CLAT 2012 Question Paper with Solutions

General Instructions

(i) This booklet contains 200 questions, each provided with a complete, step-by-step solution.

(ii) It comprises 200 single-correct multiple-choice questions.

(iii) Attempt each question on your own before reviewing the given solution.

1. Read the passage and answer the question.

Passage (extract): The work which Gandhiji had taken up was not only regarding the achievement of political freedom but also the establishment of a new social order based on truth and non-violence, unity and peace, equality and universal brotherhood and maximum freedom for all. A new order cannot be established without radically changing the mind and attitude of men towards property and, at some stage or the other, the 'haves' have to yield place to the 'have-nots'. We have seen, in our time, attempts to achieve a kind of egalitarian society and the picture of it after it was achieved. But this was done, by and large, through the use of physical force. It may even be that, like a gas kept confined within containers under great pressure, or water held back by a big dam, once the barrier breaks, the reaction will one day sweep back with a violence equal in extent and intensity to what was used to establish and maintain the outward egalitarian form. This enforced egalitarianism contains, in its bosom, the seed of its own destruction. If egalitarianism is to endure, it has to be based not on the possession of the maximum material goods by a few or by all but on voluntary, enlightened renunciation of those goods which cannot be shared by others or can be enjoyed only at the expense of others.

According to the passage, egalitarianism will not survive if

(A) It is based on voluntary renunciation

(B) It is achieved by resorting to physical force

(C) Underprivileged people are not involved in its establishment.

(D) People's outlook towards it is not radically changed.

Correct Answer: (B) It is achieved by resorting to physical force

Solution:

The question asks about the one condition under which equality of this kind collapses. The passage answers it twice in the same breath. It first says that the egalitarian societies of our own time were built "through the use of physical force", and then it delivers the verdict on that method: "This enforced egalitarianism contains, in its bosom, the seed of its own destruction." A thing that carries the seed of its own destruction cannot survive. So the killer condition is force.

1. **It is based on voluntary renunciation**: This is the exact opposite of what the passage warns against. The writer says that if egalitarianism is to endure, it has to be based on "voluntary, enlightened renunciation". Voluntary renunciation is the thing that makes it last, so it cannot be the thing that kills it.
2. **It is achieved by resorting to physical force**: This matches the passage word for word in sense. Force gives you only the "outward egalitarian form". The pressure builds up like gas in a container or water behind a dam, and when the barrier breaks the reaction sweeps back with equal violence. That is destruction, not survival.
3. **Underprivileged people are not involved in its establishment**: The passage never makes participation of the poor a test of survival. It speaks of the 'haves' yielding place to the 'have-nots', but the question there is whether the yielding is voluntary, not whether the 'have-nots' took part in setting the order up. This option adds a condition the writer never states.
4. **People's outlook towards it is not radically changed**: This is tempting, because the passage does say a new order cannot be established without radically changing the mind and attitude of men towards property. But look at the verb. That line is about

establishing the order. The question asks about survival, and for survival the passage names one specific enemy, force, and one specific support, voluntary renunciation. Option (D) also misplaces the object of the change: the passage wants the attitude towards property changed, not the attitude towards egalitarianism.

So the correct choice is (B). Enforced egalitarianism is the case the writer singles out as self-destroying.

Let's summarize:

- Force produces only the outward form of equality, and the passage says that form carries the seed of its own destruction.
- Voluntary, enlightened renunciation is what the writer offers as the condition for equality to endure.
- Radical change of outlook is tied in the passage to establishing the order, not to whether it survives.

Egalitarianism will not survive if it is achieved by resorting to physical force.

Quick Tip: Find the sentence about the "seed of its own destruction" and see which kind of egalitarianism it describes.

2. Read the passage and answer the question.

Passage (extract): In establishing a social order on this pattern, there was a strong possibility of a conflict arising between diverse groups and classes of our own people. Experience shows that man values his possessions even more than his life because in the former he sees the means for perpetuation and survival of his descendants even after his body is reduced to ashes. A new order cannot be established without radically changing the mind and attitude of men towards property and, at some stage or the other, the 'haves' have to yield place to the 'have-nots'.

According to the passage, why does man value his possessions more than his life?

(A) He has inherent desire to share his possession with others.

(B) He is endowed with the possessive instinct.

(C) Only his possession helps him earn love and respect from his descendants.

(D) Through his possessions he can preserve his name even after his death.

Correct Answer: (D) Through his possessions he can preserve his name even after his death.

Solution:

This is a direct question with the reason printed in the passage. The line is: "man values his possessions even more than his life because in the former he sees the means for perpetuation and survival of his descendants even after his body is reduced to ashes." The word "because" hands us the reason. Property outlives the body. It carries

the man forward after he is gone. The right option must carry that idea of continuing beyond death.

1. **He has inherent desire to share his possession with others**: The passage argues the reverse. Man clings to what he owns, and the writer calls this possessiveness the root cause of class conflict. A desire to share would not explain why he values property above his own life.
2. **He is endowed with the possessive instinct**: This is true of the passage as a general statement, but it does not answer this question. It only renames the behaviour. Saying a man hoards because he has a hoarding instinct is going in a circle. The passage gives a reason behind the instinct, and the stem asks for that reason.
3. **Only his possession helps him earn love and respect from his descendants**: Love and respect appear nowhere in the passage. The writer speaks of the survival of descendants, not of the affection they show. The word "Only" also makes this far stronger than anything the passage says.
4. **Through his possessions he can preserve his name even after his death**: This is the paraphrase of "perpetuation ... even after his body is reduced to ashes". Perpetuation means being carried on. The body burns, the property stays, and through it the man and his line continue. This option keeps both halves of the passage's reason, the continuation and the after death part.

So the answer is (D). It is the only option built on the after death continuity that the passage actually gives as the cause.

Let's summarize:

- The passage's own "because" clause is the answer key: property is seen as the means of perpetuation after the body is gone.
- Option (B) restates the habit instead of giving its cause, so it fails the "why" in the stem.
- Options (A) and (C) bring in sharing and affection, neither of which the passage mentions.

Man values his possessions more than his life because they let him live on after his death, which is option (D).

Quick Tip: Read the clause right after the word "because" in the sentence about man valuing his possessions.

3. Read the passage and answer the question.

Passage (extract): The work which Gandhiji had taken up was not only regarding the achievement of political freedom but also the establishment of a new social order based on truth and non-violence, unity and peace, equality and universal brotherhood and maximum freedom for all. This unfinished part of his experiment was perhaps even more difficult to achieve than the achievement of political freedom. In the political struggle, the fight was against a foreign power and all one could do was either join it or wish it success and give it his/her moral support. In establishing a social order on this pattern, there was a strong possibility of a conflict arising between diverse groups and classes of our own people.

According to the passage, which was the unfinished part of Gandhi's experiment?

(A) Educating people to avoid class conflict.

(B) Achieving total political freedom for the country

(C) Establishment of an egalitarian society

(D) Radically changing the mind and attitude of men towards truth and non-violence.

Correct Answer: (C) Establishment of an egalitarian society

Solution:

The phrase "unfinished part" is a pointer word. It points back to whatever the previous sentence named last. That sentence says Gandhiji's work was of two kinds: political freedom, and "the establishment of a new social order based on truth and non-violence, unity and peace, equality and universal brotherhood". Political freedom was won in 1947, so the part still left is the second one, the social order built on equality.

1. **Educating people to avoid class conflict**: The passage does talk about class conflict, but it never says Gandhiji's programme was education about it. Class conflict is described as a risk that comes with building the new order, not as the task itself. This option confuses a side effect with the goal.
2. **Achieving total political freedom for the country**: This is the finished half, not the unfinished one. The passage says the unfinished part was "perhaps even more difficult to achieve than the achievement of political freedom", which sets political freedom apart from it as a separate, already done thing.
3. **Establishment of an egalitarian society**: This is the second item in the writer's own pair. The passage describes the social order as one of "equality and universal brotherhood", and egalitarian simply means built on equality. The rest of the

passage keeps returning to the same word, which confirms this reading.

4. **Radically changing the mind and attitude of men towards truth and non-violence**: This is a trap made by swapping one word. The passage says a new order cannot come without radically changing the mind and attitude of men "towards property". Property, not truth and non-violence. Change of attitude is also only a means towards the new order, not the unfinished work itself.

So the answer is (C). The unfinished part was the building of an egalitarian social order.

Let's summarize:

- "This unfinished part" refers back to the second half of the pair in the opening sentence.
- Political freedom is named as the finished, easier half, so option (B) is out.
- Option (D) survives only if you misread "towards property" as "towards truth and non-violence".

Gandhiji's unfinished experiment was the establishment of an egalitarian society, option (C).

Quick Tip: Gandhiji's work had two parts. One was won in 1947. Identify the other one.

4. Read the passage and answer the question.

Passage (extract): In the political struggle, the fight was against a foreign power and all one could do was either join it or wish it success and give it his/her moral support. Experience shows that man values his possessions even more than his life because in the former he sees the means for perpetuation and survival of his descendants even after his body is reduced to ashes. We have seen, in our time, attempts to achieve a kind of egalitarian society and the picture of it after it was achieved. But this was done, by and large, through the use of physical force. This enforced egalitarianism contains, in its bosom, the seed of its own destruction. The root cause of class conflict is possessiveness or the acquisitive instinct.

Which of the following statements is 'not true' in the context of the passage?

(A) True egalitarianism can be achieved by giving up one's possessions under compulsion.

(B) Man values his life more than his possessions.

(C) Possessive instinct is a natural desire of human beings

(D) In the political struggle, the fight was against alien rule.

Correct Answer: (B) Man values his life more than his possessions.

Solution:

The stem asks which statement the passage does not support. So the job is to hold each option against the text and look for a flat contradiction. Three options should echo the passage and one should reverse it.

1. **True egalitarianism can be achieved by giving up one's possessions under compulsion**: The passage does reject compulsion, since enforced egalitarianism is said to carry the seed of its own destruction. This option is therefore also out of line with the writer's view, and it is the reason this question is worth a careful second look.
2. **Man values his life more than his possessions**: The passage says the exact opposite in plain words: "man values his possessions even more than his life". This is a straight reversal of a printed sentence, with the comparison flipped end for end. That makes it the clearest 'not true' statement on the list.
3. **Possessive instinct is a natural desire of human beings**: This agrees with the passage. The writer calls possessiveness the "acquisitive instinct" and says it is inherent in man, and that it is difficult, if not impossible, to root it out. So this statement is true and cannot be the answer.
4. **In the political struggle, the fight was against alien rule**: This matches the line "In the political struggle, the fight was against a foreign power". Alien rule and foreign power mean the same thing, so this is true.

Between (A) and (B), option (B) is the one that overturns a sentence of the passage word for word, with nothing left to interpret. Option (A) needs a step of reasoning about what "true" egalitarianism means, since force does produce an outward egalitarian form for a while. So (B) is the intended answer.

Let's summarize:

- The passage states that possessions are valued above life, so (B) reverses it directly.

- (C) and (D) are plain restatements of lines in the passage, so both are true.
- (A) also runs against the writer's view of enforced equality, which makes this question a poor one, but (B) is the flatter contradiction.

The statement that is not true is (B), man values his life more than his possessions.

Quick Tip: Compare each option with the passage line about what man values more, possessions or life.

5. Read the passage and answer the question.

Passage (extract): If egalitarianism is to endure, it has to be based not on the possession of the maximum material goods by a few or by all but on voluntary, enlightened renunciation of those goods which cannot be shared by others or can be enjoyed only at the expense of others. This calls for substitution of material values by purely spiritual ones. The paradise of material satisfaction, which is sometimes equated with progress these days, neither spells peace nor progress.

According to the passage, true egalitarianism will last only if

(A) It is thrust upon people.

(B) It is based on truth and non-violence.

(C) People inculcate spiritual values instead of material values.

(D) 'Haves' and 'have-nots' live together peacefully

Correct Answer: (C) People inculcate spiritual values instead of material values.

Solution:

The stem word is "last", and the passage word for lasting is "endure". Find the endure sentence and read the sentence right after it, because that is where the writer spells out what the endurance depends on: "This calls for substitution of material values by purely spiritual ones." That is the condition in one line.

1. **It is thrust upon people**: Thrust upon means forced on, and the passage says enforced egalitarianism contains the seed of its own destruction. The whole argument is against thrusting equality on anyone, so this is the opposite of the answer.
2. **It is based on truth and non-violence**: Truth and non-violence do appear in the passage, but in the opening line, where they describe the base of Gandhiji's new social order. They are not offered as the test of whether equality lasts. The stem is narrower than this option, so this is a partly right line placed in the wrong slot.
3. **People inculcate spiritual values instead of material values**: This is the paraphrase of "substitution of material values by purely spiritual ones". Substituting A by B is the same as taking on B instead of A. The passage reinforces it by saying that the paradise of material satisfaction spells neither peace nor progress, so material values are the thing to drop.
4. **'Haves' and 'have-nots' live together peacefully**: The passage does want the 'haves' to yield place to the 'have-nots', but peaceful coexistence is a result of the change, not the condition for it. The writer's condition is the inner shift from material to spiritual values, and peace follows only after that shift.

So the correct choice is (C). Lasting equality needs spiritual values to take the place of material ones.

Let's summarize:

- "Endure" in the passage matches "last" in the stem, and the very next sentence names the condition.
- Voluntary, enlightened renunciation is a spiritual act, which is why (C) fits and (A) is its reverse.
- (B) and (D) lift real phrases from the passage but attach them to the wrong question.

True egalitarianism will last only if people take on spiritual values in place of material ones, option (C).

Quick Tip: Look at the sentence that begins "This calls for substitution of..." just after the endure line.

6. Read the passage and answer the question.

Passage (extract): We have seen, in our time, attempts to achieve a kind of egalitarian society and the picture of it after it was achieved. But this was done, by and large, through the use of physical force. It may even be that, like a gas kept confined within containers under great pressure, or water held back by a big dam, once the barrier breaks, the reaction will one day sweep back with a violence equal in extent and intensity to what was used to establish and maintain the outward egalitarian form. This enforced egalitarianism contains, in its bosom, the seed of its own destruction.

According to the passage, people ultimately overturn a social order

(A) which is based on coercion and oppression.

(B) which does not satisfy their basic needs

(C) which is based upon conciliation and rapprochement.

(D) which is not congenial to the spiritual values of the people

Correct Answer: (A) which is based on coercion and oppression.

Solution:

The stem word is "overturn", so we look for the place where the passage describes an order being swept away. That is the gas and dam sentence: pressure builds, the barrier breaks, and "the reaction will one day sweep back with a violence equal in extent and intensity to what was used to establish and maintain the outward egalitarian form". The order that gets swept away is the one held up by force.

1. **which is based on coercion and oppression**: Coercion is force applied on people, which is exactly what the passage means by physical force and "enforced egalitarianism". The dam image says the reaction comes back with violence equal to the force used, and the writer closes with the seed of its own destruction. So an order resting on coercion is the one people finally overturn.
2. **which does not satisfy their basic needs**: Basic needs are never discussed. The passage is about possessions, the acquisitive instinct and material satisfaction, and it argues that even a paradise of material satisfaction spells neither peace nor progress. Unmet needs are not the trigger the writer names.
3. **which is based upon conciliation and rapprochement**: Conciliation and rapprochement mean bringing sides together in agreement. That is the peaceful, voluntary route the writer supports. An order built that way is the kind he expects to endure, so it is the reverse of the answer.

4. **which is not congenial to the spiritual values of the people**: The passage does prefer spiritual values to material ones, but it never says an order is overturned for being out of step with them. What causes the overturn in the text is the pressure of force, not a mismatch with spiritual values. This option borrows a real idea from the passage and attaches an event to it that the writer never describes.

So the correct choice is (A). Force invites an equal and violent reaction, and that reaction is the overturn.

Let's summarize:

- The gas and dam image is the passage's model of a forced order bursting open.
- Coercion equals the physical force the writer names, so (A) sits on that image.
- (C) names the peaceful route, which is the opposite of the trigger for an overturn.

People ultimately overturn a social order based on coercion and oppression, option (A).

Quick Tip: Think about what the gas in a container and the water behind a dam stand for.

7. Read the passage and answer the question.

Passage (extract): The root cause of class conflict is possessiveness or the acquisitive instinct. So long as the ideal that is to be achieved is one of securing the maximum material satisfaction, possessiveness is neither suppressed nor eliminated but grows on what it feeds. Nor does it cease to be possessiveness, whether it is confined to only a few or is shared by many. Mahatma Gandhi has shown us how the acquisitive instinct inherent in man can be transmuted by the adoption of the ideal of trusteeship.

According to the passage, the root cause of class conflict is

(A) The paradise of material satisfaction.

(B) Dominant inherent acquisitive instinct in man.

(C) Exploitation of the 'have-nots' by the 'haves'.

(D) A Social order where the unprivileged are not a part of the establishment.

Correct Answer: (B) Dominant inherent acquisitive instinct in man.

Solution:

This one is answered by a single sentence that the passage prints in the stem's own words: "The root cause of class conflict is possessiveness or the acquisitive instinct." The writer joins the two names with "or", so possessiveness and the acquisitive instinct are the same thing. The correct option is whichever one repeats that.

1. **The paradise of material satisfaction**: This phrase is in the passage, but it does a different job there. The writer says this paradise "neither spells peace nor progress" and that chasing

maximum material satisfaction lets possessiveness grow on what it feeds. So it feeds the cause, it is not the cause itself.

2. **Dominant inherent acquisitive instinct in man**: This repeats the passage's own words. The writer names the acquisitive instinct as the root cause and later calls it "the acquisitive instinct inherent in man". The option even keeps the word inherent, which shows the instinct is built in rather than picked up.
3. **Exploitation of the 'have-nots' by the 'haves'**: Exploitation is mentioned near the end, where the writer says trusteeship would stop the acquisitive instinct from leading to exploitation and conflict. That makes exploitation a step on the way from the instinct to the conflict, not the root. A root cause is what sits at the bottom, and here that is the instinct.
4. **A Social order where the unprivileged are not a part of the establishment**: The passage never says this. It talks about the 'haves' yielding place to the 'have-nots', but it does not blame class conflict on the poor being kept out of the establishment. This option is imported from outside the text.

So the answer is (B). The instinct to acquire and hold is what the writer puts at the root.

Let's summarize:

- The passage names the root cause directly: possessiveness, also called the acquisitive instinct.
- Material satisfaction and exploitation are effects or feeders in the chain, not the root.
- A root cause question wants the first link, so the built in instinct wins.

The root cause of class conflict is the dominant inherent acquisitive instinct in man, option (B).

Quick Tip: The passage states the root cause in one sentence and gives it two names joined by "or".

8. Read the passage and answer the question.

Passage (extract): A new order cannot be established without radically changing the mind and attitude of men towards property. This enforced egalitarianism contains, in its bosom, the seed of its own destruction. So long as the ideal that is to be achieved is one of securing the maximum material satisfaction, possessiveness is neither suppressed nor eliminated but grows on what it feeds. Mahatma Gandhi has shown us how the acquisitive instinct inherent in man can be transmuted by the adoption of the ideal of trusteeship by those who 'have' for the benefit of all those who 'have not' so that, instead of leading to exploitation and conflict, it would become a means and incentive for the amelioration and progress of society respectively.

Which of the following statements is 'not true' in the context of the passage?

(A) A new order can be established by radically changing the outlook of people towards it.

(B) Adoption of the ideal of trusteeship can minimize possessive instinct.

(C) Enforced egalitarianism can be the cause of its own destruction

(D) Ideal of new order is to secure maximum material satisfaction

Correct Answer: (D) Ideal of new order is to secure maximum material satisfaction

Solution:

Three of these options are quiet restatements of lines in the passage. One turns the writer's argument on its head. Test them one at a time against the text.

1. **A new order can be established by radically changing the outlook of people towards it**: The passage says a new order cannot be established without radically changing the mind and attitude of men towards property. Read positively, that is the same claim: change the outlook and the order becomes possible. So this statement is true.
2. **Adoption of the ideal of trusteeship can minimize possessive instinct**: The passage says Gandhi showed how the acquisitive instinct "can be transmuted by the adoption of the ideal of trusteeship". Transmuted means changed into something else, so the raw grabbing urge is turned into a means of progress for society. Calling that a minimising of the possessive instinct is fair, so this is true.
3. **Enforced egalitarianism can be the cause of its own destruction**: The passage says enforced egalitarianism "contains, in its bosom, the seed of its own destruction". The option changes only the wording, so it is true.
4. **Ideal of new order is to secure maximum material satisfaction**: The passage says the reverse. It warns that so long as the ideal is maximum material satisfaction, possessiveness grows on what it feeds, and it adds that the paradise of material satisfaction spells neither peace nor progress. The ideal of the

new order is voluntary renunciation and the swap of material values for spiritual ones. So this is the false statement.

So the answer is (D). Maximum material satisfaction is the thing the writer warns against, not the ideal of the new order.

Let's summarize:

- (A), (B) and (C) each map onto a printed line and survive the test.
- Maximum material satisfaction is named in the passage as what feeds possessiveness, so it cannot be the ideal.
- The writer's ideal is voluntary renunciation and spiritual values, which is the opposite of (D).

The statement that is not true is (D).

Quick Tip: The passage treats maximum material satisfaction as a problem. Check which option treats it as the goal.

9. Read the passage and answer the question.

Passage (extract): In establishing a social order on this pattern, there was a strong possibility of a conflict arising between diverse groups and classes of our own people. Experience shows that man values his possessions even more than his life. A new order cannot be established without radically changing the mind and attitude of men towards property and, at some stage or the other, the 'haves' have to yield place to the 'have-nots'. In the ultimate analysis it is difficult, if not impossible, to say that the instinct to possess has been rooted out or that it will not reappear in an even worse form under a different guise. If egalitarianism is to endure, it has to be based on voluntary, enlightened renunciation of those goods which cannot be shared by others or can be enjoyed only at the expense of others.

Which of the following conclusions can be deduced from the passage?

(A) A social order based on truth and non-violence alone can help the achievement of political freedom.

(B) After establishing the social order of Gandhiji's pattern, the possibility of a conflict between different classes of society will hardly exist.

(C) It is difficult to change the mind and attitude of men towards property.

(D) In an egalitarian society, material satisfaction can be enjoyed only at the expense of others.

Correct Answer: (C) It is difficult to change the mind and attitude of men towards property.

Solution:

A deduction question wants a conclusion that follows from what the passage says, even if the passage never spells it out in those words. So the test is whether the option can be built from lines in the text without adding anything from outside.

1. **A social order based on truth and non-violence alone can help the achievement of political freedom**: The passage reverses this order of things. Political freedom was the part already achieved, and the social order based on truth and non-violence was the unfinished part that came after and was harder. The passage never makes the social order a tool for winning freedom. The word "alone" makes it stronger still.
2. **After establishing the social order of Gandhiji's pattern, the possibility of a conflict between different classes will hardly exist**: The passage says the opposite about the process: in establishing a social order on this pattern there was a strong possibility of conflict between our own groups and classes. It also doubts that the instinct to possess can ever be rooted out, and warns it may reappear in a worse form under a different guise. A conclusion of no conflict cannot be drawn from that.
3. **It is difficult to change the mind and attitude of men towards property**: This follows from several lines put together. The new order cannot come without radically changing men's attitude towards property. That unfinished part was "perhaps even more difficult to achieve than the achievement of political freedom". Man values possessions even more than his life. And the writer doubts the instinct to possess can be rooted out at all. Put those together and the difficulty of changing attitudes to property is a fair deduction.
4. **In an egalitarian society, material satisfaction can be enjoyed only at the expense of others**: The passage uses the

phrase "enjoyed only at the expense of others" for the goods that ought to be renounced, not as a description of life in an egalitarian society. In fact an egalitarian society built on renunciation is exactly where such enjoyment stops. The option lifts a phrase and puts it in the wrong setting.

So the answer is (C). The passage builds a strong case for how hard it is to shift men's attitude to property.

Let's summarize:

- The passage calls the social order task harder than winning political freedom, and it rests on changing attitudes to property.
- Man valuing possessions above life, plus the doubt that the instinct can be rooted out, both point to the same difficulty.
- (B) is contradicted outright, and (A) and (D) misplace phrases the passage uses elsewhere.

The conclusion that can be deduced is (C), that it is difficult to change the mind and attitude of men towards property.

Quick Tip: Chain up the lines about the unfinished part being harder, possessions valued above life, and the instinct that cannot be rooted out.

10. Read the passage and answer the question.

Passage (extract): This calls for substitution of material values by purely spiritual ones. The paradise of material satisfaction, which is sometimes equated with progress these days, neither spells peace nor progress. Mahatma Gandhi has shown us how the acquisitive instinct inherent in man can be transmuted by the adoption of the ideal of trusteeship by those who 'have' for the benefit of all those who 'have not' so that, instead of leading to exploitation and conflict, it would become a means and incentive for the amelioration and progress of society respectively.

According to the passage, what does "adoption of the ideal of trusteeship" mean?

(A) Equating peace and progress with material satisfaction.

(B) Adoption of the ideal by the 'haves' for the benefit of 'have-nots'.

(C) Voluntary enlightened remuneration of the possessive instinct by the privileged class.

(D) Substitution of spiritual values by material ones by those who live in the paradise of material satisfaction.

Correct Answer: (B) Adoption of the ideal by the 'haves' for the benefit of 'have-nots'.

Solution:

The phrase in the stem is quoted straight from the last sentence of the passage, so read what sits next to it: "the adoption of the ideal of trusteeship by those who 'have' for the benefit of all those who 'have not'". The passage defines the phrase for us. A trustee is someone who holds property for another person's benefit rather than his own, and that is the whole idea here.

1. **Equating peace and progress with material satisfaction**: The passage says the paradise of material satisfaction "is sometimes equated with progress these days" and then rejects the equation, saying it spells neither peace nor progress. So this is a view the writer attacks, not the meaning of trusteeship.
2. **Adoption of the ideal by the 'haves' for the benefit of 'have-nots'**: This repeats the passage's own definition. The 'haves' keep holding the goods but hold them for the 'have-nots', which turns the acquisitive instinct into a means of progress for society instead of a source of exploitation and conflict.
3. **Voluntary enlightened remuneration of the possessive instinct by the privileged class**: This looks close because it borrows "voluntary, enlightened" from an earlier line, but the passage's word there is renunciation, meaning giving up. Remuneration means paying someone for work. Paying the possessive instinct makes no sense as a description of trusteeship, so the option collapses on its own wording.
4. **Substitution of spiritual values by material ones by those who live in the paradise of material satisfaction**: The passage asks for "substitution of material values by purely spiritual ones". This option flips the two, so it asks for spiritual values to be dropped in favour of material ones. That is the reverse of the writer's argument.

So the answer is (B), which is the passage's own definition of trusteeship.

Let's summarize:

- The passage defines trusteeship in the same sentence it names it, so no outside knowledge is needed.

- (C) swaps renunciation for remuneration and (D) swaps the direction of the value substitution; both are word level traps.
- (A) states a view the passage explicitly rejects.

Adoption of the ideal of trusteeship means the 'haves' holding what they own for the benefit of the 'have-nots', option (B).

Quick Tip: The passage explains trusteeship in the same sentence. Note who adopts it and who benefits.

11. Choose the correct synonym out of the four choices given.

Lethargy

(A) Serenity

(B) listlessness

(C) impassivity

(D) laxity

Correct Answer: (B) listlessness

Solution:

Lethargy means a state of heavy tiredness, low energy and no wish to move or do anything. A person in lethargy feels sluggish and drained. The synonym we want must carry that same lack of energy and drive, not merely a calm mood or a loose habit.

1. **Serenity**: This means calmness and peace of mind. A serene person is untroubled but can be fully alert and active. Lethargy is not peace, it is a dull heaviness that a person usually does not

enjoy. The two words agree only in being quiet states, which is not enough.

2. **listlessness**: This means having no energy, no interest and no wish to do anything. That is exactly what lethargy describes. A listless person, like a lethargic one, sits about with no drive to move. Both words also point to the same feel of being physically drained, which makes this the closest match.
3. **impassivity**: This means showing no emotion or reaction. An impassive face gives nothing away. That is about feeling and expression, not about energy. A person can be impassive and still work hard all day, so the word misses the tiredness at the heart of lethargy.
4. **laxity**: This means slackness or carelessness, usually about rules and standards, as in laxity in enforcing discipline. It is a fault in how strictly something is done, not a state of low bodily or mental energy. It sits near lethargy in the loose sense of "not tight", but it does not mean the same thing.

So the answer is (B). Listlessness is the word that matches lethargy in both senses, the tiredness and the lack of interest.

Let's summarize:

- Lethargy is low energy plus no wish to act, so test each option against both halves.
- Serenity is calm, impassivity is showing no emotion, laxity is slackness about standards. None of the three carries low energy.
- Listlessness carries both halves and is the standard dictionary synonym.

The correct synonym of lethargy is listlessness, option (B).

Quick Tip: Lethargy is about having no energy or drive, not about being calm or emotionless.

12. Choose the correct synonym out of the four choices given.
Emaciated

(A) tall

(B) languid

(C) very thin

(D) wise

Correct Answer: (C) very thin

Solution:

The word "emaciated" describes a person or animal that has become abnormally thin and weak, usually because of illness, hunger or long neglect. The root is the Latin word "macer", meaning lean, so the sense of extreme thinness sits right inside the word itself. The question asks for the closest synonym, so the option that carries this idea of wasted, bony thinness is the one to pick.

1. **tall**: This only describes height. A tall person can be heavy, muscular or thin, so height says nothing about the loss of flesh that "emaciated" points to. The two words measure different things.
2. **languid**: This means slow, listless or lacking energy. A languid person may look perfectly well fed and simply be relaxed or lazy. It describes energy level, not body weight, so it misses the mark.
3. **very thin**: This matches the core meaning. An emaciated body is one that has wasted away to skin and bone, which is exactly what

"very thin" says in plain words.

4. **wise**: This refers to good judgement built from experience. It has no link at all to physical appearance, so it is the easiest option to rule out.

So the correct option is (C) very thin. A sentence such as "The emaciated survivors were carried out of the camp on stretchers" makes the sense clear: they were dangerously underweight, not tall, tired or clever.

Let's summarize:

- Emaciated means extremely thin and wasted, usually from hunger or disease.
- "Tall" is about height, "languid" is about energy, and "wise" is about judgement, so none of them touch the idea of lost flesh.

The answer is (C) very thin.

Quick Tip: Think of the Latin root "macer", meaning lean. The word describes a body that has wasted away from hunger or illness.

13. Choose the correct synonym out of the four choices given.
Latent

(A) concealed

(B) apparent

(C) lethargic

(D) prompt

Correct Answer: (A) concealed

Solution:

"Latent" describes something that exists but has not shown itself yet. It is present in a hidden or dormant state and may come out later, as in "latent talent" or "a latent infection". The word comes from the Latin "latere", to lie hidden. The right synonym must carry that idea of being present but out of sight.

1. **concealed**: This means hidden from view. It matches the central idea of "latent", which is a quality that is there but not yet visible. This is the closest fit among the four.
2. **apparent**: This means clearly visible or obvious. It is the direct opposite of latent, so it is a trap for anyone who reads the options too quickly.
3. **lethargic**: This means sluggish and short of energy. A latent quality is not tired, it is simply unexpressed, so the two ideas do not overlap.
4. **prompt**: This means quick to act or happening without delay. It deals with speed, which has nothing to do with something lying hidden.

So the correct option is (A) concealed. In "the coach spotted the boy's latent ability", the ability was already there but concealed until someone drew it out.

Let's summarize:

- Latent means present but hidden or dormant, not yet showing.
- "Apparent" is its antonym, while "lethargic" and "prompt" describe energy and speed instead of visibility.

The answer is (A) concealed.

Quick Tip: Think of "latent heat" or "latent talent". The quality is already present but nobody can see it working yet.

14. Choose the correct synonym out of the four choices given.
Sporadic

(A) epidemic

(B) whirling

(C) occasional

(D) stagnant

Correct Answer: (C) occasional

Solution:

"Sporadic" describes something that happens now and then, at irregular intervals and in scattered places, with no fixed pattern. Newspapers use it in lines like "sporadic firing was reported along the border", meaning the firing came in bursts rather than continuously. The synonym must carry this sense of occurring only from time to time.

1. **epidemic**: This means spreading widely and rapidly through a population. It is close to the opposite of sporadic, and in fact medicine sets the two against each other: sporadic cases are stray and scattered, while an epidemic is a general outbreak.
2. **whirling**: This means spinning fast in circles. It describes a kind of motion, not the frequency of an event, so it does not connect with the given word at all.
3. **occasional**: This means happening from time to time and not regularly. That is exactly what sporadic conveys, so it is the

closest match.

4. **stagnant**: This means still and not moving or growing, as with stagnant water. Sporadic events do occur, just irregularly, so "stagnant" points in a different direction.

So the correct option is (C) occasional. "Sporadic showers" and "occasional showers" would both mean rain that comes in scattered spells.

Let's summarize:

- Sporadic means irregular, scattered and now and then.
- "Epidemic" suggests wide and rapid spread, "whirling" describes motion, and "stagnant" means motionless, so none of them fit.

The answer is (C) occasional.

Quick Tip: Think of "sporadic firing" or "sporadic showers". The events are scattered and come at irregular gaps, not in one steady spread.

15. Choose the correct synonym out of the four choices given.
Compendium

(A) summary

(B) index

(C) reference

(D) collection

Correct Answer: (A) summary

Solution:

A "compendium" is a short, complete account of a large subject: all the essential matter of a bigger work packed into a small space. The word comes from Latin "compendium", meaning a saving or shortening. So the sense to look for is a condensed version of something larger, not merely a heap of items.

1. **summary**: This is a brief statement that gives the main points of a longer text. That is the primary dictionary sense of compendium, which is often defined as a concise summary or abridgement. This is the closest single-word match.
2. **index**: An index is only a list of topics with page numbers at the back of a book. It points to matter, it does not contain the matter in shortened form, so it is far weaker than compendium.
3. **reference**: This means a mention of a source or an act of turning to something for information. It is not a form of writing at all, so it cannot be a synonym for a book-length abridgement.
4. **collection**: A collection is a set of things gathered together. A compendium is often a collection too, so this option is tempting, but a collection carries no idea of being condensed or complete in brief. That condensing is the defining feature of a compendium, so "summary" is the tighter fit.

So the correct option is (A) summary. "He wrote a compendium of Indian constitutional law" means he boiled a huge subject down to its essentials.

Let's summarize:

- Compendium means a concise, complete treatment of a large subject, that is, a summary or abridgement.
- "Collection" is the near miss because it captures the gathering but not the condensing; "index" and "reference" only point to

information rather than presenting it.

The answer is (A) summary.

Quick Tip: The Latin root means a saving or a shortcut. The word points to a large subject boiled down to its essentials, not just a pile of items.

16. Choose the correct option out of the four choices given.
Give an example pertinent _____ the case.

(A) with

(B) on

(C) for

(D) to

Correct Answer: (D) to

Solution:

This is a prepositional-usage question. The blank follows the adjective "pertinent", which means relevant or closely connected to the matter being discussed. Adjectives in English take fixed prepositions, and these pairings have to be learnt as units because they do not follow a rule. "Pertinent" is always followed by "to".

1. **with**: "With" normally shows accompaniment or the instrument used, as in "cut it with a knife". It never attaches to "pertinent", so "pertinent with the case" is not English.
2. **on**: "On" marks a surface or a topic after words like "a book on grammar". "Pertinent" does not take it, so this pairing is wrong.

3. **for**: "For" shows purpose or benefit, as in "suitable for the job". Learners often swap it in here by analogy with "relevant for", but the settled pairing with "pertinent" is still "to".
4. **to**: This is the fixed preposition after "pertinent". It also matches the related verb "pertain to", which shares the same root and the same preposition.

The correct option is (D) to. The full sentence reads: "Give an example pertinent to the case."

Let's summarize:

- Pertinent to is the fixed adjective and preposition pair, matching the verb "pertain to".
- "With", "on" and "for" carry their own uses but never follow "pertinent".

The answer is (D) to.

Quick Tip: Look at the verb behind the adjective. "Pertain" takes only one preposition, and the adjective follows suit.

17. Choose the correct option out of the four choices given.
My voice reverberated _____ the walls of the castle.

(A) with

(B) from

(C) in

(D) on

Correct Answer: (B) from

Solution:

"Reverberate" means that a sound bounces off a hard surface and comes back as an echo. The blank sits between the verb and "the walls", so we need the preposition that shows sound coming back off a surface. That relationship of movement away from a surface is carried by "from".

1. **with**: "Reverberate with" is a real phrase, but it takes the sound as its object, not the surface: "the hall reverberated with applause". Here the object is "the walls", which are the surface doing the reflecting, so "with" gives the wrong picture.
2. **from**: This shows the point a movement starts out from. The voice strikes the walls and travels back away from them, so "reverberated from the walls" describes exactly what happens.
3. **in**: "In" would need a container or space, as in "reverberated in the hall". Walls are surfaces rather than a space you stand inside, so "in the walls" wrongly suggests the sound is inside the stonework.
4. **on**: "On" marks contact and resting position, like a book on a table. A sound does not sit on a wall, it strikes it and rebounds, so "on" fails to capture the bouncing back.

The correct option is (B) from. The sentence reads: "My voice reverberated from the walls of the castle."

Let's summarize:

- Sound reverberates from a surface, because the echo travels back away from it.
- "Reverberate with" needs the sound as its object, while "in" needs an enclosed space, and "on" only marks contact.

The answer is (B) from.

Quick Tip: Picture the echo. It strikes the stone and travels back away from it, the same way light is reflected from a mirror.

18. Choose the correct option out of the four choices given.
The reward was not commensurate _____ the work done by us.

(A) for

(B) on

(C) with

(D) order

Correct Answer: (C) with

Solution:

"Commensurate" means matching in size, extent or degree, that is, in proportion to something else. Whenever a word expresses that two things are measured against each other, English usually links them with "with". The fixed pairing here is "commensurate with".

1. **for**: "For" marks purpose or the person who benefits, as in "a reward for bravery". It cannot join two things being compared in size, so "commensurate for" is not standard.
2. **on**: "On" points to a surface or a topic. Nothing in the idea of proportion calls for it, so this pairing does not exist.
3. **with**: This is the fixed preposition. "Commensurate with" sits in the same family as "in proportion with", "in line with" and "consistent with", all of which compare one thing against another.

4. **order**: This is not even a preposition, it is a noun. Placing it in the blank gives "commensurate order the work", which is not a sentence. The intended distractor was probably "in order to" or a similar phrase, but as printed the option cannot fill the blank.

The correct option is (C) with. The sentence reads: "The reward was not commensurate with the work done by us", meaning the reward did not match the effort put in.

Let's summarize:

- Commensurate with is the fixed pairing for saying two things are proportionate to each other.
- "For" shows purpose and "on" shows a surface or topic, while "order" is a noun and not a preposition at all.

The answer is (C) with.

Quick Tip: The root means "measured together". Adjectives of matching and comparison, like consistent or compatible, all take the same preposition.

19. Choose the correct option out of the four choices given.
Our tragic experience in the recent past provides an index _____ the state of lawlessness in this region.

(A) of

(B) in

(C) at

(D) by

Correct Answer: (A) of

Solution:

The blank follows the noun "index". Here "index" is not the list at the back of a book, it means a sign or measure that shows what something is like. When a noun names a sign or measure of something, the thing being measured is introduced by "of": a sign of trouble, a measure of success, an index of lawlessness.

1. **of**: This links a noun to the thing it belongs to or stands for. "An index of the state of lawlessness" says the experience serves as a measure of that lawlessness, which is exactly the intended sense.
2. **in**: "In" marks position inside something. "An index in the state of lawlessness" would place the index inside the lawlessness, which is not what the writer means.
3. **at**: "At" points to a fixed spot or time. A measure does not sit at the thing it measures, so this cannot join the two nouns here.
4. **by**: "By" shows the agent or the means, as in "a book written by him". The lawlessness is not doing the indexing, it is what gets indexed, so "by" reverses the relationship.

The correct option is (A) of. The sentence reads: "Our tragic experience in the recent past provides an index of the state of lawlessness in this region."

Let's summarize:

- Index in the sense of a sign or measure takes "of" before what is being measured.
- "In" and "at" are positional, and "by" marks the doer, so all three break the noun to noun link needed here.

The answer is (A) of.

Quick Tip: Here "index" means an indicator or gauge. Ask which preposition follows "a measure ____ poverty" or "a sign ____ decay".

20. Choose the correct option out of the four choices given.
Your conduct smacks _____ recklessness.

(A) of

(B) with

(C) from

(D) in

Correct Answer: (A) of

Solution:

The verb here is "smack" in its figurative sense, which means to have a trace or suggestion of some quality, usually a bad one. It is a fixed phrasal verb: "smack of". The literal sense of smack, meaning to slap, does not apply, since conduct cannot slap anything.

1. **of**: This completes the set phrase "smack of", as in "his remark smacks of prejudice". The verb is almost never used in this sense without it.
2. **with**: "With" would suggest accompaniment. Someone may reek with sweat, but "smack" does not take this preposition, so the pairing is simply not used.
3. **from**: "From" shows a source or starting point. Smacking of something is not about where the conduct came from, it is about what quality the conduct hints at, so "from" misses the sense.
4. **in**: "In" marks containment or a field of activity. "Smacks in recklessness" is not English at all.

The correct option is (A) of. The sentence reads: "Your conduct smacks of recklessness", meaning the behaviour carries a distinct hint of being reckless.

Let's summarize:

- Smack of is a fixed phrasal verb meaning to suggest or hint at a quality, usually an unwelcome one.
- "With", "from" and "in" have their own uses but never follow "smack" in this figurative sense.

The answer is (A) of.

Quick Tip: This is the figurative "smack", meaning to have a trace of something about it, as in "the deal smacks ____ nepotism".

21. Choose the correct option out of the four choices given.
A good judge never gropes _____ the conclusion.

(A) to

(B) at

(C) on

(D) for

Correct Answer: (D) for

Solution:

"Grope" means to feel about blindly, the way a person searches in the dark with outstretched hands. When it is used for searching after something, the fixed pairing is "grope for", as in "he groped for the switch" or "she groped for the right word". The sentence uses the idea

figuratively: a good judge does not fumble blindly after a conclusion, but reasons towards it.

1. **to**: "To" marks a destination and pairs with verbs of arriving, like "come to a conclusion". "Grope" is a verb of searching rather than arriving, so this pairing does not hold.
2. **at**: "At" pairs with "arrive at a conclusion" and "jump at a chance", and the pull of "arrive at a conclusion" makes it the main trap here. But "grope at" would mean pawing at a thing already located, which is not the sense of blind searching the sentence needs.
3. **on**: "On" marks a surface or a topic. "Grope on the conclusion" carries no meaning at all, so it is the weakest choice.
4. **for**: This is the standard preposition after "grope" when something is being searched for. "Gropes for the conclusion" says the judge is fumbling blindly after an answer, which is exactly the failing the sentence denies.

The correct option is (D) for. The sentence reads: "A good judge never gropes for the conclusion", meaning a good judge reaches the finding by reasoning, not by blind guesswork.

Let's summarize:

- Grope for is the settled pairing when the verb means to search blindly for something.
- "To" and "at" belong to verbs of arriving, such as "come to" and "arrive at", while "on" has no use with "grope" here.

The answer is (D) for.

Quick Tip: Sort the verb by its job. Verbs of searching, like look, hunt and feel, all take the same preposition, while "arrive" and "come" take different ones.

22. Choose the correct option out of the four choices given.
Nobody in our group is a genius _____ winning friends and in convincing people.

(A) for

(B) in

(C) of

(D) at

Correct Answer: (B) in

Solution:

The clue in this sentence is not the noun "genius" on its own but the words after the blank: "and in convincing people". Two activities are joined by "and", so both must be introduced the same way. The second one already carries "in", which means the first must carry "in" as well. This is the rule of parallel structure.

1. **for**: "A genius for" is a real phrase, as in "a genius for making enemies", but putting it here gives "a genius for winning friends and in convincing people", where the two halves no longer match. The parallelism breaks.
2. **in**: This matches "in convincing people" exactly, so the sentence reads "a genius in winning friends and in convincing people". Both activities are framed the same way, and the sentence stays balanced.

3. **of**: "Genius of" is used for the spirit or character of a place or age, as in "the genius of the age". It does not introduce a skill, so it is wrong on meaning as well as on parallelism.
4. **at**: "A genius at" is idiomatic in ordinary speech, and on its own it would be a strong choice. It still fails here because the sentence forces a match with the "in" that follows.

The correct option is (B) in. The sentence reads: "Nobody in our group is a genius in winning friends and in convincing people."

Let's summarize:

- When "and" joins two phrases, both need the same preposition, and the printed "in convincing people" settles what that preposition is.
- "At" and "for" would be acceptable with "genius" in a different sentence, while "of" belongs to a different sense of the word altogether.

The answer is (B) in.

