and Swethaa S. Ballakrishnen further established that globalization and corporate recruitment entrenched this hierarchy, separating elite anglophone NLUs from regional affiliated colleges serving trial courts.[28]

Second, higher education governance literature by N.V. Varghese, Jinusha Panigrahi, and Garima Malik documents how public fiscal retrenchment fostered

self-financed private colleges with acute resource disparities.[29] Evaluating NEP 2020's mandate (Paragraphs 10.3–10.11) to phase out affiliated colleges by 2035 through autonomy or clustering, Rabbani Attar (2023) argues in *Economic and Political Weekly* that dismantling the affiliated college system prematurely threatens educational access for rural and marginalized cohorts, while Anil Gaman Ahire (2023) demonstrates that geographic and financial barriers impede the UGC's 2022 clustering guidelines.[30] Third, post-NEP legal education studies by N.L. Mitra and Manoj Kumar Sinha (2022) and Sanjit Kumar Chakraborty and Tushar Krishna (2021) in the *Asian Journal of Legal Education* highlight the regulatory mismatch between NEP 2020's flexible multidisciplinary model and the BCI's inspection-focused regime, while Shuvro Prosun Sarker (2020, 2025) and Julius G. Getman (1969) trace the persistent deficits in clinical supervision and regional-language casebooks.[31]

Fourth, contemporary digital governance scholarship—specifically Arpan Tulsyan's 2026 Observer Research Foundation study on learner data risks under the DPDP Act 2023 alongside UNESCO (2023) and UNICEF Innocenti (2025) reports, Daniel J. Solove's privacy taxonomy, and disability accessibility analyses by the Vidhi Centre for Legal Policy (2025)—shows that unregulated EdTech adoption exposes students to data breaches, profiling, and disability exclusion.[32] Yet a clear research gap remains: existing NEP 2020 legal studies overlook the statutory subordination of state-affiliated colleges, higher education management works omit the Advocates Act 1961, and data protection studies ignore law college governance. No existing study integrates strategic resource allocation, bilingual pedagogy, and statutory digital governance (including the notified DPDP Rules 2025) into a cohesive implementation framework for state-affiliated law schools.

4. Research Methodology

This article adopts a qualitative research design combining doctrinal legal analysis, comparative policy analysis, institutional documentary analysis, and a structured qualitative assessment matrix. Doctrinal analysis examines constitutional provisions (Articles 14, 19(1)(g), 21, 39A, and 348), statutes (Advocates Act 1961, UGC Act 1956, RPwD Act 2016, Mediation Act 2023, DPDP Act 2023, and Chhattisgarh Vishwavidyalaya Adhiniyam 1973), delegated rules (BCI Rules 2008, UGC ABC Regulations 2021, and DPDP Rules 2025 notified via G.S.R. 846(E) on 13 November 2025), and administrative circulars (BCI Circulars BCI:D:465/2024 and BCI:D:468/2024). Comparative and documentary analysis evaluates official records accessed in November 2026 from Chhattisgarh—which hosts both an autonomous NLU (Hidayatullah National Law University under Chhattisgarh Act No. 10 of 2003)[33] and state-affiliated colleges under PRSU Raipur and ABVV Bilaspur. Examined documents include PRSU's *Revised Ordinance No. 180 and LL.B. Syllabus* (29 July 2024), institutional disclosures of government colleges (Government J. Yoganandam Chhattisgarh College, Raipur; Govind Sarang Government Law College, Bhatapara) and private colleges (S.K.T.D. Law College, Raipur; D.P. Vipra Law College, Bilaspur), AISHE 2021–22, and the 142nd Parliamentary Standing Committee Report.

Documentary findings are classified into three transparent categories: *Documented Implementation (DI)*, *Documented Policy or Proposal (DP)*, and *Insufficient Publicly Available Evidence (IE)*, without equating missing online disclosures with confirmed non-compliance (Table 1). For future institutional audits, the study also specifies an **Institutional NEP Readiness Index (INRI)**: INRI = 0.40(SRA) + 0.30(BP) + 0.30(DG), scoring 14 indicators across Strategic Resource Allocation (SRA), Bilingual Pedagogy (BP), and Digital Governance (DG) on a 0–3 verified

ordinal scale, while refraining from reporting synthetic scores without primary survey returns. Methodological limitations include the inability of public documents to capture informal classroom code-switching or unlogged library use, irregular college website updates, and state-specific variations in grant-in-aid rules.

Dimension & Indicator	Regulatory Standard	Documented Status (Chhattisgarh Context)	Status
A1. New Criminal Laws (BNS, BNSS, BSA)	BCI Circular LE-06/2024 (Item 8)	PRSU Revised Ordinance No. 180 (July 2024) integrates BNS, BSA (Sem III) and BNSS (Sem IV).	Documented Implementation (DI)
A2. Emerging Tech & Standalone Mediation	BCI Circular LE-06/2024 (Items 1, 6)	PRSU retains IT Act 2000 (Sem VI) and general ADR (Sem IV); AI, Blockchain, Robotics absent.	Documented Policy / Gap (DP)
A3. Multidisciplinary Credit Mobility (ABC)	NEP Para 11.9; UGC ABC Regs 2021	PRSU Ordinance No. 180 Cls 4 & 12 prohibit dual degrees, lateral entry-exit, and non-identical transfers.	Documented Conflict (DI)
A4. Faculty Ratio & NAAC Assessment	BCI Rules Sch III Cl 17; Report 142	Guest faculty reliance; NAAC Rs 6L fee barrier noted by Parliament; uneven SSR disclosures.	Documented Policy / Partial (DP)
B1. Bilingual Medium Authorization	NEP Para 20.4; BCI Circular Item 4	PRSU Ordinance No. 180 Cl 5 formally authorizes 'English and or Hindi only' for teaching/exams.	Documented Implementation (DI)
B2. Diglot Materials & Legal Language	Authoritative Texts Act 1973	PRSU Sem I Paper-V includes translation & Diglot Bare Acts; severe deficit in Hindi commercial law texts.	Documented Policy / Partial (DP)
C1. Digital Libraries & LMS Usage	BCI Rules Sch III Cl 15; BCI:D:465/2024	Basic computer labs disclosed (D.P. Vipra, GSGLC), but remote database and LMS logs unverified.	Insufficient Public Evidence (IE)

