



GUIDELINES FOR AUTHORS

(BLOG TEMPLATE)

PREREQUISITES

Blog Title	<i>Enter your working title here (10–15 words)</i>
Author Name	<i>Full name, designation, and institutional affiliation</i>
Category / Tag	<i>e.g. Constitutional Law · Criminal Justice · Gender & Law · Human Rights</i>
Target Audience	<i>Law students, legal practitioners, academics, civil society</i>
Keyword	<i>5-7 Main keywords (e.g. 'Article 21', 'Crime', 'Artificial Intelligence')</i>
Citation Style	<i>Choose one: JILI Style/Harvard Bluebook/OSCOLA (Preferably with DOI/URL)</i>
Legislation Cited	<i>Mention primary statutes, treaties, or constitutional provisions</i>
Cases Cited	<i>Mention primary case(s) with full citation</i>
Process of Publication	<i>Submission of Draft · Plagiarism and AI Check · Peer Review · Approved/Major or Minor Changes · Published</i>

Essential Guidelines for Blog Submission

1. Co-authorship limit

A maximum of two co-authors is permitted per blog submission.

2. File format

All submissions must be uploaded as a single Word file (either .doc or .docx).

3. Plagiarism threshold

The overall plagiarism percentage must not exceed 15%.

4. AI usage restriction

Use of AI-generated content is strictly prohibited. Any AI contribution must remain below 10% of the total submission.

5. Funding acknowledgement

Any grants or financial support received for the blog's preparation must be clearly mentioned.

NOTE: SUBMISSION OF THE DRAFT WITH AI AND PLAGIARISM REPORT IS PREFERRED



CITATION STYLE GUIDE – CHOOSE & APPLY CONSISTENTLY

The Mendes Legal follows formal academic citation standards for all socio-legal content.

Select ONE citation style per post and apply it throughout, and do not mix styles.

- ILI (Indian Law Institute Style): Recommended for purely domestic Indian law topics.
- Harvard Bluebook: Recommended for comparative law, international law, and US-centric topics.
- OSCOLA (Oxford Standard for Citation of Legal Authorities): Recommended for UK/Commonwealth law.

All citations must appear as footnotes (preferred) or endnotes. In-text parenthetical citations are not used.

Feature	ILI Style	Harvard Bluebook	OSCOLA
Jurisdiction	India (domestic)	USA (international use)	UK / Commonwealth
Case citation	AIR 1994 SC 1844	Kesavananda Bharati v. State of Kerala, AIR 1973 SC 1461	Maneka Gandhi v Union of India [1978] AIR SC 597
Act citation	The Constitution of India, 1950, Art. 21	Constitution of India art. 21 (1950)	Constitution of India 1950, art 21
Journal article	Author, 'Title' (Year) Vol JName Page	Author, Title, Vol J. Name Page (Year)	Author, 'Title' (Year) Vol J Name Page
Footnote style	Superscript numeral; ibid./supra used	Superscript; id./supra/hereinafter	Superscript; ibid/above n used
Bibliography	End-of-article references list	Not required; footnotes suffice	Separate bibliography at end
Foreign cases	Full citation; translated if needed	Standard Bluebook foreign citation rules	Pinpoint citation; translated title in []

COMMON CITATION EXAMPLES

ILI Style – Quick Reference

Case: Maneka Gandhi v. Union of India, AIR 1978 SC 597.

Statute: The Protection of Children from Sexual Offences Act, 2012, s. 4.

Article: Upendra Baxi, "The Place of the Human Rights in Contemporary India", 2 *J. Indian L. Inst.* 1 (2000).

Book: H M Seervai, *Constitutional Law of India* 245 (4th edn, Universal, 2013).

Website: Supreme Court of India 'Judgments', available at: <https://www.sci.gov.in> (last visited on Apr. 10, 2025).



Harvard Bluebook — Quick Reference

Case: Kesavananda Bharati v. State of Kerala, AIR 1973 SC 1461 (India).
Statute: Protection of Children from Sexual Offences Act, No. 32 of 2012, § 4 (India).
Article: Rajeev Dhavan, *The Supreme Court Under Strain: The Challenge of Arrears*, 15 J. INDIAN L. INST. 1, 4 (1973).
Book: M P JAIN, INDIAN CONSTITUTIONAL LAW 457 (7th ed. 2014).
Website: Supreme Court of India, available at: <https://www.sci.gov.in>> accessed 10 April 2025.