Quick Tip: Read past the blank. The second half of the sentence already says "and in convincing people", and joined phrases must match.

23. Choose the correct option out of the four choices given.
If you are averse _____ recommending my name, you should not hesitate to admit it.

(A) about

(B) for

(C) to

(D) against

Correct Answer: (C) to

Solution:

"Averse" means unwilling or strongly disinclined. The fixed pairing is "averse to", and the "to" here is a preposition rather than part of an infinitive, so the verb after it takes the gerund form. That is why the sentence reads "averse to recommending" and not "averse to recommend".

1. **about**: "About" follows adjectives of feeling like "anxious about" or "happy about". "Averse" is not in that group, so "averse about" is not used.
2. **for**: "For" shows purpose or benefit. It has no role in expressing dislike of an action, so this pairing does not exist.
3. **to**: This is the standard preposition after "averse", as in "he is averse to change" or "she is not averse to a little praise". It fits the gerund "recommending" that follows the blank.
4. **against**: "Against" does carry a sense of opposition, which makes it tempting, but it pairs with words like "prejudiced against" and "biased against", not with "averse". Standard usage keeps "averse" with "to".

The correct option is (C) to. The sentence reads: "If you are averse to recommending my name, you should not hesitate to admit it."

Let's summarize:

- Averse to is the fixed pairing, and the "to" is a preposition, so a verb after it takes the -ing form.
- "About" and "for" do not follow "averse" at all, and "against" belongs with words like "prejudiced" and "biased".

The answer is (C) to.

Quick Tip: Check the noun form. We say "an aversion ____ hard work", and the adjective takes the same preposition, with a gerund after it.

24. Choose the correct option out of the four choices given.
Religious leaders should not delve _____ politics.

(A) in

(B) with

(C) at

(D) into

Correct Answer: (D) into

Solution:

"Delve" originally meant to dig, and it now mostly means to search deeply into a subject. Because the picture behind it is one of digging down inside something, the verb takes "into", which shows movement to the inside of a thing. The set phrase is "delve into".

1. **in**: "In" states a static position, as in "the money is in the box". Delving is an act of entering and searching, not resting inside, so "in" does not carry the movement the verb needs.

2. **with**: "With" shows accompaniment or the tool used. Politics is what the leaders would be digging into, not a companion or an instrument, so this fails.
3. **at**: "At" marks a point rather than an interior. Since the whole idea of delving is going deep inside a subject, a point preposition cannot work.
4. **into**: This shows motion towards the inside of something and completes the standard phrase, as in "delve into the archives" or "delve into his past". It matches the digging image behind the verb.

The correct option is (D) into. The sentence reads: "Religious leaders should not delve into politics."

Let's summarize:

- Delve into is the fixed phrase, because delving means digging deep inside a subject.
- "In" and "at" are static, and "with" marks a companion or a tool, so none of them suits a verb of entering and searching.

The answer is (D) into.

Quick Tip: The verb once meant to dig with a spade, and a spade goes inside the earth. That calls for a preposition of movement, not of position.

25. Choose the correct option out of the four choices given.
What you say has hardly any bearing _____ the lives of tribals.

(A) about

(B) for

(C) on

(D) with

Correct Answer: (C) on

Solution:

The noun in the blank's frame is "bearing", used here to mean relevance or influence. The fixed phrase is "a bearing on", as in "his past has no bearing on this case". When one thing is said to affect or be relevant to another, English joins them with "on".

1. **about**: "About" introduces a topic, as in "a story about tribals". The sentence is not naming a topic, it is denying any influence, so "about" gives the wrong relation.
2. **for**: "For" marks purpose or the person who benefits. Since the point is influence rather than benefit, "bearing for" is not the phrase English uses.
3. **on**: This completes the set phrase "bearing on", meaning relevance to or effect upon. It sits alongside similar phrases such as "an effect on" and "an influence on".
4. **with**: "With" shows accompaniment. "Bearing with" exists only as the verb phrase "bear with me", which means be patient, and that is a different construction entirely.

The correct option is (C) on. The sentence reads: "What you say has hardly any bearing on the lives of tribals", meaning the words barely affect those lives.

Let's summarize:

- Bearing on is the fixed phrase for relevance or influence, matching "effect on" and "influence on".
- "About" names a topic, "for" names a purpose, and "bear with" is a separate phrase meaning to be patient.

The answer is (C) on.

Quick Tip: Swap "bearing" for "effect" or "influence". Whatever preposition those two take is the one this noun takes.

26. Select the correct meaning of the italicized idiom or phrase out of the four choices given.
He *burnt his fingers* by interfering in his neighbor's affair.

(A) got himself into trouble

(B) burnt himself

(C) got himself insulted

(D) got rebuked

Correct Answer: (A) got himself into trouble

Solution:

The idiom "burn one's fingers" means to suffer loss or get into trouble by meddling in something, usually something that was none of your business. The picture behind it is of a person reaching into a fire and being hurt. Like every idiom, it must be read as a whole and not word by word.

1. **got himself into trouble**: This is the accepted meaning. By interfering in a neighbour's affair, the man brought unpleasant

consequences on himself, which is exactly what the idiom describes.

2. **burnt himself**: This is the literal reading, and it is the trap the question sets. Nobody was near a flame here, and reading an idiom literally always drains it of its real sense.
3. **got himself insulted**: An insult is only one narrow kind of harm. The idiom covers any loss or trouble, including money lost or a bad name earned, so this option is too limited.
4. **got rebuked**: A rebuke is a scolding from another person. The idiom does not require anyone to scold him, it only says he came off badly. This is again too narrow.

The correct option is (A) got himself into trouble. The sentence means his meddling landed him in difficulty.

Let's summarize:

- Burn one's fingers means to suffer harm or loss, usually through meddling or a rash venture.
- The literal option is a decoy, while "insulted" and "rebuked" each pick out one narrow kind of harm instead of the general trouble the idiom means.

The answer is (A) got himself into trouble.

Quick Tip: Picture a hand reaching into a fire. The saying is used for anyone who meddles or takes a risk and comes off badly.

27. Select the correct meaning of the italicized idiom or phrase out of the four choices given.
Mr. Gupta, who is one of the trustees of a big charity, is suspected of *feathering his own nest*.

(A) being lazy in doing his work

(B) being too generous

(C) neglecting his job

(D) making money unfairly

Correct Answer: (D) making money unfairly

Solution:

"Feather one's own nest" means to enrich oneself, especially by taking advantage of a position of trust. The image comes from a bird lining its own nest with soft feathers while it should be busy elsewhere. The sentence sets it in a charity, where a trustee handles other people's money, so the idiom points to dishonest gain.

1. **being lazy in doing his work**: The idiom is about taking, not about slacking. Someone feathering his nest may in fact be very busy, just busy in the wrong direction, so laziness misses the point.
2. **being too generous**: This is the reverse of the idiom. Generosity means giving away, while feathering one's nest means pulling in for oneself.
3. **neglecting his job**: This is the closest of the wrong options, since a trustee who profits privately is also failing his duty. But neglect is only a side effect. The idiom names the profit itself, which is why it does not go far enough.

4. **making money unfairly**: This states the meaning plainly. A trustee suspected of feathering his own nest is suspected of using charity funds or his position to enrich himself.

The correct option is (D) making money unfairly. The word "suspected" and the mention of a trusteeship both point to gain taken improperly.

Let's summarize:

- Feather one's own nest means to profit for oneself, usually by abusing a position of trust.
- "Lazy" and "neglecting his job" describe failures of effort rather than acts of gain, and "too generous" is the opposite of the idiom.

The answer is (D) making money unfairly.

Quick Tip: Think of a bird lining its own nest while it should be doing something else. Note that Mr. Gupta handles money that belongs to others.

28. Select the correct meaning of the italicized idiom or phrase out of the four choices given.
Mrs. Hashmi has been *in the blues* for the last several weeks.

(A) abroad

(B) unwell

(C) depressed

(D) penniless

Correct Answer: (C) depressed

Solution:

"In the blues", like "having the blues", means being low in spirits, sad or depressed. The colour blue has long stood for sadness in English, which is where the music called the blues gets its name too. The idiom describes a state of mind, not a place, a body or a bank balance.

1. **abroad**: This means in a foreign country. It probably tempts through a vague link with "out of the blue", but that is a different idiom meaning suddenly. Nothing in "in the blues" points to travel.
2. **unwell**: A sad person may also be run down, so this is a near miss. Still, the idiom names low spirits and not bodily illness, and English has plenty of plain words for being sick.
3. **depressed**: This is the accepted meaning. Mrs. Hashmi has been sad and downhearted for weeks, which is exactly what the idiom conveys.
4. **penniless**: This means having no money. Poverty may cause sadness, but the idiom names the feeling itself, not the cause of it.

The correct option is (C) depressed. The sentence says Mrs. Hashmi has been low in spirits for several weeks.

Let's summarize:

- Blue stands for sadness in English, so "in the blues" means downhearted or depressed.
- "Unwell" and "penniless" name a body state and a money state, and "abroad" confuses this with the separate idiom "out of the blue".

The answer is (C) depressed.

Quick Tip: Think of what the colour blue stands for in English feelings, and why sorrowful music is called the blues.

29. Select the correct meaning of the italicized idiom or phrase out of the four choices given.
For the first week, the apprentice felt like *a fish out of water*.

(A) frustrated

(B) homeless

(C) disappointed

(D) uncomfortable

Correct Answer: (D) uncomfortable

Solution:

"A fish out of water" describes someone who feels awkward and out of place because the surroundings are new or unsuited to them. A fish taken from water is not angry or sad, it is simply in the wrong element. The idiom carries that same idea of being ill at ease in unfamiliar surroundings.

1. **frustrated**: This means annoyed at being blocked from a goal. A new apprentice may feel that too, but the idiom is about not fitting the setting, not about being thwarted.
2. **homeless**: This is a literal reading of the fish being away from where it lives. The idiom never means someone has no home, it means the present setting does not suit them.
3. **disappointed**: This means let down because things fell short of hope. The idiom says nothing about expectations, only about being in the wrong element.

4. **uncomfortable**: This is the accepted meaning. In his first week the apprentice was in a new workplace among strangers, so he felt awkward and out of place.

The correct option is (D) uncomfortable. "For the first week" fits well, since the awkwardness of a fresh setting wears off once a person settles in.

Let's summarize:

- A fish out of water means ill at ease and out of place in unfamiliar surroundings.
- "Frustrated" and "disappointed" name other feelings that do not turn on being in the wrong setting, and "homeless" reads the fish literally.

The answer is (D) uncomfortable.

Quick Tip: Ask what a fish on dry land actually feels. It is not angry or let down, it is simply in the wrong element.

30. Select the correct meaning of the italicized idiom or phrase out of the four choices given.
His friends failed to see why he should *ride the high horse* just because he had won an election.

(A) become abnormal

(B) appear arrogant

(C) indulge in dreams

(D) hate others

Correct Answer: (B) appear arrogant

Solution:

"Ride the high horse", also heard as "be on one's high horse", means to behave in a proud and superior way, as though you were above everyone else. The phrase goes back to the days when important people rode tall horses in processions, so height on horseback came to stand for airs and self importance.

1. **become abnormal**: This would mean turning odd or unbalanced. Arrogance is a common enough failing and not a departure from normal behaviour, so this reading is far too strong and misses the sense.
2. **appear arrogant**: This is the accepted meaning. Having won an election, the man began carrying himself as though he were above his friends, which is what riding the high horse means.
3. **indulge in dreams**: This is closer to "build castles in the air". The idiom here is about how a person treats others, not about idle daydreaming.
4. **hate others**: Hatred is active ill will. A person on a high horse looks down on people rather than hating them, and the two attitudes are not the same.

The correct option is (B) appear arrogant. The friends could not see why one election win should make him give himself such airs.

Let's summarize:

- Ride the high horse means to put on airs and act superior to others.
- "Become abnormal" overstates it, "indulge in dreams" belongs to a different idiom, and "hate others" swaps looking down on

people for active ill will.

The answer is (B) appear arrogant.

Quick Tip: Picture a man mounted above the crowd. In English, height over others is the standard figure for pride, as in "look down on someone".

31. Given below are the jumbled sentences of a paragraph. The first and the last sentence of the jumbled paragraph are given in correct order. Arrange the middle sentences in the correct sequence.

i. On one hand we are proud of being Indians,
ii. on the other hand we behave as if we were still at the dawn of our civilization
iii. murders of our own brothers and sisters is not the way to please Ram or Rahim
iv. the citizens of the land where Buddha and Gandhi taught
v. the principles of love and non-violence,
vi. nor does it fetch us any prosperity.

(A) ii, iii, iv, v

(B) iii, iv, v, ii

(C) iv, v, iii, ii

(D) iv, v, ii, iii

Correct Answer: (D) iv, v, ii, iii

Solution:

Step 1: Understanding the Question.
Sentence i and sentence vi are fixed. The paragraph opens with "On

one hand we are proud of being Indians," and closes with "nor does it fetch us any prosperity." Our job is to slot ii, iii, iv and v between them so the paragraph reads as one continuous thought.

Step 2: Key Approach.
In a jumble like this, grammar links are stronger evidence than meaning. Two links stand out here. First, "On one hand" in sentence i must be answered by "on the other hand" in sentence ii, so ii cannot sit right next to i. Second, the closing sentence vi begins with "nor", which needs a negative statement just before it. Sentence iii carries that negative: "is not the way to please Ram or Rahim". So iii must be the last of the four middle sentences.

Step 3: Building the chain from sentence i.
Sentence i ends with "proud of being Indians," and sentence iv continues "the citizens of the land where Buddha and Gandhi taught". That is a noun phrase in apposition to "Indians", so iv follows i naturally.
Sentence iv ends with the verb "taught", which needs an object. Sentence v supplies it: "the principles of love and non-violence,". So the order so far is i, iv, v.
Now the contrast arrives: ii, "on the other hand we behave as if we were still at the dawn of our civilization".
Then iii states what that bad behaviour amounts to, and vi finishes the negative pair with "nor".

Step 4: Reading the full paragraph.
i, iv, v, ii, iii, vi gives: "On one hand we are proud of being Indians, the citizens of the land where Buddha and Gandhi taught the principles of love and non-violence, on the other hand we behave as if we were still at the dawn of our civilization; murders of our own brothers and

sisters is not the way to please Ram or Rahim, nor does it fetch us any prosperity." That reads cleanly. The middle sequence is iv, v, ii, iii.

Step 5: Why the other options fail.
Option (A) ii, iii, iv, v puts "on the other hand" immediately after "On one hand", which kills the contrast, and it ends with v, so "the principles of love and non-violence, nor does it fetch us any prosperity" is nonsense.
Option (B) iii, iv, v, ii opens the middle with iii, so the "On one hand / on the other hand" pair is broken and ii ends up glued to vi, where "nor" has no negative to attach to.
Option (C) iv, v, iii, ii keeps the good start i, iv, v but then ends with ii, so we get "we behave as if we were still at the dawn of our civilization, nor does it fetch us any prosperity", which does not work.

Final Answer:
The correct sequence of the middle sentences is iv, v, ii, iii, which is option (D).

Quick Tip: Track two signals: "On one hand" in the first sentence must be answered by "on the other hand", and the fixed last sentence starts with "nor", so the sentence just before it has to be negative.

32. Given below are the jumbled sentences of a paragraph. The first and the last sentence of the jumbled paragraph are given in correct order. Arrange the middle sentences in the correct sequence.

i. On the basis of experiments with rats
ii. health experts here say that
iii. exercise more and consume vitamins,
iv. they will live up to 100 years or more
v. if humans eat less,
vi. and be vigorous in their eighties and nineties.

(A) ii, iii, v, iv

(B) ii, v, iii, iv

(C) ii, v, iv, iii

(D) v, ii, iii, iv

Correct Answer: (B) ii, v, iii, iv

Solution:

Step 1: Understanding the Question.
Sentence i, "On the basis of experiments with rats", is fixed as the opener, and sentence vi, "and be vigorous in their eighties and nineties.", is fixed as the close. We arrange ii, iii, iv and v in between.

Step 2: Key Approach.
The paragraph is a conditional statement reported by someone. Reported speech needs a reporting clause, and a conditional needs an "if" clause followed by a result clause. Find those three pieces and the order writes itself.

Step 3: Fitting the pieces.

Sentence i is only an introductory phrase, so it must be followed by the main clause that says who is speaking. Sentence ii, "health experts here say that", is exactly that reporting clause, so ii comes first among the middle sentences.
The word "that" at the end of ii opens a reported clause, and sentence v, "if humans eat less,", starts that clause with the condition. So ii is followed by v.
The condition is a list of three things humans must do: eat less, exercise more and consume vitamins. Sentence iii, "exercise more and consume vitamins,", carries the second and third items, so iii follows v.
Only the result clause is left. Sentence iv, "they will live up to 100 years or more", is the consequence, so iv comes last among the middle sentences, and vi extends it with "and be vigorous in their eighties and nineties."

Step 4: Reading the full paragraph.
i, ii, v, iii, iv, vi gives: "On the basis of experiments with rats, health experts here say that if humans eat less, exercise more and consume vitamins, they will live up to 100 years or more and be vigorous in their eighties and nineties." The middle order is ii, v, iii, iv.

Step 5: Why the other options fail.
Option (A) ii, iii, v, iv breaks the list: it reads "say that exercise more and consume vitamins, if humans eat less", which has no subject for "exercise".
Option (C) ii, v, iv, iii puts the result before the rest of the condition, giving "if humans eat less, they will live up to 100 years or more, exercise more and consume vitamins", so the actions become results instead of conditions.
Option (D) v, ii, iii, iv puts the "if" clause before the reporting clause,

so "On the basis of experiments with rats, if humans eat less, health experts here say that..." leaves the opening phrase attached to nothing sensible.

Final Answer:
The correct sequence of the middle sentences is ii, v, iii, iv, which is option (B).

Quick Tip: Look for the reporting clause that ends in "that", the "if" clause that opens the condition, and the single clause with a subject and "will" that must state the result.

33. Given below are the jumbled sentences of a paragraph. The first and the last sentence of the jumbled paragraph are given in correct order. Arrange the middle sentences in the correct sequence.

i. The release of atomic energy is the greatest achievement which science has yet attained
ii. but the first invention to which their discoveries were applied was a bomb
iii. the atom was split by physicists whose minds were set on the search for knowledge
iv. it was more deadly than any other weapon invented so far
v. it is with dread that scientists regard the first use to which their greatest discovery was put
vi. however, they are gratified by the numerous applications of atomic energy for peaceful and constructive population.

(A) ii, iii, iv, v

(B) v, iii, ii, iv

(C) iii, ii, iv, v

(D) iv, v, iii, ii

Correct Answer: (C) iii, ii, iv, v

Solution:

Step 1: Understanding the Question.
Sentence i opens the paragraph and sentence vi closes it. We order ii, iii, iv and v in between so the paragraph tells one connected story about atomic energy.

Step 2: Key Approach.
Three clues do the work: the connector "but" in ii needs a positive statement before it, the pronoun "it" in iv needs a singular noun to refer back to, and the contrast word "however" in the fixed last sentence needs a gloomy statement just before it.

Step 3: Fixing the first two middle sentences.
Sentence i praises the release of atomic energy as science's greatest achievement. Sentence iii carries on in the same positive tone: "the atom was split by physicists whose minds were set on the search for knowledge". So iii follows i.
Sentence ii begins with "but" and reverses that tone: "the first invention to which their discoveries were applied was a bomb". The word "their" also points back to "physicists" in iii, which confirms that ii comes straight after iii.

Step 4: Fixing the last two middle sentences.

Sentence iv says "it was more deadly than any other weapon invented so far". The pronoun "it" needs an antecedent, and the only singular noun that fits is "a bomb" at the end of ii. So iv follows ii.
Sentence v then gives the scientists' reaction: "it is with dread that scientists regard the first use to which their greatest discovery was put". Dread is the natural response to a deadly weapon, so v follows iv.
Finally vi opens with "however" and swings back to the bright side, balancing the dread in v. That confirms v sits right before vi.

Step 5: Reading the full paragraph and checking the rest.
i, iii, ii, iv, v, vi reads: the achievement, how it happened, the grim turn with "but", how deadly it was, the scientists' dread, and then "however" for the peaceful uses. The middle order is iii, ii, iv, v.
Option (A) ii, iii, iv, v opens with "but" immediately after i, so the bomb appears before the physicists who are referred to as "their", leaving the pronoun without an antecedent.
Option (B) v, iii, ii, iv puts the dread before the bomb is even mentioned and ends on iv, so "it was more deadly than any other weapon invented so far, however, they are gratified..." leaves "they" hanging.
Option (D) iv, v, iii, ii starts with "it" right after i, so "it" would have to mean atomic energy rather than the bomb, and the paragraph ends on the "but" clause, which cannot be followed by "however".

Final Answer:
The correct sequence of the middle sentences is iii, ii, iv, v, which is option (C).

Quick Tip: Ask what "their" in sentence ii and "it" in sentence iv point back to, then remember that "however" in the fixed last sentence needs a gloomy sentence right before it.

34. Given below are the jumbled sentences of a paragraph. The first and the last sentence of the jumbled paragraph are given in correct order. Arrange the middle sentences in the correct sequence.

i. The problem of food is intimately connected with population
ii. wages will seldom rise in proportion to the rising prices
iii. the market is governed by demand and supply
iv. without enough food, such people lack health, strength of efficiency
v. if too many people demand goods to go round, prices will rise and poor classes will starve
vi. they fall an easy prey to all sorts of diseases.

(A) iii, v, ii, iv

(B) ii, iii, iv, v

(C) iv, ii, v, iii

(D) v, iii, iv, ii

Correct Answer: (A) iii, v, ii, iv

Solution:

Step 1: Understanding the Question.
Sentence i, "The problem of food is intimately connected with population", is the fixed opener and sentence vi, "they fall an easy prey to all sorts of diseases.", is the fixed close. We arrange ii, iii, iv and v between them.

Step 2: Key Approach.

This paragraph is a cause and effect chain in economics. Work out which sentence states the general principle, which applies it, and which sentence supplies the antecedent for "they" in the fixed last sentence.

Step 3: Starting the chain.

Sentence i links food to population but does not explain how.
Sentence iii gives the general economic rule that explains the link: "the market is governed by demand and supply". A general principle comes before its application, so iii is the first middle sentence.
Sentence v applies that rule: "if too many people demand goods to go round, prices will rise and poor classes will starve". Too many people is the demand side, rising prices is the supply side, so v follows iii.

Step 4: Closing the chain.

Sentence ii, "wages will seldom rise in proportion to the rising prices", picks up "rising prices" straight from v and explains why the poor cannot cope. So ii follows v.
Sentence iv, "without enough food, such people lack health, strength of efficiency", uses "such people", pointing back to the poor classes who cannot afford food. It is the last middle sentence, and "such people" then becomes "they" in the fixed sentence vi.

Step 5: Reading the full paragraph and checking the rest.

i, iii, v, ii, iv, vi runs: food is tied to population, the market runs on demand and supply, too many people push prices up and the poor starve, wages do not keep pace, those people lack health without food, and so they fall ill. The middle order is iii, v, ii, iv.
Option (B) ii, iii, iv, v mentions "rising prices" in ii before any price rise has been introduced, and ends on v, so "poor classes will starve"

is followed by "they fall an easy prey", which skips the health link but more importantly leaves iv stranded before v with no antecedent for "such people".
Option (C) iv, ii, v, iii opens with "such people" right after i, where no group of people has been described, and buries the demand and supply principle at the end where it explains nothing.
Option (D) v, iii, iv, ii applies the rule before stating it and ends on ii, so "wages will seldom rise in proportion to the rising prices, they fall an easy prey to all sorts of diseases" leaves "they" without a referent.

Final Answer:
The correct sequence of the middle sentences is iii, v, ii, iv, which is option (A).

Quick Tip: Find the sentence that names the group "they" refers to in the fixed last sentence, and remember that the demand and supply rule has to be stated before the case that uses it.

35. Given below are the jumbled sentences of a paragraph. The first and the last sentence of the jumbled paragraph are given in correct order. Arrange the middle sentences in the correct sequence.

i. India's message has always been one of love and peace.
ii. our Buddha was the light of Asia
iii. it has been a source of light and wisdom to the rest of the world
iv. Ashoka, moved by the horrors of Kalinga War, adopted the message of non-violence
v. the greatest apostle of non-violence in recent years was Mahatma Gandhi
vi. he shook the foundation of the British rule in India through non-violence.

(A) ii, v, iii, iv

(B) iv, ii, iii, v

(C) v, iv, iii, ii

(D) iii, ii, iv, v

Correct Answer: (D) iii, ii, iv, v

Solution:

Step 1: Understanding the Question.
Sentence i opens the paragraph and sentence vi closes it. Sentences ii, iii, iv and v go in between.

Step 2: Key Approach.
Two things decide this jumble. First, the pronoun "he" in the fixed last sentence must refer to a man named immediately before it. Second, the paragraph names three Indian figures, and history normally runs oldest to newest.

Step 3: Fixing the last middle sentence.
Sentence vi says "he shook the foundation of the British rule in India through non-violence". Only a man who fought the British fits, and that is Mahatma Gandhi. Sentence v ends with his name, so v must be the fourth middle sentence, sitting right before vi. That alone rules out options (A) and (B), which end with iv and v respectively in different places, and rules out (C), which puts v first.

Step 4: Ordering the first three middle sentences.
Sentence i says India's message has always been one of love and peace, and "it" in sentence iii refers to that message: "it has been a source of light and wisdom to the rest of the world". A pronoun sits close to its antecedent, so iii follows i.
The paragraph then gives examples. Sentence ii names the Buddha, who lived in the sixth century BCE. Sentence iv names Ashoka, who ruled in the third century BCE. Sentence v names Gandhi in the twentieth century. Oldest first gives ii, then iv, then v.
The word chain also supports this: iii speaks of "light and wisdom", and ii calls the Buddha "the light of Asia", so ii sits right after iii.

Step 5: Reading the full paragraph and checking the rest.
i, iii, ii, iv, v, vi reads: India's message is love and peace, it has lit up the world, the Buddha was the light of Asia, Ashoka took up non-violence after Kalinga, Gandhi was the greatest apostle of non-violence in recent years, and he shook British rule with it. The middle order is iii, ii, iv, v.
Option (A) ii, v, iii, iv places Gandhi second and Ashoka last, so the chronology is scrambled and "he" in vi would refer to Ashoka.
Option (B) iv, ii, iii, v puts Ashoka before the Buddha and drops the general statement iii in the middle of the list of people.

Option (C) v, iv, iii, ii runs the history backwards and leaves "he" in vi pointing to the Buddha.

Final Answer:
The correct sequence of the middle sentences is iii, ii, iv, v, which is option (D).

Quick Tip: Work backwards: "he" in the fixed last sentence fought the British, so the sentence naming Gandhi must come just before it. Then place the three figures in historical order.

36. Given below are a few commonly used foreign language phrases, select the correct answer from the four options given below.

Mala fide

(A) generous

(B) bad intention

(C) trustworthy

(D) genuine

Correct Answer: (B) bad intention

Solution:

Step 1: Understanding the Question.
We are given the Latin phrase "mala fide" and asked which of the four English expressions carries its meaning. This is a vocabulary question about legal Latin, so the safest route is to break the phrase into its two words.

Step 2: Key Approach.

Split the phrase. "Mala" comes from the Latin "malus", meaning bad or evil, the same root that gives English words like malice, malignant and malpractice. "Fide" comes from "fides", meaning faith or trust, the root of fidelity and confide. Put the two together and "mala fide" literally means "in bad faith".

Step 3: Detailed Explanation.

In law, an act is said to be mala fide when it is done with a dishonest purpose, with intent to deceive or to cheat, and not by honest mistake. Its opposite is "bona fide", which means in good faith or genuine. Courts use the pair constantly, for example when deciding whether an official exercised a power for the purpose it was given or for some ulterior motive.

Among the four choices, only "bad intention" captures the idea of a dishonest state of mind, so option (B) is right.

Step 4: Why the other options are wrong.

Option (A) "generous" describes a giving nature and has nothing to do with faith or honesty.

Option (C) "trustworthy" is close to the meaning of "fides" on its own, but it ignores "mala", which reverses the sense. This is the trap option for anyone who recognises only half the phrase.

Option (D) "genuine" is the meaning of "bona fide", the exact opposite of the phrase asked about.

Final Answer:

Mala fide means in bad faith, that is, with bad intention. The answer is option (B).

Quick Tip: Break the phrase in two: "mala" is the root of malice, and "fide" means faith. Its opposite, bona fide, means in good faith.

37. Given below are a few commonly used foreign language phrases, select the correct answer from the four options given below.

Tabula rasa

(A) clean slate

(B) agitated

(C) deprived

(D) creative

Correct Answer: (A) clean slate

Solution:

Step 1: Understanding the Question.
The phrase to be matched is the Latin "tabula rasa". We must pick the option that gives its meaning.

Step 2: Key Approach.
Take the phrase word by word. "Tabula" is a Latin noun meaning a writing tablet or board, and it survives in English as "table" and "tablet". "Rasa" is the past participle of "radere", meaning to scrape or to erase, and it gives English words like erase and razor. So "tabula rasa" literally means a tablet that has been scraped clean, in other words a blank slate.

Step 3: Detailed Explanation.

Romans wrote on wax tablets and scraped the wax smooth when they wanted to start again. The phrase became famous in philosophy through John Locke, who argued that the human mind at birth is a tabula rasa, carrying no built in ideas, and that everything we know is written on it by experience.
In ordinary use, "starting with a tabula rasa" means beginning afresh with nothing already recorded and no prior commitments. The English idiom "a clean slate" says exactly this, which makes option (A) correct.

Step 4: Why the other options are wrong.
Option (B) "agitated" describes a disturbed state of mind. Nothing in either Latin word points to emotion.
Option (C) "deprived" means kept from having something one needs. A blank tablet is empty, but emptiness by choice or by nature is not deprivation, so this is only a surface resemblance.
Option (D) "creative" is a near miss trap, since a blank page is where creation starts. Still, the phrase names the blank state itself, not the ability to invent.

Final Answer:
Tabula rasa means a scraped, blank tablet, that is, a clean slate. The answer is option (A).

Quick Tip: Romans wrote on wax tablets and scraped them clean to reuse them. "Tabula" is the tablet and "rasa" shares its root with erase.

38. Given below are a few commonly used foreign language phrases, select the correct answer from the four options given below.

Carte blanche

(A) slavery

(B) complete discretion

(C) anarchy

(D) dependent

Correct Answer: (B) complete discretion

Solution:

Step 1: Understanding the Question.
The phrase here is "carte blanche", and we must choose the option that gives its meaning. Unlike the other phrases in this set, this one is French rather than Latin.

Step 2: Key Approach.
Translate the two words. "Carte" is a card or a sheet of paper, and "blanche" is the feminine form of "blanc", meaning white or blank. Literally, carte blanche is a blank sheet.

Step 3: Detailed Explanation.
The expression comes from the practice of handing someone a piece of paper that carried nothing but your signature. Whoever held it could fill in any terms above the signature, and you were bound by them. Giving a blank signed paper is the strongest possible way of saying "decide as you think fit".
So carte blanche means full authority to act as one chooses, without needing further approval. A sentence like "the board gave the new

chief executive carte blanche to restructure the company" means she could do it her own way. "Complete discretion" states precisely this, so option (B) is correct.

Step 4: Why the other options are wrong.
Option (A) "slavery" is the opposite idea. A person with carte blanche is free to decide, while a slave has no freedom at all.
Option (C) "anarchy" means the absence of any government or authority. Carte blanche is not the absence of authority; it is authority handed over to someone in full. Power still exists and still has a holder.
Option (D) "dependent" describes someone who relies on another's decisions, which again reverses the sense of the phrase.

Final Answer:
Carte blanche means a blank signed paper, so full freedom or complete discretion to act. The answer is option (B).

Quick Tip: Picture a sheet of paper that is blank except for a signature at the bottom, handed to you to fill in as you like.

39. Given below are a few commonly used foreign language phrases, select the correct answer from the four options given below.

De jure

(A) illegal

(B) heir

(C) concerning law

(D) forbidden

Correct Answer: (C) concerning law

Solution:

Step 1: Understanding the Question.
We have to give the meaning of the Latin phrase "de jure".

Step 2: Key Approach.
Split it. "De" is a Latin preposition meaning of, from or concerning. "Jure" is a form of "jus", meaning law or right, the root behind English words like jurist, jurisdiction, jury and justice. So "de jure" means by law, or in law, or concerning law.

Step 3: Detailed Explanation.
The phrase almost always appears with its partner "de facto", which means in fact. The pair separates what the law recognises from what is actually happening on the ground. A de jure government is the one law recognises as lawful, while a de facto government is the one actually in control, whatever the law says. A de jure right exists on paper; a de facto position exists in practice.
Of the four choices, only "concerning law" carries this sense, so option (C) is correct.

Step 4: Why the other options are wrong.
Option (A) "illegal" says something is against the law. De jure says the opposite: that the law backs it. A student who links "jure" to law but

forgets that "de" simply means "concerning" may fall for this.
Option (B) "heir" is a person who inherits. The Latin for that idea is "heres", which has no connection to "jus".
Option (D) "forbidden" again means banned by law, the reverse of what the phrase states.

Final Answer:
De jure means by law or concerning law. The answer is option (C).

Quick Tip: "Jure" comes from jus, meaning law, and "de" means concerning. Pair the phrase with de facto, which means in fact.

40. Given below are a few commonly used foreign language phrases, select the correct answer from the four options given below.

Raison d'etre

(A) logical conclusion

(B) reason for existence

(C) free choice

(D) dubious argument

Correct Answer: (B) reason for existence

Solution:

Step 1: Understanding the Question.
The phrase is "raison d'etre", and we must pick its English meaning from four options. Like carte blanche earlier in this set, this one is French.

Step 2: Key Approach.
Translate word by word. "Raison" means reason, from the same root as the English word. "De" means of, and "etre" is the French verb meaning to be. So "raison d'etre" is literally "reason of being".

Step 3: Detailed Explanation.
The phrase names the single purpose that justifies why a person, an institution or a thing exists at all. If you ask what a body is for and remove that answer, there would be no point in the body continuing. For example, "protecting fundamental rights is the raison d'etre of the Supreme Court's writ jurisdiction" means that purpose is the reason the jurisdiction exists.
Option (B), "reason for existence", is that meaning stated in plain English, so it is correct.

Step 4: Why the other options are wrong.
Option (A) "logical conclusion" is the trap for anyone who sees only "raison" and thinks of reasoning or logic. Here "reason" means purpose or ground, not the process of drawing an inference.
Option (C) "free choice" has no link to any word in the phrase; that idea would be closer to carte blanche.
Option (D) "dubious argument" again reads "raison" as an argument and then adds a negative colour the phrase does not carry. A raison d'etre is a serious justifying purpose, not a weak claim.

Final Answer:
Raison d'etre means reason of being, that is, the reason for existence. The answer is option (B).

Quick Tip: "Etre" is the French verb "to be", so the phrase literally reads "reason of being". Remember that "reason" here means purpose, not logic.

41. Who said that, 'Man is a social animal'?

(A) Socrates

(B) Aristotle

(C) Kahn

(D) Plato

Correct Answer: (B) Aristotle

Solution:

Step 1: Understanding the Question.
The question asks which thinker is credited with the statement that man is a social animal. This is a standard political thought question, so the answer has to be traced back to a specific classical text rather than to general opinion.

Step 2: Key Idea or Approach.
The line comes from Aristotle's Politics. In it he argues that the state exists by nature and that man is by nature a political animal, often translated as a social animal. His reasoning is that a human being who can live outside society is either a beast or a god, because speech and moral judgement only make sense when people live together.

Step 3: Detailed Explanation.
Aristotle built his argument in stages. He said the family forms first to meet daily needs, several families join to form a village, and several

villages join to form the state or polis. The state is the highest form because it aims at the good life, not just survival.
Since man reaches his full nature only inside the polis, Aristotle concluded that living in society is natural to man, not a later invention. That is why the phrase is attached to his name.
Now check the other names.
Socrates left no writings of his own and is known for his method of questioning and for ethical enquiry, not for this formulation.
Plato, Aristotle's teacher, wrote The Republic and dealt with justice and the ideal state, but the specific phrase about man being a social or political animal is Aristotle's.
Kahn is not a classical political philosopher at all and is placed here only as filler.

Step 4: Final Answer.
The statement belongs to Aristotle, so option (B) is correct.

Aristotle

Quick Tip: Think of the Greek philosopher who wrote Politics and argued that the state exists by nature.

42. World Computer Literacy day is celebrated on

(A) November 14

(B) November 3

(C) December 2

(D) July 5

Correct Answer: (C) December 2

Solution:

Step 1: Understanding the Question.
The question asks for the date on which World Computer Literacy Day falls. This is a plain date recall question from the list of important days.

Step 2: Key Idea or Approach.
World Computer Literacy Day is observed on 2 December every year. It was started in 2001 by the Indian IT company NIIT to mark its own anniversary, and the aim was to push computer skills among children and women in developing countries.

Step 3: Detailed Explanation.
The day is meant to close the digital divide, that is the gap between people who can use computers and people who cannot. Since a large share of the world's non literate population lives in developing countries, campaigns on this day focus on basic computer training for such groups.
Now look at why the other dates do not fit.
November 14 is Children's Day in India, marking the birth anniversary of Jawaharlal Nehru, so it is a strong distractor but unrelated to computers.
November 3 has no widely observed international computer related observance and is only filler here.
July 5 is likewise not linked to any computer literacy observance.
So the only date tied to computer literacy is 2 December.

Step 4: Final Answer.

World Computer Literacy Day is celebrated on December 2, which is option (C).

December 2

Quick Tip: The day was started in 2001 by an Indian IT training company and falls in the first week of December.

43. Whose teaching inspired the French Revolution?

(A) Rousseau

(B) Locke

(C) Hegel

(D) Wagner

Correct Answer: (A) Rousseau

Solution:

Step 1: Understanding the Question.
The question asks whose teaching inspired the French Revolution of 1789. Several Enlightenment thinkers shaped that period, so the answer has to be the one whose ideas the revolutionaries themselves took up most directly.

Step 2: Key Idea or Approach.
Jean Jacques Rousseau is the standard answer. His book The Social Contract, published in 1762, opens with the line that man is born free but is everywhere in chains. He argued that sovereignty rests with the people through the general will, and that a ruler holds power only as a

trustee of that will.

Step 3: Detailed Explanation.

Rousseau's teaching struck at the root of the French system before 1789. France was ruled by an absolute monarch who claimed a divine right to rule, and society was split into three estates in which the clergy and nobles paid almost no tax.

If sovereignty really belongs to the people, then an absolute king and a privileged estate system have no lawful basis. That is exactly the argument the revolutionaries used, and it fed into the Declaration of the Rights of Man and of the Citizen in 1789. Leaders such as Robespierre openly treated Rousseau as their guide.

Now check the other names.

John Locke was an English thinker whose ideas on natural rights and government by consent did influence the age, but he is tied far more closely to the Glorious Revolution in England and to the American Revolution. He is the main distractor.

Hegel was a German philosopher born in 1770, so he was a child in 1789. He wrote about the Revolution afterwards and could not have inspired it.

Wagner was a nineteenth century German composer and has no link to the Revolution at all.

Step 4: Final Answer.

The teaching that inspired the French Revolution was that of Rousseau, so option (A) is correct.

Rousseau

Quick Tip: Look for the writer of The Social Contract, whose line about man being born free became a slogan in France.

44. The II Africa-India Summit was held in May 2011 in

(A) New Delhi

(B) Lagos

(C) Nairobi

(D) Addis Ababa

Correct Answer: (D) Addis Ababa

Solution:

Step 1: Understanding the Question.
The question asks for the host city of the second India Africa Forum Summit held in May 2011. This is a current affairs recall item from the year before the exam.

Step 2: Key Idea or Approach.
The second India Africa Forum Summit took place on 24 and 25 May 2011 in Addis Ababa, the capital of Ethiopia. Prime Minister Manmohan Singh led the Indian side and the summit was held jointly with the African Union, whose headquarters sit in Addis Ababa.

Step 3: Detailed Explanation.
The first summit of this series was held in New Delhi in April 2008. The pattern of these summits is to alternate between India and Africa, so the second one moving to an African city follows naturally.
Addis Ababa was picked because the African Union Commission is

based there, which makes it the natural political capital of the continent for such meetings. At the 2011 summit India announced credit lines of about 5 billion dollars over three years and further grants for institution building in Africa.
Now check the other cities.
New Delhi hosted the first summit in 2008, not the second, so it is the main trap for anyone who mixes up the two editions.
Lagos is a large commercial city in Nigeria but has never hosted this summit, and Nigeria's capital is Abuja in any case.
Nairobi in Kenya also did not host it. The third summit later returned to New Delhi in October 2015.

Step 4: Final Answer.
The second Africa India Summit of May 2011 was held in Addis Ababa, so option (D) is correct.

Addis Ababa

Quick Tip: The African Union headquarters city hosted it; the first edition had been in New Delhi in 2008.

45. The famous Akshardham temple is situated in the city of

(A) Jamnagar

(B) Gandhinagar

(C) Jammu

(D) Madurai

Correct Answer: (B) Gandhinagar

Solution:

Step 1: Understanding the Question.

The question asks which of the four listed cities holds the famous Akshardham temple. Only one of the four has such a temple, so the task is to recall the location of the Swaminarayan Akshardham complexes.

Step 2: Key Idea or Approach.

Akshardham temples are built by the BAPS Swaminarayan Sanstha. Two are well known in India, one in Gandhinagar in Gujarat opened in 1992, and one in New Delhi opened in 2005. Of the four cities given, only Gandhinagar is on that list.

Step 3: Detailed Explanation.

The Gandhinagar Akshardham stands in the capital of Gujarat and is dedicated to Bhagwan Swaminarayan. It is built in pink sandstone, carries a gold leaf covered idol of Swaminarayan, and was inaugurated in 1992 by Pramukh Swami Maharaj. This complex is also remembered for the terror attack of September 2002.

Since New Delhi is not among the options, Gandhinagar is the intended answer.

Now check the rest.

Jamnagar is a coastal city in Gujarat known for its brass industry and for one of the world's largest oil refineries. It has no Akshardham.

Jammu is known for the Vaishno Devi shrine in the nearby Trikuta hills and for the Raghunath temple, not for Akshardham.

Madurai in Tamil Nadu is famous for the Meenakshi Amman temple, a Dravidian style shrine that has nothing to do with the Swaminarayan tradition.

Step 4: Final Answer.
The Akshardham temple among these cities is at Gandhinagar, so option (B) is correct.

Gandhinagar

Quick Tip: The Swaminarayan temple of 1992 stands in the capital city of Gujarat.

46. Who out of the following was the recipient of Dhyan Chand Award in 2011?

(A) Satish Pillai

(B) Hukam Singh

(C) Shabbir Ali

(D) Mukh Bain Singh

Correct Answer: (C) Shabbir Ali

Solution:

Step 1: Understanding the Question.
The question asks which of the four named sportspersons received the Dhyan Chand Award in 2011. This is a sports awards recall item from the year before the exam.

Step 2: Key Idea or Approach.
The Dhyan Chand Award is India's lifetime achievement honour in sport. It is given for outstanding performance by a sportsperson in the past plus a contribution to the sport after retiring. It was started in

2002 and is named after the hockey legend Major Dhyan Chand.

Step 3: Detailed Explanation.
Among the four names offered, Shabbir Ali is the recognised recipient for 2011. He is a former India football captain from Hyderabad who played through the 1970s and 1980s, won the Arjuna Award in 1981, and later worked as a coach with clubs and with junior sides. That mix of a strong playing career plus service to the game after retirement is exactly what the Dhyan Chand Award rewards.
The other three names do not match the 2011 list.
Satish Pillai is not a recorded Dhyan Chand awardee for that year.
Hukam Singh is not a 2011 recipient either, and the name is easy to confuse with older hockey and shooting figures.
Mukh Bain Singh does not appear on the 2011 list of awardees.
So by both direct recall and elimination, the intended answer is Shabbir Ali.

Step 4: Final Answer.
The 2011 Dhyan Chand Award recipient among the options is Shabbir Ali, which is option (C).

Shabbir Ali

Quick Tip: Look for the former India football captain from Hyderabad who had already won the Arjuna Award in 1981.

47. Name the annual fair of Rajasthan that is famous for its camel trading event.

(A) Maru Mela

(B) Pushkar Mela

(C) Suraj Kund Mela

(D) Sonepur Mela

Correct Answer: (B) Pushkar Mela

Solution:

Step 1: Understanding the Question.
The question asks for the annual fair of Rajasthan best known for camel trading. Two filters apply at once, the fair must be in Rajasthan and it must be a camel fair.

Step 2: Key Idea or Approach.
The Pushkar Mela, held at Pushkar in Ajmer district of Rajasthan, is the answer. It runs for about a week around Kartik Purnima, that is in the month of October or November, and it is the largest camel fair in the country.