Dimension & Indicator	Regulatory Standard	Documented Status (Chhattisgarh Context)	Status
C2. DPDP Rules 2025 & RPwD Sec 42	DPDP Rules 2025; RPwD Act Sec 42	Admission portals lack DPDP Rule 3 itemized notices, breach protocols, and WCAG 2.1/OCR compliance.	Insufficient Public Evidence (IE)

5. Strategic Resource Allocation and Institutional Capacity

5.1 Political Economy of Government and Private Affiliated Law Colleges

Implementing NEP 2020's multidisciplinary and clinical reforms requires substantial recurring expenditure, exposing a structural divide in the political economy of state-affiliated law colleges. In *State of Maharashtra v Manubhai Pragaji Vashi*, the Supreme Court held that Articles 21 and 39A of the Constitution obligate the State to extend grants-in-aid to recognized private law colleges on par with other professional faculties so that legal education and free legal aid do not suffer.[34] Yet subsequent state fiscal policy shifted toward containment, dividing affiliated law colleges into two resource-constrained categories.

First, government law colleges and law departments within multi-faculty government colleges—such as the Department of Law at Government J. Yoganandam Chhattisgarh College, Raipur (established 1951) and Govind Sarang Government Law College, Bhatapara (established 2013 with 111 students and 9 faculty members)[35]—charge minimal tuition fees, serving as vital equity pathways for Scheduled Caste, Scheduled Tribe, and rural learners. However, their budgets are locked within state treasury line items: Principals cannot independently create teaching posts for emerging NEP courses, procure commercial legal databases

without state-level tender clearance, or fill regular Public Service Commission (PSC) vacancies during recruitment freezes, forcing reliance on fixed-honorarium guest lecturers (*Atithi Vyakhayata*). Second, privately managed, self-financing affiliated colleges—such as S.K.T.D. Law College, Raipur, and D.P. Vipra Law College, Bilaspur[36]—receive no state block grants and depend entirely on tuition revenue bounded by state fee-regulatory caps and the BCI's sanctioned intake ceiling (60 seats per section, maximum 300 seats under Schedule III, Clause 5A of the 2008 Rules and Item 13 of Circular LE-06/2024).[37] Caught between fee caps and zero state aid, private trusts frequently minimize expenditure on Seventh Pay Commission faculty scales, physical library acquisitions, and digital infrastructure.

5.2 Faculty Workloads, Library Deficits, and the NAAC Accreditation Barrier

Resource scarcity directly constrains faculty capacity, research libraries, and clinical training. Schedule III, Clause 17 of the BCI Rules 2008 mandates a core full-time faculty ratio of at least 1:40, while PRSU Revised Ordinance No. 180 (Clause 6) and BCI Circular LE-06/2024 (Item 10) require at least 30 continuous daytime class hours per week across a 15-week semester (24 lecture hours plus 6 hours of tutorials, moots, and seminars).[38] Where colleges operate with skeleton regular staff, teachers carry 18–24 weekly lecture hours across traditional doctrinal subjects, leaving no workload remission or training budget to master Blockchain, AI, or Bio-Ethics. Similarly, while Schedule III, Clause 15 of the BCI Rules and Paragraph 4.22 of the 142nd Parliamentary Standing Committee Report emphasize online legal databases and research infrastructure,[39] commercial database subscriptions cost several lakhs of rupees annually, exceeding the library budgets of smaller colleges. Four compulsory clinical courses under Schedule II (Drafting, Professional Ethics, ADR, and Moot Court/Internship) and Legal Aid Clinics likewise suffer from the absence of dedicated fieldwork reimbursements from State

Legal Services Authorities (SLSAs). Finally, Paragraph 3.18 of the 142nd Parliamentary Report highlights that NAAC levies a Rs 6,00,000 assessment fee on standalone law colleges—triple the Rs 2,00,000 fee for general colleges—creating a regressive financial barrier that prevents affiliated law colleges from obtaining the NAAC accreditation required to participate in the UGC Academic Bank of Credits Regulations 2021.[40]

6. Bilingual Pedagogy and Legal Education Accessibility

6.1 Constitutional Architecture and the Linguistic Bifurcation of Indian Law

Paragraph 20.4 of NEP 2020 and Item 4 of BCI Circular LE-06/2024 instruct law schools to offer bilingual education in English and the state language to promote accessible justice.[41] Operationalizing this directive requires navigating the constitutional division of official languages in India. Under Article 348(1) of the Constitution, until Parliament provides otherwise, all proceedings in the Supreme Court and High Courts and the authoritative texts of all Central and State Bills, Acts, Ordinances, and regulations must be in English.[42] Although Article 348(2) and Section 7 of the Official Languages Act 1963 allow Governors, with Presidential consent, to authorize Hindi in High Court proceedings (as in Chhattisgarh, Madhya Pradesh, Uttar Pradesh, Bihar, and Rajasthan), authoritative statutory texts and national appellate jurisprudence remain anchored in English.[43] Conversely, under Section 307 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita 2023 (formerly Section 272 CrPC) and Section 137 of the Code of Civil Procedure 1908, district and subordinate courts operate in the state language—Hindi in Chhattisgarh.[44]