OSCOLA — Quick Reference

Case: Vishaka v State of Rajasthan [1997] AIR SC 3011.
Statute: Constitution of India 1950, art 21.
Article: Upendra Baxi, 'Constitutionalism as a Site of State Formative Practices' (2000) 33 Cornell ILJ 463.
Book: Granville Austin, *The Indian Constitution: Cornerstone of a Nation* (OUP 1966) 115.
Website: Law Commission of India, 'Report No. 277' (2018) <<https://lawcommissionofindia.nic.in>> accessed 10 April 2025.

HOW TO USE THIS TEMPLATE

1. Complete the Blog Metadata table before writing.
2. Select your citation style and note it in the metadata table.
3. Work through each numbered writing section in order.
4. Replace every cyan placeholder box with your actual content.
5. Insert footnote citations at every claim, quotation, or statutory reference.
6. Run the Pre-Publish Checklist before submitting to the editor.

Style note: The Mendes Legal uses formal, academic prose. Avoid colloquialisms. Footnotes, not endnotes, are strongly preferred for readability.



BLOG STRUCTURE – WRITING SECTIONS

1

Title & Subtitle (10–15 words)

The title should signal the socio-legal issue precisely. Include a subtitle where the scope, jurisdiction, or angle requires clarification.

- › Use precise legal terminology — avoid clickbait
- › Include the jurisdiction or statute name where relevant (e.g., 'Section 124A IPC')
- › Subtitle may specify the angle: 'A Critical Analysis', 'A Comparative Study', 'An Empirical Assessment'

➡ Main Title

e.g. 'The Right to Privacy in India: Implications of the Puttaswamy Judgment'

➡ Subtitle (optional)

e.g. 'A Critical Analysis of the Supreme Court's Unanimous Verdict in K.S. Puttaswamy v. Union of India'

➡ Meta Description (150–160 characters)

Include primary keyword; summarise the central argument.

2

Introduction (150–200 words)

Frame the socio-legal problem, situate it in the contemporary legal landscape, and set out the structure of the post. Cite foundational sources from the outset.

- › Open with the factual or legal context — a landmark case, recent legislation, or social phenomenon
- › Clearly state the central argument or research question
- › Briefly outline the structure: 'This post examines... in three parts...'
- › Place your first footnote citation here (case, statute, or academic source)

➡ Opening Context (2–3 sentences)

Describe the legal or social issue and why it matters now. Cite a case or statute.¹

➡ Research Question / Thesis (1–2 sentences)

State the precise question this post answers or the argument it advances.

➡ Structural Roadmap (1–2 sentences)



e.g. 'Part I examines the constitutional basis... Part II analyses judicial trends... Part III proposes reforms...'

3

Part I — Legal & Constitutional Framework (300–350 words)

Set out the applicable law: constitutional provisions, statutes, and foundational precedents. This gives the reader the doctrinal grounding needed to follow the analysis.

- › Cite every statutory provision and constitutional article with full citation
- › Identify the leading case(s) that established the doctrine; pinpoint to paragraph/page
- › Note any legislative history or parliamentary debates (Constituent Assembly Debates, etc.)
- › Use an H2 subheading that names the legal instrument or doctrine

➡ **H2 Subheading — Legal Framework**

e.g. 'Article 21 and the Evolving Right to Privacy: Statutory and Constitutional Contours'

➡ **Part I Content (300–350 words)**

Outline the applicable law, key provisions, and the landmark case(s). Use footnotes for every citation.

4

Part II — Judicial Trends & Socio-Legal Analysis (350–450 words)

This is the analytical core. Examine how courts, tribunals, or policymakers have applied (or failed to apply) the law, and situate those findings in a broader social context.

- › Analyse at least two judicial decisions with critical commentary
- › Draw on socio-legal scholarship, empirical data, or comparative jurisdictions
- › Identify gaps, inconsistencies, or progressive developments in the case law
- › Cite academic articles, law commission reports, or government data as appropriate

➡ **H2 Subheading — Judicial / Policy Analysis**

e.g. 'Judicial Interpretation of Privacy Post-Puttaswamy: Progressive Steps and Remaining Lacunae'

➡ **Case Analysis (200–250 words)**

Analyse 2–3 decisions. Quote or paraphrase the court's reasoning and offer your critical commentary. Cite pinpoint paragraphs.