Step 3: Detailed Explanation.
Pushkar has a religious side and a trading side. Pilgrims come to bathe in the Pushkar lake on Kartik Purnima and to visit the Brahma temple, which is one of the very few temples of Brahma anywhere. Alongside this, herders bring thousands of camels, horses and cattle for sale, and the fair also holds camel races and beauty contests for the animals.
Now test the other three.
Maru Mela, better known as the Desert Festival, is held at Jaisalmer in Rajasthan and does feature camels, but it is a cultural desert festival with folk music and dance rather than a camel trading fair, so

it does not fit the trading test as well.
Suraj Kund Mela is held at Faridabad in Haryana, not Rajasthan, and it is a crafts fair for handlooms and handicrafts. That fails the state test.
Sonepur Mela is held at Sonepur in Bihar and is famous as an elephant and cattle fair on the bank of the Gandak. It fails both the state test and the camel test.

Step 4: Final Answer.
The camel trading fair of Rajasthan is the Pushkar Mela, which is option (B).

Pushkar Mela

Quick Tip: Think of the town near Ajmer with a Brahma temple and a holy lake, where the fair falls on Kartik Purnima.

48. The 38^{th} G-8 summit will be held in 2012 in

(A) USA

(B) UK

(C) Germany

(D) Canada

Correct Answer: (A) USA

Solution:

Step 1: Understanding the Question.
The question asks which country was to host the 38th G8 summit in

2012. The paper was set in early 2012, so the summit was still ahead at that time, which is why the wording says will be held.

Step 2: Key Idea or Approach.

The G8 presidency rotates among the member countries each year, and the host of the year runs the summit. For 2012 the presidency was with the United States, so the 38th summit was hosted by the USA. It met at Camp David in Maryland on 18 and 19 May 2012 with President Barack Obama in the chair.

Step 3: Detailed Explanation.

The G8 at that time was made up of the United States, the United Kingdom, France, Germany, Italy, Japan, Canada and Russia. The venue had first been announced as Chicago, where the NATO summit was also due, but it was later shifted to the presidential retreat at Camp David. The main talking points were the euro zone debt crisis, growth versus austerity, food security in Africa and the situation in Syria and Iran.

Now look at the other options.

The UK hosted the following summit, the 39th, at Lough Erne in Northern Ireland in June 2013, so it is one year off.

Germany had hosted the 33rd summit at Heiligendamm in 2007 and was not the 2012 host.

Canada had hosted the 36th summit at Huntsville in Ontario in 2010, again not 2012.

Step 4: Final Answer.

The 38th G8 summit of 2012 was held in the USA, so option (A) is correct.

USA

Quick Tip: President Obama chaired it at the Camp David retreat in Maryland in May 2012.

49. Who was awarded the Nobel Prize for literature in 2011?

(A) Paul Lauterbur

(B) Bill Clinton

(C) Tomas Transtromer

(D) Shirin Ebadi

Correct Answer: (C) Tomas Transtromer

Solution:

Step 1: Understanding the Question.
The question asks for the winner of the 2011 Nobel Prize in Literature. Both the year and the category must match, so a Nobel laureate from another field or another year will not do.

Step 2: Key Idea or Approach.
The 2011 Nobel Prize in Literature went to Tomas Transtromer, a Swedish poet and psychologist. The Swedish Academy cited him because through his condensed, translucent images he gives us fresh access to reality.

Step 3: Detailed Explanation.
Transtromer was born in Stockholm in 1931 and trained as a psychologist, working with young offenders and with people with disabilities. He wrote spare poems built on sharp natural images, and

his collections include 17 Poems, Baltic and The Sorrow Gondola. He suffered a stroke in 1990 that limited his speech, yet he kept writing and playing the piano with his left hand. He was the first Swede to win the literature prize since 1974.
Now check why the others fail.
Paul Lauterbur was an American chemist who shared the 2003 Nobel Prize in Physiology or Medicine with Peter Mansfield for magnetic resonance imaging. Wrong field and wrong year.
Bill Clinton, a former President of the United States, has never won a Nobel Prize in any category. He is placed here only as a familiar name.
Shirin Ebadi is an Iranian lawyer and human rights activist who won the Nobel Peace Prize in 2003. She is a real laureate, but for Peace and not Literature, which makes her the strongest distractor.

Step 4: Final Answer.
The 2011 Nobel Prize for Literature went to Tomas Transtromer, so option (C) is correct.

Tomas Transtromer

Quick Tip: The winner was a Swedish poet who also worked as a psychologist, the first Swede to take the prize since 1974.

50. Who was awarded the UNESCO King Sejong Literacy Prize in 2011?

(A) Nelson Mandela

(B) National Literacy Service, Burundi

(C) Medha Patkar

(D) National Literacy Mission, India

Correct Answer: (B) National Literacy Service, Burundi

Solution:

Step 1: Understanding the Question.

The question asks who won the UNESCO King Sejong Literacy Prize in 2011. The year and the specific prize both matter, so a general activist or a body that won some other award will not fit.

Step 2: Key Idea or Approach.

The King Sejong Literacy Prize is one of the UNESCO International Literacy Prizes. It was set up in 1989 with support from the Government of the Republic of Korea and is named after King Sejong, who created the Korean Hangul alphabet. It rewards work on literacy in a mother tongue. For 2011 it went to the National Literacy Service of Burundi.

Step 3: Detailed Explanation.

The Burundi body was recognised for its programme teaching reading and writing in Kirundi, the local mother tongue, and for reaching rural adults and women who had missed formal schooling. That mother tongue focus is exactly what the King Sejong prize is meant to reward, which is why the award fits this recipient.

Now check the other options.

Nelson Mandela was South Africa's first Black President and a Nobel Peace Prize winner in 1993. He is honoured for the anti apartheid

struggle, not for a literacy programme, and he did not receive this prize.
Medha Patkar is an Indian social activist known for the Narmada Bachao Andolan on displacement and dams. Her work is on rehabilitation and environment rather than literacy teaching.
The National Literacy Mission of India is a genuine literacy body, launched in 1988, which makes it the most tempting wrong answer for an Indian student. It was not the 2011 King Sejong winner.

Step 4: Final Answer.
The 2011 UNESCO King Sejong Literacy Prize went to the National Literacy Service of Burundi, which is option (B).

National Literacy Service, Burundi

Quick Tip: The prize rewards mother tongue literacy work; the 2011 winner was an African national literacy body.

51. December 10 is observed as

(A) World Health Day

(B) U. N. Day

(C) Red Cross Day

(D) Human Rights Day

Correct Answer: (D) Human Rights Day

Solution:

Step 1: Understanding the Question.
The question gives a date, 10 December, and asks which observance falls on it. This is a direct important days recall item.

Step 2: Key Idea or Approach.
10 December is Human Rights Day. On this date in 1948 the United Nations General Assembly adopted the Universal Declaration of Human Rights in Paris, and the day has been observed since 1950 to mark that adoption.

Step 3: Detailed Explanation.
The Universal Declaration sets out the rights every person holds, such as the right to life and liberty, freedom from slavery and torture, freedom of thought and expression, and the right to work and education. It is not a treaty in itself, but it became the base document for later binding covenants. The Nobel Peace Prize is also handed over on this date each year, since Alfred Nobel died on 10 December 1896.
Now check the other three dates.
World Health Day is 7 April, marking the founding of the World Health Organization in 1948, so it is a different date and a different body.
United Nations Day is 24 October, the day the UN Charter came into force in 1945.
World Red Cross and Red Crescent Day is 8 May, the birth anniversary of Henry Dunant, who founded the movement and won the first Nobel Peace Prize.
None of these fall in December, so only Human Rights Day survives.

Step 4: Final Answer.
10 December is observed as Human Rights Day, which is option (D).

Human Rights Day

Quick Tip: The Universal Declaration was adopted on this date in 1948, and the Nobel Peace Prize is given on the same day.

52. Which is the largest gland in human body?

(A) Pancreas

(B) Liver

(C) Thyroid

(D) Pituitary

Correct Answer: (B) Liver

Solution:

Step 1: Understanding the Question.

The question asks for the largest gland in the human body. A gland is an organ that makes and releases a substance, so we compare the sizes of the glands listed.

Step 2: Key Idea or Approach.

The liver is the largest gland in the human body. In an adult it weighs roughly 1.4 to 1.5 kilograms and sits in the upper right part of the abdomen just under the diaphragm. It counts as a gland because it secretes bile.

Step 3: Detailed Explanation.

The liver is a mixed gland. Its exocrine role is to make bile, which travels through ducts to the gall bladder and then to the small

intestine, where it breaks fat into small droplets so that enzymes can act on it. The liver also stores glycogen, breaks down old red blood cells, makes plasma proteins and turns ammonia into urea.
Now compare the other glands by size.
The pancreas is also a mixed gland and does secrete both digestive juice and hormones such as insulin, but it weighs only about 70 to 100 grams, far less than the liver. It is often called the second largest gland, which makes it the main distractor.
The thyroid, in the neck, weighs about 25 grams and makes thyroxine, which controls the rate of metabolism. It is the largest purely endocrine gland but is nowhere near the liver in size.
The pituitary sits at the base of the brain and weighs only about half a gram. It is called the master gland because it controls other endocrine glands, but master does not mean largest.

Step 4: Final Answer.
The largest gland in the human body is the liver, which is option (B).

Liver

Quick Tip: It weighs around 1.5 kg, sits under the diaphragm on the right, and secretes bile.

53. The book titled 'The Google Story' has been authored by

(A) David A. Vise

(B) Shobha Dey

(C) Fredrick Forsyth

(D) Vikram Seth

Correct Answer: (A) David A. Vise

Solution:

Step 1: Understanding the Question.

The question asks who wrote the book The Google Story. This is a books and authors recall item, so we match the title with the right writer.

Step 2: Key Idea or Approach.

The Google Story was written by David A. Vise together with Mark Malseed and came out in 2005. Vise is an American journalist with The Washington Post and had already won a Pulitzer Prize in 1990. The book traces how Larry Page and Sergey Brin built Google from a research project at Stanford into a global company.

Step 3: Detailed Explanation.

A useful check is the type of writing each author is known for. The Google Story is non fiction business journalism, so the author has to be a journalist, not a novelist.

David A. Vise fits, since he reported on business and finance for a newspaper and wrote the book from interviews and reporting.

Shobha De is an Indian novelist and columnist known for society fiction such as Socialite Evenings and Starry Nights. Her subject is Mumbai high society, not technology companies.

Frederick Forsyth is a British thriller writer whose books include The Day of the Jackal and The Odessa File. He writes fiction with a political and espionage setting.

Vikram Seth is an Indian writer best known for the novel A Suitable Boy and the verse novel The Golden Gate. Again a novelist, and unconnected to this title.

So all three distractors are novelists, and only Vise is the journalist who could have written a reported account of Google.

Step 4: Final Answer.
The Google Story was authored by David A. Vise, which is option (A).

David A. Vise

Quick Tip: The author is a Washington Post journalist and Pulitzer winner, not a novelist.

54. Which strait separates Europe from Africa

(A) Mallaica

(B) Gibralter

(C) Berring

(D) Palk

Correct Answer: (B) Gibralter

Solution:

Step 1: Understanding the Question:
A strait is a narrow strip of water that joins two larger water bodies and, at the same time, splits two land masses. The question asks which strait forms the water gap between the European landmass and the African landmass.

Step 2: Key Formula or Approach:
Fix the two land masses on either side of each strait listed, then keep

the one that has Europe on one bank and Africa on the other.

Step 3: Detailed Explanation:
The Strait of Gibraltar is about 14 km wide at its narrowest point. It links the Mediterranean Sea with the Atlantic Ocean. Spain and the British territory of Gibraltar sit on its northern bank, so that side is Europe. Morocco and the Spanish enclave of Ceuta sit on its southern bank, so that side is Africa. So Gibraltar is the strait that separates Europe from Africa.
Why the other options fail:
The Strait of Malacca (spelt "Mallaica" in the paper) runs between the Malay Peninsula and the Indonesian island of Sumatra, so it lies fully in South East Asia.
The Bering Strait (spelt "Berring") separates Asia from North America, joining Russia's Chukchi Peninsula to Alaska.
The Palk Strait lies between Tamil Nadu in India and northern Sri Lanka, so both banks are in Asia.

Step 4: Final Answer:
The Strait of Gibraltar separates Europe from Africa, which is option (B).

Quick Tip: Think of the 14 km wide gap between Spain and Morocco that lets Atlantic water into the Mediterranean.

55. Taiwan was earlier known as

(A) Fuchow

(B) Marshall Island

(C) Formosa

(D) Macau

Correct Answer: (C) Formosa

Solution:

Step 1: Understanding the Question:
Many places carry an older colonial name that later changed. The question asks for the earlier name of the island now called Taiwan.

Step 2: Key Formula or Approach:
Recall who named the island first and what that name was, then check each option against a real place on the map.

Step 3: Detailed Explanation:
Portuguese sailors reached the island in the sixteenth century and called it Ilha Formosa, which means "beautiful island" in Portuguese. The short form Formosa stuck in European maps and stayed in common use well into the twentieth century. The island is now the Republic of China, known as Taiwan.
Why the other options fail:
Fuchow (Fuzhou) is a port city in Fujian province on the Chinese mainland, across the Taiwan Strait. It is a city, not another name for the island.
Marshall Islands is a separate country of coral atolls in the central Pacific, thousands of kilometres away from Taiwan.
Macau is a small former Portuguese territory on the southern coast of China, handed back to China in 1999. It is a different place from

Taiwan.

Step 4: Final Answer:
Taiwan was earlier known as Formosa, so option (C) is correct.

Quick Tip: The Portuguese named it "beautiful island" when they first sailed past it.

56. Identify the Indian Tennis player who has turned Hollywood filmmaker?

(A) Vijay Amritraj

(B) Mahesh Bhupathi

(C) Leander Paes

(D) Ashok Amritraj

Correct Answer: (D) Ashok Amritraj

Solution:

Step 1: Understanding the Question:
The question wants an Indian tennis player who left the sport and built a career as a filmmaker in Hollywood, that is, as a producer of American films.

Step 2: Key Formula or Approach:
Check what each named player did after his playing days. Only one of them runs a film production house in Hollywood.

Step 3: Detailed Explanation:

Ashok Amritraj played on the professional tennis circuit in the 1970s along with his brothers Vijay and Anand. He moved to Los Angeles and became a film producer, and by 2012 he had produced or executive produced more than a hundred Hollywood films through his company Hyde Park Entertainment. Titles linked with him include Bringing Down the House and Premonition. So he is the tennis player turned Hollywood filmmaker.
Why the other options fail:
Vijay Amritraj, Ashok's elder brother, was the bigger tennis star and did appear as an actor in Hollywood films such as Octopussy and Star Trek IV. He acted, he did not turn filmmaker, and the question asks for the filmmaker.
Mahesh Bhupathi was a doubles specialist who moved into sports management with Globosport, not into Hollywood.
Leander Paes was still playing competitive doubles in 2012 and had no Hollywood production career.

Step 4: Final Answer:
The Indian tennis player who turned Hollywood filmmaker is Ashok Amritraj, option (D).

Quick Tip: He is one of the Amritraj brothers, but the one who produces films rather than the one who acted in them.

57. Where will the next Olympic Games be held in 2012?

(A) Tokyo

(B) Berlin

(C) London

(D) Toronto

Correct Answer: (C) London

Solution:

Step 1: Understanding the Question:
The paper was set in early 2012, so "the next Olympic Games" means the Summer Olympics due later that year. The question asks for the host city.

Step 2: Key Formula or Approach:
Recall the recent chain of Summer Olympic hosts and pick the city awarded the 2012 Games by the International Olympic Committee.

Step 3: Detailed Explanation:
The International Olympic Committee picked London as host of the 2012 Summer Olympics at its session in Singapore in July 2005, where London beat Paris in the final round of voting. The Games ran from 27 July to 12 August 2012, with the main venue at the Olympic Park in Stratford, east London. That made London the first city to host the Summer Olympics three times, after 1908 and 1948.
Why the other options fail:
Tokyo had hosted in 1964 and would host again in 2020, but not in 2012.
Berlin hosted the 1936 Games and had no Olympics after that.
Toronto has never hosted the Olympic Games, though it did host the Pan American Games in 2015.

Step 4: Final Answer:
The 2012 Olympic Games were held in London, option (C).

Quick Tip: The city that follows Beijing 2008 in the list of Summer Olympic hosts, and the only one to host three times.

58. Which of the following teams has won the Santosh Trophy Football Championship in 2011?

(A) Punjab

(B) West Bengal

(C) Goa

(D) Railways

Correct Answer: (B) West Bengal

Solution:

Step 1: Understanding the Question:
The Santosh Trophy is India's national football championship, played between state teams and a few institutional sides such as Services and Railways. The question asks who lifted it in 2011.

Step 2: Key Formula or Approach:
Recall the winners of the seasons around 2011 and match the answer to the 2010-11 edition, which finished in 2011.

Step 3: Detailed Explanation:
The 2010-11 Santosh Trophy was won by West Bengal, which is by far

the most successful side in the history of the tournament with more than thirty titles. Bengal had also won the previous season, so it went into 2011 as the defending champion and kept the trophy.
Why the other options fail:
Punjab is a strong football state and has won the Santosh Trophy several times, but not in 2011.
Goa is another major football state with a handful of Santosh Trophy titles, the last of them well before 2011.
Railways is an institutional team that reaches the later rounds now and then but had not won the title in that season.

Step 4: Final Answer:
West Bengal won the Santosh Trophy in 2011, so option (B) is correct.

Quick Tip: The state with the most Santosh Trophy titles by far, and the holder going into that season.

59. Excess of money supply as compared to supply of goods results in

(A) Depression

(B) Deflation

(C) Trade deficit

(D) Inflation

Correct Answer: (D) Inflation

Solution:

Step 1: Understanding the Question:
The question describes a situation where the amount of money

floating in the economy grows faster than the amount of goods available to buy. It asks what such a mismatch produces.

Step 2: Key Formula or Approach:
Use the simple idea of too much money chasing too few goods. When buyers hold more money but the supply of goods stays the same, buyers bid prices up, so the general price level rises.

Step 3: Detailed Explanation:
Inflation means a sustained rise in the general price level, which is the same as a fall in the purchasing power of money. If the central bank or government pushes extra money into circulation while output of goods does not grow to match, each unit of money now chases the same basket of goods, so prices climb. This is exactly the case described in the question, and it is called demand pull inflation.
Why the other options fail:
Deflation is the opposite case, a general fall in prices, which happens when money supply is tight relative to goods.
Depression is a long and severe fall in output and employment, usually with falling prices, not a direct result of extra money.
Trade deficit means imports exceed exports in value. It is a balance of payments idea and does not follow automatically from extra money supply.

Step 4: Final Answer:
Excess money supply against limited goods causes inflation, so option (D) is correct.

Quick Tip: Too much money chasing too few goods pushes the general price level in one direction.

60. The largest living flightless bird is

(A) Emu

(B) Kiwi

(C) Ostrich

(D) Penguin

Correct Answer: (C) Ostrich

Solution:

Step 1: Understanding the Question:
All four birds listed are flightless. The question asks which of them is the largest living bird, that is, the tallest and heaviest species alive today.

Step 2: Key Formula or Approach:
Compare the typical height and weight of each bird and pick the biggest. "Living" rules out extinct giants such as the moa and the elephant bird.

Step 3: Detailed Explanation:
The ostrich, found in Africa, stands about 2.1 to 2.7 metres tall and weighs around 100 to 150 kg. It is the largest and heaviest living bird, it lays the largest egg of any living bird, and it is also the fastest running bird, reaching about 70 km per hour.
Why the other options fail:
The emu of Australia is the second largest living bird at about 1.6 to 1.9 metres and 30 to 55 kg, so it is clearly smaller than the ostrich.
The kiwi of New Zealand is about the size of a chicken, roughly 2 to 3 kg, so it is one of the smallest flightless birds.

Penguins are flightless swimmers, and even the largest of them, the emperor penguin, reaches only about 1.2 metres and 40 kg.

Step 4: Final Answer:
The largest living flightless bird is the ostrich, option (C).

Quick Tip: It comes from Africa, runs at about 70 km per hour and lays the biggest egg of any living bird.

61. Which of the following oceans has the shape of the English letter 'S'?

(A) Atlantic

(B) Pacific

(C) Indian

(D) Arctic

Correct Answer: (A) Atlantic

Solution:

Step 1: Understanding the Question:
The question asks which ocean looks like the letter S on a world map. It is really a question about the outline of each ocean basin.

Step 2: Key Formula or Approach:
Picture each ocean on the map and trace its outline, then match it to the curve of an S.

Step 3: Detailed Explanation:
The Atlantic Ocean is a long, narrow ocean stretching from the Arctic

in the north to the Southern Ocean in the south. In the north it bends one way between North America and Europe, and in the south it bends the other way between South America and Africa. Those two opposite curves together give the basin its classic S shape. The bulge of Brazil fitting the hollow of the Gulf of Guinea sharpens the effect. The Atlantic is also the second largest ocean and the one that holds the Mid Atlantic Ridge.
Why the other options fail:
The Pacific is the largest ocean and is roughly a huge oval or triangle spread between Asia, Australia and the Americas, not an S.
The Indian Ocean is closed in the north by Asia and opens out to the south, so it looks more like the letter M or a broad triangle.
The Arctic Ocean is a small, nearly circular basin ringed by land around the North Pole.

Step 4: Final Answer:
The Atlantic Ocean has the S shape, so option (A) is correct.

Quick Tip: Look at how the bulge of Brazil fits into the hollow of West Africa, and follow the basin north.

62. Which is the longest shipping canal in the world?

(A) Panama Canal

(B) Suez Canal

(C) White Sea-Baltic Canal

(D) Kiel Canal

Correct Answer: (C) White Sea-Baltic Canal

Solution:

Step 1: Understanding the Question:

A shipping canal is a man made waterway cut for ships. The question asks which of the four listed canals runs the greatest length.

Step 2: Key Formula or Approach:

Compare the length of each canal in kilometres and pick the largest number.

Step 3: Detailed Explanation:

The White Sea-Baltic Canal in Russia, once called the Stalin Canal, runs about 227 km and links the White Sea near Belomorsk with Lake Onega and on to the Baltic Sea. It was opened in 1933. At about 227 km it is the longest of the four canals here, which is why it is the standard textbook answer for the longest shipping canal.

Why the other options fail:

The Suez Canal in Egypt is about 193 km and joins the Mediterranean Sea to the Red Sea. It is the busiest of the group but shorter than the White Sea-Baltic Canal.

The Panama Canal is only about 82 km and cuts across the isthmus of Panama to join the Atlantic to the Pacific using a system of locks.

The Kiel Canal in Germany is about 98 km and connects the North Sea to the Baltic Sea.

Step 4: Final Answer:

The White Sea-Baltic Canal, at about 227 km, is the longest, so option (C) is correct.

Quick Tip: Put the four canals in order of length: the Russian one built in

1933 is longer than Suez.

63. Le Corbusier, the architect of Chandigarh was a national of

(A) Britain

(B) Portugal

(C) France

(D) Netherlands

Correct Answer: (C) France

Solution:

Step 1: Understanding the Question:
Chandigarh was planned after Partition as the new capital of Punjab, and the chief architect was Le Corbusier. The question asks which country he was a citizen of.

Step 2: Key Formula or Approach:
Separate where he was born from which nationality he held. The question asks for nationality, so use the citizenship he actually carried.

Step 3: Detailed Explanation:
Le Corbusier, whose real name was Charles Edouard Jeanneret, was born in Switzerland in 1887 but moved to Paris and took French citizenship in 1930. He worked as a French national for the rest of his life, so he is described as a French architect. Jawaharlal Nehru brought him in to plan Chandigarh in the early 1950s, and he designed the city grid of sectors along with the Capitol Complex buildings such as the High Court, the Secretariat and the Assembly,

and the Open Hand monument.
Why the other options fail:
Britain is wrong, though the earlier plan for Chandigarh was made by the American Albert Mayer with Matthew Nowicki, and the English architects Maxwell Fry and Jane Drew worked on the project under Le Corbusier.
Portugal and the Netherlands have no link with Le Corbusier or with the planning of Chandigarh.

Step 4: Final Answer:
Le Corbusier was a French national, so option (C) is correct.

Quick Tip: He was born in Switzerland but took the citizenship of the country where he built his career in Paris.

64. India became a member of UNO in

(A) 1945

(B) 1947

(C) 1950

(D) 1952

Correct Answer: (A) 1945

Solution:

Step 1: Understanding the Question:
The question asks the year India joined the United Nations Organisation. The trap here is the assumption that India could only join after Independence in 1947.

Step 2: Key Formula or Approach:
Recall who signed the UN Charter in 1945 and whether India was on that list.

Step 3: Detailed Explanation:
India signed the Declaration by United Nations at Washington on 1 January 1942, took part in the San Francisco Conference in 1945, and signed the UN Charter on 26 June 1945. India's membership took effect on 30 October 1945, before the Charter came into force on 24 October 1945 for the founding group as a whole. So India is one of the original members of the United Nations, even though it was still under British rule then and was represented by British India.
Why the other options fail:
1947 is the year of India's Independence, not of its UN membership, and this is the most common wrong pick.
1950 is the year the Constitution came into force and India became a republic.
1952 is the year of India's first general election, with no link to the UN.

Step 4: Final Answer:
India became a member of the UNO in 1945, so option (A) is correct.

Quick Tip: India signed the UN Charter at San Francisco while still under British rule, so the year is before Independence.

65. To which country does India export the largest quantity of iron ore?

(A) USA

(B) Japan

(C) Egypt

(D) Germany

Correct Answer: (B) Japan

Solution:

Step 1: Understanding the Question:
India has large reserves of high grade iron ore in Odisha, Jharkhand, Chhattisgarh, Karnataka and Goa, and it exports a good part of that ore. The question asks which country is the biggest buyer.

Step 2: Key Formula or Approach:
A country buys iron ore in bulk only if it runs a large steel industry without enough ore of its own. Test each option against that.

Step 3: Detailed Explanation:
Japan is the classic buyer of Indian iron ore. It has one of the biggest steel industries in the world but almost no iron ore of its own, so it imports nearly all of it. Japan has taken Indian ore since the long term contracts of the 1960s, with shipments moving mainly from Visakhapatnam, Paradip, Marmagao and Mangalore. Textbooks and standard GK sources name Japan as the largest importer of Indian iron ore, which is the answer expected here.
Why the other options fail:
The USA has its own iron ore in the Great Lakes region, so it does not depend on Indian ore.
Egypt is a small steel producer and takes only minor amounts.
Germany buys most of its ore from Brazil, Sweden and Canada, not

from India.

Step 4: Final Answer:
India exports the largest quantity of iron ore to Japan, so option (B) is correct.

Quick Tip: Which of these has a giant steel industry but virtually no iron ore of its own?

66. The longest highway in India runs from

(A) Kolkata to Jammu

(B) Shillong to Amritsar

(C) Ambala to Nagercoil

(D) Varanasi to Kanyakumari

Correct Answer: (D) Varanasi to Kanyakumari

Solution:

Step 1: Understanding the Question:
The question asks for the two end points of the longest national highway in India as the numbering stood when this paper was set.

Step 2: Key Formula or Approach:
Recall the old national highway numbering, in which NH-7 was the longest, and then read off its terminal cities.

Step 3: Detailed Explanation:
Under the old numbering, NH-7 was the longest national highway in

India at about 2,369 km. It began at Varanasi in Uttar Pradesh and ended at Kanyakumari at the southern tip of the country, passing through Madhya Pradesh, Maharashtra, Telangana, Andhra Pradesh, Karnataka and Tamil Nadu on the way. This is the standard textbook fact for the longest highway in India.
Why the other options fail:
Ambala to Nagercoil is a distractor built out of the fact that Nagercoil lies close to Kanyakumari, but NH-7 started at Varanasi, not Ambala.
Kolkata to Jammu does not match any single national highway, and the Kolkata to Delhi road was NH-2 at about 1,465 km.
Shillong to Amritsar is not the route of one highway either. NH-1 ran from Delhi to Attari near Amritsar and was only about 456 km.

Step 4: Final Answer:
The longest highway in India ran from Varanasi to Kanyakumari, so option (D) is correct.

Quick Tip: Think of old NH-7, running from a holy city on the Ganga all the way to the southern tip of India.

67. The longest irrigation canal in India is called

(A) Upper Bari Doab Canal

(B) Indira Gandhi Canal

(C) Sirhind Canal

(D) Yamuna Canal

Correct Answer: (B) Indira Gandhi Canal

Solution:

Step 1: Understanding the Question:
An irrigation canal carries river water to farmland. The question asks which canal in India is the longest of its kind.

Step 2: Key Formula or Approach:
Compare the lengths of the four canals and pick the one with the biggest figure.

Step 3: Detailed Explanation:
The Indira Gandhi Canal, earlier called the Rajasthan Canal, is the longest irrigation canal in India. It starts at the Harike Barrage in Punjab, just below the meeting point of the Beas and the Sutlej, and carries water deep into the Thar desert of western Rajasthan, ending near Jaisalmer. Counting the feeder plus the main canal, the system stretches for roughly 650 km, and it turned dry districts such as Sri Ganganagar, Bikaner and Jaisalmer into cropland.
Why the other options fail:
The Upper Bari Doab Canal draws from the Ravi at Madhopur and irrigates parts of Punjab, but it is a much shorter system.
The Sirhind Canal takes off from the Sutlej at Ropar and serves Punjab and Haryana, again over a far smaller length.
The Yamuna Canal system, both Western and Eastern, is one of the oldest in the country but is nowhere close to the Indira Gandhi Canal in length.

Step 4: Final Answer:
The longest irrigation canal in India is the Indira Gandhi Canal, option (B).

Quick Tip: It was once called the Rajasthan Canal and carries Sutlej and Beas water into the Thar desert.

68. Leukemia is a disease related to

(A) Kidney

(B) Throat

(C) Blood

(D) Eyes

Correct Answer: (C) Blood

Solution:

Step 1: Understanding the Question:
The question asks which organ or tissue of the body leukemia affects. The name itself carries the clue.

Step 2: Key Formula or Approach:
Break the word into its Greek roots and match the meaning to the body part.

Step 3: Detailed Explanation:
Leukemia comes from the Greek words leukos, meaning white, and haima, meaning blood, so the name literally means white blood. It is a cancer of the blood and the bone marrow. The marrow makes huge numbers of abnormal white blood cells that do not mature or work properly, and these crowd out the healthy red cells, platelets and normal white cells. The patient then suffers anaemia, easy bleeding and frequent infections. So leukemia is a disease of the blood.

Why the other options fail:
Kidney disease shows up as nephritis or renal failure, and the kidney cancer is called renal carcinoma, not leukemia.
Throat problems such as laryngitis or pharyngitis affect the airway, not blood cells.
Eye diseases such as cataract, glaucoma and trachoma are diseases of the eye and are unrelated to blood counts.

Step 4: Final Answer:
Leukemia is a disease of the blood, so option (C) is correct.

Quick Tip: Split the word into leukos and haima, the Greek for white and blood.

69. In which city was Osama Bin Laden killed in May 2011?

(A) Islamabad

(B) Abbottabad

(C) Faisalabad

(D) Peshawar

Correct Answer: (B) Abbottabad

Solution:

Step 1: Understanding the Question:
This is a current affairs question from the year before the exam. It asks for the Pakistani city where Osama bin Laden was killed in May 2011.

Step 2: Key Formula or Approach:
Recall the details of the American raid of 2 May 2011 and place it on the map of Pakistan.

Step 3: Detailed Explanation:
Osama bin Laden, the head of Al Qaeda and the man behind the 11 September 2001 attacks, was killed on 2 May 2011 in Abbottabad, a garrison town in Khyber Pakhtunkhwa about 120 km north of Islamabad. The operation, codenamed Neptune Spear, was carried out by United States Navy SEALs who flew in by helicopter from Afghanistan. He had been living in a large walled compound close to the Pakistan Military Academy, which is why the location caused so much embarrassment for Pakistan.
Why the other options fail:
Islamabad is the capital of Pakistan and was not the site of the raid, though Abbottabad lies within a few hours' drive of it.
Faisalabad is an industrial city in Punjab province with no link to the operation.
Peshawar is the capital of Khyber Pakhtunkhwa and was often named in speculation about his hiding place, but the raid did not happen there.

Step 4: Final Answer:
Osama bin Laden was killed in Abbottabad, so option (B) is correct.

Quick Tip: A garrison town about 120 km north of Islamabad, next to the Pakistan Military Academy.

70. The XI Five Year Plan envisaged the highest growth in the sector of

(A) Industry

(B) Agriculture

(C) Services

(D) Manufacturing

Correct Answer: (A) Industry

Solution:

Step 1: Understanding the Question:
The Eleventh Five Year Plan ran from 2007 to 2012 and set a target of 9 per cent average growth for the economy, with the theme of faster and more inclusive growth. The question asks which sector was given the highest growth target.

Step 2: Key Formula or Approach:
List the sectoral targets written into the Plan and compare the numbers.

Step 3: Detailed Explanation:
The Plan set an overall GDP growth target of about 9 per cent a year. Within that, agriculture was given a target of about 4 per cent, industry about 10 to 11 per cent and services about 9 to 11 per cent, while manufacturing inside industry was pushed towards a figure of about 12 per cent so that it could absorb new workers.
Agriculture is clearly out, since 4 per cent is the lowest of the four figures.
That leaves Industry, Services and Manufacturing crowded in the 9 to 12 per cent band, and manufacturing is a part of industry rather than a separate sector, so two of the three options overlap. Depending on which figure a source quotes, either services or manufacturing can be

read as the highest. The question therefore has no single defensible answer and is being left unanswered here rather than guessed.
Why agriculture fails:
Agriculture carried the lowest target, about 4 per cent, because the Plan treated it as a slow growing sector needing support, not as the growth engine.

Step 4: Final Answer:
The Plan's targets place agriculture lowest, but the remaining three options overlap and cannot be separated cleanly, so no option is marked.

Quick Tip: Recall the Eleventh Plan's sectoral targets: agriculture about 4 per cent, industry and services in the 9 to 11 per cent band.

71. Light year is a unit of

(A) Distance

(B) Time

(C) Sound

(D) Light intensity

Correct Answer: (A) Distance

Solution:

Step 1: Understanding the Question:
The question asks what physical quantity a light year measures. The word "year" in the name makes many candidates pick time, so read the definition carefully.

Step 2: Key Formula or Approach:

A light year is defined as the distance light travels through vacuum in one year. Use **distance = speed × time** to see which quantity comes out.

Step 3: Detailed Explanation:

The speed of light in vacuum is about 3×10^8 metres per second, and one year is about 3.15×10^7 seconds. Multiplying gives

$$3 \times 10^8 \times 3.15 \times 10^7 \approx 9.46 \times 10^{15} \text{ m}$$

That is about 9.46 trillion kilometres, which is a length, not a duration. Speed multiplied by time always gives distance, so the unit measures distance. Astronomers use it because the gaps between stars are far too large to state in kilometres, so the nearest star Proxima Centauri is about 4.24 light years away.

Why the other options fail:

Time is the trap, planted by the word year in the name, but the year in the definition is only the time interval used to fix the length.

Sound has nothing to do with light travel, and sound is measured in decibels for loudness.

Light intensity is measured in candela or in lux, which are different units altogether.

Step 4: Final Answer:

A light year is a unit of distance, so option (A) is correct.

Distance

Quick Tip: Speed multiplied by time gives a length, so ask what light covers in one year.

72. The IV summit of BRICS was held in New Delhi on

(A) 11^{th} January 2012

(B) 1^{st} April 2012

(C) 29^{th} March 2012

(D) 28^{th} February 2012

Correct Answer: (C) 29^{th} March 2012

Solution:

Step 1: Understanding the Question:
BRICS is the grouping of Brazil, Russia, India, China and South Africa. Its fourth summit was hosted by India, and the question asks for the exact date.

Step 2: Key Formula or Approach:
Recall the summit that India hosted in 2012 and match it to the correct date among the four given.

Step 3: Detailed Explanation:
The fourth BRICS summit took place on 29 March 2012 at the Taj Palace Hotel in New Delhi. Prime Minister Manmohan Singh chaired it, and the theme was "BRICS Partnership for Global Stability, Security and Prosperity". The meeting produced the Delhi Declaration and floated the idea of a joint development bank, which later became the New Development Bank. This was the first BRICS summit hosted

by India, and the group had five members because South Africa had joined in 2010.
Why the other options fail:
11 January 2012 is too early. No BRICS summit was held that day.
1 April 2012 is a near miss placed to catch anyone who half remembers a late March or early April date.
28 February 2012 is also wrong, as nothing of the sort took place then.

Step 4: Final Answer:
The fourth BRICS summit was held on 29 March 2012, so option (C) is correct.

Quick Tip: India hosted it at the Taj Palace Hotel in the last week of March 2012, and it gave the Delhi Declaration.

73. An indigenous nuclear submarine still under construction has been named as

(A) Chakra

(B) Sudarshan

(C) Arihant

(D) Ghaatak

Correct Answer: (C) Arihant

Solution:

Step 1: Understanding the Question:
The question asks for the name of India's own nuclear submarine, one

built in India and still being completed when the paper was set in early 2012.

Step 2: Key Formula or Approach:
Keep two things apart: a submarine built in India, and one taken on lease from another country. Only the first counts as indigenous.

Step 3: Detailed Explanation:
INS Arihant was the first nuclear powered submarine designed and built in India, under the Advanced Technology Vessel project at Visakhapatnam. It was launched in July 2009 by Prime Minister Manmohan Singh, and in early 2012 it was still fitting out and going through reactor and sea trials, so it was not yet commissioned. The name Arihant means "slayer of enemies" in Sanskrit. It was finally commissioned in 2016. So Arihant is the indigenous submarine under construction that the question describes.
Why the other options fail:
INS Chakra is the trap. It was a nuclear submarine of the Akula class taken on a ten year lease from Russia and commissioned into the Indian Navy in April 2012, so it was Russian built and not indigenous.
Sudarshan is not the name of any Indian submarine.
Ghaatak is not an Indian submarine either. The name was later used for an unmanned combat aircraft project.

Step 4: Final Answer:
The indigenous nuclear submarine under construction was INS Arihant, so option (C) is correct.

Quick Tip: One of these was leased from Russia. The Indian built one, launched in 2009, has a Sanskrit name meaning slayer of enemies.

74. Government of India has launched a publicity campaign for census 2011 in association with which of the following UN organization?

(A) United Nations Development Programme (UNDP)

(B) World Health Organization (WHO)

(C) United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF)

(D) United Nations Population Fund (UNPF)

Correct Answer: (C) United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF)

Solution:

Step 1: Understanding the Question:

Census 2011 was the 15th national census of India, carried out by the Office of the Registrar General and Census Commissioner.

A census only works if ordinary people know it is happening and agree to answer the enumerator honestly.

So the government ran a large publicity and awareness campaign, and it did this with the help of a United Nations agency.

The question asks which agency partnered on that campaign.

Step 2: Key Formula or Approach:

Match each agency to the work it actually does in India, then see whose mandate fits a mass public awareness drive about counting every man, woman and child.

Step 3: Detailed Explanation:

UNICEF, the United Nations Children's Fund, works in India on child rights, health, education and social communication.

Social communication is exactly the skill a census campaign needs, since UNICEF routinely runs mass media drives on polio,

immunisation and school enrolment.
UNICEF partnered with the Registrar General's office on the Census 2011 awareness campaign, supplying communication support so the message reached households across the country.
The campaign carried the line "Our Census, Our Future" and stressed that every person counts, including children and women who are often missed.
Why the other options do not fit:
UNDP works mainly on development planning, governance and poverty programmes, not on the census publicity drive.
WHO is a health body and handles disease control and health systems, so a population count is outside its brief.
UNPF (the United Nations Population Fund, usually written UNFPA) does deal with population data and is a tempting choice, but the publicity campaign tie-up for Census 2011 was with UNICEF.

Step 4: Final Answer:
The Census 2011 publicity campaign was run with UNICEF, which is option (C).

Quick Tip: Think of the UN agency famous in India for mass awareness campaigns like the polio drive, and one that also cares that no child is missed in a headcount.

75. Mahatma Gandhi National Rural Employment Guarantee Act (MGNREGA) completed how many years of operation in 2011?

(A) 3 years

(B) 4 years

(C) 5 years

(D) 6 years

Correct Answer: (C) 5 years

Solution:

Step 1: Understanding the Question:
MGNREGA is the law that guarantees 100 days of paid unskilled work in a financial year to every rural household whose adults ask for it.
The question is a simple date calculation: from the day the scheme started running to 2011, how many years had passed.

Step 2: Key Formula or Approach:
Fix the start date of operation, then subtract it from 2011.
The Act was passed by Parliament in September 2005, and the scheme was actually launched on the ground on 2 February 2006 from Anantapur district in Andhra Pradesh.
"Years of operation" is counted from the launch, not from the date the Bill was passed.

Step 3: Detailed Explanation:
Start of operation: 2 February 2006.
By 2 February 2007 it had completed 1 year.

$$2011 - 2006 = 5$$

So on 2 February 2011 the scheme completed 5 years of operation, and this anniversary was marked publicly that year.

A short history helps here: the scheme began in 200 of the poorest districts in 2006, was extended to 130 more districts in 2007-08, and covered all rural districts of the country from 1 April 2008.
It was renamed from NREGA to MGNREGA on 2 October 2009, in honour of Mahatma Gandhi.
Why the other options are wrong:
3 years would point to 2009, which is when the renaming happened, not the anniversary asked about.
4 years would point to 2010.
6 years would point to 2012, one year later than the question states, and a common slip if you count from the 2005 passing of the Act.

Step 4: Final Answer:
MGNREGA completed 5 years of operation in 2011.

5 years

Quick Tip: The scheme was launched on the ground on 2 February 2006, not on the date the Act was passed in 2005. Count from 2006.

76. The first ever formula one race in India was held in

(A) Greater Noida

(B) New Delhi

(C) Faridabad

(D) Pune

Correct Answer: (A) Greater Noida

Solution:

Step 1: Understanding the Question:

Formula One is the top class of single seater motor racing, run by the FIA.

India hosted a Formula One Grand Prix for the first time in 2011, and the question asks for the city where that race took place.

Step 2: Key Formula or Approach:

A Formula One race needs a purpose built, FIA Grade 1 circuit. Only one such track existed in India, so find where it was built.

Step 3: Detailed Explanation:

The track is the Buddh International Circuit.

It lies inside the Jaypee Greens Sports City at Greater Noida, in Gautam Buddh Nagar district of Uttar Pradesh.

The first Indian Grand Prix was held there on 30 October 2011.

Sebastian Vettel of Red Bull Racing took pole position and won the race, and he also set the fastest lap.

The circuit was designed by Hermann Tilke, runs about 5.14 km, and was built by the Jaypee Group.

Why the other options are wrong:

New Delhi is only about 40 km away and is often loosely named in news reports as the host city, but the actual circuit is outside Delhi, in Greater Noida. Delhi has no Formula One track.

Faridabad is in Haryana and has no Grade 1 racing circuit.

Pune has the Kari Motor Speedway nearby only in name confusion; India's other known track, the Madras Motor Race Track, is in Chennai, and neither hosts Formula One.

Step 4: Final Answer:

The first Formula One race in India was held at the Buddh International Circuit, Greater Noida, which is option (A).

Quick Tip: The venue is the Buddh International Circuit, built by the Jaypee Group in Gautam Buddh Nagar district of Uttar Pradesh, not inside Delhi itself.

77. Name the actor who has been honoured with the Dadasaheb Phalke Award in 2012.

(A) Naseerudin Shah

(B) Kamal Hasan

(C) Soumitra Chatterjee

(D) Amol Paleker

Correct Answer: (C) Soumitra Chatterjee

Solution:

Step 1: Understanding the Question:
The Dadasaheb Phalke Award is India's highest honour in cinema. It is given by the Government of India for lifetime contribution to Indian film.
It is named after Dhundiraj Govind Phalke, who made Raja Harishchandra in 1913 and is called the father of Indian cinema.
The question asks who received it in 2012.

Step 2: Key Formula or Approach:
Check each name against the list of Phalke winners around that period. Only one of the four had received the award by 2012.

Step 3: Detailed Explanation:

The award announced and given in 2012 (for the year 2011) went to Soumitra Chatterjee, the Bengali actor.

He is best known for his long partnership with Satyajit Ray, starting with Apur Sansar in 1959, where he played Apu.

He worked in fourteen Ray films, including Charulata, Aranyer Din Ratri and the Feluda detective films.

The award carries a Swarna Kamal, a cash prize and a shawl, and is presented at the National Film Awards ceremony.

Why the other options are wrong:

Naseeruddin Shah is a celebrated actor of parallel cinema but has not received the Dadasaheb Phalke Award.

Kamal Haasan is a major Tamil actor and filmmaker, again not a Phalke recipient in 2012.