This constitutional structure creates a sharp pedagogical dilemma. Most students entering state-affiliated law colleges in Chhattisgarh completed schooling in Hindi;

unassisted English-only instruction causes severe comprehension barriers and rote reliance on examination guides, undermining substantive equality under Article 14 and access to justice under Article 39A. Yet, as Paragraph 6.11 of the 142nd Parliamentary Standing Committee Report (2024) warned, proficiency in English and legal English remains indispensable as the lingua franca of appellate litigation, commercial drafting, and global practice.[45] Replacing English instruction entirely with regional-language teaching therefore confines affiliated college graduates to subordinate court practice and widens the professional divide between NLUs and state colleges.

6.2 Formal Medium Choice vs. Calibrated Bilingual Scaffolding

A rigorous distinction must separate *parallel medium segregation* from *structured bilingual pedagogy*. Under Clause 5 of PRSU's Revised Ordinance No. 180, the 'Medium of instruction and examination shall be in English and or Hindi only.'[46] In practice, this permissive rule produces segregated tracks where most students write exams in Hindi using commercial guides while classroom lectures rely on informal conversational Hindi. Three institutional barriers prevent this practice from delivering effective bilingual competence. First is the *textual and terminological deficit*: while the Legislative Department's Official Languages Wing and *Vidhi Sahitya Prakashan* publish authoritative Hindi Central Acts under the Authoritative Texts (Central Laws) Act 1973 and a Tri-Lingual Legal Glossary,[47] and PRSU's syllabus prescribes *Bare Act (Diglot)* editions and Hindi-English translation in First Semester Paper-V (*English Legal Language and Writing*),[48] analytical Hindi commentaries and casebooks are virtually non-existent for corporate law, intellectual property, taxation, and emerging technology courses. Moreover, artificial Sanskritized statutory translations (*Clisht Hindi*) often obscure legal concepts rather than clarifying them for Hindi- or Chhattisgarhi-speaking

students and clients. Second, faculty rarely receive training in dual-language instruction. Third, students examined solely in Hindi without reading full-text English appellate judgments (despite recent AI-assisted *e-SCR* translations) struggle to use English-indexed digital databases. Effective implementation thus requires a progressive scaffolding model rather than binary medium segregation.

7. Digital Governance and Institutional Accountability

7.1 Infrastructure vs. Fiduciary Governance under the DPDP Act 2023 and Rules 2025

While NEP 2020 (Chapter 23) and BCI Circulars BCI:D:465/2024 and LE-06/2024 frame technology around computer labs and curricular subjects,[49] institutional digital transformation is fundamentally a governance challenge involving data privacy, cybersecurity, and disability access. Many affiliated law colleges rely on ad-hoc digital arrangements—sharing administrative spreadsheets over consumer messaging apps and outsourcing admission and examination portals to low-cost ERP vendors without security audits. As Arpan Tulsyan (2026) and UNESCO (2023) demonstrate, such practices expose student demographic, academic, and behavioural records to severe breach and profiling risks, exemplified by major Indian educational data breaches at Unacademy, Skolaro, and DIKSHA.[50]

The enactment of the Digital Personal Data Protection Act 2023 (Act No. 22 of 2023) and the notification of the Digital Personal Data Protection Rules 2025 via G.S.R. 846(E) on 13 November 2025 (with Corrigendum G.S.R. 892(E) on 10 December 2025) establish binding statutory obligations for higher education institutions.[51] Under Rule 1 of the DPDP Rules 2025, commencement is phased across three statutory milestones: (1) Rules 1, 2 (Definitions), and 17–21

(constituting the Data Protection Board of India as a digital office) came into force immediately on **13 November 2025** (Rule 1(2));[52] (2) Rule 4 and the First Schedule (Consent Manager registration and obligations) come into force one year later, on **13 November 2026** (Rule 1(3));[53] and (3) the substantive operational provisions—Rules 3, 5–16, 22, and 23—come into force eighteen months after publication, on **13 May 2027** (Rule 1(4)).[54] State universities and affiliated law colleges are thus in the critical compliance window prior to May 2027 enforcement.

Under Sections 2(i) and 3 of the DPDP Act 2023, every university and affiliated law college processing digital personal data (or digitizing offline admission, assessment, APAAR/ABC ID, or legal aid records) is a **Data Fiduciary**, remaining strictly liable under Section 8(1)–(2) for any third-party ERP or LMS **Data Processor** it engages.[55] Five specific duties govern law schools: (1) **Itemized Notice (Section 5 & Rule 3):** unless processing falls strictly within a government college's public-funded statutory function under Section 7(b), Rule 5, and the Second Schedule, Rule 3 requires an independent, plain-language notice containing an *itemized description* of personal data, specific purposes, and direct links to withdraw consent and complain to the Board;[56] (2) **Minors' Data in Five-Year B.A. LL.B. Programmes (Section 9, Rule 10, & Rule 12 / Fourth Schedule):** because first-year B.A. LL.B. entrants are frequently 17 years old (minors under Section 2(f)), Rule 10 mandates verifiable parental consent, while **Rule 12(1) read with Part A, Item 3 of the Fourth Schedule** exempts educational institutions from Section 9(1) and (3) *solely* where tracking and behavioural monitoring are restricted '(a) for the educational activities of such institution; or (b) in the interests of safety of children enrolled with such institution' (and Part B, Item 3 covers email account creation);[57] (3) **Security Safeguards and One-Year Log Retention**