➡ **Socio-Legal Commentary (150–200 words)**



Connect the legal doctrine to real-world impact — who is affected, how, and why the law matters beyond the courtroom.

5

Part III — Critical Appraisal & Reform Proposals (300–400 words)

Offer an original critique of the current legal position and, where appropriate, propose reforms grounded in comparative or normative analysis.

- › Identify the specific doctrinal, procedural, or policy shortcoming
- › Draw on comparative law (UK, USA, ECtHR, etc.) if relevant — cite foreign cases per chosen style
- › Support reform proposals with academic authority or law commission recommendations
- › Acknowledge counter-arguments and engage with them fairly

➡ H2 Subheading — Critique & Reform

e.g. 'Shortcomings in Existing Data Protection Law and the Path to Legislative Reform'

➡ Critical Appraisal (150–200 words)

Identify and explain the principal weakness or gap in the current law.

➡ Reform Proposals (150–200 words)

State your recommendation clearly. Ground it in comparative experience, human rights standards, or academic scholarship.

6

Supporting Legal Elements (As needed)

Use these elements to add analytical depth and reader-friendliness to the post.

- › Case summary box — brief facts, holding, and significance
- › Statutory comparison table — side-by-side reading of provisions across jurisdictions
- › Key definitions box — define contested or technical legal terms
- › Pull quote — significant judicial dictum or academic quote with full citation
- › Footnotes — insert at every claim, quotation, paraphrase, or statutory reference

➡ Judicial Dictum / Pull Quote

Insert a significant quote from a judgment or leading scholar. Include full footnote citation.



Provision / Aspect	India	United Kingdom	European Union
Scope	Enter provision	Enter provision	Enter provision
Enforcement Body	Enter provision	Enter provision	Enter provision
Individual Rights	Enter provision	Enter provision	Enter provision
Penalties	Enter provision	Enter provision	Enter provision

↑ Optional comparative table. Fill with relevant statutory or constitutional provisions.

7

Conclusion (150–200 words)

Bring together the strands of the analysis into a clear, original conclusion. Restate the thesis, synthesise the key findings, and signal the path forward.

- › Restate the central argument in light of the analysis — do not introduce new material
- › Highlight the post's contribution to the discourse (doctrinal clarity, reform, awareness)
- › Close with a precise call to action: further research, legislative reform, judicial reconsideration
- › Optional: pose a reflective question to invite reader engagement

➡ **Synthesis (3–4 sentences)**

Bring together Parts I–III into a coherent conclusion. Refer to your thesis.

➡ **Path Forward / Call to Action**

e.g. 'The legislature must enact...', 'Scholars should examine...', 'Share your view in the comments below.'

WORD COUNT TRACKER

#	Section	Target Words	Actual Words
1	Title & Subtitle	50–80 chars	
2	Introduction	150–200	
3	Part I — Legal Framework	300–350	
4	Part II — Judicial & Socio-Legal	350–450	
5	Part III — Critique & Reform	300–400	
6	Supporting Legal Elements	As needed	
7	Conclusion	150–200	
	TOTAL	1,500–2,000	



PRE-PUBLISH CHECKLIST

Content & Legal Accuracy	Citation & Technical
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><input type="checkbox"/> Word count 1,500 – 2,000 (excl. footnotes)<input type="checkbox"/> Introduction states the thesis clearly<input type="checkbox"/> Three-part structure is logically sequenced<input type="checkbox"/> All legal claims are supported by authority<input type="checkbox"/> Counter-arguments are acknowledged<input type="checkbox"/> Conclusion synthesises – no new material<input type="checkbox"/> Language is formal and precise<input type="checkbox"/> No plagiarism – all paraphrases are cited	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><input type="checkbox"/> Single citation style used throughout<input type="checkbox"/> All case names are correctly italicised<input type="checkbox"/> All statutes include correct Act number/year<input type="checkbox"/> Footnotes are sequentially numbered<input type="checkbox"/> Ibid./Id. used correctly for repeat citations<input type="checkbox"/> Primary keyword in title and first paragraph<input type="checkbox"/> Meta description written (150–160 chars)<input type="checkbox"/> Mobile preview and final PDF checked

REVISION HISTORY

Date	Revised By	Notes / Changes

The Mendes Legal · Blog Template · For Internal Use Only