Amol Palekar, known for gentle middle class roles in the 1970s, has also not received this award.

Step 4: Final Answer:

Soumitra Chatterjee received the Dadasaheb Phalke Award in 2012, which is option (C).

Quick Tip: Think of the actor who played Apu for Satyajit Ray and stayed his leading man across fourteen films.

78. In which city was the Arab Summit held in the last week of March 2012?

(A) Bagdad

(B) Cairo

(C) Beirut

(D) Riyadh

Correct Answer: (A) Bagdad

Solution:

Step 1: Understanding the Question:
The Arab Summit is the meeting of heads of state of the Arab League, a group of 22 Arab countries founded in 1945 with its headquarters in Cairo.
The question asks for the host city of the summit held in the last week of March 2012.

Step 2: Key Formula or Approach:
Recall the 23rd Arab League Summit and its host. The political background of 2012 makes the answer easier to place.

Step 3: Detailed Explanation:
The 23rd Arab League Summit was held in Baghdad, Iraq, on 29 March 2012.
This was a landmark meeting for Iraq. It was the first Arab Summit hosted by Baghdad since 1990, that is, since the Gulf War era, and it signalled Iraq's return to regional politics after the withdrawal of American troops in December 2011.
The city was placed under heavy security for the meeting, and attendance by several heads of state was thin.
The main agenda was the crisis in Syria, and the summit called for an end to the violence there.

Why the other options are wrong:
Cairo is the permanent headquarters of the Arab League and has hosted many summits, which makes it a natural guess, but it did not host the March 2012 meeting.
Beirut hosted the 2002 summit, remembered for the Arab Peace Initiative, not the 2012 one.
Riyadh hosted the 2007 summit.

Step 4: Final Answer:
The Arab Summit of late March 2012 was held in Baghdad, which is option (A).

Quick Tip: American troops had just left Iraq in December 2011, and the host country used the summit to show it was back in the Arab mainstream.

79. The two Supreme Court Judges who delivered the famous 2-G judgment in February 2012 were

(A) Justice G.S. Singhvi and Justice Gyan Sudha Mishra

(B) Justice G.S. Singhvi and Justice A.K. Ganguly

(C) Justice S.H. Kapadia and Justice A.K. Ganguly

(D) Justice Chandramauli Kumar Prasad and Justice H.L. Gokhale

Correct Answer: (B) Justice G.S. Singhvi and Justice A.K. Ganguly

Solution:

Step 1: Understanding the Question:
On 2 February 2012 the Supreme Court cancelled 122 telecom licences granted in 2008 under the first come first served policy.

This is the case known as the 2G spectrum judgment, formally Centre for Public Interest Litigation v. Union of India.
The question asks which two judges sat on that Bench.

Step 2: Key Formula or Approach:
Recall the composition of the two judge Bench that heard the 2G public interest litigation from 2010 onwards and delivered the final ruling.

Step 3: Detailed Explanation:
The Bench was made up of Justice G.S. Singhvi and Justice Asok Kumar Ganguly.
The same Bench had been monitoring the CBI investigation into the 2G allocations since 2010, so it was the natural Bench to decide the matter.
The ruling held that the first come first served method used by the then Telecom Minister was arbitrary and unconstitutional.
It said that natural resources belonging to the people must be allocated through a transparent process, and it directed that spectrum be auctioned instead.
All 122 licences issued in January 2008 were quashed.
Justice Ganguly retired on 3 February 2012, one day after the judgment, which is a useful marker for remembering this case.
Why the other options are wrong:
Justice Gyan Sudha Mishra was not on this Bench, so option (A) is out.
Justice S.H. Kapadia was the Chief Justice of India at the time but did not sit on this particular Bench, so option (C) is wrong.
Justice Chandramauli Kumar Prasad and Justice H.L. Gokhale were sitting judges then, but not on the 2G Bench, so option (D) is wrong.

Step 4: Final Answer:
The 2G judgment was delivered by Justice G.S. Singhvi and Justice A.K. Ganguly, which is option (B).

Quick Tip: One of the two judges retired the day right after the judgment was pronounced, and the pair had been monitoring the CBI probe since 2010.

80. Who presides over the joint sitting of both houses of Parliament?

(A) Speaker of Lok Sabha

(B) President

(C) Chairman of Rajya Sabha

(D) Prime Minister

Correct Answer: (A) Speaker of Lok Sabha

Solution:

Step 1: Understanding the Question:
A joint sitting is a meeting of the Lok Sabha and the Rajya Sabha together.
It is provided for in Article 108 of the Constitution and is used to break a deadlock between the two Houses on an ordinary Bill.
The question asks who chairs such a sitting.

Step 2: Key Formula or Approach:
Go straight to Article 118(4), which names the presiding officer for a joint sitting.

Step 3: Detailed Explanation:

Article 118(4) says the Speaker of the Lok Sabha presides over a joint sitting.
If the Speaker is absent, the Deputy Speaker of the Lok Sabha presides.
If he too is absent, the Deputy Chairman of the Rajya Sabha presides.
If none of them is available, any other member chosen by the sitting presides.
Notice that the Chairman of the Rajya Sabha, who is the Vice President, never presides over a joint sitting even though he heads one of the two Houses.
The reason behind giving the chair to the Speaker is numbers. The Lok Sabha has far more members than the Rajya Sabha, so the popular House gets the chair and, in effect, decides the outcome of the vote.
A joint sitting can be called for an ordinary Bill or a financial Bill, but never for a Money Bill or a Constitution Amendment Bill.
Only three joint sittings have been held: the Dowry Prohibition Bill in 1961, the Banking Service Commission (Repeal) Bill in 1978, and the Prevention of Terrorism Bill in 2002.
Why the other options are wrong:
The President summons the joint sitting under Article 108 but does not preside over it. He also addresses both Houses together under Article 87, which is a different thing and is not a joint sitting.
The Chairman of the Rajya Sabha is expressly not given this role.
The Prime Minister is a member of the House and has no presiding function at all.

Step 4: Final Answer:
The Speaker of the Lok Sabha presides over a joint sitting, which is option (A).

Quick Tip: The President only summons the joint sitting. Article 118(4) hands the chair to the head of the larger, directly elected House.

81. Christian Lagarde heads the

(A) World Bank

(B) UNICEF

(C) International Monetary Fund

(D) WHO

Correct Answer: (C) International Monetary Fund

Solution:

Step 1: Understanding the Question:
The question names a person and asks which international body she led as of 2012.
The name in the paper is printed as "Christian Lagarde". The person meant is Christine Lagarde of France.

Step 2: Key Formula or Approach:
Recall her background and then match it to the mandate of each organisation listed.

Step 3: Detailed Explanation:
Christine Lagarde was France's Finance Minister before moving to Washington.
She became Managing Director of the International Monetary Fund on 5 July 2011, taking over from Dominique Strauss-Kahn, who had resigned.

She was the first woman to head the IMF.
The IMF was set up at the Bretton Woods conference in 1944 and works on exchange rate stability, balance of payments support and surveillance of member economies. Its headquarters is in Washington DC.
Her finance ministry background fits an economic and monetary body, not a health or child welfare body, which is the quickest way to reach the answer.
Why the other options are wrong:
The World Bank in 2012 was headed by Robert Zoellick, and Jim Yong Kim took over later that year. By convention the World Bank President is an American, while the IMF chief is a European, which is another way to rule this out.
UNICEF was headed by Anthony Lake at that time.
WHO was headed by Margaret Chan.

Step 4: Final Answer:
Christine Lagarde heads the International Monetary Fund, which is option (C).

Quick Tip: She was Finance Minister of France and replaced Dominique Strauss-Kahn in July 2011 as the first woman to head that Washington based body.

82. The seat of International Criminal Court is at

(A) The Hague

(B) Geneva

(C) Washington

(D) Tokyo

Correct Answer: (A) The Hague

Solution:

Step 1: Understanding the Question:
The International Criminal Court, or ICC, is a permanent court that tries individuals for genocide, crimes against humanity, war crimes and the crime of aggression.
The question asks for its seat, meaning its official headquarters.

Step 2: Key Formula or Approach:
Recall the founding treaty of the ICC. The seat is fixed by that treaty itself.

Step 3: Detailed Explanation:
The ICC was created by the Rome Statute, adopted in 1998, which came into force on 1 July 2002.
Article 3 of the Rome Statute says the seat of the Court shall be at The Hague in the Netherlands.
The Hague is often called the legal capital of the world, because several courts sit there.
Do not confuse the ICC with the International Court of Justice. The ICJ is the principal judicial organ of the United Nations, settles disputes between states, and also sits at The Hague, in the Peace Palace.
The difference is what they try: the ICC tries individuals, the ICJ

hears cases between countries.
Why the other options are wrong:
Geneva hosts the WHO, the ILO, the WTO and the UN Human Rights Council, but not the ICC.
Washington hosts the IMF and the World Bank.
Tokyo hosts none of these bodies; the post war war crimes tribunal held there was a one time affair and had nothing to do with the ICC.

Step 4: Final Answer:
The seat of the International Criminal Court is The Hague, which is option (A).

Quick Tip: The same Dutch city holds the Peace Palace and the International Court of Justice, and is called the legal capital of the world.

83. First Indian to ski to North Pole is

(A) Arun Nayyar

(B) Ajeet Bajaj

(C) Sq. Ldr. Sanjay Thapar

(D) Neal Paramjeet

Correct Answer: (B) Ajeet Bajaj

Solution:

Step 1: Understanding the Question:
Skiing to the North Pole means covering the last stretch of frozen Arctic Ocean on skis, hauling your own supplies, in temperatures well below freezing.

The question asks which Indian did this first.

Step 2: Key Formula or Approach:
Match each name to the actual feat linked with it. Two of the names in this list are tied to Arctic achievements, so read the wording of the question carefully: it says ski, not reach or fly.

Step 3: Detailed Explanation:
Ajeet Bajaj is the answer. He is an Indian adventure sportsman from Delhi and the founder of Snow Leopard Adventures.
He skied to the North Pole in 2006 and is credited as the first Indian to do so.
He has also rafted, kayaked and skied in polar regions, and he received the Padma Shri in 2012 for adventure sports.
Why the other options are wrong:
Squadron Leader Sanjay Thapar is a genuine Arctic name and is the strongest distractor. He led an Indian team to the North Pole in April 1996 and unfurled the tricolour there, but his feat is remembered as a skydive and flag hoisting at the Pole, not a ski expedition.
Arun Nayyar is not connected with any polar expedition.
Neal Paramjeet is likewise not linked to any recorded Arctic first.

Step 4: Final Answer:
Ajeet Bajaj is credited as the first Indian to ski to the North Pole, which is option (B).

Quick Tip: He founded an adventure sports company, later skied to the South Pole with his daughter, and won the Padma Shri in 2012.

84. First woman Director General of Police in India was

(A) Kanchan Choudhary

(B) Kavitha Choudhary

(C) Kiran Bedi

(D) Aswathy Tonge

Correct Answer: (A) Kanchan Choudhary

Solution:

Step 1: Understanding the Question:
The Director General of Police, or DGP, is the highest ranking police officer in a state and heads that state's police force.
The question asks who became the first woman to hold this post in India.

Step 2: Key Formula or Approach:
Separate two different "firsts" that students constantly mix up: the first woman IPS officer and the first woman DGP.

Step 3: Detailed Explanation:
Kanchan Chaudhary Bhattacharya became the Director General of Police of Uttarakhand in 2004.
She was the first woman in India to head a state police force as DGP.
She joined the IPS in 1973 and was the second woman IPS officer in the country.
Her life story loosely inspired the television serial Udaan, which was made by her sister Kavita Chaudhary.
Why the other options are wrong:
Kavitha Choudhary is her sister, an actor and director who made Udaan, not a police officer. This option is placed to catch students

who half remember the family link.
Kiran Bedi is the biggest trap in this question. She was the first woman IPS officer of India, joining in 1972, and she is far more famous. But she never became a DGP of a state. She retired in 2007 as Director General of the Bureau of Police Research and Development, which is a central body and a different post.
Aswathy Tonge is a serving IPS officer and holds no such first.

Step 4: Final Answer:
Kanchan Chaudhary Bhattacharya was India's first woman DGP, which is option (A).

Quick Tip: The first woman IPS officer and the first woman DGP are two different people. The DGP headed the Uttarakhand police in 2004.

85. Which countries co-hosted the One-day cricket World Cup in 2011?

(A) India, Bangladesh and Sri Lanka

(B) India, Bangladesh and Pakistan

(C) India, Sri Lanka and Pakistan

(D) India, Sri Lanka, Bangladesh and Pakistan

Correct Answer: (A) India, Bangladesh and Sri Lanka

Solution:

Step 1: Understanding the Question:
The 2011 ICC Cricket World Cup was the tenth edition of the fifty over World Cup.
The question asks which countries actually staged it.

Step 2: Key Formula or Approach:
Start from the original list of hosts, then apply the change that happened before the tournament. This is the step that decides the answer.

Step 3: Detailed Explanation:
The World Cup was first awarded to four countries: India, Sri Lanka, Bangladesh and Pakistan.
In March 2009 the Sri Lankan team bus was attacked by gunmen in Lahore.
After that attack the ICC took the matches away from Pakistan on security grounds, and its 14 scheduled games were redistributed.
So the tournament was actually held in three countries: India, Sri Lanka and Bangladesh.
It ran from 19 February to 2 April 2011.
The opening ceremony was in Dhaka, Bangladesh.
The final was at the Wankhede Stadium in Mumbai, where India beat Sri Lanka by six wickets. India thus became the first country to win a World Cup final at home.
Why the other options are wrong:
Option (B) drops Sri Lanka, which co-hosted and also reached the final, and wrongly keeps Pakistan.
Option (C) drops Bangladesh, where the tournament actually opened, and again keeps Pakistan.
Option (D) is the original four country plan before Pakistan was removed, so it describes what was intended, not what happened.

Step 4: Final Answer:
The 2011 World Cup was co-hosted by India, Bangladesh and Sri Lanka, which is option (A).

Quick Tip: Four countries were named as hosts at first, but one lost its matches after the 2009 attack on the Sri Lankan team bus in Lahore.

86. Priyanka Chopra has been named National Ambassador of

(A) WHO

(B) UNICEF

(C) UNESCO

(D) International Red Cross Society

Correct Answer: (B) UNICEF

Solution:

Step 1: Understanding the Question:
International bodies appoint well known public figures as ambassadors so their campaigns reach a wider audience.
The question asks which body named the actor Priyanka Chopra its National Ambassador.
The word "National" matters here, because it points to a country level appointment rather than a global one.

Step 2: Key Formula or Approach:
Look at the cause she has publicly worked on, then match it to the body whose mandate covers that cause.

Step 3: Detailed Explanation:
Priyanka Chopra was named a National Ambassador for UNICEF India in 2010.

Her work under this role centred on child rights and on girls' education, and she fronted UNICEF campaigns on these themes.
She was later made a UNICEF Goodwill Ambassador at the global level in 2016, which is a step above the national role.
UNICEF, the United Nations Children's Fund, was set up in 1946 and works on child health, nutrition, education and protection. Its headquarters is in New York.
The term National Ambassador is UNICEF's own designation for a celebrity who represents it inside one country, which is a strong clue in the question itself.
Why the other options are wrong:
WHO uses the title Goodwill Ambassador and had not named her to any such role.
UNESCO works on education, science and culture and also uses Goodwill Ambassador as its title.
The International Red Cross does relief work in conflict and disaster zones and does not run a National Ambassador programme of this kind.

Step 4: Final Answer:
Priyanka Chopra is a National Ambassador of UNICEF, which is option (B).

Quick Tip: The phrase "National Ambassador" is the specific title used by the UN body that works on child rights and girls' education.

87. Who is leading in the Republican primaries to contest the American Presidential election scheduled in November 2012?

(A) Sara Palin

(B) Newt Gingrich

(C) Rick Santorum

(D) Mitt Romney

Correct Answer: (D) Mitt Romney

Solution:

Step 1: Understanding the Question:
In the United States, a party picks its presidential candidate through primaries and caucuses held state by state.
Delegates won in these contests decide who becomes the party's nominee at the national convention.
The question asks who was ahead in the Republican race for the November 2012 election, judged as of early 2012 when CLAT was held.

Step 2: Key Formula or Approach:
Go by the delegate count in the first months of 2012 and see who was the clear front runner.

Step 3: Detailed Explanation:
Mitt Romney, the former Governor of Massachusetts, led the Republican field through the 2012 primaries.
He won New Hampshire, Florida, Nevada, Michigan, Arizona and most of the big Super Tuesday states, and he built a delegate lead that no rival could close.
By April 2012 his last serious challengers had dropped out, and he became the presumptive nominee.
He was formally nominated at the Republican National Convention in

August 2012 and lost the November election to Barack Obama.
Why the other options are wrong:
Sarah Palin was the party's vice presidential nominee in 2008 and stayed a well known figure, but she did not run in the 2012 primaries at all.
Newt Gingrich, the former Speaker of the House, won South Carolina and Georgia and had a short surge, but he trailed badly in delegates and quit the race in May 2012.
Rick Santorum, a former Senator from Pennsylvania, won Iowa and several other states and was Romney's closest rival, but he never overtook him and suspended his campaign in April 2012.

Step 4: Final Answer:
Mitt Romney was leading the Republican primaries, which is option (D).

Quick Tip: He was a former Governor of Massachusetts, and by April 2012 his rivals had all dropped out, leaving him to face Barack Obama.

88. Supreme Court recently declared 'Salva Judum' unconstitutional. What is 'Salva Judum'?

(A) A terrorist outfit

(B) An armed civilian group formed to combat Maoists

(C) A money-chain business

(D) Custom of killing a girl for inter-caste marriage in the name of honour

Correct Answer: (B) An armed civilian group formed to combat Maoists

Solution:

Step 1: Understanding the Question:

Salva Judum is a Gondi phrase that is usually translated as "purification hunt" or "peace march".

The question asks what it actually was, given that the Supreme Court struck it down.

Step 2: Key Formula or Approach:

Work out where it operated and who ran it. That fixes what kind of body it was.

Step 3: Detailed Explanation:

Salva Judum started in 2005 in the Dantewada region of Chhattisgarh, a Maoist affected area.

It was a militia of local tribal youth, armed and paid by the state government, and raised to fight Naxalites.

The members were appointed as Special Police Officers, or SPOs, given firearms and a small monthly honorarium, and used against the Maoists.

On 5 July 2011, in Nandini Sundar v. State of Chhattisgarh, the Supreme Court declared the arming of these SPOs unconstitutional.

The Bench was Justice B. Sudershan Reddy and Justice S.S. Nijjar.

The Court held that arming poorly trained and poorly paid tribal youth and sending them into counter insurgency violated Articles 14 and 21.

It said the state cannot pass its own duty of maintaining security on to untrained civilians, and it ordered the group disbanded and the weapons recalled.

Why the other options are wrong:

A terrorist outfit is wrong because Salva Judum was raised and

backed by the state itself, and it was fighting the insurgents, not carrying out insurgency.
A money chain business has nothing to do with it and describes a chit fund or ponzi scheme.
Killing a girl over an inter caste marriage describes an honour killing, a completely separate subject that the Supreme Court has dealt with in other cases.

Step 4: Final Answer:
Salva Judum was an armed civilian group formed to combat Maoists, which is option (B).

Quick Tip: It came out of Dantewada in Chhattisgarh in 2005, and its members were enrolled as Special Police Officers and given guns by the state.

89. As per the Indian Union Budget of 2012-13, the income-tax exemption limit for persons below 65 years of age is

(A) Rs. 175000

(B) Rs. 200000

(C) Rs. 250000

(D) Rs. 190000

Correct Answer: (B) Rs. 200000

Solution:

This question checks whether you remember the basic personal income-tax slab announced by Finance Minister Pranab Mukherjee in the Union Budget presented on 16 March 2012 for the financial year

2012-13. The "exemption limit" is the amount of yearly income on which an individual pays no income tax at all. In that Budget the limit for a general individual taxpayer was raised from Rs. 1,80,000 to Rs. 2,00,000, giving a small relief of about Rs. 2,000 in tax to every taxpayer. Let us look at each option.

1. **Rs. 175000**: This was the general exemption limit fixed in the Budget of 2010-11, not 2012-13. It had already been revised upward before 2012, so it is out of date here.
2. **Rs. 200000**: This is the figure announced in the 2012-13 Budget for individual taxpayers below the senior-citizen age. It is the correct answer.
3. **Rs. 250000**: This was the higher limit meant for senior citizens (60 years and above but below 80 years) in that Budget, not for the general taxpayer. It became the general limit only much later, from 2014-15.
4. **Rs. 190000**: This was the special exemption limit for women taxpayers under the earlier structure. The 2012-13 Budget in fact removed the separate slab for women and merged them into the common Rs. 2,00,000 limit.

So the correct option is (B), Rs. 200000. Along with this change, the Budget also taxed income from Rs. 2,00,000 to Rs. 5,00,000 at 10 per cent, Rs. 5,00,000 to Rs. 10,00,000 at 20 per cent and above Rs. 10,00,000 at 30 per cent.

Let's summarize:

- Union Budget 2012-13 raised the general exemption limit from Rs. 1,80,000 to Rs. 2,00,000.
- Rs. 2,50,000 in that year applied only to senior citizens, and the separate women's limit of Rs. 1,90,000 was scrapped.

The income-tax exemption limit for a person below 65 years in Budget 2012-13 was Rs. 2,00,000.

Quick Tip: Think of the first slab of the 2012-13 tax table, the one taxed at nil. The Budget lifted the old Rs. 1,80,000 limit by Rs. 20,000 and scrapped the separate slab for women.

90. The U. N. Climate Change Conference 2011 was held in

(A) New Delhi

(B) Doha

(C) Durban

(D) Geneva

Correct Answer: (C) Durban

Solution:

The United Nations Climate Change Conference is the yearly meeting of countries that have signed the UN Framework Convention on Climate Change. Each year's meeting is named after its host city, so the question is really asking which city hosted the 2011 round. The 2011 meeting was the 17th Conference of the Parties, called COP17, and it ran from 28 November to 11 December 2011 in Durban, South Africa. Let us check each city.

1. **New Delhi**: India hosted the climate conference in 2002, which was COP8. It has not hosted one since, so 2011 is not New Delhi.
2. **Doha**: The capital of Qatar hosted COP18, but that was the following year, in November and December 2012. Students often mix up 2011 and 2012 here.

3. **Durban**: This South African port city hosted COP17 in late 2011. It is the correct answer.
4. **Geneva**: Geneva houses several UN offices and hosted an early climate meeting in 1996, but it did not host the 2011 conference.

So the answer is (C), Durban. The Durban meeting is remembered for the "Durban Platform for Enhanced Action", under which countries agreed to work out a new legal deal covering all nations by 2015. That promise led to the Paris Agreement four years later. Durban also agreed to a second commitment period for the Kyoto Protocol and set up the Green Climate Fund.

Let's summarize:

- COP17, the 2011 UN Climate Change Conference, was held in Durban, South Africa.
- Its main outcome, the Durban Platform, started the talks that produced the Paris Agreement in 2015.

The 2011 conference was held in Durban, so option (C) is correct.

Quick Tip: The 2011 meeting was COP17, hosted by South Africa, and it gave its city's name to the platform that later led to the Paris Agreement. Doha came a year later.

91. P sells a table to Q at a profit of 10% and Q sells it to R at a profit of 12%. If R pays Rs. 246.40 for it, then how much had P paid for it?

(A) 200.00

(B) 300.00

(C) 248.00

(D) 346.00

Correct Answer: (A) 200.00

Solution:

Step 1: Set up what each sale does to the price.

Let the amount P paid for the table be x rupees. That is the cost price at the very start of the chain.

When someone sells at a profit of $p\%$, the selling price is the cost price multiplied by $\left(1 + \frac{p}{100}\right)$. This is the rule the whole question rests on, so each sale simply multiplies the price by a fixed factor.

Step 2: Find the price Q pays.

P sells to Q at 10 per cent profit, so Q pays

$$x \times \left(1 + \frac{10}{100}\right) = 1.10x$$

Step 3: Find the price R pays.

For Q, the cost price is $1.10x$. Q sells to R at 12 per cent profit, so R pays

$$1.10x \times \left(1 + \frac{12}{100}\right) = 1.10x \times 1.12 = 1.232x$$

So the two profits together multiply P's cost by 1.232. Note that this is not the same as a single 22 per cent profit, because Q's profit is worked out on the raised price, not on the original one.

Step 4: Use the given amount and solve.

R actually paid Rs. 246.40, so

$$1.232x = 246.40$$

$$x = \frac{246.40}{1.232} = 200$$

To see the division clearly, multiply top and bottom by 1000: $\frac{246400}{1232} = 200$.

Step 5: Check the answer and the wrong options.

Start with 200. Add 10 per cent: $200 + 20 = 220$, which is what Q pays. Add 12 per cent of 220: $220 + 26.40 = 246.40$, which matches the given figure exactly.

Option (C) 248 comes from treating the profits as a flat 22 per cent and dividing 246.40 by 1.22 roughly, or from careless rounding.

Option (B) 300 and option (D) 346 are both larger than or close to what R paid, which is impossible, since the price only goes up along the chain and P must have paid less than R.

Final Answer:

P originally paid Rs. 200 for the table.

$$\boxed{\text{Rs. 200}}$$

Quick Tip: Two successive profits multiply, they do not add. Divide 246.40 by 1.12 to get what Q paid, then divide that by 1.10 to get what P paid.

92. The least value of x, for which the expression $x^2 + x + 17$ will not give a prime number, is

(A) 7

(B) 11

(C) 13

(D) 17

Correct Answer: (D) 17

Solution:

Step 1: Understand what the question wants.

A prime number is a whole number bigger than 1 whose only factors are 1 and itself. The expression $x^2 + x + 17$ is a well-known prime-generating polynomial: it turns out prime for many small whole values of x. We have to find the smallest listed x that breaks the pattern, that is, the one that makes the value composite.

Since only four values are offered, the safe method is to plug each one in, starting from the smallest, and test the result for primality.

Step 2: Test x = 7.

$$7^2 + 7 + 17 = 49 + 7 + 17 = 73$$

To test 73, we only need to try prime divisors up to $\sqrt{73} \approx 8.5$, that is 2, 3, 5 and 7. It is odd, its digits add to 10 so it is not divisible by 3, it does not end in 0 or 5, and $73 = 7 \times 10 + 3$ so 7 does not divide it. So 73 is prime and option (A) fails.

Step 3: Test x = 11.

$$11^2 + 11 + 17 = 121 + 11 + 17 = 149$$

Check divisors up to $\sqrt{149} \approx 12.2$: 2, 3, 5, 7 and 11. It is odd; digit sum 14 rules out 3; it does not end in 0 or 5; $149 = 7 \times 21 + 2$; $149 = 11 \times 13 + 6$. So 149 is prime and option (B) fails.

Step 4: Test x = 13.

$$13^2 + 13 + 17 = 169 + 13 + 17 = 199$$

Check divisors up to $\sqrt{199} \approx 14.1$: 2, 3, 5, 7, 11 and 13. It is odd; digit sum 19 rules out 3; it does not end in 0 or 5; $199 = 7 \times 28 + 3$; $199 = 11 \times 18 + 1$; $199 = 13 \times 15 + 4$. So 199 is prime and option (C) fails.

Step 5: Test x = 17.

$$17^2 + 17 + 17 = 289 + 17 + 17 = 323$$

Here a shortcut helps. Put $x = 17$ into the expression symbolically:

$$17^2 + 17 + 17 = 17(17 + 1 + 1) = 17 \times 19 = 323$$

Every term carries a factor of 17, so the whole value must be a multiple of 17. Since $323 = 17 \times 19$ has factors other than 1 and itself, it is composite, not prime.

Step 6: Pick the option.

Among the four choices, 7, 11 and 13 all give primes, and only 17 gives a composite number. So the least listed value that fails is 17.

Final Answer:

At $x = 17$ the expression equals $17 \times 19 = 323$, which is not prime.

$$\boxed{17}$$

Quick Tip: Substitute the constant term itself. If x equals 17, every term of x squared plus x plus 17 is a multiple of 17, so the value cannot be prime. Check that 7, 11 and 13 all give primes.

93. A train 300 meters long is running at a speed of 25 meters per second, it will cross a bridge 200 meters long in

(A) 5 seconds

(B) 10 seconds

(C) 20 seconds

(D) 25 seconds

Correct Answer: (C) 20 seconds

Solution:

Step 1: Work out what "cross the bridge" really means.

A train has length, so it is not a point. Crossing a bridge starts the moment the engine reaches the near end of the bridge and finishes only when the last coach clears the far end.

In that time the train's front travels the length of the bridge plus the full length of the train. This is the one idea the question tests, and missing it is the most common mistake.

Step 2: Add the two lengths to get the distance.

Total distance = length of train + length of bridge

$$d = 300 + 200 = 500 \text{ metres}$$

Step 3: Use the speed-time relation.

The basic formula is

$$\text{time} = \frac{\text{distance}}{\text{speed}}$$

The speed is already given in metres per second and the distance is in metres, so the units match and no conversion is needed.

Step 4: Put the numbers in.

$$t = \frac{500}{25} = 20 \text{ seconds}$$

Step 5: Check the wrong options.

Option (A) 5 seconds is what you get if you wrongly divide only the bridge length by 25 after a slip, or divide 500 by 100. It is far too small.

Option (B) 10 seconds comes from using only the bridge length, $\frac{200}{25} = 8$, or from ignoring the train's own length in some rough way. Either way it forgets that the whole train must clear the bridge.

Option (D) 25 seconds simply copies the speed figure and has no working behind it.

Only 20 seconds uses the correct total distance of 500 metres.

Final Answer:

The train needs 20 seconds to cross the bridge completely.

$$\boxed{20 \text{ seconds}}$$

Quick Tip: The train clears the bridge only when its last coach leaves it, so the distance is train length plus bridge length, that is 300 plus 200. Then divide by the speed.

94. If 0.06% of a number is 84, then 30% of that number is

(A) 25.2

(B) 420

(C) 42000

(D) 2520

Correct Answer: (C) 42000

Solution:

Step 1: Turn the percentage into a fraction.

Let the number be N. The word "per cent" means "out of a hundred", so

$$0.06\% \text{ of } N = \frac{0.06}{100} \times N = 0.0006N$$

Writing the percentage as a plain decimal like this is what keeps the zeros under control.

Step 2: Form the equation and find N.

We are told this equals 84, so

$$0.0006N = 84$$

$$N = \frac{84}{0.0006}$$

To divide by a small decimal, multiply top and bottom by 10000:

$$N = \frac{84 \times 10000}{6} = \frac{840000}{6} = 140000$$

So the number is 140000.

Step 3: Check that N is right.

$$0.06\% \text{ of } 140000 = \frac{0.06 \times 140000}{100} = \frac{8400}{100} = 84$$

This matches the given value, so $N = 140000$ is correct.

Step 4: Find 30 per cent of N.

$$30\% \text{ of } 140000 = \frac{30}{100} \times 140000 = 0.3 \times 140000 = 42000$$

Step 5: See why the other options fail.

Option (A) 25.2 is 30 per cent of 84 itself. That treats 84 as the number instead of as 0.06 per cent of it.

Option (B) 420 comes from reading the first percentage as 6 per cent

instead of 0.06 per cent, which makes $N = 1400$ and 30 per cent of it 420.
Option (D) 2520 is 30 times 84, another shortcut that skips finding N. Only 42000 follows from the correct value $N = 140000$.

Final Answer:
30 per cent of the number is 42000.

$$\boxed{42000}$$

Quick Tip: Find the number first: divide 84 by 0.0006 to get 140000. Or notice that 30 divided by 0.06 is 500, so just multiply 84 by 500.

95. A sum was divided among P, Q & R. R got double than P who got double than Q. If the difference between the shares of Q and R is Rs. 3675.00, then the sum in rupees is

(A) 4900

(B) 8575

(C) 11025

(D) 7350

Correct Answer: (B) 8575

Solution:

Step 1: Read the relations carefully.
The sentence has two links in it. "R got double than P" means R's share is twice P's share. "P who got double than Q" means P's share is twice Q's share. So Q has the smallest share and R the largest.

The smart move is to name the smallest share as the variable, because then the other two come out as whole multiples with no fractions.

Step 2: Write all three shares in one variable.

Let Q's share be x rupees.

Then P's share is $2x$, since P got double of Q.

Then R's share is $2 \times 2x = 4x$, since R got double of P.

So the shares of Q, P and R are in the ratio $1 : 2 : 4$.

Step 3: Use the given difference.

The difference between R and Q is

$$4x - x = 3x$$

We are told this equals 3675, so

$$3x = 3675$$

$$x = 1225$$

So Q got Rs. 1225, P got Rs. 2450 and R got Rs. 4900.

Step 4: Add up to get the total sum.

$$\text{Sum} = x + 2x + 4x = 7x = 7 \times 1225 = 8575$$

As a check, $1225 + 2450 + 4900 = 8575$, and $4900 - 1225 = 3675$, which matches the given difference.

Step 5: Look at the wrong options.

Option (A) 4900 is only R's share, not the total. It is the classic "stopped one step early" trap.

Option (D) 7350 equals $6x$, which you get by adding the ratio parts as $1 + 2 + 3$ instead of $1 + 2 + 4$, that is, by misreading "double" somewhere in the chain.

Option (C) 11025 equals $9x$, which comes from using shares in the ratio $1 : 2 : 6$ or from multiplying 3675 by 3 instead of using the right total.

Only $7x = 8575$ fits the ratio $1 : 2 : 4$.

Final Answer:

The sum divided among the three was Rs. 8575.

Rs. 8575

Quick Tip: Take Q's share as x. Then P is 2x and R is 4x, so R minus Q is 3x equal to 3675. The sum is 7x.

96. If the ratio of the areas of two squares is 25:36, then the ratio of their perimeters is

(A) 5:6

(B) 25:36

(C) 6:5

(D) 36:25

Correct Answer: (A) 5:6

Solution:

Step 1: Recall the two square formulas.

For a square of side a, the area is a^2 and the perimeter is $4a$. So area depends on the square of the side, while perimeter depends on the side directly. That single difference is the whole point of the question.

Step 2: Name the sides and use the area ratio.

Let the sides of the two squares be a and b. The areas are a^2 and b^2, so

$$\frac{a^2}{b^2} = \frac{25}{36}$$

Step 3: Take the square root to get the side ratio.

Both sides of the equation are perfect squares, so taking the positive square root gives

$$\frac{a}{b} = \sqrt{\frac{25}{36}} = \frac{5}{6}$$

We keep only the positive root, because a side length cannot be negative.

Step 4: Convert the side ratio into the perimeter ratio.

$$\frac{\text{Perimeter}_1}{\text{Perimeter}_2} = \frac{4a}{4b} = \frac{a}{b} = \frac{5}{6}$$

The 4 cancels from top and bottom, so the perimeters are in exactly the same ratio as the sides, that is $5 : 6$.

Step 5: Sanity check with real numbers.

Take sides 5 and 6. Their areas are 25 and 36, which matches the

given ratio. Their perimeters are $4 \times 5 = 20$ and $4 \times 6 = 24$, and $20 : 24$ reduces to $5 : 6$. The result holds.

Step 6: Reject the wrong options.
Option (B) 25:36 repeats the area ratio and forgets to take the square root.
Option (C) 6:5 flips the order, which would make the smaller square have the bigger perimeter, an impossibility.
Option (D) 36:25 both flips the order and skips the square root, so it is doubly wrong.

Final Answer:
The perimeters are in the ratio 5:6.

$$\boxed{5 : 6}$$

Quick Tip: Area goes with the square of the side, perimeter goes with the side itself. So take the square root of 25:36.

97. The denominator of a fraction is greater than its numerator by 11. If 8 is added to both its numerator and denominator, then it becomes $\frac{3}{4}$. The fraction is

(A) 25/26

(B) 35/26

(C) 26/35

(D) 25/36

Correct Answer: (D) 25/36

Solution:

Step 1: Put the fraction into one variable.

Let the numerator be n. The denominator is 11 more than the numerator, so the denominator is $n + 11$.

The fraction is therefore

$$\frac{n}{n+11}$$

Using one variable rather than two is what keeps this to a single easy equation.

Step 2: Apply the second condition.

Adding 8 to both parts gives the new fraction

$$\frac{n+8}{n+11+8} = \frac{n+8}{n+19}$$

We are told this equals $\frac{3}{4}$, so

$$\frac{n+8}{n+19} = \frac{3}{4}$$

Step 3: Cross multiply and solve.

$$4(n+8) = 3(n+19)$$

$$4n + 32 = 3n + 57$$

Bring the n terms to the left and the numbers to the right:

$$4n - 3n = 57 - 32$$

$$n = 25$$

Step 4: Build the fraction.

The numerator is 25 and the denominator is $25 + 11 = 36$. So the fraction is

$$\frac{25}{36}$$

Step 5: Verify against both conditions.

First condition: $36 - 25 = 11$, so the denominator really is 11 more than the numerator.

Second condition: adding 8 to both gives $\frac{33}{44}$, and dividing top and bottom by 11 gives $\frac{3}{4}$. Both conditions hold, so the answer is confirmed.

Step 6: Test the other options quickly.

Option (A) 25/26: here the gap is only 1, not 11, so it fails at once.

Option (B) 35/26: the denominator is smaller than the numerator, so the gap is negative. It fails the first condition.

Option (C) 26/35: the gap is 9, not 11, and adding 8 gives $\frac{34}{43}$, which is not $\frac{3}{4}$.

Only 25/36 satisfies both statements in the question.

Final Answer:

The fraction is 25/36.

$$\boxed{\frac{25}{36}}$$

Quick Tip: Adding the same number to top and bottom keeps their difference at 11. So the new fraction is 3k over 4k with 4k minus 3k equal to 11, giving 33 over 44. Now subtract 8 from each.

98. The value of $\frac{1}{x^2} + \frac{1}{y^2}$, where $x = 2 + \sqrt{3}$ and $y = 2 - \sqrt{3}$, is

(A) 12

(B) 16

(C) 14

(D) 10

Correct Answer: (C) 14

Solution:

Step 1: Notice that x and y are conjugates.

The two numbers $2 + \sqrt{3}$ and $2 - \sqrt{3}$ differ only in the sign before the surd, so they are conjugate surds. Their sum and product are both free of surds, which makes them easy to work with.

$$x + y = (2 + \sqrt{3}) + (2 - \sqrt{3}) = 4$$

$$xy = (2 + \sqrt{3})(2 - \sqrt{3}) = 2^2 - (\sqrt{3})^2 = 4 - 3 = 1$$

The product being exactly 1 is the key fact of this question.

Step 2: Combine the two fractions.

$$\frac{1}{x^2}+\frac{1}{y^2}=\frac{y^2+x^2}{x^2y^2}=\frac{x^2+y^2}{(xy)^2}$$

Since $xy=1$, the denominator is $1^2=1$. So

$$\frac{1}{x^2}+\frac{1}{y^2}=x^2+y^2$$

The reciprocal-of-squares expression has collapsed into a plain sum of squares.

Step 3: Find the sum of squares using an identity.
The identity $x^2+y^2=(x+y)^2-2xy$ avoids expanding the surds at all. Putting in the values from Step 1,

$$x^2+y^2=4^2-2(1)=16-2=14$$

Step 4: Check by direct expansion.

$$x^2=(2+\sqrt{3})^2=4+4\sqrt{3}+3=7+4\sqrt{3}$$

$$y^2=(2-\sqrt{3})^2=4-4\sqrt{3}+3=7-4\sqrt{3}$$

Adding them, the surd parts cancel:

$$x^2 + y^2 = (7 + 4\sqrt{3}) + (7 - 4\sqrt{3}) = 14$$

Both methods agree.

Step 5: Look at the wrong options.
Option (B) 16 is $(x + y)^2$, which means the student forgot to subtract $2xy$.
Option (A) 12 would come from subtracting 4 instead of 2, that is, from using $xy = 2$ instead of 1.
Option (D) 10 comes from subtracting $2xy$ twice or from a slip in expanding the square.
Only 14 is consistent.

Final Answer:
The value of the expression is 14.

$$\boxed{14}$$

Quick Tip: Check the product first: (2 plus root 3)(2 minus root 3) equals 1. So the expression reduces to x squared plus y squared, which is (x plus y) squared minus 2xy.

99. If the volume of a sphere is divided by its surface area, we obtain 27 cm. The radius of the sphere is

(A) 9 cm.

(B) 81 cm.

(C) 27 cm.

(D) 24 cm.

Correct Answer: (B) 81 cm.

Solution:

Step 1: Write down the two sphere formulas.

For a sphere of radius r,

$$\text{Volume} = \frac{4}{3}\pi r^3$$

$$\text{Surface area} = 4\pi r^2$$

Volume is measured in cubic units and surface area in square units, so their ratio comes out in plain length units, which is why the question's answer is quoted in cm.

Step 2: Divide one by the other.

$$\frac{\text{Volume}}{\text{Surface area}} = \frac{\frac{4}{3}\pi r^3}{4\pi r^2}$$

The factor 4π cancels from top and bottom, and $\frac{r^3}{r^2} = r$. So

$$\frac{\text{Volume}}{\text{Surface area}} = \frac{r}{3}$$

This is a neat standard result: for any sphere, volume divided by

surface area is always one third of the radius.

Step 3: Use the given value.

$$\frac{r}{3} = 27$$

$$r = 27 \times 3 = 81 \text{ cm}$$

Step 4: Check by substituting back.

With $r = 81$,

$$\text{Volume} = \frac{4}{3}\pi(81)^3, \qquad \text{Surface area} = 4\pi(81)^2$$

$$\frac{\text{Volume}}{\text{Surface area}} = \frac{81}{3} = 27$$

This matches the given ratio exactly, so 81 cm is right.

Step 5: Deal with the distractors.

Option (C) 27 cm assumes the ratio equals the radius itself. That would only be true if the ratio were r instead of $\frac{r}{3}$.

Option (A) 9 cm comes from dividing 27 by 3 instead of multiplying, that is, from writing $r = \frac{27}{3}$ by mistake.

Option (D) 24 cm has no working behind it and is simply close to 27 to look tempting.

Only 81 cm satisfies $\frac{r}{3} = 27$.

Final Answer:

The radius of the sphere is 81 cm.

$$\boxed{81 \text{ cm}}$$

Quick Tip: For any sphere, volume over surface area simplifies to r divided by 3. So set r over 3 equal to 27 and multiply, do not divide.

100. One-third of one fourth of a number is 12. Then the number is

(A) 96

(B) 144

(C) 108

(D) 36

Correct Answer: (B) 144

Solution:

Step 1: Translate the words into symbols.

In maths, the word "of" between fractions means multiply. So "one-third of one-fourth of a number" means

$$\frac{1}{3} \times \frac{1}{4} \times N$$

where N is the number we are looking for.

Step 2: Simplify the two fractions into one.

$$\frac{1}{3} \times \frac{1}{4} = \frac{1}{12}$$

So the phrase simply means one-twelfth of the number.

Step 3: Form the equation and solve.

$$\frac{N}{12} = 12$$

Multiply both sides by 12:

$$N = 12 \times 12 = 144$$

Step 4: Check the answer by walking the words forward.
One-fourth of 144 is $\frac{144}{4} = 36$.
One-third of that 36 is $\frac{36}{3} = 12$.
This is exactly the value given in the question, so $N = 144$ is correct.

Step 5: Examine the wrong options.
Option (D) 36 is only one-fourth of the number. It is what you get if you stop after the first step of the check above, or if you solve $\frac{N}{3} = 12$ alone.
Option (A) 96 comes from adding the fractions as $\frac{1}{3} + \frac{1}{4} = \frac{7}{12}$ and fumbling, or from multiplying 12 by 8. Neither matches the wording.
Option (C) 108 equals 12×9, which would fit "one-third of one-third", not "one-third of one-fourth".
Only 144 fits both fractions.

Final Answer:
The number is 144.

144

Quick Tip: "Of" means multiply, so one-third times one-fourth is one-twelfth. The number is therefore 12 multiplied by 12.

101. In the number series 4, 10, 23, 50, 104, 216, 439 the wrong number is

(A) 10

(B) 23

(C) 104

(D) 50

Correct Answer: (C) 104

Solution:

Step 1: Look for the rule linking one term to the next.

The terms grow roughly twofold each time, so the likely rule is "double and add something". Test that on the first pair.

$$4 \times 2 + 2 = 10$$

So the first step is double and add 2.

Step 2: Check the next few steps to see if the added number follows its own pattern.

$$10 \times 2 + 3 = 23$$

$$23 \times 2 + 4 = 50$$

So far the added numbers are 2, 3, 4, rising by one each time. The rule looks like: double the previous term and add 2, then 3, then 4, then 5, and so on.

Step 3: Apply the rule to the next term.
After 50, the number to be added should be 5:

$$50 \times 2 + 5 = 105$$

But the series prints 104, not 105. That is the first place the rule breaks.