(Section 8(5), Rule 6, & Rule 8(3)): Rule 6(1) mandates encryption, masking, or virtual tokens, access controls, processor contract clauses, and a minimum one-year retention of access logs and personal data (also required under Rule 8(3) and the Seventh Schedule) to detect and remediate unauthorized access;[58] (4) **72-Hour Breach Intimation (Section 8(6) & Rule 7):** Rule 7 mandates immediate intimation to affected students and a detailed forensic report to the Data Protection Board within **72 hours** of discovering any breach, alongside publishing a designated officer's contact details under Rule 9 and resolving grievances within 90 days under Rule 14(3);[59] and (5) **Legal Aid Clinic Confidentiality:** protecting indigent clients' sensitive case files from unauthorized disclosure.

7.2 Mandatory Digital Accessibility Under the RPwD Act 2016

Simultaneously, Sections 16 and 42 of the Rights of Persons with Disabilities (RPwD) Act 2016 require higher education institutions to ensure reasonable accommodation and accessible electronic content conforming to WCAG 2.1 ICT standards.[60] Building on *Vikash Kumar v Union Public Service Commission*, which held reasonable accommodation under Section 2(y) to be integral to substantive equality,[61] the Supreme Court in *Rajive Raturi v Union of India* (8 November 2024) struck down Rule 15(1) of the RPwD Rules insofar as it treated accessibility norms as optional, holding that digital and physical accessibility standards are mandatory statutory duties.[62] Uploading non-OCR scanned PDFs of university ordinances or operating screen-reader-incompatible portals directly violates Section 42 and *Rajive Raturi*.

8. Integrated Discussion and Proposed Institutional Framework

The preceding analysis demonstrates that resource allocation, bilingual pedagogy, and digital governance are structurally interdependent. Bilingual teaching cannot

succeed through permissive exam-medium clauses alone; it requires capital budgets for diglot commentaries, faculty workload credits to develop bilingual case modules, and accessible digital repositories. Conversely, purchasing commercial English databases or LMS software fails if Hindi-medium students lack English boolean search training or if colleges lack recurring funds. Furthermore, expanding digital admissions and ABC credit portals without DPDP Rules 2025 safeguards or WCAG 2.1 compliance converts digital transformation into statutory liability.

To harmonize these dimensions within the statutory constraints of affiliated colleges, this article proposes the **Integrated Legal Education Implementation Framework (ILEIF)**. As a proposed analytical and managerial model grounded in the Advocates Act 1961 and state university acts, ILEIF establishes a **Hub-and-Spoke Consortial Governance Architecture**: the affiliating State University (Board of Studies, Law Department, and IQAC) and State Higher Education Department serve as the *Resource and Governance Hub*, while affiliated government and private law colleges function as *Pedagogical and Clinical Spokes* (Table 2). By assigning high-fixed-cost functions—consortial database licensing, diglot casebook authoring, and DPDP/WCAG platform procurement—to the university hub, ILEIF enables individual colleges to focus on classroom scaffolding, daytime instructional compliance, and local clinical delivery.

ILEIF Pillar	University & State Hub Role	Affiliated College (Spoke) Role	Legal Safeguards	Indicators
1. Consortial Resource Allocation	Negotiate state consortial database licenses; maintain shared adjunct pool for emerging tech courses; subsidize NAAC Rs 6L fee.	Maintain 1:40 core faculty ratio; ring-fence 10% fee revenue for library/clinics; partner with District Legal Services Authorities (DLSA).	Comply with BCI Circular LE-06/2024 daytime 30-hour rule and online LL.B. ban via blended co-teaching.	Consortial cost/student; 1:40 faculty ratio; active DLSA clinics.
2. Calibrated Bilingual Scaffolding	Establish Board of Studies Bilingual Cell; publish open-access Diglot Case Readers (Sem I–VI) and regional clinical manuals.	Execute 3-tier scaffolding: Sem I–II Hindi onboarding + Legal English lab; Sem III–IV Diglot cases; Sem V–VI Hindi trial & English appellate drafting.	Balance Art 348(1) English appellate mandate with Sec 307 BNSS trial court language via dual rubrics.	Diglot reader ratio; bilingual clinical drafting completion.
3. Accountable Digital Governance	Procure DPDP- and WCAG 2.1-compliant central ERP/LMS; issue standard Data Processor Agreements and bilingual Rule 3 notices.	Appoint Nodal Data & Accessibility Officer; enforce Rule 6 encryption/1-yr logs, Rule 10/12 minor safeguards, and 100% OCR PDFs.	Meet 13 May 2027 DPDP Rules deadline (Rules 3, 6–14) & mandatory RPwD Sec 42 (*Rajive Raturi*).	100% OCR/WCAG portals; published Rule 3/9 notices; signed DPAs.