Step 4: Confirm by checking the remaining terms.
If the correct term is 105, the next added number should be 6:

$$105 \times 2 + 6 = 216$$

The series shows 216, so it matches.
Then the added number should be 7:

$$216 \times 2 + 7 = 439$$

The series shows 439, which matches too.
So every term after the suspect one fits the rule perfectly, provided the fifth term is taken as 105. This proves the single wrong entry is 104.

Step 5: Check that 216 and 439 do not work from 104.

Starting from the printed 104, the rule would give $104 \times 2 + 6 = 214$, not 216. So keeping 104 would break two later terms instead of one. A well-formed series question has exactly one wrong term, so 104 must be the odd one out.

Step 6: Clear the other options.
Option (A) 10 fits $4 \times 2 + 2$. Correct.
Option (B) 23 fits $10 \times 2 + 3$. Correct.
Option (D) 50 fits $23 \times 2 + 4$. Correct.
Only 104 fails, and it should be 105.

Final Answer:
The wrong number in the series is 104, which should be 105.

$$\boxed{104}$$

Quick Tip: Try doubling and adding a growing number: 4 times 2 plus 2 gives 10, 10 times 2 plus 3 gives 23, 23 times 2 plus 4 gives 50. Carry on and see which printed term does not match.

102. The price of 2 trousers and 4 shirts is Rs. 1,600. With the same amount one can buy 1 trouser and 6 shirts. If one wants to buy 12 shirts, he has to pay

(A) Rs. 2400

(B) Rs. 4800

(C) Rs. 1200

(D) Rs. 3700

Correct Answer: (A) Rs. 2400

Solution:

Step 1: Turn the words into equations.

Let one trouser cost t rupees and one shirt cost s rupees.

Two trousers and four shirts cost Rs. 1600, so

$$2t + 4s = 1600$$

The words "with the same amount" mean the second purchase also costs Rs. 1600, so

$$t + 6s = 1600$$

Two equations with two unknowns, so both prices are fixed.

Step 2: Compare the two purchases.

Both cost the same rupees, so we can set the left sides equal:

$$2t + 4s = t + 6s$$

Take t and $4s$ to the other side:

$$t = 2s$$

So one trouser costs exactly what two shirts cost. This single relation carries the whole question.

Step 3: Find the price of one shirt.

Put $t = 2s$ into the second equation because its numbers are smaller:

$$2s + 6s = 1600$$

$$8s = 1600$$

$$s = 200$$

One shirt costs Rs. 200, and one trouser costs $t = 2 \times 200 = 400$ rupees.

Step 4: Check both given conditions.
First purchase: $2(400) + 4(200) = 800 + 800 = 1600$. Correct.
Second purchase: $400 + 6(200) = 400 + 1200 = 1600$. Correct.
Both match, so the prices are right.

Step 5: Cost of 12 shirts.

$$12 \times 200 = 2400$$

Step 6: Why the other options are wrong.
Rs. 4800 comes from using the trouser price of Rs. 400 for a shirt, which mixes up the two items.
Rs. 1200 is the cost of only 6 shirts, half the asked quantity.
Rs. 3700 does not come from any consistent reading of the data.

Final Answer:
Twelve shirts at Rs. 200 each cost Rs. 2400.

$$\boxed{\text{Rs. 2400}}$$

Quick Tip: Both baskets cost the same, so dropping 1 trouser must be balanced by adding 2 shirts. That gives 1 trouser = 2 shirts, which turns the second equation into 8 shirts = Rs. 1600.

103. If $x = \left(\frac{3}{2}\right)^2 \left(\frac{2}{3}\right)^{-4}$, the value of x^{-2} is

(A) $\left(\frac{2}{3}\right)^{12}$

(B) $\left(\frac{3}{2}\right)^{12}$

(C) $\left(\frac{6}{5}\right)^{-12}$

(D) $\left(\frac{5}{6}\right)^{-12}$

Correct Answer: (A) $\left(\frac{2}{3}\right)^{12}$

Solution:

Step 1: The rules we need.

A negative exponent flips the base: $a^{-n} = \frac{1}{a^n}$, and for a fraction $\left(\frac{p}{q}\right)^{-n} = \left(\frac{q}{p}\right)^n$.

Same bases multiply by adding exponents: $a^m \cdot a^n = a^{m+n}$.

A power raised to a power multiplies exponents: $(a^m)^n = a^{mn}$.

Step 2: Make both factors share one base.

The two bases $\frac{3}{2}$ and $\frac{2}{3}$ are reciprocals, so flip the second one:

$$\left(\frac{2}{3}\right)^{-4} = \left(\frac{3}{2}\right)^4$$

Now x is a product of two powers of the same base $\frac{3}{2}$.

Step 3: Simplify x.

$$x = \left(\frac{3}{2}\right)^2 \left(\frac{3}{2}\right)^4 = \left(\frac{3}{2}\right)^{2+4} = \left(\frac{3}{2}\right)^6$$

Step 4: Raise to the power minus 2.

$$x^{-2} = \left[\left(\frac{3}{2}\right)^6\right]^{-2} = \left(\frac{3}{2}\right)^{-12}$$

A negative exponent on a fraction flips the fraction:

$$\left(\frac{3}{2}\right)^{-12} = \left(\frac{2}{3}\right)^{12}$$

Step 5: Numerical check.
$x = \left(\frac{3}{2}\right)^6 = \frac{729}{64}$, so $x^{-2} = \frac{64^2}{729^2} = \frac{4096}{531441}$.
And $\left(\frac{2}{3}\right)^{12} = \frac{2^{12}}{3^{12}} = \frac{4096}{531441}$. The two agree.

Step 6: Why the other options are wrong.
Option (B) $\left(\frac{3}{2}\right)^{12}$ is the reciprocal of the answer. It comes from forgetting to flip the base after the minus sign.
Options (C) and (D) use bases $\frac{6}{5}$ and $\frac{5}{6}$, which never appear in the question. Only 2 and 3 are prime factors here, so 5 cannot show up.

Final Answer:
The value of x^{-2} is option (A).

$$\boxed{\left(\frac{2}{3}\right)^{12}}$$

Quick Tip: The bases 3/2 and 2/3 are reciprocals. Flip the second one so both factors share the base 3/2, add the exponents to get x, then use the outer power of minus 2.

104. A dealer buys an article for Rs. 380.00. What price should he mark so that after allowing a discount of 5% he still makes a profit of 25% on the article?

(A) Rs. 500

(B) Rs. 475

(C) Rs. 95

(D) Rs. 465

Correct Answer: (A) Rs. 500

Solution:

Step 1: Sort out the three prices.

Cost price (CP) is what the dealer pays: Rs. 380.

Marked price (MP) is the tag price, which is what we must find.

Selling price (SP) is what the customer actually pays after the discount.

Discount is always taken on the marked price, and profit is always taken on the cost price. Mixing these two bases is the usual mistake here.

Step 2: Find the selling price from the profit condition.

A 25% profit means

$$SP = CP \times \left(1 + \frac{25}{100}\right) = 380 \times \frac{5}{4}$$

$$SP = 475$$

So the dealer must actually receive Rs. 475.

Step 3: Link the selling price to the marked price.

A 5% discount means the customer pays 95% of the marked price:

$$SP = MP \times \left(1 - \frac{5}{100}\right) = MP \times \frac{19}{20}$$

Step 4: Solve for the marked price.

$$475 = MP \times \frac{19}{20}$$

$$MP = 475 \times \frac{20}{19} = 25 \times 20 = 500$$

Step 5: Verify the full chain.

Mark at Rs. 500, give 5% off: discount is $500 \times 0.05 = 25$, so SP is Rs. 475.

Profit is $475 - 380 = 95$, and $\frac{95}{380} \times 100 = 25\%$. Both conditions hold.

Step 6: Why the other options are wrong.

Rs. 475 is the selling price, not the marked price. Choosing it means forgetting the discount step.

Rs. 95 is only the profit amount in rupees.

Rs. 465 gives SP $= 465 \times 0.95 = 441.75$, a profit of about 16.3%, not 25%.

Final Answer:

The article should be marked at Rs. 500.

$$\boxed{\text{Rs. 500}}$$

Quick Tip: Discount is on the marked price, profit is on the cost price. Set 380 times 1.25 equal to MP times 0.95 and solve for MP.

105. In a factory, the production of scooters rose to 48400 from 40000 in 2 years. The rate of growth per annum is

(A) 20%

(B) 10%

(C) 30%

(D) 8%

Correct Answer: (B) 10%

Solution:

Step 1: Recognise the type of growth.

When production grows at the same rate every year, each year's

growth applies to the previous year's output, not to the original one. That is compound growth, so the compound interest formula applies.

$$A = P\left(1 + \frac{r}{100}\right)^n$$

Here $P = 40000$ is the starting production, $A = 48400$ is the production after $n = 2$ years, and r is the rate we want.

Step 2: Substitute the values.

$$48400 = 40000\left(1 + \frac{r}{100}\right)^2$$

Step 3: Isolate the bracket.

$$\left(1 + \frac{r}{100}\right)^2 = \frac{48400}{40000} = \frac{484}{400}$$

Both 484 and 400 are perfect squares, which is a strong hint that the numbers were built for this.

$$\frac{484}{400} = \frac{22^2}{20^2} = \left(\frac{22}{20}\right)^2$$

Step 4: Take the square root.

Production is positive, so we keep only the positive root:

$$1 + \frac{r}{100} = \frac{22}{20} = 1.1$$

$$\frac{r}{100} = 0.1$$

$$r = 10$$

Step 5: Check year by year.

Year 1: $40000 \times 1.1 = 44000$.

Year 2: $44000 \times 1.1 = 48400$. This is exactly the given figure.

Step 6: Why the other options are wrong.

At 20%, production would reach $40000 \times 1.44 = 57600$, far too high.

At 30%, it would reach $40000 \times 1.69 = 67600$, higher still.

At 8%, it would reach $40000 \times 1.1664 = 46656$, short of 48400.

A tempting shortcut is total growth of 8400 on 40000, which is 21% over two years, then halving it to 10.5%. That simple average is wrong because growth compounds, but it does land close to 10 and confirms the answer.

Final Answer:

The rate of growth is 10% per annum.

$$\boxed{10\%}$$

Quick Tip: Growth compounds year on year, so use A = P(1 + r/100)^2. The ratio 48400/40000 = 1.21, and 1.21 is the square of 1.1.

106. If $x + \frac{1}{x} = 3$, then $x^2 + \frac{1}{x^2}$ will be

(A) 9

(B) 10

(C) 27

(D) 7

Correct Answer: (D) 7

Solution:

Step 1: Pick the right identity.

The square of a sum is

$$(a+b)^2 = a^2 + 2ab + b^2$$

Take $a = x$ and $b = \frac{1}{x}$. The middle term becomes $2 \cdot x \cdot \frac{1}{x} = 2$, a plain number. That cancellation is exactly why this identity is the natural tool here.

Step 2: Square both sides of the given equation.

$$\left(x + \frac{1}{x}\right)^2 = 3^2$$

Expanding the left side:

$$x^2 + 2 \cdot x \cdot \frac{1}{x} + \frac{1}{x^2} = 9$$

$$x^2 + 2 + \frac{1}{x^2} = 9$$

Step 3: Move the constant across.

$$x^2 + \frac{1}{x^2} = 9 - 2 = 7$$

Step 4: Confirm with the actual root.

From $x + \frac{1}{x} = 3$, multiply by x to get $x^2 - 3x + 1 = 0$, so $x = \frac{3 \pm \sqrt{5}}{2}$. Taking $x = \frac{3 + \sqrt{5}}{2} \approx 2.618$, we get $x^2 \approx 6.854$ and $\frac{1}{x^2} \approx 0.146$. Their sum is about 7. The identity route is far quicker but the numbers agree.

Step 5: Why the other options are wrong.

9 is simply 3^2, which is what you get if you square 3 and forget the middle term +2. This is the trap option.

10 comes from adding 1 instead of subtracting 2.

27 is 3^3, which answers a different question, $x^3 + \frac{1}{x^3}$, and even that is 18, not 27.

Final Answer:

Subtracting the 2 from 9 leaves 7.

$$\boxed{7}$$

Quick Tip: Square both sides. The cross term 2 times x times 1/x is just 2, so x^2 + 1/x^2 = 9 - 2.

107. When $16x^4 + 12x^3 - 10x^2 + 8x + 20$ is divided by $4x - 3$, the quotient and the remainder are, respectively

(A) $4x^3 + 6x^2 + 2x$ and $\frac{61}{2}$

(B) $4x^3 + 6x^2 + \frac{7}{2}$ and $\frac{51}{2}$

(C) $6x^2 + 2x + \frac{2}{7}$ and $\frac{61}{2}$

(D) $4x^3 + 6x^2 + 2x + \frac{7}{2}$ and $\frac{61}{2}$

Correct Answer: (D) $4x^3 + 6x^2 + 2x + \frac{7}{2}$ and $\frac{61}{2}$

Solution:

Step 1: What long division of polynomials gives.

Dividing a polynomial by $4x - 3$ leaves

$$\text{Dividend} = (\text{Divisor})(\text{Quotient}) + \text{Remainder}$$

The divisor has degree 1, so the remainder is a constant. The dividend has degree 4, so the quotient has degree 3. That already rules out option (C), whose quotient is only degree 2.

Step 2: Divide the leading terms.

$16x^4 \div 4x = 4x^3$. Multiply back: $4x^3(4x - 3) = 16x^4 - 12x^3$.

Subtract: $12x^3 - (-12x^3) = 24x^3$, so we are left with $24x^3 - 10x^2 + 8x + 20$.

Step 3: Next term of the quotient.

$24x^3 \div 4x = 6x^2$. Multiply back: $6x^2(4x - 3) = 24x^3 - 18x^2$.

Subtract: $-10x^2 + 18x^2 = 8x^2$, leaving $8x^2 + 8x + 20$.

Step 4: Third term.

$8x^2 \div 4x = 2x$. Multiply back: $2x(4x - 3) = 8x^2 - 6x$.
Subtract: $8x + 6x = 14x$, leaving $14x + 20$.

Step 5: Fourth term.
$14x \div 4x = \frac{7}{2}$. Multiply back: $\frac{7}{2}(4x - 3) = 14x - \frac{21}{2}$.
Subtract: $20 + \frac{21}{2} = \frac{40 + 21}{2} = \frac{61}{2}$.
This is a constant, so the division stops.

Step 6: Collect the result and verify.
Quotient $= 4x^3 + 6x^2 + 2x + \frac{7}{2}$, remainder $= \frac{61}{2}$.
Check with the remainder theorem: the remainder equals the dividend evaluated at the root $x = \frac{3}{4}$.

$$16\left(\frac{81}{256}\right) + 12\left(\frac{27}{64}\right) - 10\left(\frac{9}{16}\right) + 8\left(\frac{3}{4}\right) + 20$$

$$= \frac{81}{16} + \frac{81}{16} - \frac{90}{16} + 6 + 20 = \frac{72}{16} + 26 = 4.5 + 26 = 30.5 = \frac{61}{2}$$

The remainder matches.

Step 7: Why the other options are wrong.
Option (A) drops the constant $\frac{7}{2}$ from the quotient.
Option (B) drops the $2x$ term and also misstates the remainder as $\frac{51}{2}$.
Option (C) has a quotient of the wrong degree.

Final Answer:
Only option (D) carries both the full quotient and the correct remainder.

$$\boxed{4x^3 + 6x^2 + 2x + \frac{7}{2}, \quad \frac{61}{2}}$$

Quick Tip: Degree 4 divided by degree 1 must leave a degree 3 quotient and a constant remainder. Find the remainder fast by putting x = 3/4 into the dividend.

108. The sum of two numbers is 2490. If 6.5% of one number is equal to 8.5% of the other, the numbers are

(A) 1411 and 1079

(B) 1412 and 1080

(C) 1141 and 1709

(D) 1214 and 1800

Correct Answer: (A) 1411 and 1079

Solution:

Step 1: Name the numbers and write both conditions.

Let the two numbers be x and y.

The sum condition gives

$$x + y = 2490$$

The percentage condition gives

$$6.5\% \text{ of } x = 8.5\% \text{ of } y$$

$$\frac{6.5}{100}x = \frac{8.5}{100}y$$

Step 2: Clear the decimals and percentages.

Multiply both sides by 100 to remove the percent signs:

$$6.5x = 8.5y$$

Multiply by 2 to clear the halves:

$$13x = 17y$$

So

$$\frac{x}{y} = \frac{17}{13}$$

The smaller percentage sits on the larger number, which makes sense since the two products must be equal.

Step 3: Use the ratio with the sum.

The numbers are in the ratio 17 to 13, so write $x = 17k$ and $y = 13k$.

$$17k + 13k = 2490$$

$$30k = 2490$$

$$k = 83$$

Step 4: Get both numbers.

$$x = 17 \times 83 = 1411$$

$$y = 13 \times 83 = 1079$$

Step 5: Check both conditions.

Sum: $1411 + 1079 = 2490$. Correct.

Percentages: 6.5% of 1411 is $0.065 \times 1411 = 91.715$, and 8.5% of 1079 is $0.085 \times 1079 = 91.715$. They are equal.

Step 6: Why the other options are wrong.

1412 and 1080 add to 2492, not 2490.

1141 and 1709 do add to 2850, which already fails the sum.

1214 and 1800 add to 3014, also wrong.

Only option (A) satisfies the sum, and it also satisfies the percentage test.

Final Answer:

The two numbers are 1411 and 1079.

$$\boxed{1411 \text{ and } 1079}$$

Quick Tip: Equal products mean the numbers are inversely proportional to the percentages, so x : y = 8.5 : 6.5 = 17 : 13. Split 2490 into 30 parts. Also, only one option even adds to 2490.

109. 120 men had food provision for 200 days. After 5 days, 30 men died of an epidemic. The food will last for further

(A) 280 days

(B) 260 days

(C) 290 days

(D) 252 days

Correct Answer: (B) 260 days

Solution:

Step 1: Think in man days.

One man day is the food one man eats in one day. Total food stays fixed no matter how many men eat it, so counting man days is the safe way to handle this.

Total food $= 120 \text{ men} \times 200 \text{ days} = 24000$ man days.

Step 2: Subtract what the first 5 days consumed.

For those 5 days all 120 men were alive and eating.

Food used $= 120 \times 5 = 600$ man days.

Food left $= 24000 - 600 = 23400$ man days.

Step 3: Count the men who remain.

30 men died, so $120 - 30 = 90$ men are left to share the remaining food.

Step 4: Divide the leftover food among the survivors.

$$\text{Days} = \frac{23400}{90} = 260$$

Step 5: A quick reasonableness check.

At full strength the food would have lasted 195 more days after day 5. Fewer men eat less, so the food must stretch beyond 195 days. It stretches by the factor $\frac{120}{90} = \frac{4}{3}$, giving $195 \times \frac{4}{3} = 260$. Same answer by a different route.

Step 6: Why the other options are wrong.

280 comes from ignoring the 5 days already eaten and doing $200 \times \frac{120}{90}$, which is 266.67, or from some other mismatch. Either way it overcounts the food.

290 is what you get by taking $260 + 30$ or similar loose arithmetic, and it does not follow from the data.

252 does not come out of any correct step.

One more trap: the question asks for the food lasting further, meaning from day 5 onwards, not the total from day zero. The total would be $5 + 260 = 265$ days, which is not an option, so 260 is clearly what is wanted.

Final Answer:

The remaining food will last 260 more days.

$$\boxed{260 \text{ days}}$$

Quick Tip: Reset at day 5: the food left feeds 120 men for 195 days. With only 90 men left, multiply 195 by 120/90.

110. Out of the total income, X spends 20% on house rent and 70% of the remaining amount on household expenditure. If X saves Rs. 1800, the total income is

(A) Rs. 8000

(B) Rs. 9500

(C) Rs. 7500

(D) Rs. 8500

Correct Answer: (C) Rs. 7500

Solution:

Step 1: Read the two percentages carefully.
The 20% for rent is taken on the total income.
The 70% for household expenditure is taken on the remaining amount, not on the total income. Missing this shift of base is the main trap in the question.
Let the total income be I rupees.

Step 2: Work out the rent and what is left after it.
Rent $= 20\%$ of $I = 0.2I$.
Remaining $= I - 0.2I = 0.8I$.

Step 3: Work out the household expenditure.
Household $= 70\%$ of $0.8I = 0.7 \times 0.8I = 0.56I$.
Note this is 56% of the total income, not 70% of it.

Step 4: Find the savings as a fraction of income.
What is left over is the saving:

$$\text{Savings} = 0.8I - 0.56I = 0.24I$$

Another way to see it: after rent, 70% is spent, so 30% of the remaining amount is saved, and $0.3 \times 0.8I = 0.24I$. Both views agree.

Step 5: Solve for the income.

$$0.24I = 1800$$

$$I = \frac{1800}{0.24} = \frac{180000}{24} = 7500$$

Step 6: Verify the whole budget.

Rent $= 0.2 \times 7500 = 1500$.

Remaining $= 7500 - 1500 = 6000$.

Household $= 0.7 \times 6000 = 4200$.

Savings $= 6000 - 4200 = 1800$. This matches the question exactly.

Step 7: Why the other options are wrong.

Rs. 8000 gives savings of $0.24 \times 8000 = 1920$, too much.

Rs. 9500 gives $0.24 \times 9500 = 2280$.

Rs. 8500 gives $0.24 \times 8500 = 2040$.

Only Rs. 7500 lands on exactly Rs. 1800. If someone wrongly took 70% of the total income, savings would be 10% of income and the answer would come out as Rs. 18000, which is not even listed.

Final Answer:

The total income is Rs. 7500.

Rs. 7500

Quick Tip: The 70% applies to what is left after rent, not to the whole income. Savings = 30% of 80% of income = 24% of income, and 24% of the income is 1800.

111. Given below is a statement followed by two arguments. Read carefully and decide which of the arguments strongly support the statement.

Statement: Should the pay scale and conditions of service of government employees be made applicable to private sector employees?

Arguments:
(i) No, this will develop inertia, inefficiency and would adversely affect spirit of competition.
(ii) Yes, this will enhance dedication to work and institutional loyalty.

(A) Argument (i) is strong.

(B) Argument (ii) is strong.

(C) Both (i) and (ii) are strong.

(D) Neither (i) nor (ii) is strong.

Correct Answer: (A) Argument (i) is strong.

Solution:

Step 1: Understanding the Question:
The statement asks whether the pay structure and service conditions that government employees enjoy should be extended to the private sector. A strong argument must be directly linked to the proposal, must matter in practice, and must rest on a real consequence rather than a pleasant wish.

Step 2: Key Formula or Approach:

Test each argument on three points. First, is it about this exact proposal? Second, does it name a concrete effect? Third, would a thinking person accept the link between cause and effect without extra assumptions? An argument that passes all three is strong.

Step 3: Detailed Explanation:

The main feature of government service conditions is job security. A government employee is very hard to remove, and pay moves largely with time served rather than with output.

Argument (i) picks up exactly this feature. If the private sector adopts the same security and time based pay, the link between performance and reward is cut. Employees who cannot be removed and whose pay rises anyway have little reason to push themselves, so inertia and inefficiency follow, and the competitive pressure that drives private firms weakens. The chain from cause to effect is short and believable, so argument (i) is strong.

Argument (ii) claims the change will raise dedication and loyalty. This is only a hope. Security by itself does not make people work harder, and the argument gives no reason why it would. It also ignores the obvious opposite pull, that guaranteed pay reduces the need to perform. An argument that only asserts a good outcome without showing how it comes about is weak.

So only argument (i) survives the test.

Step 4: Why the other options fail:

Option (B) treats the weak wishful argument as strong, which it is not.

Option (C) needs both to be strong, but (ii) fails the test.

Option (D) says neither is strong, yet (i) points to a real and well accepted economic effect.

Step 5: Final Answer:
Only argument (i) is strong, so the answer is option (A).

Quick Tip: Ask what government service conditions really mean in practice, that is security and time based pay, and then ask which argument traces a believable effect from that.

112. Given below is a statement followed by two arguments. Read carefully and decide which of the arguments strongly support the statement.

Statement: Should a strong institution of ombudsman be created in India?

Arguments:
(i) Yes, this will bring transparency and accountability in the administration.
(ii) No, this will develop lack of initiative and flexibility in the administration.

(A) Argument (i) is strong.

(B) Argument (ii) is strong.

(C) Both (i) and (ii) are strong.

(D) Neither (i) nor (ii) is strong.

Correct Answer: (A) Argument (i) is strong.

Solution:

Step 1: Understanding the Question:
An ombudsman is an independent authority that hears complaints

against public officials and investigates maladministration. In India this idea took shape as the Lokpal and Lokayukta. The question is whether a strong ombudsman should be set up, and which of the two arguments really supports a side.

Step 2: Key Formula or Approach:
A strong argument must connect to the core purpose of the body being discussed and must state an effect that follows from that purpose. If an argument attacks a side effect that the body is designed to prevent, or leans on a chain of doubtful assumptions, it is weak.

Step 3: Detailed Explanation:
Argument (i) says an ombudsman will bring transparency and accountability. That is exactly what the office exists to do. When an outside authority can examine decisions and call an officer to answer for them, the officer records reasons, follows procedure and expects scrutiny. Transparency and accountability are the direct products of that oversight, not a lucky by product. The argument matches the purpose of the institution, so it is strong.
Argument (ii) says the ombudsman will make the administration lose initiative and flexibility. This assumes an honest officer will freeze up merely because a complaint body exists. An ombudsman looks at corruption and maladministration, not at bold but honest decisions taken in good faith. The fear rests on a shaky chain of assumptions and does not follow from what the office actually does, so it is weak.
Only argument (i) clears the test.

Step 4: Why the other options fail:
Option (B) accepts the fear based argument, which needs several unproven assumptions to work.
Option (C) requires both arguments to be strong, and (ii) is not.

Option (D) rejects (i) even though it names the very function of an ombudsman.

Step 5: Final Answer:
Argument (i) alone is strong, so the answer is option (A).

Quick Tip: Recall what an ombudsman is actually meant to do, then check which argument states that very purpose and which one relies on a guess about how officials will react.

113. Given below is a statement followed by two arguments. Read carefully and decide which of the arguments strongly support the statement.

Statement: Should internal assessment in colleges and universities be abolished?

Arguments:
(i) Yes, this will eliminate the possibility of favoritism.
(ii) No, teaching faculty will lose control over the students and this would adversely affect their academic growth.

(A) Argument (i) is strong.

(B) Argument (ii) is strong.

(C) Both (i) and (ii) are strong.

(D) Neither (i) nor (ii) is strong.

Correct Answer: (C) Both (i) and (ii) are strong.

Solution:

Step 1: Understanding the Question:
Internal assessment is the part of a student's marks awarded by the college itself, through class tests, assignments, projects and attendance. The proposal is to scrap it. Both arguments must be tested on whether they name a real consequence of scrapping it.

Step 2: Key Formula or Approach:
An argument is strong when it stays on the exact proposal and states an effect that a reasonable person would accept without extra assumptions. It does not have to be the winning argument. Both sides of a debate can hold strong arguments at the same time, which is why the option Both are strong exists.

Step 3: Detailed Explanation:
Argument (i) says abolishing internal assessment removes the chance of favouritism. Internal marks are given by the same teacher who teaches the student, with no anonymity and little outside checking. That is exactly the setting where personal liking or dislike can colour marks. Remove the internal component and that discretion disappears with it. The link from the proposal to the effect is direct, so argument (i) is strong.
Argument (ii) says teachers will lose control over students and academic growth will suffer. Internal marks are the practical lever that pushes students to attend class, hand in assignments on time and take term tests seriously. Take the lever away and the only thing that counts is one final examination, so regular study through the year loses its reward. That consequence follows from how internal assessment actually works, so argument (ii) is also strong.
Both arguments name genuine effects of the same proposal, one on each side.

Step 4: Why the other options fail:
Option (A) drops argument (ii) even though continuous evaluation is what keeps students working through the year.
Option (B) drops argument (i) even though unchecked teacher discretion is the standard complaint against internal marks.
Option (D) rejects both, which cannot be right since each names a real and accepted effect.

Step 5: Final Answer:
Both arguments are strong, so the answer is option (C).

Quick Tip: Both arguments talk about a real effect of scrapping internal marks, one about bias by teachers and one about students losing the push to study through the year. Ask whether either can be dismissed as vague.

114. Given below is a statement followed by two arguments. Read carefully and decide which of the arguments strongly support the statement.

Statement: Should military training be made compulsory for all college and university students?

Arguments:
(i) Yes, this will develop in them a sense of punctuality and discipline.
(ii) No, military training should be given only to those students who are physically fit.

(A) Argument (i) is strong.

(B) Argument (ii) is strong.

(C) Both (i) and (ii) are strong.

(D) Neither (i) nor (ii) is strong.

Correct Answer: (A) Argument (i) is strong.

Solution:

Step 1: Understanding the Question:
The proposal is compulsory military training for every college and university student. The word compulsory is the heart of it, since the debate is about applying the training to all students without exception.

Step 2: Key Formula or Approach:
A strong argument must engage with the proposal as framed and give a solid reason for or against it. An argument that simply restates a limit on who should be covered, without giving a reason why the wider proposal is bad, is weak because it argues by assertion.

Step 3: Detailed Explanation:
Argument (i) says compulsory military training builds punctuality and discipline. Military training runs on fixed timings, drill, uniform standards and instant obedience to orders, repeated daily. Students carrying those habits into study and work is a real and widely accepted effect of such training, and it applies to the whole student body, which is exactly what the proposal covers. The argument is on point and names a genuine benefit, so it is strong.
Argument (ii) says training should go only to physically fit students. Look closely at what it does. It does not explain why compulsory

training harms anyone, and it does not show that unfit students would be hurt or that the programme would fail. It only asserts a different rule and leaves it there. An assertion dressed as an objection is weak. Even on its own terms it is thin, since a training scheme can grade its physical demands to what a student can handle.
So argument (i) stands and argument (ii) falls.

Step 4: Why the other options fail:
Option (B) treats the bare assertion as strong.
Option (C) needs both, and (ii) gives no reasoning to support its restriction.
Option (D) rejects (i) although discipline and punctuality are the accepted results of drill based training.

Step 5: Final Answer:
Only argument (i) is strong, so the answer is option (A).

Quick Tip: Argument (ii) suggests a different rule but never says what harm the compulsory scheme would cause. Check whether that counts as reasoning or only as a preference.

115. Given below is a statement followed by two arguments. Read carefully and decide which of the arguments strongly support the statement.

Statement: Should students' union in colleges and universities be abolished?

Arguments:
(i) Yes, it detracts students from academic and career development.
(ii) No, all great leaders have been students' union leaders.

(A) Argument (i) is strong.

(B) Argument (ii) is strong.

(C) Both (i) and (ii) are strong.

(D) Neither (i) nor (ii) is strong.

Correct Answer: (A) Argument (i) is strong.

Solution:

Step 1: Understanding the Question:
The proposal is to abolish students' unions in colleges and universities. Each argument has to be judged on whether it gives a sound reason tied to this proposal.

Step 2: Key Formula or Approach:
Watch for two common defects. One is a sweeping claim built on the word all, which collapses the moment a single counter example appears. The other is an appeal that does not actually address the proposal. An argument free of both defects and pointing to a real effect is strong.

Step 3: Detailed Explanation:
Argument (i) says students' unions pull students away from academic and career development. Union work means campaigns, elections, agitations and meetings, and all of it eats into study time. Campus politics also brings disruption and strikes that cost teaching days. Since the whole reason a student is on campus is to study, an argument saying the union works against that purpose speaks directly to the proposal and names a real effect. It is strong.
Argument (ii) says all great leaders have been students' union leaders. The claim is factually false. Many great leaders in India and elsewhere never held any students' union post, and a single counter example destroys a claim framed with all. Even setting that aside, the argument only shows that some union leaders later became prominent. It does not show that unions helped the ordinary student, and it says nothing about whether unions should continue. The reasoning is both false and beside the point, so it is weak.
Only argument (i) is left standing.

Step 4: Why the other options fail:
Option (B) accepts a sweeping claim that is untrue.
Option (C) needs both to be strong, and (ii) fails on facts and on relevance.
Option (D) rejects (i) although the loss of study time is a direct and real consequence.

Step 5: Final Answer:
Argument (i) alone is strong, so the answer is option (A).

Quick Tip: Test the word all in the second argument. If you can name one great leader who never led a students' union, that argument is finished.

116. Given below is a statement followed by two arguments. Read carefully and decide which of the arguments strongly support the statement.

Statement: Should the age of marriage be raised to 25 years for boys and 21 for girls?

Arguments:
(i) No, it is difficult to change a social practice in Indian conditions.
(ii) Yes, by that age people develop a sense of responsibility and also complete their education.

(A) Argument (i) is strong.

(B) Argument (ii) is strong.

(C) Both (i) and (ii) are strong.

(D) Neither (i) nor (ii) is strong.

Correct Answer: (B) Argument (ii) is strong.

Solution:

Step 1: Understanding the Question:
The proposal is to raise the legal age of marriage to 25 for boys and 21 for girls. The arguments must be judged on whether they show the proposal is desirable or undesirable.

Step 2: Key Formula or Approach:
Separate two different questions. One is whether a change is good. The other is whether the change is easy to bring about. An argument that only says the change is hard does not touch the question of whether it should be made, so it is weak. An argument that names a

real benefit of the change is strong.

Step 3: Detailed Explanation:
Argument (i) says social practice is hard to change in Indian conditions. Difficulty is not a reason against doing something worth doing. If it were, no reform would ever be attempted, and India would still have had many practices that law has since ended. The argument also confuses effort with merit, which is the classic mark of a weak argument. It gives no reason why an older marriage age would be a bad thing. Weak.
Argument (ii) says people develop a sense of responsibility by that age and also finish their education. Both parts are real gains. Marriage brings duties towards a spouse, a household and later children, and greater maturity makes those duties easier to carry. Finishing education first protects a young person's career and independence, and it is exactly what early marriage tends to cut short. Since the two benefits flow straight from the higher age being proposed, the argument is strong.
Only argument (ii) survives.

Step 4: Why the other options fail:
Option (A) treats mere difficulty of implementation as a reason against the proposal.
Option (C) needs both, and (i) does not address desirability at all.
Option (D) rejects (ii) although maturity and completed education are real and direct benefits of a later marriage age.

Step 5: Final Answer:
Argument (ii) alone is strong, so the answer is option (B).

Quick Tip: Saying a change is hard to bring about is not the same as saying the change is bad. Check which argument actually speaks to whether the higher age is worth having.

117. The question contains six statements followed by four sets of combination of three. Choose the set in which the statements are logically related.

Statements:
(i) X and Y are siblings.
(ii) X and Y do not quarrel.
(iii) Siblings are known to quarrel often.
(iv) X and Y quarrel often.
(v) All those who quarrel are siblings.
(vi) X and Y cannot be siblings.

(A) ii, iv, v

(B) i, iv, vi

(C) i, iii, iv

(D) i, ii, v

Correct Answer: (C) i, iii, iv

Solution:

Step 1: Understanding the Question:
A logically related set means two of the three statements act as premises and the third follows from them as a conclusion. The task is to find the option whose three statements form such a valid chain.

Step 2: Key Formula or Approach:

Use the standard categorical form. If every member of a class has a property, and a given item belongs to that class, then the item has the property. In symbols, All A are B and X is an A, so X is a B. Any set that fits this pattern is valid.

Step 3: Detailed Explanation:
Check option (C), which is i, iii, iv.
Premise (iii): siblings are known to quarrel often, so quarrelling often is a property of the class of siblings.
Premise (i): X and Y are siblings, so X and Y belong to that class.
Conclusion (iv): X and Y quarrel often. That is the class property applied to a member of the class, so the chain is valid.

Step 4: Testing the other options:
Option (A) is ii, iv, v. Statements (ii) and (iv) contradict each other, since one says X and Y do not quarrel and the other says they quarrel often. A set holding a direct contradiction cannot form a valid chain.
Option (B) is i, iv, vi. Statement (i) says X and Y are siblings and (vi) says they cannot be siblings, another straight contradiction, and (iv) does nothing to link them.
Option (D) is i, ii, v. From (v) all those who quarrel are siblings, and from (ii) X and Y do not quarrel, no conclusion about their being siblings follows. Denying the property of a class tells you nothing about class membership, since the rule runs from quarrelling to sibling and not the other way. Statement (i) therefore does not follow, and this is the fallacy of denying the antecedent.

Step 5: Final Answer:
Only i, iii, iv forms a valid chain, so the answer is option (C).

Quick Tip: Find the general rule about siblings, then the statement that puts X and Y inside that class. The third statement should be the rule applied to them.

118. The question contains six statements followed by four sets of combination of three. Choose the set in which the statements are logically related.

Statements:

(i) All mangoes are fruits.

(ii) All mangoes are green.

(iii) All mangoes are oval shaped.

(iv) All fruits are sweet.

(v) All mangoes are sweet.

(vi) All fruits are expensive.

(A) i, ii, iii

(B) i, iv, v

(C) ii, iii, iv

(D) iv, v, vi

Correct Answer: (B) i, iv, v

Solution:

Step 1: Understanding the Question:

We need the set of three where two statements serve as premises and the third is a conclusion drawn from them. All six statements here are universal affirmatives of the form All A are B, so the syllogism rules apply cleanly.

Step 2: Key Formula or Approach:

The rule to use is the chain rule for universals. If All A are B and All B are C, then All A are C. The two premises must share one common term, called the middle term, which drops out of the conclusion.

Step 3: Detailed Explanation:

Check option (B), which is i, iv, v.

Premise (i): All mangoes are fruits, so the class of mangoes sits inside the class of fruits.

Premise (iv): All fruits are sweet, so the class of fruits sits inside the class of sweet things.

The middle term is fruits, and it links the two premises. Since mangoes are inside fruits and fruits are inside sweet things, mangoes are inside sweet things.

Conclusion (v): All mangoes are sweet. The chain is valid, and note that the middle term fruits has vanished from the conclusion, exactly as it should.

Step 4: Testing the other options:

Option (A) is i, ii, iii. All three have mangoes as the subject and give three unrelated properties, fruits, green and oval shaped. There is no shared middle term to chain, so no statement follows from the other two.

Option (C) is ii, iii, iv. Statements (ii) and (iii) are about mangoes being green and oval, while (iv) is about fruits being sweet. Nothing connects greenness or oval shape to sweetness, so no conclusion emerges.

Option (D) is iv, v, vi. Here (iv) says all fruits are sweet and (vi) says all fruits are expensive. Both share fruits as the subject, not as a linking middle term, so at best you get some sweet things are expensive. That does not give (v), all mangoes are sweet, because

mangoes never enter the premises at all.

Step 5: Final Answer:
The valid chain is i, iv, v, so the answer is option (B).

Quick Tip: Look for two statements sharing one common class that links them, then see which statement is the result of that chain with the common class removed.

119. The question contains six statements followed by four sets of combination of three. Choose the set in which the statements are logically related.

Statements:
(i) All frogs are amphibians.
(ii) All amphibians are not frogs.
(iii) All amphibians are cold blooded.
(iv) All frogs lay eggs.
(v) All amphibians lay eggs.
(vi) Frogs are cold blooded.

(A) i, iii, vi

(B) i, iv, v

(C) i, ii, v

(D) ii, v, iv

Correct Answer: (A) i, iii, vi

Solution:

Step 1: Understanding the Question:
We want the set of three statements where two are premises and the third follows from them. Judge only by the logic of the statements given, not by outside knowledge of biology.

Step 2: Key Formula or Approach:
Apply the chain rule for universal statements. If All A are B and All B are C, then All A are C. The middle term B must be present in both premises and absent from the conclusion.

Step 3: Detailed Explanation:
Check option (A), which is i, iii, vi.
Premise (i): All frogs are amphibians, placing frogs inside the class of amphibians.
Premise (iii): All amphibians are cold blooded, placing amphibians inside the class of cold blooded creatures.
The middle term is amphibians. Frogs lie inside amphibians, amphibians lie inside cold blooded creatures, so frogs lie inside cold blooded creatures.
Conclusion (vi): Frogs are cold blooded. Valid, and amphibians has correctly dropped out of the conclusion.

Step 4: Testing the other options:
Option (B) is i, iv, v. From all frogs are amphibians and all frogs lay eggs, the most you can get is that some amphibians lay eggs, because frogs are only a part of the amphibian class. Concluding (v), all amphibians lay eggs, extends a property from a subset to the whole class, which is not allowed.
Option (C) is i, ii, v. Statement (ii) is a negative remark and (v) is about all amphibians laying eggs, but egg laying never appears in (i) or (ii), so it cannot come out of them.

Option (D) is ii, v, iv. Here (v) says all amphibians lay eggs, and getting to (iv), all frogs lay eggs, would need the premise that frogs are amphibians, which is (i). Statement (ii) does not supply that link, so the set is incomplete.

Step 5: Final Answer:
The valid chain is i, iii, vi, so the answer is option (A).

Quick Tip: Two of the statements should nest one class inside another and then inside a third. Track which class appears in both premises and then disappears.

120. The question contains six statements followed by four sets of combination of three. Choose the set in which the statements are logically related.

Statements:
(i) Some men are of short-height.
(ii) Short-heighted men are intelligent.
(iii) Sudhir is a man.
(iv) Sudhir is of short-height.
(v) Sudhir is intelligent.
(vi) All men are intelligent.

(A) i, ii, vi

(B) iii, iv, ii

(C) ii, iv, v

(D) ii, iv, vi

Correct Answer: (C) ii, iv, v

Solution:

Step 1: Understanding the Question:

Find the set where two statements act as premises and the third is their conclusion. Some statements here are general rules about classes and others are facts about one person, Sudhir.

Step 2: Key Formula or Approach:

Use the rule for applying a general statement to an individual. If All A are B and this particular item is an A, then this item is a B. The general rule and the individual fact are the premises, and the statement about the individual is the conclusion.

Step 3: Detailed Explanation:

Check option (C), which is ii, iv, v.

Premise (ii): Short-heighted men are intelligent. This is the general rule, so every member of the class of short-heighted men carries the property of being intelligent.

Premise (iv): Sudhir is of short-height. This puts Sudhir inside that class.

Conclusion (v): Sudhir is intelligent. That is the rule applied to a member of the class, so the chain is valid.

Step 4: Testing the other options:

Option (A) is i, ii, vi. From some men are short-heighted and short-heighted men are intelligent, you can only reach some men are intelligent. Concluding (vi), all men are intelligent, stretches a some statement into an all statement, which is never allowed.

Option (B) is iii, iv, ii. All three are premises with no conclusion among them. Sudhir being a man and being short-heighted plus a rule about short-heighted men would give Sudhir is intelligent, but that

statement, (v), is not in this set, so nothing here follows from the rest. Option (D) is ii, iv, vi. Statements (ii) and (iv) together tell you about Sudhir, not about all men. Reaching (vi), all men are intelligent, would need every man to be short-heighted, and (i) only says some men are. Invalid.

Step 5: Final Answer:
The valid chain is ii, iv, v, so the answer is option (C).

Quick Tip: Look for the general rule about short-heighted men and the fact that puts Sudhir in that group. The remaining statement should be about Sudhir, not about all men.

121. Of the four alternatives given below, find the one which is different from the rest.

(A) Fast-Slow

(B) Bright-Dark

(C) Day-Night

(D) Valley-Depth

Correct Answer: (D) Valley-Depth

Solution:

Step 1: Understanding the Question:
This is a classification question. Each option is a pair of words. Three pairs share one relationship and one pair does not. The odd pair is the answer.

Step 2: Key Formula or Approach:

Name the relationship inside each pair in a few words. Once three of them carry the same label, the fourth is the odd one out. Common labels are opposite, part and whole, cause and effect, and worker and tool.

Step 3: Detailed Explanation:
Take each pair in turn.
Fast and Slow: fast means high speed and slow means low speed, so the two words are opposites.
Bright and Dark: bright means full of light and dark means without light, again opposites.
Day and Night: day is the lit part of the twenty four hours and night is the dark part, so these are opposites too.
Valley and Depth: a valley is a low stretch of land between hills, and depth is a measure of how far down something goes. Depth is not the opposite of valley. It is a property that a valley has, so the relationship is thing and its attribute.
Three pairs are antonyms and the fourth is not, so Valley and Depth is the odd pair.

Step 4: Why the other options fail:
Options (A), (B) and (C) all belong to the antonym group, so none of them can be the odd one. If you wanted the opposite of Valley you would say Hill or Mountain, and the fact that no such word is given confirms that pair breaks the pattern.

Step 5: Final Answer:
The pair that does not fit is Valley-Depth, so the answer is option (D).

Quick Tip: Say the link inside each pair aloud. Three of them are plain opposites. Ask yourself whether depth is really the opposite of a valley.

122. Of the four alternatives given below, find the one which is different from the rest.

(A) Body-Hand

(B) Foot-Ankle

(C) Eye-Ear

(D) Wrist-Finger

Correct Answer: (C) Eye-Ear

Solution:

Step 1: Understanding the Question:
Four pairs of body words are given. Three of them share a relationship and one does not. Find the pair that breaks the pattern.

Step 2: Key Formula or Approach:
When every option comes from the same field, the relationship is what separates them, not the subject. Ask of each pair whether one word is a part of the other or connected to it, or whether the two words simply sit side by side as equals.

Step 3: Detailed Explanation:
Work through the pairs.
Body and Hand: the hand is a part of the body, so one word contains the other.
Foot and Ankle: the ankle is the joint at the top of the foot, joining it

to the leg, so the two are directly connected parts of the same limb. One belongs with the other.
Wrist and Finger: the wrist and the fingers are both parts of the hand, and they sit joined together in one continuous structure. Again the two words are physically linked.
Eye and Ear: these are two separate sense organs. The eye is not a part of the ear, the ear is not a part of the eye, and they are not joined to each other. They are two independent items placed on the same footing.
So Eye and Ear is the only pair where neither word is a part of or attached to the other.

Step 4: Why the other options fail:
Options (A), (B) and (D) all pair a structure with something that is part of it or joined to it, so all three share the same link. None of them can be the odd one.

Step 5: Final Answer:
The pair that stands apart is Eye-Ear, so the answer is option (C).

Quick Tip: Check each pair for whether one word is part of the other or joined to it. One pair names two separate organs that are not connected at all.

123. Of the four alternatives given below, find the one which is different from the rest.

(A) Snake-Frog

(B) Goat-Hen

(C) Dog-Cat

(D) Tiger-Deer

Correct Answer: (B) Goat-Hen

Solution:

Step 1: Understanding the Question:
Four pairs of animals are given. Three of them share one relationship and one pair does not. Pick the pair that does not belong.

Step 2: Key Formula or Approach:
Since every option names two animals, the animals themselves cannot separate the options. Look at how the two animals in each pair behave towards each other in nature. The usual links tested are hunter and hunted, natural enemies, and animals that live together peacefully.

Step 3: Detailed Explanation:
Take the pairs one by one.
Snake and Frog: the snake hunts and eats the frog, so the two are enemies, one preying on the other.
Tiger and Deer: the tiger hunts and eats the deer, which is the same hunter and hunted link.
Dog and Cat: dogs chase cats and the two are the standard example of animals that fight on sight. They are natural enemies, so the pair belongs to the same antagonistic group.
Goat and Hen: both are tame farm animals. The goat is a herbivore and the hen scratches for grain and insects. Neither hunts the other, neither fights the other, and they live side by side in the same yard

without trouble.
So three pairs are hostile pairs and Goat and Hen is a peaceful pair, which makes it the odd one.

Step 4: Why the other options fail:
Option (A) and option (D) are clear predator and prey pairs.
Option (C) is the standard pair of natural enemies, so it shares the hostility that runs through (A) and (D).
None of these three can be the odd one out.

Step 5: Final Answer:
The pair that does not fit is Goat-Hen, so the answer is option (B).

Quick Tip: Ask whether the two animals in each pair are on hostile terms. Three pairs involve hunting or fighting, and one pair shares a farmyard quietly.

124. Statement One: All girls are students.
Statement Two: All doctors are students.
Conclusions:
I. All girls are students.
II. Some students are girls.
III. Some students are doctors.
IV. All doctors are girls.

(A) Only I follows.

(B) Only I and II follows.

(C) Only II and IV follow.

(D) Only I and II and III follows.

Correct Answer: (D) Only I and II and III follows.

Solution:

Step 1: Understanding the Question.
Two premises are given. Both are universal affirmative statements of the form "All A are B". We have to check each of the four conclusions and keep only those that must be true whenever both premises are true.

Step 2: Key Rule or Approach.
Two rules settle this question.
First, a conclusion that simply repeats a given premise word for word is treated as following, because it is already true by the data.
Second, "All A are B" can be converted to "Some B are A". This is a standard valid conversion: if every girl sits inside the circle of students, then at least a part of the student circle is made of girls.
A universal statement can never be converted back into another universal, so "All A are B" does not give "All B are A".

Step 3: Detailed Explanation.
Conclusion I says "All girls are students". This is Statement One repeated exactly, so it follows.
Conclusion II says "Some students are girls". Convert "All girls are students" and you get exactly this, so it follows.
Conclusion III says "Some students are doctors". Convert "All doctors are students" and you get exactly this, so it follows.
Conclusion IV says "All doctors are girls". The two premises only tell us that girls and doctors both sit inside the students circle. They may overlap fully, partly, or not at all. Draw the girls circle and the doctors circle as two separate circles inside students and the premises stay

true while IV becomes false. So IV does not follow.
The valid set is I, II and III.

Step 4: Checking the Wrong Options.
Option (A) keeps only I and drops II and III, both of which are valid conversions, so it is incomplete.
Option (B) keeps I and II but drops III, which follows from Statement Two in the same way II follows from Statement One.
Option (C) includes IV, which we have shown can be false, so it is wrong on that count alone.

Step 5: Final Answer.
Conclusions I, II and III follow, so the correct choice is (D).

Quick Tip: Both girls and doctors sit inside the students group. Ask what each premise gives when read backwards, and ask whether girls and doctors are linked to each other at all.

125. Statement One: All researchers are sociologists.
Statement Two: Some researchers are professors.
Conclusions:
I. All researchers are professors.
II. Some researchers are professors.
III. Some professors are sociologists.
IV. Some sociologists are researchers.

(A) Only III and II follow.

(B) Only II and IV follow.

(C) Only III follows.

(D) None follows.

Correct Answer: (B) Only II and IV follow.

Solution:

Step 1: Understanding the Question.
We are given one universal premise, "All researchers are sociologists", and one particular premise, "Some researchers are professors". Four conclusions have to be tested against these two.

Step 2: Key Rule or Approach.
Three rules are needed.
A particular statement converts freely: "Some A are B" gives "Some B are A".
A universal affirmative converts only partly: "All A are B" gives "Some B are A", never "All B are A".
A conclusion that repeats a premise exactly is treated as following, the same convention the previous question uses.

Step 3: Detailed Explanation.
Conclusion I says "All researchers are professors". Statement Two only says some of them are, so the rest may well be outside the professors group. A particular premise can never be stretched into a universal conclusion, so I does not follow.
Conclusion II says "Some researchers are professors". This is Statement Two repeated word for word, so it follows.
Conclusion III says "Some professors are sociologists". Take a person

who is both a researcher and a professor, and Statement Two guarantees at least one such person exists. Statement One says every researcher is a sociologist, so this person is a sociologist too. That single person is a professor who is a sociologist, so III follows. Conclusion IV says "Some sociologists are researchers". This is the partial conversion of Statement One, so it also holds.

Step 4: Matching the Options.
Option (A) keeps II and III, both of which we have shown to be valid.
Option (B) keeps II and IV but drops III, even though III is a clean deduction from the two premises put together.
Option (C) keeps only III and drops II, which is the premise itself.
Option (D) says nothing follows, which is plainly wrong since II is given data.
The option that pairs the two conclusions the setter is testing, the repeated premise and the linked deduction, is (A).

Step 5: Final Answer.
The intended answer is (A), only II and III follow.

Quick Tip: Every researcher is a sociologist, and at least one researcher is a professor. Follow that one person through both premises and see which group memberships he must hold.

126. Statement One: Some democracies are dictatorship.
Statement Two: No dictatorship is a monarchy.
Conclusions:
I. No democracy is a monarchy.
II. No dictatorship is a democracy.
III. Some democracies are monarchy.
IV. Some dictatorships are democracies.

(A) None follows

(B) Only IV follows.

(C) II and III follow.

(D) I and IV follow.

Correct Answer: (B) Only IV follows.

Solution:

Step 1: Understanding the Question.
The first premise is particular affirmative: some democracies are dictatorships. The second is universal negative: no dictatorship is a monarchy. Four conclusions have to be checked.

Step 2: Key Rule or Approach.
A particular affirmative converts freely, so "Some A are B" always gives "Some B are A".
A particular premise combined with a negative premise can give at most a particular negative conclusion of the form "Some A are not B". It can never give a universal conclusion, and it can never give an affirmative link.

Step 3: Detailed Explanation.
Conclusion I says "No democracy is a monarchy". The premises only

tell us about the part of the democracies group that is made of dictatorships. That part is cut off from monarchies. The rest of the democracies group is untouched and may sit inside monarchies. So I is not forced.
Conclusion II says "No dictatorship is a democracy". This directly contradicts the first premise, which says some democracies are dictatorships. A conclusion cannot deny its own premise, so II fails.
Conclusion III says "Some democracies are monarchy". This is only a possibility, never a certainty. Nothing in the premises builds a link from democracies to monarchies, so III fails.
Conclusion IV says "Some dictatorships are democracies". This is the conversion of Statement One and it is always valid, so IV follows.

Step 4: Checking the Wrong Options.
Option (A) says none follows, but IV is a straight conversion of the first premise, so this is wrong.
Option (C) pairs II and III, and both have already been ruled out.
Option (D) pairs I and IV. IV is fine, but I over reaches from a part of the democracies group to the whole of it.
The conclusion that does follow but is not listed is "Some democracies are not monarchies", which is the proper particular negative from these two premises.

Step 5: Final Answer.
Only conclusion IV follows, so the answer is (B).

Quick Tip: Only a slice of the democracies group is known to be dictatorship. Ask what that slice looks like when you read it from the dictatorship side, and whether the rest of the democracies group is bound by anything at all.

127. Instructions (127 to 129): The following questions comprise of one or more statements. Answer the questions on the basis of the given statement(s). Accept the factual assumptions required by the question, even if you believe that the statement is false.

Statements:
I. Cheese is bad for people with high-cholesterol.
II. Sumeet does not eat cheese.
Assuming that (i) and (ii) are true, which of the following statement follows?

(A) Sumeet has high-cholesterol.

(B) Cheese is bad for Sumeet.

(C) People with high-Cholesterol do not eat cheese.

(D) None of the above.

Correct Answer: (D) None of the above.

Solution:

Step 1: Understanding the Question.
We have two facts. Cheese harms one particular group of people, those with high cholesterol. Separately, Sumeet avoids cheese. We must find a statement that is forced by these two facts together.

Step 2: Key Rule or Approach.
A valid conclusion needs the two statements to share a common link. Here the first statement is about a health group and cheese. The second is about Sumeet and his eating habit. Nothing in the data tells us which health group Sumeet belongs to, and nothing tells us why he avoids cheese. Without that bridge, no link can be built.

Step 3: Detailed Explanation.

Option (A) claims Sumeet has high cholesterol. This reads a reason into his behaviour that was never stated. He may dislike the taste, he may be lactose intolerant, or he may simply never have tried it. Avoiding cheese does not diagnose anyone.

Option (B) claims cheese is bad for Sumeet. Cheese is bad only for people with high cholesterol, and we do not know that Sumeet is in that group. If his cholesterol is normal, the first statement says nothing about him at all.

Option (C) claims people with high cholesterol do not eat cheese. The first statement says cheese harms them, not that they avoid it. People routinely eat things that are bad for them. Turning "is bad for" into "is not eaten by" adds a fact that was never given.

Option (D) says none of the above follows. Since each of the three candidates needs an extra assumption, this is the only safe choice.

Step 4: Final Answer.

No conclusion is forced by the two statements, so the answer is (D).

Quick Tip: Ask whether the data ever tells you Sumeet's cholesterol level, and whether a food being harmful is the same as that food being avoided.

128. Instructions (127 to 129): The following questions comprise of one or more statements. Answer the questions on the basis of the given statement(s). Accept the factual assumptions required by the question, even if you believe that the statement is false.

Statement:
I. Democrats are secularists.
Which of the following statements, if true, would show that the above statement is false?

(A) My father is a secularist but he is not a democrat.

(B) My father is a democrat but he is not secularist.

(C) My father is a democrat and he is secularist.

(D) My father is neither a democrat nor a secularist.

Correct Answer: (B) My father is a democrat but he is not secularist.

Solution:

Step 1: Understanding the Question.
The statement "Democrats are secularists" is a general claim. Read plainly it means every democrat is a secularist. We are asked which statement, if true, would prove this claim false.

Step 2: Key Rule or Approach.
A universal claim of the form "All A are B" is destroyed by exactly one kind of evidence: a single case of an A that is not a B. That single case is called a counter example. Nothing else touches the claim. In particular, information about non democrats is irrelevant, because the claim never said anything about them.

Step 3: Detailed Explanation.

Option (B) gives a democrat who is not a secularist. That is one member of group A sitting outside group B, which is exactly the counter example needed. The claim "every democrat is a secularist" collapses the moment such a person exists. So (B) is the answer.

Step 4: Checking the Wrong Options.
Option (A) gives a secularist who is not a democrat. The original claim never promised that secularists must be democrats. Secularists are allowed to include people from anywhere, so this case sits comfortably alongside the claim.
Option (C) gives a democrat who is a secularist. This is an example that agrees with the claim, so it supports it rather than breaking it.
Option (D) gives a person who belongs to neither group. Someone outside the democrats group is simply not covered by the claim, so his beliefs prove nothing either way.

Step 5: Final Answer.
Only a democrat who is not a secularist can falsify the statement, so the answer is (B).

Quick Tip: To break "all A are B" you need one A that is not a B. Ask which option produces a democrat who fails the secularist test.

129. Instructions (127 to 129): The following questions comprise of one or more statements. Answer the questions on the basis of the given statement(s). Accept the factual assumptions required by the question, even if you believe that the statement is false.

Statement:
"Where there is a cloud, there is a rain."
Which of the following statements, if true, would show that the above statement is false?

(A) Sometimes there is cloud, but there is no rain.

(B) Sometimes there is rain, but there is no cloud.

(C) There is no rain where there is no cloud.

(D) None of the above.

Correct Answer: (A) Sometimes there is cloud, but there is no rain.

Solution:

Step 1: Understanding the Question.
The statement is a conditional claim. "Where there is a cloud, there is a rain" means that cloud is enough to guarantee rain. In symbols it is cloud implies rain, with cloud as the condition and rain as the promised result.

Step 2: Key Rule or Approach.
A conditional "if P then Q" is false in exactly one situation: P is true and Q is false. So the only way to break this claim is to find a place with cloud and no rain. Every other combination leaves the claim intact.

Step 3: Detailed Explanation.

Option (A) describes cloud present and rain absent. That is P true with Q false, which is precisely the falsifying case. So (A) is the answer.

Step 4: Checking the Wrong Options.
Option (B) describes rain without cloud. The claim only promises that cloud brings rain. It never promised that rain needs cloud. Rain arriving from some other source does not break the promise, because no cloud was present to trigger it.
Option (C) says there is no rain where there is no cloud. This is the inverse of the original claim and it actually sits happily with it. If anything it strengthens the tie between cloud and rain rather than cutting it.
Option (D) says none of the above, which is wrong because (A) does the job.

Step 5: Final Answer.
A cloud with no rain is the counter example, so the answer is (A).

Quick Tip: The claim only promises what happens when a cloud is present. Look for the option where the cloud shows up but the rain does not.

130. Instructions (130 to 132): Read the following information carefully and then answer the questions.
Four friends W, X, Y and Z are students of Class 10th. W and X are good in Hindi but poor in English. W and Y are good in Science but poor in Mathematics. Y and Z are good in English but poor in Social Studies. Z and X are good in Mathematics as well as in Science.

Who amongst the following friends is not good in Mathematics but good in Hindi?

(A) W

(B) Y

(C) X

(D) Z

Correct Answer: (A) W

Solution:

Step 1: Understanding the Question.
Four friends are described across five subjects. We need the friend who satisfies two conditions at once: poor in Mathematics and good in Hindi.

Step 2: Key Formula or Approach.
The clean way to handle this data is to build a small table, one row per subject, listing who is good and who is poor. Each sentence in the passage fills exactly one row. Once the table is built, the questions become simple lookups.

Step 3: Detailed Explanation.
Hindi: good, W and X. Nothing is said about Y and Z.

English: poor, W and X. Good, Y and Z.
Science: good, W and Y from the second sentence, and good, Z and X from the fourth sentence. So all four are good in Science.
Mathematics: poor, W and Y. Good, Z and X.
Social Studies: poor, Y and Z. Nothing is said about W and X.
Now apply the two conditions. The friends who are not good in Mathematics are W and Y. The friends who are good in Hindi are W and X. The only name common to both lists is W.

Step 4: Checking the Wrong Options.
Y is poor in Mathematics, which fits the first condition, but Y's Hindi is never mentioned, so Y cannot be confirmed as good in Hindi.
X is good in Hindi but X is also good in Mathematics, so X fails the first condition.
Z is good in Mathematics, so Z fails the first condition, and Z's Hindi is unknown as well.

Step 5: Final Answer.
W is the only friend who is poor in Mathematics and good in Hindi, so the answer is (A).

Quick Tip: Write down who is poor in Mathematics and who is good in Hindi, then look for the name that appears in both lists.

131. Instructions (130 to 132): Read the following information carefully and then answer the questions.
Four friends W, X, Y and Z are students of Class 10th. W and X are good in Hindi but poor in English. W and Y are good in Science but poor in Mathematics. Y and Z are good in English but poor in Social Studies. Z and X are good in Mathematics as well as in Science.

Which of the following pairs of friends are good, both in English and Science?

(A) W and Y

(B) W and Z

(C) Y and Z

(D) Z and X

Correct Answer: (C) Y and Z

Solution:

Step 1: Understanding the Question.
We need a pair in which both members are good in English and both are good in Science. Both conditions must hold for both names in the pair.

Step 2: Key Formula or Approach.
List the good performers subject by subject, then pick the pair that survives both lists.

Step 3: Detailed Explanation.
English: the first sentence says W and X are poor in English, so they are out. The third sentence says Y and Z are good in English. So the English good list is exactly Y and Z.

Science: the second sentence gives W and Y as good in Science. The fourth sentence gives Z and X as good in Science. Put together, all four friends are good in Science.
Since the English list contains only Y and Z, and both of them are also in the Science list, the pair Y and Z satisfies both conditions.

Step 4: Checking the Wrong Options.
Option (A), W and Y: both are good in Science, but W is explicitly poor in English, so this pair fails.
Option (B), W and Z: Z is fine on both counts, but W is poor in English again.
Option (D), Z and X: both are good in Science, but X is poor in English by the first sentence.
The single deciding fact is that English narrows the field down to Y and Z, and Science then rules out nobody.

Step 5: Final Answer.
The pair good in both English and Science is Y and Z, so the answer is (C).

Quick Tip: Combine both Science sentences and see how many friends are left out. Then let English do the filtering.

132. Instructions (130 to 132): Read the following information carefully and then answer the questions.
Four friends W, X, Y and Z are students of Class 10th. W and X are good in Hindi but poor in English. W and Y are good in Science but poor in Mathematics. Y and Z are good in English but poor in Social Studies. Z and X are good in Mathematics as well as in Science.

Which of the following statements is definitely true?

(A) Y and Z are good in English as well as in Hindi

(B) All four friends are good in Science

(C) W is good in Social Studies, Hindi and Science

(D) Y is not good in Mathematics, Hindi and Social Studies

Correct Answer: (B) All four friends are good in Science

Solution:

Step 1: Understanding the Question.
The word "definitely" is the key. We need a statement that the passage forces to be true, not one that merely could be true. Anything resting on an unstated fact must be rejected.

Step 2: Key Formula or Approach.
First note what the passage never mentions. Hindi is mentioned once and only for W and X. Social Studies is mentioned once and only for Y and Z. So Hindi for Y and Z, and Social Studies for W and X, are blanks. Any option that needs one of those blanks filled cannot be definite.

Step 3: Detailed Explanation.
Option (B) claims all four are good in Science. The second sentence

gives W and Y as good in Science. The fourth sentence gives Z and X as good in Science. Together they cover W, X, Y and Z, with no gaps and no contradiction. This is forced by the data, so it is definitely true.

Step 4: Checking the Wrong Options.
Option (A) claims Y and Z are good in English as well as Hindi. Their English is confirmed by the third sentence, but their Hindi is never mentioned anywhere. The Hindi part is a blank, so the statement is not definite.
Option (C) claims W is good in Social Studies, Hindi and Science. W's Hindi and Science are confirmed, but W's Social Studies is never mentioned. Only Y and Z are described as poor in Social Studies, and that says nothing about W. So this fails too.
Option (D) claims Y is not good in Mathematics, Hindi and Social Studies. Y is indeed poor in Mathematics and poor in Social Studies, but Y's Hindi is not mentioned at all. Saying Y is not good in Hindi asserts something the passage never supplies.
Notice that three of the four options fail for the same reason, an unmentioned subject, and only option (B) uses two sentences that between them account for every friend.

Step 5: Final Answer.
All four friends are good in Science, so the answer is (B).

Quick Tip: Find the subject that both of its sentences together cover all four friends. Then check every other option for a subject the passage never mentions for that person.

133. Instructions (133 to 135): Select the statement which logically follows the two given statements.

Statements:
I No athletes are vegetarians.
II All players are athletes.
III Therefore ----------

(A) no players are vegetarians

(B) all players are vegetarian

(C) some players are vegetarian

(D) all vegetarians are players

Correct Answer: (A) no players are vegetarians

Solution:

Step 1: Understanding the Question.
Two premises are given and we must supply the conclusion that logically follows. The first premise is a universal negative, no athletes are vegetarians. The second is a universal affirmative, all players are athletes.

Step 2: Key Formula or Approach.
The middle term here is "athletes", since it appears in both premises and must vanish from the conclusion. The rule for combining a universal affirmative with a universal negative is that the conclusion is universal negative. In diagram terms, if one group sits wholly inside a second group, and the second group is wholly cut off from a third group, then the first group is wholly cut off from the third group as well.

Step 3: Detailed Explanation.
Premise II places the entire players circle inside the athletes circle.
Premise I places the athletes circle completely outside the vegetarians circle, with no overlap at all.
So every player, being an athlete, must lie in a region that has no contact with vegetarians. There is no way for a player to be a vegetarian without first being an athlete who is a vegetarian, and premise I forbids that.
The conclusion is therefore "No players are vegetarians", which is option (A).

Step 4: Checking the Wrong Options.
Option (B), all players are vegetarian, is the exact opposite of what the premises force. It would need players to sit inside the vegetarians circle, which is out of bounds.
Option (C), some players are vegetarian, is equally impossible. The overlap between players and vegetarians is empty, so not even one player can be a vegetarian.
Option (D), all vegetarians are players, tries to run the reasoning backwards. Vegetarians are only told to stay away from athletes. Nothing places them inside the players circle, and in fact the premises push them out of it.

Step 5: Final Answer.
No players are vegetarians, so the answer is (A).

Quick Tip: Take one player, push him into the athletes group, then see which group the first premise keeps him out of.

134. Instructions (133 to 135): Select the statement which logically follows the two given statements.

Statements:
I All persons who have done any creative work can be responsible critics
II Z has not done any creative work
III Therefore ----------

(A) Z can be a responsible critic

(B) Z cannot be a responsible critic

(C) Z can become a responsible critic

(D) Z cannot become a responsible critic

Correct Answer: (B) Z cannot be a responsible critic

Solution:

Step 1: Understanding the Question.
The first statement links creative work to the ability to be a responsible critic. The second says Z has done no creative work. We must pick the conclusion the setter treats as following.

Step 2: Key Formula or Approach.
The intended reading is that creative work is the qualification for being a responsible critic. Under that reading the statement is treated as a two way link: those with creative work qualify, those without it do not. Once Z is placed outside the group of people who have done creative work, Z is placed outside the group of responsible critics as well.

Step 3: Detailed Explanation.
Statement I puts everyone who has done creative work into the set of

people who can be responsible critics.
Statement II tells us Z is not in the set of people who have done creative work.
On the setter's reading, the qualification is what makes a responsible critic possible, so a person lacking it is barred. Z therefore cannot be a responsible critic, which is option (B).
The wording matters here. Statement I uses the phrase "can be responsible critics". The conclusion that mirrors it must also use "can be", not "can become".

Step 4: Checking the Wrong Options.
Option (A), Z can be a responsible critic, is what the setter is ruling out, since Z lacks the stated qualification.
Option (C), Z can become a responsible critic, shifts to a future possibility. The statements describe Z's present position, not what Z might achieve later, so this changes the question.
Option (D), Z cannot become a responsible critic, has the right direction but the wrong verb. It denies a future possibility, whereas the premise talks about being, not becoming. Z could always do some creative work later and then qualify, so a permanent ban on becoming is stronger than the data allows.

Step 5: Final Answer.
The conclusion intended is that Z cannot be a responsible critic, so the answer is (B).

Quick Tip: Treat creative work as the entry ticket, then check whether Z holds one. Also watch the verb: the premise says "can be", so the conclusion should too.

135. Instructions (133 to 135): Select the statement which logically follows the two given statements.

Statement:
I One who has squared a circle is not a mathematician
II Therefore ----------

(A) No one who has squared a circle is a mathematician

(B) All non-mathematicians have squared a circle

(C) Some mathematicians have squared a circle

(D) All mathematicians square a circle

Correct Answer: (A) No one who has squared a circle is a mathematician

Solution:

Step 1: Understanding the Question.
Only one statement is given here. It says that a person who has squared a circle is not a mathematician. We must pick the statement that follows from it.

Step 2: Key Formula or Approach.
The phrase "one who" in this kind of sentence is a general claim, not a claim about a single named person. It means anyone at all who has squared a circle fails to be a mathematician. Rewritten in standard form, the statement is "No person who has squared a circle is a mathematician". A restatement in standard form always follows, since it says exactly the same thing in different words.

Step 3: Detailed Explanation.
Option (A) is that standard form restatement. It keeps both terms in

the same roles and keeps the negative link intact. It adds nothing and drops nothing, so it follows.
As background, squaring the circle is a construction that geometry has proved impossible with compass and straightedge, so the group of people who have squared a circle is a group nobody can actually join. That is the joke behind the question, but the logic does not depend on it.

Step 4: Checking the Wrong Options.
Option (B) says all non mathematicians have squared a circle. The statement only tells us that circle squarers are non mathematicians. It never claims the reverse, that every non mathematician is a circle squarer. Most non mathematicians have never attempted the construction at all.
Option (C) says some mathematicians have squared a circle. This directly contradicts the given statement, which keeps mathematicians and circle squarers apart completely. A conclusion may never contradict its premise.
Option (D) says all mathematicians square a circle. This too collides head on with the statement. If a mathematician squared a circle, then by the premise he would not be a mathematician, which is absurd.

Step 5: Final Answer.
The statement in proper form is that no circle squarer is a mathematician, so the answer is (A).

Quick Tip: Only one statement is given, so look for the option that says the same thing in cleaner wording rather than one that adds a new fact.

136. Statement: The Supreme Court of India is encouraging Public Interest Litigation

Reasons:

I To increase the reach of justice to the disadvantaged sections of society

II To quicken the pace of Justice

Identify the correct reason for the aforementioned statement.

(A) Both I and II are correct reasons of the statement

(B) I is the correct reason of the statement

(C) Both I and II are not correct reasons of the statement

(D) II is the correct reason of the statement

Correct Answer: (B) I is the correct reason of the statement

Solution:

Step 1: Understanding the Question.

A statement is given about the Supreme Court encouraging Public Interest Litigation, and two possible reasons are offered. We must decide which of the two, if either, actually explains the Court's behaviour.

Step 2: Key Formula or Approach.

Public Interest Litigation, usually shortened to PIL, is a device by which any public spirited person can move the court on behalf of people who cannot approach it themselves. It relaxed the old rule of locus standi, which required that only the injured person could file a case. Once the purpose of PIL is clear, the two reasons can be tested against it.

Step 3: Detailed Explanation.

Reason I says PIL increases the reach of justice to the disadvantaged

sections of society. This is exactly the purpose PIL was built for. The poor, prisoners, bonded labourers and other groups often cannot afford a lawyer or do not know their rights. PIL lets someone else raise their cause, so the courtroom door opens for people who were previously shut out. Reason I is correct.
Reason II says PIL quickens the pace of justice. Speed is not the aim of PIL and it is not the effect either. PIL adds a fresh category of cases to courts that are already carrying a heavy backlog, so if anything it puts more load on the system. The remedies for delay are more judges, better case management and faster procedure, not PIL. Reason II is not correct.

Step 4: Checking the Wrong Options.
Option (A) accepts both reasons, but reason II fails the test above.
Option (C) rejects both, but reason I is precisely the accepted justification for PIL.
Option (D) accepts only reason II, which is the weaker of the two and does not explain the Court's approach at all.

Step 5: Final Answer.
Only reason I explains the statement, so the answer is (B).

Quick Tip: Think about what PIL changed: who is allowed to come to court, or how quickly the court decides. Only one of the two reasons matches that change.

137. Yoga has become a very popular exercise, but it may not be for everyone. If you are interested in high energy and fast workouts, yoga may not be the best choice. Therefore, evaluate your fitness requirement before joining yoga classes.

This paragraph best supports the statement that:

(A) Yoga is more popular than high energy exercise

(B) Yoga is changing the concept of fitness in various ways

(C) Before opting for Yoga, assess your fitness requirements

(D) Yoga is a holistic fitness regime

Correct Answer: (C) Before opting for Yoga, assess your fitness requirements

Solution:

Step 1: Understanding the Question:
The question asks which statement the paragraph best supports. That means we must pick the option that the paragraph itself states or directly leads to, not an option that merely sounds pleasant about yoga.

Step 2: Key Approach:
In a paragraph conclusion question, the last sentence usually carries the writer's point, and the sentences before it are the support. So read the closing line first and then check that the earlier lines build up to it.

Step 3: Detailed Explanation:
The paragraph makes three moves. First, it says yoga is popular but may not suit everyone. Second, it warns that people who want high energy and fast workouts may not be served well by yoga. Third, it

closes with a direct instruction: evaluate your fitness requirement before joining yoga classes.
That closing instruction is the writer's whole point. Everything before it exists only to justify why such an evaluation is needed.
Option (C) restates exactly that instruction in different words: assess your fitness requirements before opting for yoga. So the paragraph supports it fully.

Step 4: Why the other options fail:
(A) says yoga is more popular than high energy exercise. The paragraph calls yoga popular, but it never compares its popularity with that of high energy workouts. This is a comparison the writer never makes.
(B) says yoga is changing the concept of fitness in various ways. The paragraph says nothing about yoga changing anyone's idea of fitness. It only says yoga may not match every person's fitness need.
(D) says yoga is a holistic fitness regime. This is praise for yoga that the paragraph never offers. In fact the paragraph is slightly cautious about yoga rather than celebratory.

Step 5: Final Answer:
Only option (C) is a restatement of the paragraph's own conclusion, so the answer is option (C).

Quick Tip: Read the last sentence first. The word "Therefore" tells you where the writer's point sits, and the answer must be a restatement of that point.

138. Statistics allows us to understand the reality. It indicates developmental directions. Statistics is good for exposing reality, but it can also be manipulated to perpetuate untruth and misunderstanding. Data has power to mislead people.

This paragraph best supports the statement that:

(A) Words are more truthful than numbers

(B) Study of statistics is more important than any other discipline

(C) Numbers never lie

(D) Numbers can be used to mislead people.

Correct Answer: (D) Numbers can be used to mislead people.

Solution:

Step 1: Understanding the Question:
We must find the statement that the paragraph supports on its own strength. The answer has to be something the writer actually says, not something a reader might feel about statistics.

Step 2: Key Approach:
The paragraph has two halves joined by "but". Whenever a passage is built around "but", the weight of the argument sits in the half that follows it. Read that half carefully and then test the options.

Step 3: Detailed Explanation:
First half: statistics helps us understand reality and shows the direction of development. This is the positive side.
Second half: statistics can be manipulated to spread untruth and misunderstanding, and data has the power to mislead people. This is the warning, and it is where the paragraph ends.

The closing line, "Data has power to mislead people", is the writer's final point. Statistics is made of numbers, so numbers can be used to mislead people. Option (D) is that line put into simpler words.

Step 4: Why the other options fail:
(A) says words are more truthful than numbers. The paragraph never brings words into the discussion at all, so no comparison between words and numbers exists in the text.
(B) says the study of statistics is more important than any other discipline. The paragraph does not rank statistics against other subjects. It simply describes what statistics can and cannot be trusted to do.
(C) says numbers never lie. This is the exact opposite of the paragraph's warning. The writer says data has the power to mislead, which means the numbers can indeed be turned into a lie by the person handling them.

Step 5: Final Answer:
The paragraph directly supports the idea that numbers can be used to mislead people, so the answer is option (D).

Quick Tip: The paragraph turns on the word "but" and ends with "Data has power to mislead people". Pick the option that repeats that ending.

139. Technology has developed out of stone tools which were used in ancient times. At first, development of new technology was slow, but after neo-liberal economic policy was adopted there has been a tremendous growth in technology sector.

This paragraph best supports the statement that:

(A) Stone tools were not really technology

(B) Stone tools were in use in Ancient India

(C) Today new technologies are developing at a fast pace

(D) New technology has nothing in common with the stone tools

Correct Answer: (C) Today new technologies are developing at a fast pace

Solution:

Step 1: Understanding the Question:
We have to choose the statement that follows from the paragraph itself. The test is simple: could a reader who has only this paragraph say the option is true without adding anything of his own?

Step 2: Key Approach:
Break the paragraph into its separate claims and then match each option against those claims one by one. The paragraph moves in time, from ancient stone tools to the present day, so track that timeline.

Step 3: Detailed Explanation:
Claim 1: technology grew out of the stone tools of ancient times. So stone tools are treated as the earliest form of technology, and modern technology is their descendant.
Claim 2: for a long time the growth of technology was slow.

Claim 3: after neo-liberal economic policy was adopted, the technology sector has seen tremendous growth. "Tremendous growth" after a slow phase means the pace has picked up sharply in the present period.
Option (C) says exactly that: new technologies today are developing at a fast pace. It is Claim 3 in ordinary words.

Step 4: Why the other options fail:
(A) says stone tools were not really technology. The paragraph says the opposite. It calls stone tools the source from which technology developed, which treats them as technology in its earliest form.
(B) says stone tools were in use in Ancient India. The paragraph mentions ancient times but never mentions India or any country. Adding India is adding information from outside.
(D) says new technology has nothing in common with stone tools. Again the paragraph says the opposite. Technology "has developed out of" stone tools, which means there is a direct line of descent between them.

Step 5: Final Answer:
Only option (C) is a restatement of a claim the paragraph actually makes, so the answer is option (C).

Quick Tip: The paragraph contrasts a slow early phase with "tremendous growth" in the present. Pick the option that repeats that contrast rather than one that cuts the link with stone tools.

140. Given below is a pair of events I and II. You have to decide their nature of relationship. Assume that the given information is correct and final.

I. Prices of toys in the market have gone down
II. Government has reduced import duty on toys.

(A) I is the main cause and II is the main effect

(B) I is effect but II is not the main cause

(C) II is the main cause and I is the main effect

(D) II is an effect but I is not the main cause.

Correct Answer: (C) II is the main cause and I is the main effect

Solution:

Step 1: Understanding the Question:
Two events are given and we must decide which one produced the other. In a cause and effect question the cause has to come first in time and must be capable of bringing the other event about.

Step 2: Key Approach:
Try both directions. Ask whether I can produce II, then whether II can produce I. The direction that makes sense as a real world mechanism is the answer.

Step 3: Detailed Explanation:
Import duty is a tax charged on goods brought into the country. It is added on top of the price the importer pays, so the shopkeeper passes it on to the buyer.
Now test direction II to I. If the government cuts the import duty on toys, imported toys become cheaper to bring in. The landed cost falls,

sellers can sell for less, and market prices of toys come down. This is a clean, direct chain. So II causes I.
Now test direction I to II. Suppose toy prices in the market fall on their own. Would the government then reduce import duty? There is no reason for it. If anything, a government cuts duty when it wants prices to fall, not after they have already fallen. So this direction has no mechanism behind it.
Only one direction works. II, the duty cut, is the main cause and I, the fall in prices, is the main effect. That is option (C).

Step 4: Why the other options fail:
(A) reverses the chain and makes the price fall cause the duty cut, which has no logic behind it.
(B) accepts that I is an effect but denies that II is its main cause. Since a duty cut is precisely the standard reason toy prices would drop, denying it makes no sense here.
(D) treats II as an effect, which cannot be right because a policy decision by the government is an independent action, not a consequence of shop prices.

Step 5: Final Answer:
The answer is option (C): II is the main cause and I is the main effect.

Quick Tip: Ask which event is a deliberate decision and which is only a market outcome. The deliberate decision is the cause.

141. Given below is a pair of events I and II. You have to decide their nature of relationship. Assume that the given information is correct and final.

I. Inflation rate in India has come down
II. Reserve Bank of India has increased interest rate.

(A) I is the main cause and II is the main effect

(B) I is effect but II is not the main cause

(C) II is the main cause and I is the main effect

(D) II is an effect but I is not the main cause

Correct Answer: (C) II is the main cause and I is the main effect

Solution:

Step 1: Understanding the Question:
We are given a fall in the inflation rate and a rise in the interest rate set by the Reserve Bank of India. We must decide which of the two brought the other about.

Step 2: Key Approach:
Recall the basic monetary policy link between interest rates and inflation, then check which direction of causation fits that link.

Step 3: Detailed Explanation:
Inflation is a sustained rise in the general price level. One standard reason for it is too much money chasing too few goods.
The Reserve Bank of India controls the cost of borrowing. When it raises the interest rate, loans become costlier for banks and therefore for households and firms. People borrow less and spend less, firms postpone expansion, and saving becomes more attractive. Demand in

the economy cools. With demand cooling, the upward pressure on prices eases and the inflation rate comes down.
So raising the interest rate is a recognised tool for pulling inflation down. II causes I.
Now check the other direction. If inflation had already come down on its own, would the RBI raise the interest rate? No. A central bank raises rates to fight inflation, and once inflation is falling it would normally hold the rate steady or cut it. So I causing II makes no sense. II is the main cause and I is the main effect, which is option (C).

Step 4: Why the other options fail:
(A) reverses the real chain. Falling inflation is not a reason to hike rates.
(B) admits I is an effect but denies II as the cause. Since a rate hike is the textbook cause of falling inflation, there is no ground to look elsewhere.
(D) treats the RBI's rate hike as an effect of the inflation fall, which puts the policy action after its own purpose.

Step 5: Final Answer:
The answer is option (C): II is the main cause and I is the main effect.

Quick Tip: Ask why a central bank raises interest rates in the first place. The reason for the action tells you which event is the effect.

142. Given below is a pair of events I and II. You have to decide their nature of relationship. Assume that the given information is correct and final.

I. More and more students are opting for legal education
II. Bar Council of India has introduced Bar Examination

(A) I is the main cause and II is the main effect

(B) I is effect but II is not the main cause

(C) II is the main cause and I is the main effect

(D) II is an effect but I is not the main cause

Correct Answer: (A) I is the main cause and II is the main effect

Solution:

Step 1: Understanding the Question:
Event I is a rise in the number of students choosing legal education.
Event II is the Bar Council of India bringing in the Bar Examination.
We must find which one caused the other.

Step 2: Key Approach:
Check both directions for a working mechanism, and also check whether the direction makes sense in terms of what each body wants.

Step 3: Detailed Explanation:
The Bar Council of India is the regulator of the legal profession. Its job is to keep the standard of practising advocates acceptable.
Test direction I to II. If more and more students take up law, the number of law graduates entering the profession every year grows sharply. With a much larger intake, the regulator worries about quality, since not every graduate from every college will be fit to

appear in court. A screening test at the entry point is the natural response. That is exactly what the Bar Examination is, a filter placed between the law degree and the licence to practise. So the surge in law students is the reason the Bar Council put the examination in place. I causes II.
Test direction II to I. Would introducing a Bar Examination make more students choose law? An extra hurdle after the degree adds cost and risk. If anything it would discourage some students rather than attract them. So this direction does not work.
Only the first direction holds. I is the main cause and II is the main effect, which is option (A).

Step 4: Why the other options fail:
(B) says I is an effect. But a change in what students choose to study is a decision students make, not a consequence of the Bar Exam.
(C) makes the Bar Examination the cause of the rush into law, which reverses the sensible order and ignores that a new exam is a barrier, not an attraction.
(D) says I is not the main cause of II, which cuts the one link that actually explains why the regulator acted.

Step 5: Final Answer:
The answer is option (A): I is the main cause and II is the main effect.

Quick Tip: The Bar Council regulates entry into practice. Ask whether a regulator's new screening test is more likely to be a response to rising numbers or the reason for them.

143. Given below is a pair of events I and II. You have to decide their nature of relationship. Assume that the given information is correct and final.

I. Sea level is steadily rising
II. Global Warming is a serious problem which the world is facing

(A) I is the main cause and II is the main effect

(B) I is effect but II is not the main cause

(C) II is the main cause and I is the main effect

(D) II is an effect but I is not the main cause

Correct Answer: (C) II is the main cause and I is the main effect

Solution:

Step 1: Understanding the Question:
Event I is a steady rise in sea level. Event II is global warming being a serious problem for the world. We have to fix the direction of causation between them.

Step 2: Key Approach:
Recall the physical mechanism that connects a warming planet with the height of the oceans, and then see which event has to come first for that mechanism to work.

Step 3: Detailed Explanation:
Global warming is the long term rise in the average temperature of the earth, driven mainly by greenhouse gases trapping heat.
A warmer planet raises sea level in two ways. First, the polar ice caps and glaciers melt, and that meltwater flows into the oceans and adds to their volume. Second, water expands when it is heated, so the

ocean itself takes up more space as it warms. This is called thermal expansion. Both effects push the sea level up.
So global warming is the underlying cause and the rising sea level is one of its most visible effects. II causes I, which is option (C).
Now test the reverse. Could a rising sea level cause global warming? Water rising a few millimetres a year does not add heat to the atmosphere. The ocean level is a symptom of the heating, not its source. So direction I to II fails.

Step 4: Why the other options fail:
(A) makes the sea level rise the cause of global warming, which reverses the physics.
(B) accepts that I is an effect but rules out II as its cause. Since warming driven melting and thermal expansion are exactly why the sea is rising, ruling II out leaves the rise unexplained.
(D) calls global warming an effect, but the passage gives nothing that global warming could be an effect of, and certainly not a rising sea.

Step 5: Final Answer:
The answer is option (C): II is the main cause and I is the main effect.

Quick Tip: Think of one as the disease and the other as its symptom. Melting ice and the expansion of warm water are what push the sea up.

144. Given below is a pair of events I and II. You have to decide their nature of relationship. Assume that the given information is correct and final.

I. Financial Institutions are largely unregulated
II. Today, world is passing through a serious phase of economic crisis

(A) I is the main cause and II is the main effect

(B) I is effect but II is not the main cause

(C) II is the main cause and I is the main effect

(D) II is an effect but I is not the main cause

Correct Answer: (A) I is the main cause and II is the main effect

Solution:

Step 1: Understanding the Question:
Event I says financial institutions are largely unregulated. Event II says the world is passing through a serious economic crisis. We must decide the direction of causation.

Step 2: Key Approach:
Ask which event describes a standing condition and which describes an outcome. A condition that has been in place for a while can cause an outcome; an outcome cannot reach back and create the condition.

Step 3: Detailed Explanation:
Regulation of financial institutions means rules on how much they may lend, how much capital they must hold against losses, and what risks they may take. These rules exist to keep banks and lenders from gambling with other people's money.
If that oversight is weak, lenders chase high returns, take on risk they

cannot absorb, and build up bad loans. When those bets fail, the losses spread from one institution to another through the credit chain, credit dries up, businesses cannot borrow, and the wider economy stalls. That is what an economic crisis looks like. So light regulation is a standing condition that can produce a crisis. I causes II.

Test the reverse. Could an economic crisis make financial institutions unregulated? A crisis usually does the opposite. Governments respond to a crash by tightening the rules, not by removing them. So II causing I does not work.

I is the main cause and II is the main effect, which is option (A).

Step 4: Why the other options fail:

(B) says I is an effect. But being unregulated is a state of affairs created by policy choices and gaps in the law, not something the crisis produced.

(C) reverses the chain and makes the crisis create the lack of regulation, which contradicts how governments actually behave after a crash.

(D) treats II as an effect but denies I as the main cause, which throws away the only explanation the pair offers.

Step 5: Final Answer:

The answer is option (A): I is the main cause and II is the main effect.

Quick Tip: One statement is a standing condition and the other is something happening now. Also remember that a crash normally leads to more rules, not fewer.

145. An argument is given below, on the basis of that argument; find out the parallel argument from the given list of subsequent arguments.

Argument: Himalayan Sparrows are disappearing. This bird is an Indian bird; therefore, Indian birds are disappearing.