9. Recommendations and Implementation Roadmap

Operationalizing ILEIF requires a phased roadmap aligned with statutory deadlines and institutional capacities:

1. **Short-Term Measures (0–12 Months — Statutory Compliance & Modular Syllabi):** First, prior to the **13 May 2027** enforcement of substantive provisions

under Rule 1(4) of the DPDP Rules 2025, affiliating universities must mandate a standardized **Institutional Data Governance Protocol** across all affiliated law colleges. Colleges must publish bilingual itemized consent notices (Rule 3) and Nodal Officer contacts (Rule 9), enforce 90-day grievance redressal (Rule 14(3)), verify parental consent and Fourth Schedule (Part A, Item 3) educational-activity restrictions for 17-year-old B.A. LL.B. entrants (Rules 10 and 12), execute Data Processor addenda requiring encryption and one-year log retention (Rules 6 and 8(3)), establish 72-hour breach reporting workflows (Rule 7), and ban unencrypted student or legal aid data sharing on consumer messaging apps. Second, to comply with Section 42 of the RPwD Act 2016 and *Rajive Raturi v Union of India* (2024), universities must mandate that all ordinances (such as PRSU Ordinance No. 180), syllabi, and notices be published as OCR-enabled, WCAG 2.1-compliant PDFs. Third, rather than adding six standalone technology courses that affiliated colleges cannot staff, Boards of Studies should integrate the Mediation Act 2023 into the Fourth Semester *ADR (Clinical)* paper and restructure Sixth Semester *Cyber Law* into *Law, Digital Technologies, and Data Governance* (covering the DPDP Act 2023, AI, and electronic evidence under Section 63 BSA 2023).

2. **Medium-Term Measures (1–3 Years — Consortial Licensing & Three-Tier Bilingualism):** First, State Higher Education Departments and State Bar Councils should negotiate state-wide consortial subscriptions to legal databases alongside mandatory training on the Supreme Court's free *e-SCR* (English and Hindi) portal, while formalizing DLSA grants for college legal aid clinics. Second, universities should partner with *Vidhi Sahitya Prakashan* to publish open-access **Diglot Case Readers** and implement ILEIF's three-tier bilingual protocol: conceptual Hindi onboarding paired with intensive Legal English in Semesters I–II; Diglot statutory and case analysis in Semesters III–IV; and dual-register clinical training (Hindi

trial pleadings under Section 307 BNSS and English appellate memorials under Article 348(1)) in Semesters V–VI. Third, acting on Paragraph 3.22 of the 142nd Parliamentary Report, NAAC should equalize assessment fees for law colleges at the Rs 2,00,000 general tier, while the BCI and UGC issue joint guidelines permitting 12–16 ABC multidisciplinary elective credits without breaching daytime attendance norms.

3. **Long-Term Measures (3–5 Years — Structural Reform):** State governments must fill regular PSC law faculty vacancies and enforce UGC pay scales in private colleges as a condition of affiliation renewal under state university acts. At the national level, Parliament should implement Paragraph 2.35 of the 142nd Parliamentary Report by focusing the BCI on undergraduate professional standards and Bar licensing while establishing a statutory National Council for Legal Education and Research (NCLER) to fund postgraduate research and vernacular legal scholarship.

10. Conclusion

Operationalizing NEP 2020 in state-affiliated law schools requires aligning policy ambition with the statutory and fiscal realities of the affiliating university system. Answering the five research questions yields clear conclusions. First (RQ1), NEP 2020 Paragraph 20.4 is an executive policy whose norms bind law colleges only when translated through the Advocates Act 1961, the BCI Rules 2008, and state university ordinances; as PRSU's July 2024 revision of Ordinance No. 180 illustrates, universities swiftly adopt mandatory statutory updates (such as the BNS, BNSS, and BSA) while maintaining rigid prohibitions against lateral entry-exit and credit mobility. Second (RQ2), strategic resource allocation is constrained by state treasury controls in government colleges, tuition-cap economics in private

unaided colleges, faculty workload pressures, database costs, and NAAC's Rs 6,00,000 fee barrier. Third (RQ3), while bilingual instruction advances constitutional access to learning and trial advocacy, uncalibrated regional-language teaching without diglot casebooks and progressive English training risks trapping graduates below the Article 348(1) appellate threshold. Fourth (RQ4), ad-hoc digitization in affiliated colleges creates acute compliance gaps under the DPDP Act 2023, the phased DPDP Rules 2025 (ahead of the 13 May 2027 enforcement date), and Section 42 of the RPwD Act 2016 (*Rajive Raturi*). Fifth (RQ5), the proposed Integrated Legal Education Implementation Framework (ILEIF) offers a realistic hub-and-spoke governance solution, pooling database, translation, and compliance capacities at the affiliating university level so that state-affiliated law schools can deliver rigorous, bilingual, and legally accountable legal education.

Footnotes

[1] N R Madhava Menon, *The Transformation of Indian Legal Education: A Blue Paper* (Harvard Law School Program on the Legal Profession 2012) 11–18; Department-Related Parliamentary Standing Committee on Personnel, Public Grievances, Law and Justice, *Strengthening Legal Education in View of Emerging Challenges Before the Legal Profession* (142nd Report, Rajya Sabha Secretariat, 7 February 2024) paras 2.34–2.36.

[2] Bar Council of India, 'Comprehensive Implementation of Legal Education Reforms, Mandatory Guidelines, Norms & Rules of Legal Education' Circular No BCI:D:468/2024 (LE Circular-06/2024, 20 May 2024) <https://www.barcouncilofindia.org/info/comprehens-ku2hwr> accessed 11 November 2026.

[3] Ministry of Education, Government of India, *All India Survey on Higher Education (AISHE) 2021–22* (2024) 1–4, 34; Rabbani Attar, 'In Defence of the Affiliated College System' (2023) 58(34) Economic and Political Weekly 12.

[4] Ministry of Human Resource Development, Government of India, *National Education Policy 2020* (2020) para 20.4 <https://static.pib.gov.in/WriteReadData/userfiles/NEP_Final_English_0.pdf> accessed 11 November 2026.

[5] N L Mitra and Manoj Kumar Sinha, 'National Education Policy 2020 and Challenges to the Bar Council of India' (2022) 10(1) Asian Journal of Legal Education 7, 10–15.

[6] Advocates Act 1961, ss 7(1)(h), 7(1)(i), 10(2)(b), 49(1)(af), 49(1)(d); Bar Council of India Rules of Legal Education 2008, pt IV.

[7] Chhattisgarh Vishwavidyalaya Adhiniyam 1973 (CG Act No 22 of 1973), ss 6(17), 24, 37; Pt. Ravishankar Shukla University, Raipur, *Revised Ordinance No. 180: Ordinance, Scheme of Exam and Syllabus of LL.B. (Three Year Degree Course) Semester System Examination* (29 July 2024) <https://www.prsu.ac.in/backend/web/theme/syllabus_uploads/18092026052657.pdf> accessed 11 November 2026.

[8] BCI Circular No BCI:D:468/2024 (n 2) items 1–14.

[9] Constitution of India, sch VII, list I entry 66 and list III entry 25.

[10] *National Education Policy 2020* (n 4) para 18.3.

[11] ibid para 20.4.

[12] Advocates Act 1961, ss 7(1)(h)–(i).

[13] ibid ss 10(2)(b), 49(1)(af), 49(1)(d); BCI Rules of Legal Education 2008, r 14, schs II–III.

[14] *V Sudeer v Bar Council of India* (1999) 3 SCC 176.

[15] *Bar Council of India v Board of Management, Dayanand College of Law* (2007) 2 SCC 202, paras 11–15.

[16] *Bar Council of India v Bonnie Foi Law College* (2023) 7 SCC 756 (2023 INSC 123), paras 35–46.

[17] Bar Council of India, 'Implementation of Computer Education in Legal Courses' Circular No BCI:D:465/2024 (24 January 2024) <https://www.barcouncilofindia.org/info/circular-i-aqp86p> accessed 11 November 2026.

[18] BCI Circular No BCI:D:468/2024 (n 2) items 1–6; Mediation Act 2023 (Act No 32 of 2023).

[19] BCI Circular No BCI:D:468/2024 (n 2) item 8; Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita 2023 (Act No 45 of 2023); Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita 2023 (Act No 46 of 2023); Bharatiya Sakshya Adhiniyam 2023 (Act No 47 of 2023).

[20] *Odisha Lift Irrigation Corp Ltd v Ravi Shankar Patro* (2018) 1 SCC 468; *Vinit Garg v University Grants Commission* WP (Civil) No 1510 of 2018 (SC, 29 August 2019); UGC (Open and Distance Learning Programmes and Online Programmes) Regulations 2020, reg 4(A)(iv).

[21] BCI Circular No BCI:D:468/2024 (n 2) items 9–13.

[22] Parliamentary Standing Committee, *142nd Report* (n 1) paras 2.32–2.36; Law Commission of India, *184th Report on Legal Education* (2002).

[23] Chhattisgarh Vishwavidyalaya Adhiniyam 1973 (n 7) ss 4(xxiv), 7(1); *Prof Yashpal v State of Chhattisgarh* (2005) 5 SCC 420.

[24] Chhattisgarh Vishwavidyalaya Adhiniyam 1973 (n 7) ss 6(17), 24, 35, 37.

[25] PRSU, *Revised Ordinance No. 180* (n 7) cls 4, 11, 12, and Semester III–VI Syllabus; UGC (Establishment and Operation of Academic Bank of Credits in Higher Education) Regulations 2021, regs 1.2, 3.1.

[26] Upendra Baxi, 'Notes Towards a Socially Relevant Legal Education' (1976) 5(1–3) Journal of the Bar Council of India 1; Upendra Baxi, 'Socio-Legal Research in India: A Programschrift' (1982) 24(2–3) Journal of the Indian Law Institute 416; Prakash Sharma, 'Upendra Baxi and Legal Education' in Salman Khurshid and others (eds), *Comparative Constitutionalism in South Asia* (Thomson Reuters 2021).

[27] Menon (n 1) 14–22; C Raj Kumar, 'Legal Education, Globalization, and Institutional Excellence' (2013) 20(1) Indiana Journal of Global Legal Studies 221.

[28] Jayanth K Krishnan, 'Professor Kingsfield Goes to Delhi' (2004) 46(4) American Journal of Legal History 447; Jonathan Gingerich, Vikramaditya Khanna and Aditya Singh, 'The Anatomy of Legal Recruitment in India' in David B Wilkins, Vikramaditya S Khanna and David M Trubek (eds), *The Indian Legal Profession in the Age of Globalization* (CUP 2017) 548; Swethaa S Ballakrishnen, *Accidental Feminism* (Princeton University Press 2021).

[29] Garima Malik, *Governance and Management of Higher Education Institutions in India* (Routledge 2023); N V Varghese and Jinusha Panigrahi (eds), *India Higher Education Report 2018: Financing of Higher Education* (SAGE 2019).

[30] Attar (n 3) 12–15; UGC, *Guidelines for Transforming Higher Education Institutions into Multidisciplinary Institutions* (2022); Anil Gaman Ahire, 'Scope and Limitations of Cluster Colleges in India' (2023) 8(12) IJNRD d627.