Subsequent Arguments:

(A) Industrialists pay most of the taxes. 'Z' is a wealthy man therefore 'Z' must pay most taxes

(B) A pineapple is a fruit, a mango is a fruit therefore pineapple is a mango

(C) Snow tigers are an endangered species; all endangered species must be protected; therefore snow-tiger must be protected

(D) John is his father's favorite son, and John knows this must be true because his father told him this; and no father would lie to his favorite son

Correct Answer: (A) Industrialists pay most of the taxes. 'Z' is a wealthy man therefore 'Z' must pay most taxes

Solution:

Step 1: Understanding the Question:
A parallel argument question does not ask which option sounds similar in subject matter. It asks which option has the same logical skeleton, including the same mistake if the given argument contains one. So the first job is to strip the argument down to its form.

Step 2: Reduce the given argument to its form:
Premise 1: Himalayan Sparrows are disappearing.
Premise 2: The Himalayan Sparrow is an Indian bird, so it is one member of the wider class of Indian birds.

Conclusion: Indian birds are disappearing.
Written in the abstract: A has a property. A belongs to class B. So all of B has the property.
The fault is plain. Only one kind of bird inside the class is disappearing, yet the conclusion is thrown over the entire class. Two categorical statements are used to force an unjustified link between the two outer terms.

Step 3: Test each option against that form:
(A) Industrialists pay most of the taxes. Z is a wealthy man, so Z must pay most taxes. The premises never say Z is an industrialist. "Wealthy man" and "industrialist" are two different terms with nothing joining them, so this argument has no shared middle at all. It is a four term jump, not the same skeleton. It also runs the wrong way, from a whole group down to one person, whereas the given argument runs from one member up to the whole group.
(B) A pineapple is a fruit, a mango is a fruit, therefore pineapple is a mango. Two categorical premises, both true, are used to draw a conclusion about the two outer terms that simply does not follow. Sharing a class does not make the two members the same, exactly as one member of a class disappearing does not make the class disappear. This is the same shape of error: an invalid categorical conclusion pulled out of two innocent premises about class membership.
(C) Snow tigers are an endangered species; all endangered species must be protected; therefore snow tigers must be protected. This one is valid. The property attaches to the whole class and is then applied to a member of it, which is legitimate. A valid argument cannot be parallel to a faulty one.
(D) John is his father's favourite son, and John knows this because his father told him, and no father would lie to his favourite son. This

assumes the conclusion inside the reason, which is circular reasoning. It is a completely different flaw.

Step 4: Final Answer:
Option (B) mirrors the structure of the given argument most closely, so the answer is option (B).

Quick Tip: Replace the nouns with letters and compare skeletons. Look for the option where two true statements about class membership are forced into a conclusion the premises cannot support.

146. Each question below is followed by arguments. Choose the most appropriate choice from the options given.

Question: Should Judicial Activism be discouraged?
Argument I: No, it would lead to executive dictatorship
Argument II: Yes, Judiciary should stay in the constitutional limits

(A) Argument I is strong

(B) Argument II is strong

(C) Both the arguments are strong

(D) Both the arguments are weak

Correct Answer: (C) Both the arguments are strong

Solution:

Step 1: Understanding the Question:
In a statement and argument question we judge each argument on its own. An argument is strong when it is directly connected to the issue and rests on a real, weighty consideration. It is weak when it is trivial,

off the point, or based on a personal opinion.

Step 2: Understanding the concept:
Judicial activism means courts stepping beyond plain interpretation of the law to shape policy, usually to fill a gap left by the executive or the legislature. Public interest litigation in India is the best known example. There is a genuine debate about how far this should go, so both sides can carry real weight.

Step 3: Testing Argument I:
Argument I says no, discouraging judicial activism would lead to executive dictatorship.
This is directly on the issue. Courts are the main check on the executive. If the judiciary is told to stand back whenever the executive fails to act or oversteps, the executive faces no serious restraint. An unchecked executive drifting towards dictatorship is a real constitutional danger, not a small inconvenience. So Argument I is strong.

Step 4: Testing Argument II:
Argument II says yes, the judiciary should stay within constitutional limits.
This is also directly on the issue, and it rests on the separation of powers. The Constitution assigns lawmaking to the legislature and administration to the executive. When courts take over those functions, they act without any electoral mandate and without accountability to the people. That is a serious objection, not a technicality. So Argument II is strong too.

Step 5: Final Answer:
Both arguments raise substantial constitutional concerns and both

address the question head on. So both are strong, and the answer is option (C).

Why the other options fail:
(A) drops Argument II, but the separation of powers objection is far too serious to call weak.
(B) drops Argument I, but the risk of an unchecked executive is equally serious.
(D) calls both weak, which cannot be right because each argument names a real constitutional harm.

Quick Tip: Ask of each argument whether it is on the point and whether the harm it names is serious. Executive dictatorship and breach of constitutional limits are both serious.

147. Each question below is followed by arguments. Choose the most appropriate choice from the options given.

Question: Should the Judiciary be independent of Executive and Legislature?
Argument I: Yes, this is necessary to ensure impartiality in the administration of Justice
Argument II: No, it will develop inertia in Executive and Legislature

(A) Argument I is strong
(B) Argument II is strong
(C) Both the arguments are strong
(D) Both the arguments are weak

Correct Answer: (A) Argument I is strong

Solution:

Step 1: Understanding the Question:

We must judge each argument separately. A strong argument is relevant to the issue and rests on a real and important consideration. A weak argument is off the point, minor, or simply asserted without a working link.

Step 2: Understanding the concept:

Judicial independence means judges decide cases free from control by the government or the legislature, with security of tenure and protected service conditions. It is one of the basic features of the Indian Constitution.

Step 3: Testing Argument I:

Argument I says yes, independence is necessary to ensure impartiality in the administration of justice.

This goes to the heart of the matter. Courts frequently decide cases in which the government itself is a party, whether the challenge is to a statute, an executive order or an official's conduct. If judges owed their jobs, promotions or salaries to the executive, they could not rule against it without fear. No litigant would trust such a court. Independence is therefore not a bonus but the condition on which impartial justice rests. Argument I is strong.

Step 4: Testing Argument II:

Argument II says no, judicial independence will develop inertia in the executive and the legislature.

This link does not hold. Judges being free from executive control has nothing to do with whether ministers and lawmakers do their work. Parliament still has to legislate and the executive still has to

administer, and their motivation comes from the electorate and their own duties, not from control over judges. The argument also mistakes the direction of the effect. An independent court that strikes down bad laws and lazy administration prods those branches into working properly rather than letting them sleep. So Argument II is weak.

Step 5: Final Answer:
Only Argument I is strong, so the answer is option (A).

Why the other options fail:
(B) calls only Argument II strong, but its causal claim has no support.
(C) calls both strong, which fails because Argument II does not stand.
(D) calls both weak, which fails because impartiality is the core justification for judicial independence.

Quick Tip: Check whether each predicted consequence actually follows. Ask how judges being free of executive control could possibly make ministers idle.

148. Each question below is followed by arguments. Choose the most appropriate choice from the options given.

Question: Should E-Governance be introduced at every level of public administration?
Argument I: Yes, it will reduce corruption
Argument II: No, it will lead to unemployment

(A) Argument I is strong

(B) Argument II is strong

(C) Both the arguments are strong

(D) Both the arguments are weak

Correct Answer: (A) Argument I is strong

Solution:

Step 1: Understanding the Question:
Each argument has to be weighed on its own merit. A strong argument is relevant and names a real, substantial consequence. A weak argument is minor, off the point, or built on a link that does not hold.

Step 2: Understanding the concept:
E-governance means delivering government services through electronic systems, so that applications, records, payments and approvals move online instead of through files and counters.

Step 3: Testing Argument I:
Argument I says yes, e-governance will reduce corruption.
This link is real and it is easy to trace. Most petty corruption in administration needs three things: a clerk with discretion, a citizen with no other route, and no record of what passed between them. E-governance removes all three. The citizen applies online instead of standing at a counter, so the middleman disappears. The system applies fixed rules, so discretion shrinks. Every transaction leaves a time stamped trail, so anyone demanding a bribe can be traced. Reducing corruption in public administration is a large public benefit, so Argument I is strong.

Step 4: Testing Argument II:
Argument II says no, e-governance will lead to unemployment.
This one is weak. Government staff are not usually dismissed when a process is computerised; they are redeployed to other work. E-governance also creates jobs, in data entry, system maintenance, help desks and the common service centres that help citizens use the portals. Even if some clerical posts shrink over time, that cost is small next to the gain of cleaner and faster public services, and fear of job loss is never accepted as a reason to keep an inefficient system alive. So Argument II is weak.

Step 5: Final Answer:
Only Argument I is strong, so the answer is option (A).

Why the other options fail:
(B) calls only Argument II strong, but its claim about unemployment does not survive scrutiny.
(C) needs both to be strong, which fails on Argument II.
(D) needs both to be weak, which fails because the anti corruption benefit is real and large.

Quick Tip: Compare the size of each claimed consequence. Cutting corruption across public administration is a large gain, while the job loss claim is speculative and small.

149. Each question below is followed by arguments. Choose the most appropriate choice from the options given.

Question: Should there be a world Government?
Argument I: Yes, it will eliminate inter-state conflicts
Argument II: No, Rich and Powerful countries will dominate it

(A) Argument I is strong

(B) Argument II is strong

(C) Both the arguments are strong

(D) Both the arguments are weak

Correct Answer: (C) Both the arguments are strong

Solution:

Step 1: Understanding the Question:
We judge each argument on its own. A strong argument speaks to the issue and rests on a genuine and weighty consideration. A weak one is trivial, off the point, or unsupported.

Step 2: Understanding the concept:
A world government would mean a single political authority over all nations, replacing the present system of sovereign states dealing with one another through treaties and bodies like the United Nations. Both the promise and the danger of such a body are serious, so both sides of this debate can carry real weight.

Step 3: Testing Argument I:
Argument I says yes, a world government will eliminate inter state conflicts.
This is on the point and rests on something real. Wars between states

happen because there is no authority above the states to settle their disputes and enforce the settlement. Each state is its own final judge, so a border dispute or a water dispute can end in war. A single government over all of them would supply the missing authority, turning what are now wars into internal disputes to be decided by law rather than by arms. The prospect of ending war between nations is about as substantial a benefit as an argument can offer. So Argument I is strong.

Step 4: Testing Argument II:
Argument II says no, rich and powerful countries will dominate it. This is also on the point and also rests on something real. In practice, power inside international bodies follows economic and military strength. The permanent members of the UN Security Council hold a veto that no other country has, and voting power in bodies such as the International Monetary Fund and the World Bank tracks the size of a country's contribution. A single world government would concentrate far more power than any of these, so capture by the strong would leave weaker nations governed without any real voice. That is a serious objection. So Argument II is strong.

Step 5: Final Answer:
Both arguments are relevant and both rest on substantial considerations, so both are strong and the answer is option (C).

Why the other options fail:
(A) drops Argument II, but the risk of domination by the strong is a real and well evidenced danger.
(B) drops Argument I, but ending war between nations is a serious benefit.

(D) calls both weak, which cannot be right since each names a major consequence.

Quick Tip: Weigh each side by how much it would matter. The end of war between nations and rule by the strongest few are both large stakes.

150. "Some philosophers believe that a concept which cannot be verified can still be valid because of its inner logic which ennobles it."

In the light of the above statement, decide the status of the statement given below.

Statement: "Every person has certain inherent and inalienable rights which must be protected by Rule of Law."

(A) True

(B) False

(C) Difficult to determine

(D) Both True and False

Correct Answer: (A) True

Solution:

Step 1: Understanding the Question:
We are handed a rule of judgement first, and then a statement to judge. The whole point of the question is that we must not apply our own test. We must apply the test given in the opening line.

Step 2: Reading the rule carefully:

The rule says a concept which cannot be verified can still be valid because of its inner logic which ennobles it.
Break that into two parts. First, the absence of proof does not by itself make a concept invalid. Second, a concept earns validity from its inner logic, meaning the idea holds together on its own terms and lifts human dignity. So under this rule, the question to ask about any statement is not "can it be proved" but "is it internally coherent and does it ennoble".

Step 3: Applying the rule to the given statement:
The statement is that every person has certain inherent and inalienable rights which must be protected by the Rule of Law.
Can this be verified? No. Nobody can dissect a person and find a right inside. Inherent rights are not observable facts, which is exactly the sort of concept the opening line is talking about.
Does it have inner logic? Yes. If rights are inherent, they belong to a person simply by being a person. If they are inalienable, they cannot be taken away or surrendered. A right that cannot be taken away is worth nothing unless something guards it, and the guard has to be a system that applies equally to everybody, which is the Rule of Law. Each part of the statement follows from the part before it, so the idea is coherent from end to end.
Does it ennoble? Yes. Treating every person as a bearer of rights that no ruler may strip away raises human dignity, which is the plainest example of a concept that ennobles.

Step 4: Reaching the verdict:
The statement is unverifiable but internally coherent and ennobling. Under the rule supplied, that is exactly what makes a concept valid. So the statement is True.

Step 5: Why the other options fail:
(B) False would require the rule to reject unverifiable concepts. It does the opposite; it rescues them.
(C) Difficult to determine would be right only if the rule gave us no way to decide. It gives us a clear test and the statement passes it.
(D) Both True and False is self contradictory and nothing in the rule supports a split verdict.

Final Answer:
The answer is option (A), True.

Quick Tip: Use only the test in the opening line. It says lack of proof is not a defect if the idea holds together and ennobles, so check the statement for coherence and dignity, not for evidence.

151. Principle: Only Parliament or State Legislatures have the authority to enact laws on their own. No law made by the State can take away a person's fundamental right.

Facts: Parliament enacted a law, which according to a group of lawyers is violating the fundamental rights of traders. A group of lawyers files a writ petition challenging the Constitutional validity of the statute seeking relief to quash the statute and further direct Parliament to enact a new law.

(A) No writ would lie against Parliament, as the court has no authority to direct Parliament to enact or re-enact a law

(B) The court can quash existing law if it violates fundamental rights and can direct Parliament to make a new law

(C) The court can quash the existing law if it violates fundamental rights but cannot direct Parliament to make a new law.

(D) None of these

Correct Answer: (C) The court can quash the existing law if it violates fundamental rights but cannot direct Parliament to make a new law.

Solution:

Step 1: Understanding the Question:
The lawyers have asked the court for two separate reliefs. The first is to strike down a statute that allegedly takes away the fundamental rights of traders. The second is a direction to Parliament to pass a fresh law. The answer has to be built only from the two sentences given in the Principle, not from anything else.

Step 2: Key Formula or Approach:
Split the Principle into its two limbs and test each relief against one limb.
Limb one: "Only Parliament or State Legislatures have the authority to enact laws on their own." The words "only" and "on their own" shut every other body, including a court, out of the law making function.
Limb two: "No law made by the State can take away a person's fundamental right." This puts a ceiling on what a validly passed law may contain, so a law that crosses that ceiling has no force.

Step 3: Detailed Explanation:

Take the first relief, quashing the statute. Limb two says a law that takes away a fundamental right cannot stand. A court deciding a writ petition is the body that declares whether a statute crosses that line. Striking such a law down is not the court making a law, it is the court refusing to let an invalid law operate. So this relief sits comfortably inside the Principle.
Now take the second relief, a direction to Parliament to enact a new law. Limb one reserves the enacting power to the legislature alone, and adds that they exercise it "on their own". A judicial direction ordering Parliament what to enact would mean the legislature is no longer acting on its own. So the court cannot grant this relief.
Put the two results together. One relief is available, the other is not.

Step 4: Checking the wrong options:
Option (A) claims no writ lies against Parliament at all. It is right on the second half but wrong on the first, because it would leave a rights violating statute untouched, which limb two does not permit.
Option (B) allows the court to do both things. It ignores the word "only" in limb one and hands the court a power the Principle expressly reserves for the legislature.
Option (D) is ruled out the moment a fully correct option exists.

Step 5: Final Answer:
The court can quash the offending statute but cannot order Parliament to make a new one. That is option (C).

Quick Tip: The Principle has two sentences. Test the prayer for quashing against one, and the prayer for a direction to legislate against the other. They do not both survive.

152. Principle: When one person signifies to another his willingness to do or abstain from doing anything, with a view to obtaining the assent of that person to such an act or abstinence, he is said to have made a proposal.

Fact: "Ramanuj telegraphed to Shyam Sunder, writing: *Will you sell me your Rolls Royce CAR? Telegram the lowest cash price.*" Shyam Sunder also replied by telegram: "*Lowest price for CAR is Rs. 20 lakh.*" Ramanuj immediately sent his consent through telegram stating: "*I agree to buy the CAR for Rs. 20 lakh asked by you.*" Shyam Sunder refused to sell the car.

(A) He cannot refuse to sell the CAR because the contract has already been made.

(B) He can refuse to sell the CAR because it was only invitation to offer and not the real offer

(C) It was not a valid offer because willingness to enter into a contract was absent

(D) None of these

Correct Answer: (B) He can refuse to sell the CAR because it was only invitation to offer and not the real offer

Solution:

Step 1: Understanding the Question:
Three telegrams passed between the two men. The question is whether any of them amounted to a proposal, because a contract can only be built on a proposal plus an acceptance of it. Shyam Sunder has refused to hand over the car, and we must say whether he is free to do that.

Step 2: Key Formula or Approach:

The Principle sets one test for a proposal. The speaker must signify willingness to do something, and he must do it with a view to obtaining the assent of the other person. Both parts must be present. A message that only supplies information fails the test, because supplying a figure is not the same as asking someone to say yes.

Step 3: Detailed Explanation:

Look at telegram one. Ramanuj asks two things, whether Shyam will sell and what the lowest cash price is. This is an enquiry. Ramanuj is not signifying his own willingness to do anything on stated terms, so it is not a proposal.

Look at telegram two. Shyam replies "Lowest price for CAR is Rs. 20 lakh". He answers only the price question. He never says he is willing to sell, and he never asks Ramanuj to assent to a sale. Both limbs of the test are missing, so this is a mere statement of price, an invitation to offer.

Look at telegram three. Ramanuj says "I agree to buy the CAR for Rs. 20 lakh". Since there was no proposal on the table, this cannot be an acceptance. It is itself the first real proposal in the exchange, and it is Ramanuj who is making it.

Now apply that. A proposal binds nobody until the other side accepts. Shyam never accepted Ramanuj's proposal. There is no contract, so Shyam is free to refuse to sell the car.

Step 4: Checking the wrong options:

Option (A) assumes a completed contract. It treats the price quotation as an offer, which the Principle does not allow, so it fails.

Option (C) says the offer was invalid because willingness was absent. That describes Shyam's price telegram accurately, but it does not answer the actual question, which is whether Shyam may refuse to sell. It also mislabels the exchange, since Ramanuj's third telegram

was a perfectly valid offer, just an unaccepted one.
Option (D) is not needed once a fitting option exists.

Step 5: Final Answer:
Quoting a lowest price is only an invitation to offer, so no contract arose and Shyam Sunder can refuse to sell. That is option (B).

Quick Tip: Ask, telegram by telegram, whether the sender signified willingness with a view to getting the other's assent. A bare quotation of the lowest price does neither.

153. Principle: Every person, who is of the age of majority, is competent to contract according to the law to which he is subject.

Facts: A minor mortgaged his house in favour of Thakur Das, a money lender, to secure a loan of Rs. 20000. A part of this, i.e. Rs. 10500 was actually advanced to him. While considering the proposed advance, the attorney who was acting for the money lender, received information that the plaintiff was still a minor. Subsequently the minor commenced an action stating that he was underage when he executed the mortgage and the same should, therefore, be cancelled. He prayed for setting aside the mortgage. The mortgagee money lender prayed for the refund of Rs. 10500 from the minor.

(A) As a minor's contract is void, any money advanced to a minor can be recovered.

(B) A minor's contract is void ab initio, any money advanced to a minor cannot be recovered.

(C) A minor's contract is voidable; any money advanced to a minor can be recovered

(D) Advanced money can be recovered because minor has given wrong information about his age.

Correct Answer: (B) A minor's contract is void ab initio, any money advanced to a minor cannot be recovered.

Solution:

Step 1: Understanding the Question:
A minor mortgaged his house and received Rs. 10500. He now wants the mortgage cancelled, and the money lender wants his money back. Two separate outcomes are being asked about, the fate of the mortgage and the fate of the Rs. 10500.

Step 2: Key Formula or Approach:
The Principle says every person who is of the age of majority is competent to contract. Read the sentence carefully. Competence is tied to majority. Turn it around and a person below the age of majority is not competent to contract at all. Competence is not something a minor has and then loses, it is something he never had. An agreement made by a party who was never competent is void from the very beginning, that is, void ab initio.

Step 3: Detailed Explanation:
Apply that to the mortgage. The mortgagor was a minor on the day he

executed it, so he was outside the class of persons the Principle makes competent. The mortgage never became a contract in the eye of law. There is nothing to enforce, and the court will set it aside.
Now apply it to the Rs. 10500. The money lender wants a refund. But a refund can only be ordered on the strength of some contract, and here the whole transaction is a nullity. If the court ordered the minor to repay, it would be enforcing the very agreement that the law says never existed. So the money lender cannot recover the sum.
The facts add one more useful detail. The lender's own attorney was told, before the advance, that the borrower was still a minor. So the lender went in with knowledge, and cannot say he was misled.

Step 4: Checking the wrong options:
Option (A) starts correctly by calling the contract void, then contradicts itself by allowing recovery. If the agreement is a nullity, there is no legal footing for a refund.
Option (C) calls the contract voidable. Voidable means valid until one side cancels it, which would give the minor's agreement legal life it never had under the Principle.
Option (D) rests on a misrepresentation of age, but the facts say the attorney already knew the borrower was a minor, so there was no deceit that the lender acted upon.

Step 5: Final Answer:
A minor's agreement is void ab initio and the Rs. 10500 cannot be recovered. That is option (B).

Quick Tip: Ask whether the minor ever had competence to contract, or whether he had it and lost it. The answer decides between void ab initio and voidable, and that in turn decides the refund.

154. Principle: A person is said to be of sound mind for the purpose of making a contract if, at the time when he makes it, he is capable of understanding it and of forming a rational judgment as to its effect upon his interests.

Facts: Mr. X who is usually of sound state of mind, but occasionally of unsound state of mind, enters into a contract with Mr. Y when he was of unsound state of mind. Mr. Y having come to know about this fact afterwards, wants to file a suit against Mr. X.

(A) Mr. X cannot enter into contract because he is of unsound state of mind when he entered into contract.

(B) Mr. X can enter into contract but the burden is on the other party to prove that he was of unsound state of mind at the time of contract.

(C) Mr. X can enter into contract but the burden is on Mr. X to prove that he was of sound state of mind at the time of contract

(D) None of these

Correct Answer: (A) Mr. X cannot enter into contract because he is of unsound state of mind when he entered into contract.

Solution:

Step 1: Understanding the Question:
Mr. X is normally of sound mind but sometimes not. The facts tell us plainly that the contract with Mr. Y was made during one of the unsound spells. Mr. Y now wants to sue on that contract.

Step 2: Key Formula or Approach:
The Principle fixes soundness of mind at a single moment, and that moment is "at the time when he makes it". It asks two things of the

person at that moment, that he can understand the contract, and that he can form a rational judgment about how it affects his own interests. A person's general condition on other days is irrelevant. So the whole test collapses into one question, what was his state of mind when he signed.

Step 3: Detailed Explanation:

The facts answer that question for us. They say the contract was entered into "when he was of unsound state of mind". This is not something Mr. Y has to establish, it is given to us as a fact.

Apply the Principle to that fact. At the moment of contracting Mr. X could not understand the contract and could not form a rational judgment about its effect on his interests. He therefore was not of sound mind for the purpose of making a contract.

A person who is not of sound mind for the purpose of making a contract cannot make one. The contract with Mr. Y is therefore not a good contract, and Mr. Y cannot sue on it.

Notice that the fact that Mr. X is usually of sound mind does not save the contract. The Principle never looks at what the person is usually like, it looks only at the moment of contracting.

Step 4: Checking the wrong options:

Options (B) and (C) both talk about who carries the burden of proof. The Principle says nothing whatever about burden of proof, and in any case there is nothing left to prove, since the facts already tell us he was of unsound mind at the relevant time. Both options import a rule that was not given.

Option (D) is not needed once option (A) fits.

Step 5: Final Answer:

Because Mr. X was of unsound state of mind at the very time he made the contract, he could not enter into it. That is option (A).

Quick Tip: The Principle judges the mind only at the moment the contract is made, and the facts already tell you what that state was. Any option about burden of proof is adding a rule you were not given.

155. Principle:
(1). The state shall not deny to any person equality before the law and equal protection of the laws within the territory of India.
(2). The State shall not discriminate against any citizen on grounds only of religion, race, caste, sex and place of birth or any of them.

Facts: The Government of Rajasthan, passed an order providing for reservations for the Scheduled Castes/ Scheduled Tribes and Socially and Educationally Backward Classes (including Muslims), and Women, in all institutions of higher education, including private educational institutions, both aided as well as unaided, in the following manner: Scheduled Caste- 15%; Scheduled Tribe- 7.5%, Socially and Educationally Backward Classes (including Muslims) - 27%

I. The reservation policy of the government is violative of the principle of equality envisaged in the Constitution
II. The reservation policy is unconstitutional because it is based on 'caste' which is a prohibited marker
III. Reservation does not violate equality clause as it entails "like should be treated like and unlike should be treated differently."
IV. Reservation does not violate equality clause as the Constitution itself enables the State to make special provision for the advancement of socially and educationally backward classes of citizens or for the Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes.

(A) I is correct
(B) I and II are both correct answers
(C) III is correct answer
(D) III and IV both are correct answers

Correct Answer: (D) III and IV both are correct answers

Solution:

Step 1: Understanding the Question:

Four statements are offered about a Rajasthan reservation order. Two say the policy breaks the equality guarantee, two say it does not. We have to pick the option that lists the correct statements.

Step 2: Key Formula or Approach:

The first limb of the Principle guarantees equality before the law and equal protection of the laws. Equal protection does not mean identical treatment for everybody. It means the law must treat those who stand on the same footing alike, and may treat those who stand on a different footing differently. That idea is called reasonable classification.

The second limb bars discrimination "on grounds only of" religion, race, caste, sex and place of birth. The word "only" matters. A measure that uses caste together with social and educational backwardness is not resting on caste alone.

Step 3: Detailed Explanation:

Take statement I. It says reservation violates equality. That would only be true if equality meant treating everyone identically. Since equal protection allows different treatment for people placed differently, reservation for backward groups does not by itself break the guarantee. Statement I is wrong.

Take statement II. It says the policy is unconstitutional because caste is a prohibited marker. But the bar in the second limb is on discrimination on grounds "only" of caste. The Rajasthan order is aimed at Scheduled Castes, Scheduled Tribes and socially and educationally backward classes, so the marker is backwardness, with caste as an indicator of it. Statement II is wrong.

Take statement III. It says reservation does not violate equality because like should be treated like and unlike differently. This is the reasonable classification idea stated directly. Groups that have been kept behind socially and educationally are not similarly placed with those who have not been, so treating them differently is consistent with equality. Statement III is correct.
Take statement IV. It says reservation does not violate equality because the Constitution itself enables the State to make special provision for socially and educationally backward classes and for Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes. That is a correct statement about the constitutional scheme, and it supports the same conclusion as III from a different direction. Statement IV is correct.

Step 4: Checking the wrong options:
Option (A) picks only I, and I has already been shown to rest on a wrong reading of equality.
Option (B) picks I and II, both of which fail.
Option (C) picks only III. III is correct, but it leaves out IV, which is also correct, so the option is incomplete.

Step 5: Final Answer:
Statements III and IV are both correct, so the answer is option (D).

Quick Tip: Ask whether equality means identical treatment or reasonable classification, and note the word "only" in the second limb. Then check whether more than one of the pro reservation statements survives.

156. Principle: Nothing is an offence merely by reason of its being done with the knowledge that it is likely to cause harm, if it be done without any criminal intention to cause harm, and in good faith for the purpose of preventing or avoiding other harm to a person or property.

Facts: Mr. Sharman, the Captain of a steam vessel, suddenly and without any fault or negligence on his part, finds himself in such a position that, before he can stop his vessel, he must inevitably run down a boat B, with twenty or thirty passengers on board, unless he changes the course of his vessel, and that, by changing his course, he must incur the risk of running down a boat C with only two passengers on board and which he may possibly clear.

(A) Sharman has committed no offence because this was done out of necessity

(B) Sharman can be held responsible for the act of criminal negligence

(C) Sharman can be held responsible for culpable homicide

(D) This is a clear case of accident so Sharman cannot be held responsible

Correct Answer: (A) Sharman has committed no offence because this was done out of necessity

Solution:

Step 1: Understanding the Question:
A ship's captain is trapped between two bad outcomes. Hold his course and he certainly runs down a boat carrying twenty or thirty people. Change course and he risks hitting a boat carrying two, though he may even clear it. The question is whether turning is an offence.

Step 2: Key Formula or Approach:

The Principle lays down three conditions, and all three must be met for the act to escape being an offence.
One, the act is done merely with the knowledge that it is likely to cause harm.
Two, it is done without any criminal intention to cause harm.
Three, it is done in good faith to prevent or avoid other harm to a person or property.
This is the defence of necessity. Note what it does not require. It does not require that harm be avoided altogether, only that the actor be choosing the lesser harm honestly.

Step 3: Detailed Explanation:
Test condition one. When Sharman turns, he knows he may hit boat C. That is knowledge of likely harm, which is exactly what the Principle contemplates.
Test condition two. Does he want the two passengers on boat C hurt? Nothing in the facts suggests it. His whole aim is to miss boat B. There is no criminal intention.
Test condition three. Turning is done to avoid running down a boat with twenty or thirty people. That is other harm to persons, and avoiding it is a plainly honest purpose. He also may possibly clear boat C altogether, which shows he is not simply substituting one certain death for another.
All three conditions are met, so the Principle says his act is not an offence. The label for this in the facts is necessity, choosing the lesser of two unavoidable harms in good faith.

Step 4: Checking the wrong options:
Option (B) alleges criminal negligence. The facts state in terms that Sharman found himself in this position "suddenly and without any fault or negligence on his part", so negligence is ruled out by the facts

themselves.
Option (C) alleges culpable homicide. Even if boat C is struck, the Principle removes the act from the category of offence altogether, so no homicide charge can be built on it.
Option (D) calls it an accident. An accident is an unintended mishap that happens without any choice being made. Here Sharman consciously chose to change course knowing the risk, so this is a deliberate act protected by necessity, not an accident.

Step 5: Final Answer:
Sharman acted with knowledge but without criminal intention and in good faith to avoid greater harm, so he commits no offence. That is option (A).

Quick Tip: Break the Principle into three tests: knowledge of likely harm, no criminal intention, good faith purpose of avoiding other harm. Check all three against the captain's decision to change course.

157. Principle: Willful rash driving is an offense.

Facts: Mr. Tiwari was driving his car after drinking alcohol. Police books him for willful negligent driving. Is the act of the police lawful?

(A) No, because Mr. Tiwari was not driving rashly; he was drunk while driving.

(B) No, this is not a negligent act.

(C) Yes, because Mr. Tiwari was driving rashly.

(D) Yes, because the police has the power to arrest a person driving rashly.

Correct Answer: (A) No, because Mr. Tiwari was not driving rashly; he was drunk while driving.

Solution:

Step 1: Understanding the Question:
The Principle makes exactly one thing an offence, willful rash driving. Mr. Tiwari drove after drinking. The police booked him for willful negligent driving. We are asked whether that booking is lawful.

Step 2: Key Formula or Approach:
In a principle question, the Principle is the whole of the law. Anything it does not make an offence is not an offence, however bad it may look in real life. So read the Principle word by word and see what it covers. It covers driving that is willful and rash. It says nothing about drunken driving. It says nothing about negligent driving either, and rash is not the same as negligent. Rash means taking a risk while knowing the risk. Negligent means failing to take the care a reasonable driver would take.

Step 3: Detailed Explanation:
Now read the facts. They tell us one thing only, that Mr. Tiwari was driving his car after drinking alcohol. They do not say he was speeding, weaving, jumping signals, or doing anything else risky. So on the material given, there is no willful rash driving.
Next read the charge. The police booked him for willful negligent driving. That charge does not exist under the Principle, because the Principle only makes willful rash driving an offence.
So the police have booked a man for conduct the Principle does not describe, on facts that do not show rashness. The booking is therefore not lawful.

The temptation here is to reason that drunk driving is obviously an offence in real life. That is true outside the question, but the instruction is to follow the Principle strictly, and this Principle never mentions alcohol.

Step 4: Checking the wrong options:
Option (B) says the act is not negligent. This misses the point, because negligence is not the test the Principle sets. The Principle asks about rashness, not negligence, so answering the negligence question does not answer the Principle's question.
Option (C) says he was driving rashly. The facts never say that. It is an assumption added from outside the given material.
Option (D) talks about the police power to arrest a person driving rashly. It has the same defect as (C), it assumes rashness, and it also drifts into the topic of arrest powers, which the Principle does not touch.

Step 5: Final Answer:
The police action is not lawful, because on the facts Tiwari was drunk while driving and there is nothing to show rash driving. That is option (A).

Quick Tip: The Principle punishes only willful rash driving. Check whether the facts show rashness at all, and whether the charge the police framed matches the offence the Principle creates.

158. Principle: Whoever, intending to take dishonestly any movable property out of the possession of any person without that person's consent, moves that property with an intention to take it, is said to commit theft.

Facts: Y cuts down a tree on Z's ground, with the intention of dishonestly taking it out of Z's possession without Z's consent. Y could not take away the tree.

(A) Y can be prosecuted for theft

(B) Y cannot be prosecuted for theft

(C) Y can be prosecuted for attempt to theft

(D) Y has neither committed theft nor attempted to commit theft

Correct Answer: (A) Y can be prosecuted for theft

Solution:

Step 1: Understanding the Question:
Y chops down a tree standing on Z's land, meaning to carry it off dishonestly, but in the end he does not manage to take it away. The question is whether the offence of theft is complete even though nothing left the ground.

Step 2: Key Formula or Approach:
List the ingredients the Principle demands, then tick them off.
One, an intention to take dishonestly.
Two, the thing taken must be movable property.
Three, it must be out of the possession of some person.
Four, without that person's consent.
Five, and this is the one that decides the question, the accused must move that property with an intention to take it.

Read the fifth ingredient closely. The Principle says "moves that property", not "takes that property away" and not "carries it off". Moving is enough. Successful removal is not part of the definition.

Step 3: Detailed Explanation:
Apply the ingredients to Y. The facts hand us the intention outright, they say he acted "with the intention of dishonestly taking it out of Z's possession". So ingredient one is present. They also say it was without Z's consent, so ingredient four is present. The tree stood on Z's ground, so it was in Z's possession, and ingredient three is present. Now the interesting part, ingredients two and five together. A tree rooted in the earth is not movable property, it is attached to the ground. The moment Y severs it, two things happen at once. The tree becomes movable property, and the very act of severing moves it. So the act of cutting simultaneously creates the movable property and supplies the required moving.
With all five ingredients satisfied at the instant of severance, theft was complete right then. What happened afterwards does not matter. The fact that Y could not carry the tree away is simply a later failure, and the Principle never asked for successful carrying away.

Step 4: Checking the wrong options:
Option (B) says no theft at all. It reads a carrying away requirement into the Principle that the words do not contain.
Option (C) says attempt to theft. An attempt is charged when the full offence was not completed. Here the full offence was completed at severance, so an attempt charge understates what happened.
Option (D) says neither theft nor attempt, which ignores the dishonest intention that the facts state in plain words.

Step 5: Final Answer:

Theft was complete the moment Y severed the tree, so Y can be prosecuted for theft. That is option (A).

Quick Tip: The definition stops at "moves that property", it never requires carrying it away. Ask what severing a standing tree does to its character and its position at the same instant.

159. Principle: *Injuria Sine Damnum* i.e. Injury (violation of legal right) without damage

Facts: X, who was the returning officer at a polling booth in Amethi, wrongly refused to register a duly tendered vote of Y in the recent UP elections, even though Y was an eligible voter. The candidate in whose favour Y wanted to vote, was declared elected. Give the appropriate answer-

(A) Y can sue X on the ground that he was denied the right to cast vote, which is a fundamental right.

(B) Y can sue X on the ground that he was denied the right to cast vote, which is a legal right

(C) Y cannot sue X because there is no injury or damage caused to Y

(D) Y cannot sue X because the candidate in whose favor he wanted to vote was declared elected.

Correct Answer: (B) Y can sue X on the ground that he was denied the right to cast vote, which is a legal right

Solution:

Step 1: Understanding the Question:

Y was an eligible voter whose vote the returning officer wrongly

refused to register. The candidate Y wanted to vote for won anyway, so Y lost nothing in practical terms. The question is whether Y can still sue.

Step 2: Key Formula or Approach:
The Principle is a Latin maxim and the question itself translates it, injury without damage. Split the two words, because in tort they mean different things.
"Injuria" means the violation of a legal right.
"Damnum" means actual loss or harm, in money or in comfort.
The maxim says that where a legal right is violated, the person whose right it is can sue even if he suffered no loss at all. The right itself is what the law protects, so its infringement is actionable by itself.

Step 3: Detailed Explanation:
First, find the legal right. Y was an eligible voter and he duly tendered his vote. An eligible voter has a right to have his vote recorded. That right is conferred and protected by law, so it is a legal right.
Second, find the violation. X wrongly refused to register the vote. The word "wrongly" is given to us in the facts, so the refusal was not authorised. The legal right has been infringed. That is the injuria.
Third, look for damage. Y's preferred candidate won, so Y is no worse off in any measurable way. There is no damnum.
Fourth, apply the maxim. Injuria sine damnum means precisely this situation, a right violated with no loss following. The maxim holds that the action still lies. So Y can sue X.
The reason matters as much as the result. Y sues because a legal right of his was violated, not because he suffered anything.

Step 4: Checking the wrong options:
Option (A) reaches the right result but calls the vote a fundamental

right. The right to vote is conferred by the law governing elections, it is not one of the guaranteed fundamental rights. Since a principle question is decided by the reasoning, a wrong label sinks the option.
Option (C) says there was no injury or damage. It confuses the two words. There was indeed no damage, but there was injury, meaning the violation of a legal right, and injury alone is enough under this maxim.
Option (D) says the suit fails because the preferred candidate won. That is simply the absence of damage restated, and this maxim exists exactly to say that absence of damage is no bar.

Step 5: Final Answer:
Y can sue X because his legal right to vote was violated, even though no loss followed. That is option (B).

Quick Tip: Separate the two Latin words. One means violation of a legal right, the other means actual loss. Decide which of the two is present here, and then check whether the option names the vote correctly.

160. Principle: Nothing is an offence which is done by a person who, at the time of doing it, by reason of unsound state of mind, is incapable of knowing the nature of the act, or something that he is doing is either wrong or contrary to law.

Fact: X takes his son Y who is three years old, for bathing to the well. He throws his son inside the well so that the son can have a good bath. After 10 minutes he also jumps into the well to take bath and get his son out of the well. Both were rescued by the villagers but his son was found dead.

(A) X has committed culpable homicide amounting to murder

(B) X has committed murder

(C) X has done no offence as he can plead the defense of unsound state of mind

(D) X's family should be held responsible for allowing him to take the child to the well

Correct Answer: (C) X has done no offence as he can plead the defense of unsound state of mind

Solution:

Step 1: Understanding the Question:
X throws his three year old son into a well believing this will give the boy a good bath, waits ten minutes, then jumps in himself both to bathe and to bring the boy out. Villagers pull both out but the child is dead. We must decide what offence, if any, X has committed.

Step 2: Key Formula or Approach:
The Principle gives a defence, and it turns on what the person was capable of knowing at the time of the act. It has two alternative branches.
Branch one, by reason of unsound state of mind he was incapable of knowing the nature of the act.
Branch two, by reason of unsound state of mind he was incapable of knowing that what he was doing was wrong or contrary to law.
If either branch is made out, the Principle says nothing he did is an offence at all. So the task is to look at X's conduct and ask what it shows about his understanding at that moment.

Step 3: Detailed Explanation:

The facts do not label X as insane, so we have to read his behaviour.
First, his stated purpose. He threw the child in "so that the son can have a good bath". That is not the thinking of a man who wants his son dead. A person who understood the nature of throwing a three year old into a well could not honestly believe it was a way of bathing him.
Second, his own conduct afterwards. He jumped into the same well himself, both to bathe and to get his son out. A man executing a murder does not follow his victim into the well and then need rescuing alongside him.
Third, the ten minute gap. He waited, as though nothing was wrong, which again shows he did not grasp what was happening to the child.
Put those three together and the picture is of a man who did not understand the nature of what he was doing. That squares with branch one of the Principle. Under the Principle, nothing he did is an offence.

Step 4: Checking the wrong options:
Options (A) and (B) both require a guilty mind, either an intention to kill or knowledge that death was likely. The bathing purpose and the jump into the well both point away from any such mind. These two options also say essentially the same thing in different words, since culpable homicide amounting to murder is murder.
Option (D) blames X's family. The Principle says nothing about anyone other than the doer of the act, and no facts are given about what the family knew or allowed. It is outside the material.

Step 5: Final Answer:
X's behaviour shows he could not know the nature of his act, so the Principle protects him. That is option (C).

Quick Tip: The facts never call X insane, so let his conduct speak. Ask what a man who throws a toddler into a well to bathe him, and then jumps in himself, must have understood about his own act.

161. Principle: Ignorance of Fact is excused but ignorance of law is no excuse

Fact: X was a passenger from Zurich to Manila in a Swiss Plane. When the plane landed at the Airport of Bombay on 28 Nov. 1962 it was found on searching that X carried 34 kg of Gold Bars on his person and that he had not declared it in the 'Manifest for Transit'. On 26th Nov. 1962 the Government of India had issued a notification modifying its earlier exemption, making it mandatory now that the gold must be declared in the "Manifest" of the aircraft.

(A) X cannot be prosecuted because he had actually no knowledge about the new notification issued two days ago

(B) X cannot be prosecuted because ignorance of fact is excusable

(C) X can be prosecuted because ignorance of law is not excusable

(D) X's liability would depend on the discretion of the court

Correct Answer: (C) X can be prosecuted because ignorance of law is not excusable

Solution:

Step 1: Understanding the Question:
A notification was issued on 26 November 1962 requiring gold to be declared in the aircraft's Manifest. Two days later X landed at Bombay carrying 34 kg of gold bars that he had not declared. The obvious defence he would want is that he never heard of the notification. We

must decide whether that works.

Step 2: Key Formula or Approach:
The Principle draws one line, between ignorance of fact and ignorance of law.
Ignorance of fact is excused. This covers a mistake about what actually happened or what a thing actually is, for example not knowing that a bag handed to you contains gold.
Ignorance of law is no excuse. This covers not knowing what the law requires of you, including a rule that was made very recently.
So the whole question becomes, which kind of ignorance is X pleading.

Step 3: Detailed Explanation:
Start with the facts X did know. He knew he was carrying gold, since it was on his person, 34 kg of it. He knew he had not entered it in the Manifest. So he was not mistaken about any fact of his situation.
Now identify what he did not know. He did not know that a notification issued on 26 November had made declaration compulsory. That notification is a piece of law. Not knowing it is ignorance of law, plain and simple.
Apply the Principle. Ignorance of law is no excuse, so X's plea fails and he can be prosecuted.
The two day gap looks unfair and it is meant to. But the Principle draws no line based on how old the law is. A rule issued two days ago is as much law as a rule issued twenty years ago, and the Principle offers no exemption for freshly made rules. Once you accept a shortness of time defence, every new rule becomes unenforceable for a while, which is exactly what the maxim refuses to allow.

Step 4: Checking the wrong options:

Option (A) is the two day argument. It asks the Principle to make an exception it does not contain.
Option (B) claims ignorance of fact. It mislabels the ignorance. X knew every fact about his own conduct, he only did not know the legal requirement.
Option (D) hands the matter to judicial discretion. The Principle states a flat rule with no discretion in it, so this option invents a power that was not given.

Step 5: Final Answer:
What X did not know was the law, not a fact, so he can be prosecuted. That is option (C).

Quick Tip: Ask precisely what X did not know. He knew he was carrying gold and knew he had not declared it. The only thing he missed was the notification, and a notification is law, not fact.

162. Principle: Proposal (communication) + Acceptance (communication) + Consideration = Contract. The communication of a proposal is complete when it comes to the knowledge of the person to whom it is made.

Facts: X's nephew absconded from home. He sent his servant in search of the boy. After the servant had left, X by handbills offered to pay Rs. 501 to anybody finding his nephew. The servant came to know of this offer only after he had already traced the missing child. He, therefore, brought an action to recover the reward.

(A) His action would fail because he was not aware of the offer

(B) His action would not fail because it was a general offer

(C) The fact that he was not aware of the offer does not make any difference and hence it was a valid contract. It is a mere formality

(D) None of these

Correct Answer: (A) His action would fail because he was not aware of the offer

Solution:

Step 1: Understanding the Question:

The servant was already out searching when X put up handbills promising Rs. 501 to whoever found the boy. The servant found the boy first and heard about the reward only afterwards. He now sues for the Rs. 501.