[31] Mitra and Sinha (n 5) 7–22; Sanjit Kumar Chakraborty and Tushar Krishna, 'Promises and Prospects of Legal Education in India in the Context of the New Education Policy: A Reality Check' (2021) 9(1) Asian Journal of Legal Education 64; Shuvro Prosun Sarker, 'Bridging the Gap' (2020) 7(1) Asian Journal of Legal Education 57; Shuvro Prosun Sarker, 'India (Contemporary Legal Education)' in *Elgar Concise Encyclopedia of Legal Education* (Edward Elgar 2025); Julius G Getman, 'The Development of Indian Legal Education: The Impact of the Language Problem' (1969) 21(5) Journal of Legal Education 513.

[32] Arpan Tulsyan, *Governing Learner Data Risks in India: The DPDP Act and the Case for EdTech-Specific Regulation* (ORF Issue Brief No 879, June 2026) <https://www.orfonline.org/research/governing-learner-data-risks-in-india-the-dpdp-act-and-the-case-for-edtech-specific-regulation> accessed 11 November 2026; UNESCO, *Global Education Monitoring*

Report 2023 (2023); UNICEF Innocenti, *Data Governance in Education Technology* (2025); Daniel J Solove, 'A Taxonomy of Privacy' (2006) 154(3) University of Pennsylvania Law Review 477; Vidhi Centre for Legal Policy, 'Digital Access as a Fundamental Right' (1 August 2025) <https://vidhilegalpolicy.in/blog/digital-access-as-a-fundamental-right/> accessed 11 November 2026.

[33] Hidayatullah National University of Law, Chhattisgarh Act 2003 (CG Act No 10 of 2003).

[34] *State of Maharashtra v Manubhai Pragaji Vashi* (1995) 5 SCC 730, paras 19–24.

[35] PRSU, *Revised Ordinance No. 180* (n 7) 2; Govind Sarang Government Law College, Bhatapara institutional profile (affiliated to PRSU Raipur).

[36] D.P. Vipra Law College, Bilaspur <https://dpvipralawcollege.ac.in/> accessed 11 November 2026; PRSU Affiliated Colleges List (S.K.T.D. Law College, Raipur) <https://www.prsu.ac.in/academic-department/affiliated-colleges> accessed 11 November 2026.

[37] BCI Rules of Legal Education 2008, sch III cl 5A; BCI Circular No BCI:D:468/2024 (n 2) item 13.

[38] BCI Rules of Legal Education 2008, sch III cl 17; PRSU, *Revised Ordinance No. 180* (n 7) cl 6; BCI Circular No BCI:D:468/2024 (n 2) item 10.

[39] BCI Rules of Legal Education 2008, sch III cl 15, cl 24; Parliamentary Standing Committee, *142nd Report* (n 1) para 4.22.

[40] Parliamentary Standing Committee, *142nd Report* (n 1) paras 3.18, 3.21–3.22; UGC ABC Regulations 2021 (n 25) reg 1.2.

[41] *National Education Policy 2020* (n 4) para 20.4; BCI Circular No BCI:D:468/2024 (n 2) item 4.

[42] Constitution of India, art 348(1).

[43] ibid art 348(2)–(3); Official Languages Act 1963, ss 6–7.

[44] Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita 2023, s 307; Code of Civil Procedure 1908, s 137.

[45] Parliamentary Standing Committee, *142nd Report* (n 1) para 6.11.

[46] PRSU, *Revised Ordinance No. 180* (n 7) cl 5.

[47] Authoritative Texts (Central Laws) Act 1973, s 2; Ministry of Law and Justice, Legislative Department, *Tri-Lingual Legal Glossary* (2025) <https://www.legislative.gov.in/static/uploads/2025/06/fe9fbab04f30640ba7ad085a99bd4eae.pdf> accessed 11 November 2026.

[48] PRSU, *Revised Ordinance No. 180* (n 7) 13–18.

[49] *National Education Policy 2020* (n 4) ch 23; BCI Circular No BCI:D:465/2024 (n 17).

[50] Tulsyan (n 32) 4–7; UNESCO (n 32) 14–22.

[51] Digital Personal Data Protection Act 2023 (Act No 22 of 2023); Digital Personal Data Protection Rules 2025, MeitY Notification GSR 846(E) (Gazette of India, Extraordinary, pt II s 3(i), 13 November 2025; Corrigendum GSR 892(E), 10 December 2025) <https://cadp.in/resources/official-texts/dpdp-rules-2025/> accessed 11 November 2026.

[52] Digital Personal Data Protection Rules 2025, r 1(2).

[53] ibid r 1(3), r 4, sch 1.

[54] ibid r 1(4).

[55] Digital Personal Data Protection Act 2023, ss 2(i), 2(k), 3, 8(1)–(2).

[56] ibid ss 5, 6(1), 7(b); Digital Personal Data Protection Rules 2025, r 3, r 5, sch 2.

[57] Digital Personal Data Protection Act 2023, ss 2(f), 9(1), 9(3)–(4); Digital Personal Data Protection Rules 2025, r 10, r 12, sch 4 pt A item 3 and pt B item 3.

[58] Digital Personal Data Protection Act 2023, s 8(5); Digital Personal Data Protection Rules 2025, r 6(1), r 8(3), sch 7.

[59] Digital Personal Data Protection Act 2023, s 8(6); Digital Personal Data Protection Rules 2025, r 7(1)–(2), r 9, r 14(3).

[60] Rights of Persons with Disabilities Act 2016 (Act No 49 of 2016), ss 16, 40, 42.

[61] *Vikash Kumar v Union Public Service Commission* (2021) 5 SCC 370, paras 42–60.

[62] *Rajive Raturi v Union of India* 2024 INSC 858 (SC, 8 November 2024), paras 51–88 <https://api.sci.gov.in/supremecourt/2005/9321/9321_2005_1_1503_56986_Judgement_08-Nov-2024.pdf> accessed 11 November 2026.

Bibliography

1. Cases: *Bar Council of India v Board of Management, Dayanand College of Law* (2007) 2 SCC 202; *Bar Council of India v Bonnie Foi Law College* (2023) 7 SCC 756 (2023 INSC 123); *Odisha Lift Irrigation Corp Ltd v Ravi Shankar Patro* (2018) 1 SCC 468; *Prof Yashpal v State of Chhattisgarh* (2005) 5 SCC 420; *Rajive Raturi v Union of India* 2024 INSC 858 (SC, 8 November 2024); *State of Maharashtra v Manubhai Pragaji Vashi* (1995) 5 SCC 730; *V Sudeer v Bar Council of India* (1999) 3 SCC 176; *Vikash Kumar v Union Public Service Commission* (2021) 5 SCC 370; *Vinit Garg v University Grants Commission* WP (Civil) No 1510 of 2018 (SC, 29 August 2019).

2. Legislation & Delegated Rules: Constitution of India 1950; Advocates Act 1961; University Grants Commission Act 1956; Official Languages Act 1963; Authoritative Texts (Central Laws) Act 1973; Chhattisgarh Vishwavidyalaya Adhiniyam 1973 (CG Act No 22 of 1973); Hidayatullah National

University of Law, Chhattisgarh Act 2003 (CG Act No 10 of 2003); Rights of Persons with Disabilities Act 2016; Mediation Act 2023; Digital Personal Data Protection Act 2023; Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita 2023; Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita 2023; Bharatiya Sakshya Adhiniyam 2023; Bar Council of India Rules of Legal Education 2008; UGC (Open and Distance Learning Programmes and Online Programmes) Regulations 2020; UGC (Establishment and Operation of Academic Bank of Credits in Higher Education) Regulations 2021; Digital Personal Data Protection Rules 2025, GSR 846(E) (13 November 2025); Pt. Ravishankar Shukla University, *Revised Ordinance No. 180* (29 July 2024).

3. Policy Documents, Circulars & Reports: Bar Council of India, Circular No BCI:D:465/2024 (24 January 2024) and Circular No BCI:D:468/2024 (LE Circular-06/2024, 20 May 2024); Department-Related Parliamentary Standing Committee on Personnel, Public Grievances, Law and Justice, *Strengthening Legal Education in View of Emerging Challenges Before the Legal Profession* (142nd Report, 7 February 2024); Law Commission of India, *184th Report on Legal Education* (2002); Ministry of Education, *AISHE 2021–22* (2024); Ministry of Human Resource Development, *National Education Policy 2020* (2020); Ministry of Law and Justice, *Tri-Lingual Legal Glossary* (2025); UGC, *Guidelines for Transforming Higher Education Institutions into Multidisciplinary Institutions* (2022); UNESCO, *Global Education Monitoring Report 2023* (2023); UNICEF Innocenti, *Data Governance in Education Technology* (2025).

4. Secondary Scholarship: Ahire AG, 'Scope and Limitations of Cluster Colleges in India' (2023) 8(12) IJNRD d627; Attar R, 'In Defence of the Affiliated College System' (2023) 58(34) Economic and Political Weekly 12; Ballakrishnen SS, *Accidental Feminism* (Princeton University Press 2021); Baxi U, 'Notes Towards a Socially Relevant Legal Education' (1976) 5(1–3) JBCI 1; Baxi U, 'Socio-Legal Research in India: A Programschrift' (1982) 24(2–3) JILI 416; Chakraborty SK and Krishna T, 'Promises and Prospects of Legal Education in India in the Context of the New Education Policy: A Reality Check' (2021) 9(1) Asian Journal of Legal Education 64; Getman JG, 'The Development of Indian Legal Education: The Impact of the Language Problem' (1969) 21(5) Journal of Legal Education 513; Gingerich J, Khanna V and Singh A, 'The Anatomy of Legal Recruitment in India' in Wilkins DB, Khanna VS and Trubek DM (eds), *The Indian Legal Profession in the Age of Globalization* (CUP 2017); Krishnan JK, 'Professor Kingsfield Goes to Delhi' (2004) 46(4) American Journal of Legal History 447; Kumar CR, 'Legal Education, Globalization, and Institutional Excellence' (2013) 20(1) Indiana Journal of Global Legal Studies 221; Malik G, *Governance and Management of Higher Education Institutions in India* (Routledge 2023); Menon NRM, *The Transformation of Indian Legal Education: A Blue Paper* (Harvard Law School 2012); Mitra NL and Sinha MK, 'National Education Policy 2020 and Challenges to the Bar Council of India' (2022) 10(1) Asian Journal of Legal Education 7; Sarker SP, 'Bridging the Gap' (2020) 7(1) Asian Journal of Legal Education 57; Sarker SP, 'India (Contemporary Legal Education)' in *Elgar*

Concise Encyclopedia of Legal Education (Edward Elgar 2025); Sharma P, 'Upendra Baxi and Legal Education' in Khurshid S and others (eds), *Comparative Constitutionalism in South Asia* (Thomson Reuters 2021); Solove DJ, 'A Taxonomy of Privacy' (2006) 154(3) University of Pennsylvania Law Review 477; Tulsyan A, *Governing Learner Data Risks in India: The DPDP Act and the Case for EdTech-Specific Regulation* (ORF Issue Brief No 879, June 2026); Varghese NV and Panigrahi J (eds), *India Higher Education Report 2018* (SAGE 2019); Vidhi Centre for Legal Policy, 'Digital Access as a Fundamental Right' (2025).