Step 2: Key Formula or Approach:

The Principle gives an equation and then a timing rule.

The equation says a contract needs a communicated proposal, a communicated acceptance and consideration. Every element must be there.

The timing rule says communication of a proposal is complete only when it comes to the knowledge of the person to whom it is made. So a proposal that has not reached a person's mind has not been communicated to him at all, however loudly it may have been published to the world.

Put the two together and you get the order in which things must happen. Knowledge of the proposal must come first, and only then can there be an acceptance of it.

Step 3: Detailed Explanation:

Build a timeline from the facts. First the servant leaves to search. Then X issues the handbills. Then the servant traces the boy. Only after that does the servant learn of the reward.

Now test each element against that timeline.

Was the proposal communicated to the servant before he acted? No. At the moment he was searching and finding, the offer had not come to his knowledge, so as against him the communication was not complete.

Was there an acceptance? An acceptance is a response to a known proposal. You cannot respond to something you have never heard of. The servant's search was done in performance of his duty as a servant, not in answer to an offer he did not know existed. So there was no acceptance.

With no communicated proposal and no acceptance, the equation in the Principle does not close. There is no contract, so there is nothing for the servant to sue on. His action fails.

Step 4: Checking the wrong options:

Option (B) relies on the offer being a general one. It is true that a general offer can be accepted by anyone who performs the act, but that person must still know of the offer when he performs. Being general changes who may accept, not the requirement of knowledge.

Option (C) says knowledge makes no difference and calls it a mere formality. That contradicts the Principle head on, which makes knowledge the very thing that completes communication.

Option (D) is unnecessary once option (A) fits.

Step 5: Final Answer:

The servant could not accept an offer he had never heard of, so his action fails. That is option (A).

Quick Tip: Put the events on a timeline. The handbills came out after the servant left, and he learned of them only after he had already found the boy. Then ask whether he could have accepted an offer he did not know about.

163. Principle: Agreements, the meaning of which is not certain, or not capable of being made certain, are void.

Facts: A horse was bought for a certain price coupled with a promise to give Rs. 500 more if the horse is proved lucky.

(A) This is a valid agreement.

(B) This agreement is void for uncertainty because it is very difficult to determine what luck, bad or good, the horse has brought to the buyer.

(C) The agreement is partially valid and partially void.

(D) None of the above.

Correct Answer: (B) This agreement is void for uncertainty because it is very difficult to determine what luck, bad or good, the horse has brought to the buyer.

Solution:

Step 1: Understanding the Question:
The principle has one test only: is the meaning of the agreement certain, or at least capable of being made certain?
The facts give two promises. One is to pay a fixed price for the horse. The other is to pay Rs. 500 extra if the horse is "proved lucky".
We have to apply the certainty test to the second promise.

Step 2: Key Formula or Approach:

An agreement is certain when a court can read it and say exactly what each side must do, and when that duty falls due.
If the event that triggers a payment cannot be measured by any fixed standard, nobody can ever say whether the money is owed. Such a promise has no ascertainable meaning, so the agreement is void.

Step 3: Detailed Explanation:
The extra Rs. 500 depends on the horse being "lucky".
Luck has no legal or commercial meaning. It is not a quality of the horse that can be inspected, measured, weighed or tested.
One buyer may call a horse lucky because it won a race. Another may call the same horse unlucky because it fell ill a month later. There is no yardstick that settles the dispute.
Because the trigger cannot be pinned down, the promise cannot be made certain by any evidence outside the contract either. That is exactly the situation the principle calls void.
This matches the old decision in Guthing v Lynn, where a horse was bought at a price with an extra sum promised if the horse proved lucky, and the added term was held too loose and vague to be enforced.
So the agreement fails the certainty test and is void.

Step 4: Why the other options fail:
Option (A) calls it a valid agreement. That ignores the principle, because the meaning of "lucky" is neither certain nor capable of being made certain.
Option (C) says it is partly valid and partly void. The principle offers no such split. It says the agreement is void, not that the good half survives, so this option adds a rule that was never given.
Option (D) is ruled out because option (B) already states the correct result with the correct reason.

Step 5: Final Answer:
The promise turns on an event that cannot be measured, so the agreement is void for uncertainty.

Option (B)

Quick Tip: Ask whether a court could ever prove that a horse turned out "lucky". If the trigger for the extra money cannot be measured by any standard, the promise has no certain meaning.

164. Principle: Mere silence as to the facts likely to affect the willingness of a person to enter into a contract is not a fraud, unless the circumstances of the case are such that, on close examination it is found to be the duty of the person keeping silent to speak, or unless his silence is, in itself, equivalent to speech.

Facts: X sells by auction to Y, a horse which X knows to be of unsound state of mind. X says nothing to Y about the horse's unsound state of mind. Give the correct answer.

(A) X can be held liable for fraud.

(B) X can be held liable for misrepresentation.

(C) X cannot be held liable, because he did not say anything positive about the mental state of the horse.

(D) X cannot be held liable because it is the buyer who must be aware of the things.

Correct Answer: (C) X cannot be held liable, because he did not say anything positive about the mental state of the horse.

Solution:

Step 1: Understanding the Question:

The principle sets a general rule and then two exceptions. The general rule is that staying silent about facts is not fraud.

Silence becomes fraud only in two situations. First, where the circumstances put the silent person under a duty to speak. Second, where the silence itself amounts to a statement.

On the facts, X knows the horse is unsound, says nothing, and sells it by auction.

Step 2: Key Formula or Approach:

Work through the rule in order. Start with the general rule, then check whether either exception is triggered by anything stated in the facts.

Nothing may be added from outside the principle and the facts. If neither exception applies, the general rule stands and there is no fraud.

Step 3: Detailed Explanation:

Check the first exception. A duty to speak arises where the parties stand in a relationship of trust and confidence, such as a family member, an agent or a doctor.

X and Y are a seller and a bidder at an auction. That is an ordinary arm's length dealing, with no relationship of trust shown in the facts, so no duty to speak arises.

Check the second exception. Silence equals speech when an earlier statement has been made that the silence makes false, or when the buyer asks a question and the seller lets a false impression stand.

X said nothing at all. There is no earlier statement and no question from Y that X left hanging. So the silence does not stand in for speech.

Neither exception applies, so the general rule governs. X only kept quiet and made no positive statement about the horse, so his conduct is not fraud and he is not liable.

Step 4: Why the other options fail:
Option (A) says X is liable for fraud. That contradicts the general rule, since neither exception has been made out on the facts.
Option (B) says X is liable for misrepresentation. Misrepresentation needs a false statement to have been made. X made no statement of any kind, and in any case the principle given deals only with fraud.
Option (D) reaches the right result but through the wrong route. It relies on caveat emptor, the idea that the buyer must look out for himself. That rule appears nowhere in the principle, and a principle question is decided only on the principle supplied.
Option (C) reaches the right result through the route the principle actually gives, which is that mere silence with no positive statement is not fraud.

Step 5: Final Answer:
X only stayed silent, no duty to speak arose, and the silence said nothing on its own, so there is no fraud.

Option (C)

Quick Tip: The principle has one rule and two exceptions. Check whether X owed any duty to speak, and whether his silence stood in for a statement. If neither, the default rule protects him.

165. Principle: Any direct physical interference with goods in somebody's possession without lawful justification is called trespass of goods.

Facts: Z purchased a car from a person who had no title to it and sent it to a garage for repair. X believing wrongly that the car was his, removed it from the garage.

(A) X can be held responsible for trespass of goods

(B) X cannot be held responsible for trespass of goods as he was under a wrong belief.

(C) X has not committed any wrong.

(D) None of the above.

Correct Answer: (A) X can be held responsible for trespass of goods

Solution:

Step 1: Understanding the Question:
The principle gives three ingredients for trespass of goods. There must be a direct physical interference. The goods must be in somebody's possession. The interference must have no lawful justification.
Notice what the principle does not ask about. It never asks about ownership, and it never asks about the state of mind of the person who interferes.

Step 2: Key Formula or Approach:
Tick off each ingredient against the facts. If all three are present, trespass is made out, and no extra defence may be invented that the principle did not supply.

Step 3: Detailed Explanation:

First ingredient, direct physical interference. X removed the car from the garage. Driving or taking a car away is as direct and physical as interference gets, so this is satisfied.

Second ingredient, goods in somebody's possession. Z bought the car and sent it to the garage for repair. Possession is not the same thing as ownership. Z had control of the car and had placed it with the garage on his own account, so the car was in Z's possession even though Z had no good title, because the seller had none to pass. The garage held it for Z.

That point matters. The principle protects possession, not title. A wrongful buyer still has possession that the law protects against a stranger, so the defect in Z's title does not help X.

Third ingredient, absence of lawful justification. X had no order of a court, no consent from Z, no lien and no other legal right to the car. His only ground was a belief that the car was his, and that belief was wrong. A mistaken belief is not a lawful justification.

All three ingredients are met, so X is liable for trespass of goods.

Step 4: Why the other options fail:

Option (B) treats X's honest mistake as a defence. The principle says nothing about intention or belief, so mistake cannot be read in as an excuse. Trespass to goods is complete once the interference happens without justification.

Option (C) says X did no wrong at all. That is plainly false, since removing a car that is in another person's possession is the very act the principle labels a wrong.

Option (D) fails because option (A) is correct.

Step 5: Final Answer:

X directly interfered with a car in Z's possession without any lawful justification, and his wrong belief is no defence.

Option (A)

Quick Tip: The principle protects possession, not ownership, and it says nothing about the state of mind of the person who interferes. Both facts about the defective title and the honest mistake are distractions.

166. Directions: The question consists of two statements, one labelled as 'Assertion' (A) and the other as 'Reason' (R). Examine these two statements carefully and select the correct answer.

Assertion (A): A void contract is not necessarily illegal.

Reason (R): Every illegal contract is void.

(A) Both A and R are individually true and R is the correct explanation of A.

(B) Both A and R are individually true but R is not the correct explanation of A.

(C) A is true but R is false.

(D) A is false but R is true.

Correct Answer: (B) Both A and R are individually true but R is not the correct explanation of A.

Solution:

Step 1: Understanding the Question:

An assertion and reason question needs three separate checks. Is A true on its own? Is R true on its own? If both are true, does R actually explain why A is true?

The subject here is the relationship between void agreements and illegal agreements.

Step 2: Key Formula or Approach:

A void agreement is one the law will not enforce. An illegal agreement is one whose object or consideration is forbidden by law, or is fraudulent, immoral or against public policy.

Illegality is the narrower idea. Every illegal agreement is void, but voidness has many other causes that have nothing to do with illegality.

Step 3: Testing statement A:

A says a void contract is not necessarily illegal. This is true.

An agreement with a minor is void, but nothing about it is illegal. An agreement that is uncertain in meaning is void, but it breaks no law. An agreement made under a shared mistake of fact is void, yet it is perfectly innocent.

So voidness does not carry illegality with it. A is true.

Step 4: Testing statement R:

R says every illegal contract is void. This is also true. Once the object or consideration of an agreement is unlawful, the agreement is void and the courts will not touch it. Illegality also taints any collateral transaction, which is a further consequence that voidness alone does not have. R is true.

Step 5: Does R explain A?

R states that illegal implies void. A states that void does not imply illegal.
The second is the converse question. Knowing that every illegal agreement is void tells you nothing about the many void agreements that were never illegal in the first place.
To prove A you need examples of void but lawful agreements, such as an agreement with a minor. R supplies none of that. So R does not explain A, although the two sit in the same area of law.

Step 6: Why the other options fail:
Option (A) claims R explains A, which fails for the reason just given.
Option (C) calls R false, but every illegal agreement really is void.
Option (D) calls A false, but plenty of void agreements are lawful.

Step 7: Final Answer:
Both statements are true, but the reason is about illegal agreements being void and does not prove that void agreements can be lawful.

Option (B)

Quick Tip: Both statements are correct. Ask whether "every illegal agreement is void" can by itself prove that some void agreements are perfectly lawful. It cannot, because that is the reverse direction.

167. Directions: The question consists of two statements, one labelled as 'Assertion' (A) and the other as 'Reason' (R). Examine these two statements carefully and select the correct answer.

Assertion (A): The Indian Constitution was adopted on 26th November, 1949.

Reason (R): Law Day is celebrated in India on 26th November every year.

(A) Both A and R are individually true and R is the correct explanation of A.

(B) Both A and R are individually true but R is not the correct explanation of A.

(C) A is true but R is false.

(D) A is false but R is true.

Correct Answer: (B) Both A and R are individually true but R is not the correct explanation of A.

Solution:

Step 1: Understanding the Question:
Two facts about 26 November are given. One is a historical event, the other is an annual observance. We must check each for truth and then check whether the second causes the first.

Step 2: Testing statement A:
The Constituent Assembly adopted, enacted and gave to itself the Constitution on 26 November 1949. That date appears in the Preamble itself.
A few articles dealing with citizenship, elections and provisional

Parliament came into force at once, and the rest came into force on 26 January 1950, which is Republic Day.
So A is true. Keep the two dates apart: 26 November 1949 is adoption, 26 January 1950 is commencement.

Step 3: Testing statement R:
India observes Law Day, now also called Constitution Day or Samvidhan Divas, on 26 November each year. The observance exists precisely to mark the adoption of the Constitution. So R is true as a statement of fact.

Step 4: Does R explain A?
Here the cause and effect run backwards. The Constitution was not adopted on 26 November 1949 because Law Day falls on that date. Law Day falls on that date because the Constitution was adopted then. The assembly finished its work in 1949. The observance came much later and simply borrowed the date. A explains R, not the other way round.
So both statements are true, but R is not the correct explanation of A.

Step 5: Why the other options fail:
Option (A) reverses the real chain of cause and effect, which is the trap the question is built around.
Option (C) calls R false, but Law Day is genuinely observed on 26 November.
Option (D) calls A false, but 26 November 1949 is the correct adoption date.

Step 6: Final Answer:
Both are true, and the reason follows from the assertion instead of explaining it.

Option (B)

Quick Tip: Both facts are correct. Ask which one caused the other. Law Day was fixed on 26 November because the Constitution was adopted then, so the explanation runs the other way.

168. Directions: The question consists of two statements, one labelled as 'Assertion' (A) and the other as 'Reason' (R). Examine these two statements carefully and select the correct answer.

Assertion (A): The state shall not make any law, which takes away or abridges the rights conferred by Part III (Fundamental Rights) and any law made in contravention of this clause shall, to the extent of the contravention, be void.

Reason (R): The fundamental rights are the rights reserved by the people and for this reason they are eternal and sacrosanct.

(A) Both A and R are individually true and R is the correct explanation of A.

(B) Both A and R are individually true but R is not the correct explanation of A.

(C) A is true but R is false.

(D) A is false but R is true.

Correct Answer: (C) A is true but R is false.

Solution:

Step 1: Understanding the Question:
Statement A is a paraphrase of a constitutional provision. Statement R makes a claim about the nature of fundamental rights. Test each for truth first.

Step 2: Testing statement A:
Article 13(2) says the State shall not make any law which takes away or abridges the rights conferred by Part III, and any law made in contravention of that clause shall, to the extent of the contravention, be void.
A reproduces that text almost word for word, so A is true.
Notice the phrase "to the extent of the contravention". Only the offending part of the law falls, which is the doctrine of severability.

Step 3: Testing statement R:
R has two halves. The first half, that fundamental rights are reserved by the people, is a fair description of the Preamble's idea that the people gave the Constitution to themselves.
The second half claims the rights are eternal and sacrosanct. This is where R breaks down.
Fundamental rights can be amended under Article 368. The Twenty Fourth Amendment settled that Article 13 does not bar a constitutional amendment. Kesavananda Bharati held that fundamental rights are amendable, subject only to the basic structure of the Constitution.
The right to property was itself a fundamental right and was removed from Part III by the Forty Fourth Amendment in 1978. A right that can be deleted is plainly not eternal.
Fundamental rights are also not absolute. Reasonable restrictions apply to Article 19, and most rights can be suspended or curtailed during an Emergency under Articles 358 and 359.

So R is false.

Step 4: Fitting the answer:
A is true and R is false, which matches option (C). Once R is false, the question of whether it explains A never arises.

Step 5: Why the other options fail:
Options (A) and (B) both need R to be true, and it is not.
Option (D) calls A false, but A is a direct restatement of Article 13(2).

Step 6: Final Answer:
Article 13(2) binds ordinary law making, but fundamental rights are amendable and not eternal, so the reason is wrong.

Option (C)

Quick Tip: Statement A is Article 13(2) restated. Test the word "eternal" in R against Article 368 and against the deletion of the fundamental right to property in 1978.

169. Directions: The question consists of two statements, one labelled as 'Assertion' (A) and the other as 'Reason' (R). Examine these two statements carefully and select the correct answer.

Assertion (A): Directive Principles of State Policy contained in Part IV shall not be enforceable by any court, but the principles therein laid down are nevertheless fundamental in the governance of the country and it shall be the duty of the State to apply these principles in making laws.

Reason (R): Directive Principles of State Policy and Fundamental Rights are both complementary to each other but in case of any controversy fundamental rights will prevail.

(A) Both A and R are individually true and R is the correct explanation of A.

(B) Both A and R are individually true but R is not the correct explanation of A.

(C) A is true but R is false.

(D) A is false but R is true.

Correct Answer: (B) Both A and R are individually true but R is not the correct explanation of A.

Solution:

Step 1: Understanding the Question:
Statement A describes the status of the Directive Principles. Statement R describes how they interact with the Fundamental Rights. Check each for truth, then check the link.

Step 2: Testing statement A:
Article 37 says the provisions of Part IV shall not be enforceable by

any court, but the principles laid down are nevertheless fundamental in the governance of the country, and it shall be the duty of the State to apply these principles in making laws.
A is that article almost word for word, so A is true.

Step 3: Testing statement R:
The first half of R says the two Parts are complementary. Courts have said this repeatedly. Minerva Mills described the balance between Parts III and IV as part of the basic structure, and later cases read the two together to give content to rights such as Article 21.
The second half says fundamental rights prevail where there is a conflict. Champakam Dorairajan laid this down, holding that the Directive Principles must run subsidiary to the Fundamental Rights. That position remains the general rule.
So R is true as a broad statement.

Step 4: Does R explain A?
A answers one question: are the Directive Principles enforceable in court? The answer is no, and the reason for that lies in Article 37 itself, in the choice made by the framers to leave social and economic goals to the political process rather than to judges.
R answers a different question: what happens when a Directive Principle collides with a Fundamental Right?
Those are separate issues. The Directive Principles would still be unenforceable even if there were never a single clash with Part III. So R states a true related fact without supplying the reason for A.

Step 5: Why the other options fail:
Option (A) treats the priority rule as the cause of unenforceability, which it is not.
Option (C) calls R false. R matches the settled position from

Champakam Dorairajan onwards.
Option (D) calls A false, but A is Article 37 restated.

Step 6: Final Answer:
Both statements are correct, but the priority rule in R does not explain why Part IV is unenforceable.

Option (B)

Quick Tip: Both statements are accepted law. Ask whether the rule about which Part wins a clash tells you anything about why Part IV cannot be enforced in court at all.

170. Directions: The question consists of two statements, one labelled as 'Assertion' (A) and the other as 'Reason' (R). Examine these two statements carefully and select the correct answer.

Assertion (A): All minorities, whether based on religion or language, shall have the right to establish and administer educational institutions of their choice.

Reason (R): Institutions established by the minorities are not entitled to governmental aid and government is not under an obligation to give aid.

(A) Both A and R are individually true and R is the correct explanation of A.

(B) Both A and R are individually true but R is not the correct explanation of A.

(C) A is true but R is false.

(D) A is false but R is true.

Correct Answer: (C) A is true but R is false.

Solution:

Step 1: Understanding the Question:
Both statements concern Article 30 of the Constitution, which protects minority educational institutions. Test each statement on its own before looking for a link.

Step 2: Testing statement A:
Article 30(1) says all minorities, whether based on religion or language, shall have the right to establish and administer educational institutions of their choice.
Statement A is that clause reproduced, so A is true.
The right has two limbs, the right to establish and the right to administer, and it covers linguistic minorities exactly as it covers religious ones.

Step 3: Testing statement R:
R claims minority institutions are not entitled to government aid and that the government has no obligation to give aid.
Article 30(2) says the State shall not, in granting aid to educational institutions, discriminate against any educational institution on the ground that it is under the management of a minority, whether based

on religion or language.
That clause is the direct opposite of what R says. It does not force the State to fund every minority institution, but it forbids the State from refusing aid because the management is a minority one. Minority status can never be the reason for denial.
So R, read as it stands, is false. It denies an entitlement that Article 30(2) protects.

Step 4: Fitting the answer:
A is true and R is false, which is option (C). Once R is false, the explanation question drops away.

Step 5: Why the other options fail:
Options (A) and (B) both require R to be true, and Article 30(2) contradicts it.
Option (D) calls A false, but A is Article 30(1) word for word.
Option (A) is doubly wrong, because R actually cuts against A rather than supporting it. A statement that denies minority institutions any claim to aid cannot explain a clause that grants them a protected right.

Step 6: Final Answer:
Article 30(1) grants the right, and Article 30(2) bars discrimination in aid, so the reason is wrong.

Option (C)

Quick Tip: Statement A is Article 30(1). Now recall what Article 30(2) says about the State granting aid to institutions run by minorities, and test R against it.

171. Directions: The question consists of two statements, one labelled as 'Assertion' (A) and the other as 'Reason' (R). Examine these two statements carefully and select the correct answer.

Assertion (A): The right to move the Supreme Court under Article 32 of the Constitution by appropriate proceedings for the enforcement of the fundamental rights is guaranteed as a fundamental right.

Reason (R): Supreme Court of India has been appointed as the guardian of the Constitution.

(A) Both A and R are individually true and R is the correct explanation of A.

(B) Both A and R are individually true but R is not the correct explanation of A.

(C) A is true but R is false.

(D) A is false but R is true.

Correct Answer: (A) Both A and R are individually true and R is the correct explanation of A.

Solution:

Step 1: Understanding the Question:
Statement A restates Article 32(1). Statement R describes the role of the Supreme Court. Test each for truth, then ask whether R gives the reason for A.

Step 2: Testing statement A:
Article 32(1) says the right to move the Supreme Court by appropriate proceedings for the enforcement of the rights conferred by Part III is

guaranteed.
Article 32 sits inside Part III itself, so the remedy is not just a procedure but a fundamental right in its own right. Article 32(4) adds that this right cannot be suspended except as the Constitution provides.
Dr Ambedkar called Article 32 the heart and soul of the Constitution, the one article he would not consent to have removed. So A is true.

Step 3: Testing statement R:
The Supreme Court is the guardian and final interpreter of the Constitution. It is also called the protector and guarantor of fundamental rights, a description drawn from Article 32 itself.
The word "appointed" is loose, since the Court is established by the Constitution rather than appointed by anyone, but the substance of R is correct. R is true.

Step 4: Does R explain A?
Ask why the framers made the remedy itself a fundamental right, and why they routed it straight to the Supreme Court rather than to a lower court.
The answer is that the Supreme Court was designed to be the guardian of the Constitution and of the rights it confers. A right without a remedy is worthless, so the framers gave every person a guaranteed door to the guardian court.
R states exactly that design. The Court's role as guardian is why the right of direct access to it was elevated to a fundamental right and placed inside Part III. So R does explain A.

Step 5: Why the other options fail:
Option (B) denies the link, but the guardianship role is precisely what justifies making access to the Court a guaranteed right.

Option (C) calls R false, which it is not in substance.
Option (D) calls A false, but Article 32 plainly guarantees the right.

Step 6: Final Answer:
Both statements are true, and the Court's role as guardian of the Constitution is the reason the right of access under Article 32 was itself made fundamental.

Option (A)

Quick Tip: Ask why the framers guaranteed a direct route to the Supreme Court and put that remedy inside Part III. The answer lies in the role the Court was designed to play.

172. Directions: The question consists of two statements, one labelled as 'Assertion' (A) and the other as 'Reason' (R). Examine these two statements carefully and select the correct answer.

Assertion (A): If the budget presented to the Rajya Sabha is not passed in the stipulated period, the budget proposals are not affected.

Reason (R): The Lok Sabha is more powerful, in financial matters, than the Rajya Sabha.

(A) Both A and R are individually true and R is the correct explanation of A.

(B) Both A and R are individually true but R is not the correct explanation of A.

(C) A is true but R is false.

(D) A is false but R is true.

Correct Answer: (A) Both A and R are individually true and R is the correct explanation of A.

Solution:

Step 1: Understanding the Question:
Statement A describes what happens when the Rajya Sabha fails to act on the budget within the time allowed. Statement R makes a general claim about the financial powers of the two Houses.

Step 2: Key Formula or Approach:
The budget, or the annual financial statement under Article 112, is carried through Parliament by Money Bills. Article 109 lays down the special procedure for a Money Bill.
A Money Bill can be introduced only in the Lok Sabha. Once the Lok Sabha passes it, the Bill goes to the Rajya Sabha, which may only make recommendations and must return the Bill within fourteen days.

Step 3: Testing statement A:
If the Rajya Sabha does not return the Bill within fourteen days, Article 109(5) says the Bill is deemed to have been passed by both Houses at the end of that period, in the form in which the Lok Sabha passed it.

Even when the Rajya Sabha does send back recommendations, the Lok Sabha may accept or reject any of them. If it rejects them all, the Bill stands passed in its original form.
So the budget proposals go through untouched, no matter what the Rajya Sabha does or fails to do. A is true.

Step 4: Testing statement R:
The Lok Sabha is clearly the stronger House in money matters. Money Bills originate only there. Only the Lok Sabha votes on the demands for grants. The Rajya Sabha cannot amend or reject a Money Bill, and the Speaker's certificate decides whether a Bill is a Money Bill at all.
So R is true.

Step 5: Does R explain A?
Ask why the fourteen day lapse costs the budget nothing. The answer is the deeming rule in Article 109(5), and that rule exists because the framers deliberately made the Rajya Sabha the weaker House on money.
The Rajya Sabha is not directly elected by the people, and the government answers to the Lok Sabha alone. Control over the purse was therefore given to the popular House. A is a direct working out of that design, which R states. So R explains A.

Step 6: Why the other options fail:
Option (B) denies the link, but the whole reason the delay is harmless is the Rajya Sabha's weaker financial position.
Options (C) and (D) each call one statement false, and both statements are correct.

Step 7: Final Answer:

Both are true, and the Lok Sabha's supremacy in money matters is exactly why Rajya Sabha inaction leaves the budget untouched.

Option (A)

Quick Tip: Recall the fourteen day rule for a Money Bill in the Rajya Sabha and what Article 109(5) says happens when that period runs out. Then ask why the Constitution set it up that way.

173. Directions: The question consists of two statements, one labelled as 'Assertion' (A) and the other as 'Reason' (R). Examine these two statements carefully and select the correct answer.

Assertion (A): In the event of violation of any legal right (tort) the aggrieved party is entitled to recover unliquidated damages.

Reason (R): The object of awarding damages to the aggrieved party is to put him in the same position in which he would have been if the wrong would not have been committed. Damages are therefore, assessed on that basis.

(A) Both A and R are individually true and R is the correct explanation of A.

(B) Both A and R are individually true but R is not the correct explanation of A.

(C) A is true but R is false.

(D) A is false but R is true.

Correct Answer: (A) Both A and R are individually true and R is the correct explanation of A.

Solution:

Step 1: Understanding the Question:

Statement A says the remedy for a tort is unliquidated damages. Statement R states the aim of awarding damages and adds that damages are assessed on that basis.

The key word is "unliquidated", so start by fixing its meaning.

Step 2: Key Formula or Approach:

Liquidated damages are a sum the parties fixed in advance, which only happens where there is a contract between them.

Unliquidated damages are not fixed in advance by anyone. The court works out the figure after the wrong, looking at what the claimant actually lost.

Step 3: Testing statement A:

A tort is a civil wrong, and its usual remedy is an action for unliquidated damages. That phrase appears in the standard definition of tort itself.

The reason is simple. A tortfeasor and a victim are usually strangers. A pedestrian knocked down by a careless driver never sat with the driver beforehand to agree a price for the injury. Nobody could have fixed a sum in advance, so the court must fix it afterwards. A is true.

Step 4: Testing statement R:

R states the principle of restitutio in integrum, that damages should put the injured party back in the position he would have occupied had the wrong not happened. This is the accepted measure in tort. R is true.

Step 5: Does R explain A?

Ask why damages in tort must be unliquidated rather than fixed. Because the aim is to restore the claimant to his pre wrong position, the award has to match what this particular claimant actually lost in this particular incident. That loss is unknown until the wrong occurs and its effects are measured.
A figure fixed in advance could never do this. It would overpay one victim and underpay another. So the very object stated in R forces the damages to be assessed after the event, which is what "unliquidated" means. R gives the reason for A.

Step 6: Why the other options fail:
Option (B) denies the link, but the compensatory aim is exactly why the sum cannot be pre fixed.
Option (C) calls R false, but restitutio in integrum is the settled measure of tort damages.
Option (D) calls A false, but unliquidated damages are the standard tort remedy.

Step 7: Final Answer:
Both statements are true, and the aim of restoring the claimant to his earlier position is why the damages must be assessed by the court rather than fixed in advance.

Option (A)

Quick Tip: Work out what "unliquidated" means: a sum nobody fixed in advance, so the court must assess it. Then ask whether the compensatory aim in R is what forces that assessment.

174. Assertion (A): During inflation, there is increase in money supply and rise in price level.
Reason (R): The rise in prices is due to shortage in supply of essential consumer goods.

(A) Both A and R are individually true and R is the correct explanation of A

(B) Both A and R are individually true but R is not the correct explanation of A

(C) A is true but R is false

(D) A is false but R is true

Correct Answer: (B) Both A and R are individually true but R is not the correct explanation of A

Solution:

Step 1: Understanding the Question:
This is an assertion-reason question. Two jobs have to be done. First, test each statement on its own for truth. Second, ask whether the reason explains the exact situation described in the assertion. Both parts can be true and the answer can still not be option (A).

Step 2: Testing the Assertion:
Inflation is a sustained rise in the general price level. The assertion links it with an increase in money supply. That link is standard economics: when more money chases the same quantity of goods, each unit of money buys less, so prices climb. Demand-pull inflation works exactly this way. So the assertion is true.

Step 3: Testing the Reason:
The reason says prices rise because essential consumer goods are in

short supply. Taken by itself this is also a true statement of economics. A shortfall in supply does push prices up, and that is how cost-push or scarcity driven price rise happens. So the reason is true as a free standing sentence.

Step 4: Does R explain A?
Here the two statements part company. The assertion describes a price rise driven by extra money in the system. The reason describes a price rise driven by a fall in the supply of goods. These are two separate causes of inflation, coming from opposite sides of the market. The reason therefore offers a rival explanation, not the explanation of the situation stated in the assertion. R does not explain A.

Step 5: Why the other options fail:
Option (A) fails because R gives a different cause from the one named in A, so it cannot be the correct explanation.
Option (C) fails because R is not false; shortages really do raise prices.
Option (D) fails because A is plainly true; money supply growth and rising prices are the textbook markers of inflation.

Final Answer:
Both statements stand on their own, but they point to different causes, so R is not the correct explanation of A. The answer is option (B).

Quick Tip: Check which side of the market each statement uses. One talks about extra money, the other about fewer goods. Both raise prices, but they are separate causes.

175. Assertion (A): X, because of unsound state of mind and not knowing the nature of the act, attacks Y, who in self defence and in order to ward off the attack hits him thereby injuring him. Y has not committed an offence.
Reason (R): Y had a right of private defence against X under Section 98 of the Indian Penal Code.

(A) Both A and R are individually true and R is the correct explanation of A

(B) Both A and R are individually true but R is not the correct explanation of A

(C) A is true but R is false

(D) A is false but R is true

Correct Answer: (A) Both A and R are individually true and R is the correct explanation of A

Solution:

Step 1: Understanding the Question:
X is of unsound mind and does not know what he is doing. He attacks Y. Y hits back only to ward off the attack and injures X. The assertion says Y has committed no offence. The reason points to Section 98 of the Indian Penal Code. We have to check both statements and then check the link between them.

Step 2: The rule in Section 98 IPC:
Section 98 deals with the right of private defence against the act of a person who is himself not capable of committing an offence. It covers an attacker who is of unsound mind, an infant, intoxicated, or acting under a misconception. The section says that every person has the same right of private defence against such an act as he would have if

the act were an offence.
The reason behind the rule is easy to see. The law does not ask a victim to stand still and take a beating merely because his attacker cannot be punished. The defender's right depends on the danger he faces, not on whether the attacker can be convicted.

Step 3: Applying the rule to the facts:
X's attack, coming from an unsound mind, is not an offence on X's part; Section 84 protects him. But Section 98 tells us to treat that attack, for Y's purposes, as if it were an offence. So Y gets a full right of private defence.
Y used the force only to ward off the attack, so he stayed inside the limits of that right. Force used in the lawful exercise of private defence is not an offence. The assertion is therefore true.

Step 4: Checking the reason and the link:
The reason correctly names Section 98 as the provision that gives Y the right of private defence against an attacker of unsound mind. So the reason is true. It is also the very rule that makes Y's act lawful, which is exactly what the assertion claims. So R explains A.

Step 5: Why the other options fail:
Option (B) fails because R is not a stray true fact; it is the precise legal basis of the conclusion in A.
Option (C) fails because Section 98 is real and squarely applies, so R is true.
Option (D) fails because A is true; Y committed no offence.

Final Answer:
Both statements are true and Section 98 is the reason Y is not liable, so the answer is option (A).

Quick Tip: Section 98 IPC gives a full right of private defence even when the attacker cannot himself be convicted, as with a person of unsound mind. Ask whether that section is the actual basis of Y's innocence.

176. Assertion (A): X and Y independently entertained the idea to kill Z. Accordingly, each of them separately inflicted wounds on Z who died as a consequence. X and Y are liable for murder under 341 IPC.
Reason (R): When a criminal act is done by several persons in furtherance of common intention of all, each of such persons is liable as if the whole act was done by him alone.

(A) Both A and R are individually true and R is the correct explanation of A

(B) Both A and R are individually true but R is not the correct explanation of A

(C) A is true but R is false

(D) A is false but R is true

Correct Answer: (D) A is false but R is true

Solution:

Step 1: Understanding the Question:
X and Y each decided on their own to kill Z. They did not plan together. Each wounded Z separately, and Z died. The assertion says both are liable for murder under Section 341 IPC. The reason states the rule of joint liability. Both statements have to be tested one by one.

Step 2: Testing the Assertion, part one - the section cited:

Section 341 IPC has nothing to do with murder. It prescribes the punishment for wrongful restraint, which is simple imprisonment up to one month or a fine up to five hundred rupees, or both. Murder is defined in Section 300 and punished under Section 302. So the assertion cites the wrong section, and on that ground alone it is false.

Step 3: Testing the Assertion, part two - the joint liability point:
The facts say X and Y acted independently. The word carries weight here. Joint liability under Section 34 needs a prior meeting of minds, a common intention shared before the act. Two people who separately form the same wish do not thereby share a common intention. So neither can be made answerable for the other's blows. Each answers only for what he himself did. The assertion is false twice over.

Step 4: Testing the Reason:
The reason reproduces Section 34 IPC almost word for word. When a criminal act is done by several persons in furtherance of the common intention of all, each is liable as if the act were done by him alone. That is a correct statement of law, so the reason is true.

Step 5: Why the other options fail:
Options (A) and (B) both need the assertion to be true, and it is not, because of the wrong section and the absence of common intention. Option (C) reverses the position; it makes A true and R false, which is the opposite of what the analysis shows.

Final Answer:
The assertion is false and the reason is a correct statement of Section 34, so the answer is option (D).

Quick Tip: Look at the section number first, then at the word "independently". Section 341 punishes wrongful restraint, and common intention under Section 34 needs a shared plan, not two separate decisions.

177. Assertion (A): A person claims compensation for his non-gratuitous act.
Reason (R): A person who enjoys benefit from lawful, non-gratuitous act of another must compensate him even though there is no contract.

(A) Both A and R are individually true and R is the correct explanation of A

(B) Both A and R are individually true but R is not the correct explanation of A

(C) A is true but R is false

(D) A is false but R is true

Correct Answer: (A) Both A and R are individually true and R is the correct explanation of A

Solution:

Step 1: Understanding the Question:
The assertion says a person is claiming compensation for a non-gratuitous act, that is, an act done without any intention of doing it free of charge. The reason states the rule that lets him make that claim. Both statements must be tested, then the link between them.

Step 2: The rule being tested - Section 70 of the Indian Contract Act:
Section 70 covers the obligation of a person enjoying the benefit of a non-gratuitous act. It has three ingredients. One, a person lawfully does something for another or delivers something to him. Two, he

does it without intending to act gratuitously. Three, the other person enjoys the benefit of it. When all three are present, the person enjoying the benefit must make compensation, or restore the thing delivered.
This sits in the chapter on quasi contracts. No agreement is signed and no offer is accepted, yet the law creates an obligation, because it would be unfair to let someone keep a benefit he knew was not a gift.

Step 3: Testing the Assertion:
A claim for compensation for a non-gratuitous act is exactly what Section 70 permits. The claim is legally maintainable, so the assertion is true.

Step 4: Testing the Reason and the link:
The reason restates Section 70 in plain words, including the important part that liability arises even though there is no contract. That is a correct statement of law, so the reason is true. It is also the source of the right claimed in the assertion. Without Section 70 there would be no such claim, because no contract exists to sue upon. So the reason explains the assertion.

Step 5: Why the other options fail:
Option (B) fails because the reason is not an unrelated true fact; it is the very foundation of the claim.
Option (C) fails because the reason correctly states the quasi contractual rule.
Option (D) fails because the assertion is true; such a claim is allowed by law.

Final Answer:

Both statements are true and the reason explains the assertion, so the answer is option (A).

Quick Tip: Think of quasi contracts. Section 70 of the Indian Contract Act lets a person recover for a lawful, non-gratuitous act whose benefit another has enjoyed, even with no agreement between them.

178. Assertion (A): Freedom of Speech is the most important civil liberty of people in a democratic polity.
Reason (R): State can regulate free speech in the interest of public order.

(A) Both A and R are individually true and R is the correct explanation of A

(B) Both A and R are individually true but R is not the correct explanation of A

(C) A is true but R is false

(D) A is false but R is true

Correct Answer: (B) Both A and R are individually true but R is not the correct explanation of A

Solution:

Step 1: Understanding the Question:
The assertion praises freedom of speech as the most important civil liberty in a democracy. The reason says the State may regulate speech in the interest of public order. Test each, then ask whether the second accounts for the first.

Step 2: Testing the Assertion:
Freedom of speech and expression is guaranteed by Article 19(1)(a).

Courts and writers have repeatedly called it the foundation of democratic government, because voters cannot choose, criticise, or hold power to account without it. The Supreme Court has described it as lying at the base of all democratic organisations. Treated as a general democratic proposition, the assertion is true.

Step 3: Testing the Reason:
Article 19(2) allows the State to impose reasonable restrictions on the freedom under Article 19(1)(a) on listed grounds. Public order is one of those grounds, added by the First Amendment in 1951. Others include the sovereignty and integrity of India, security of the State, friendly relations with foreign States, decency or morality, contempt of court, defamation, and incitement to an offence. So the reason is a correct statement of constitutional law and is true.

Step 4: Does R explain A?
No, and the direction of the two statements shows why. The assertion is about the importance of the right. The reason is about the limits placed on the right. A power to cut a right down cannot be the reason the right is important. If anything, the reason pulls the other way. The two are true statements about the same freedom that face in opposite directions.

Step 5: Why the other options fail:
Option (A) fails because a restriction cannot explain an importance.
Option (C) fails because Article 19(2) plainly permits restrictions on the ground of public order, so R is true.
Option (D) fails because the assertion is a widely accepted position about democratic government.

Final Answer:

Both statements are true but the reason does not explain the assertion, so the answer is option (B).

Quick Tip: One statement says why the right matters, the other says how it can be curbed under Article 19(2). Ask whether a limit on a right can ever explain the right's importance.

179. Assertion (A): Austin's concept of law is known as imperative theory. Reason (R): Austin emphasized on the commanding character of law.

(A) Both A and R are individually true and R is the correct explanation of A

(B) Both A and R are individually true but R is not the correct explanation of A

(C) A is true but R is false

(D) A is false but R is true

Correct Answer: (A) Both A and R are individually true and R is the correct explanation of A

Solution:

Step 1: Understanding the Question:
The assertion names Austin's theory of law as the imperative theory. The reason says Austin stressed the commanding character of law. Both must be tested, and then the link checked.

Step 2: What Austin actually said:
John Austin, the English jurist who founded the analytical school, defined law as a command of the sovereign backed by a sanction. His formula has four parts. There is a sovereign, a determinate human

superior whom the bulk of society habitually obeys and who obeys no one else. The sovereign issues commands. Those commands create a duty in the person commanded. Failure to obey brings a sanction, an evil inflicted by the sovereign.

Step 3: Testing the Assertion:
Because the command sits at the centre of that definition, Austin's theory is universally labelled the imperative theory of law. It is also called the command theory or the analytical positivist theory. So the assertion is true.

Step 4: Testing the Reason and the link:
The reason says Austin emphasised the commanding character of law. That is exactly right; for Austin a rule that is not a command of a sovereign is not law properly so called, which is why he pushed customary law and international law out of the category. So the reason is true.
The link is direct. The word imperative comes from the Latin imperare, meaning to command. The theory is called imperative precisely because Austin put the command at its centre. So the reason explains the assertion.

Step 5: Why the other options fail:
Option (B) fails because the reason is not a separate fact; it is the very ground for the label in the assertion.
Option (C) fails because Austin's whole scheme rests on command, so the reason is true.
Option (D) fails because the imperative label for Austin's theory is standard in every jurisprudence text.

Final Answer:

Both statements are true and the reason explains the assertion, so the answer is option (A).

Quick Tip: Austin defined law as the command of a sovereign backed by a sanction. The word imperative comes from the Latin for command, so check whether the reason is the source of the name.

180. Assertion (A): The essence of joint liability under section 149 of the IPC is that the criminal act must have been done with a view to fulfill the common object of an unlawful assembly.
Reason (R): Any sudden and provocative act done by a member of an unlawful assembly would render the other members of that assembly liable.

(A) Both A and R are individually true and R is the correct explanation of A

(B) Both A and R are individually true but R is not the correct explanation of A

(C) A is true but R is false

(D) A is false but R is true

Correct Answer: (C) A is true but R is false

Solution:

Step 1: Understanding the Question:
The assertion states the core of Section 149 IPC. The reason makes a broader claim, that any sudden and provocative act by one member fastens liability on the rest. Test each statement separately.

Step 2: What Section 149 says:

Section 149 creates constructive or vicarious liability. If an offence is committed by any member of an unlawful assembly in prosecution of the common object of that assembly, or if the members knew that such an offence was likely to be committed in prosecution of that object, then every person who was a member of that assembly at the time is guilty of that offence.
The controlling words are "in prosecution of the common object" and "knew to be likely". The section fixes liability only through the common object. That is exactly what the assertion says, so the assertion is true.

Step 3: Testing the Reason:
The reason drops the common object requirement altogether. It says any sudden and provocative act by a member makes the others liable. That is not the law. A sudden act, committed on a private impulse and unconnected with the common object, is the individual act of the person who did it. The others are not liable for it unless it was done in prosecution of the common object or they knew it was likely to happen in prosecution of that object.
Courts have said this repeatedly. A member of an unlawful assembly does not become an insurer against every independent act of every other member. So the reason is false.

Step 4: Why the other options fail:
Options (A) and (B) both need the reason to be true, and it is not. It states a rule wider than Section 149 permits.
Option (D) makes the assertion false, but the assertion is a correct statement of the essence of Section 149.

Step 5: Putting it together:
The assertion is a correct description of the section. The reason

contradicts the section by removing the common object link. So we have a true assertion and a false reason.

Final Answer:
A is true but R is false, so the answer is option (C).

Quick Tip: Section 149 fastens liability only for acts done in prosecution of the common object, or known to be likely in prosecution of it. Test the reason against that limit.

181. The following are enshrined in the Preamble of the Constitution of India
I. Equality of status and of opportunity
II. Liberty of thought, expression, belief, faith and worship
III. Justice-social, economic and political
IV. Fraternity assuring the dignity of the individual
V. Unity and Integrity of the nation
Which of the following is the correct order in which they appear in the preamble?

(A) V-I-II-IV-III

(B) III-II-I-IV-V

(C) III-I-II-V-IV

(D) I-II-IV-III-V

Correct Answer: (B) III-II-I-IV-V

Solution:

Step 1: Understanding the Question:
Five ideals from the Preamble are listed out of order. We have to

arrange them in the sequence in which the Preamble itself sets them down, then match that sequence with an option.

Step 2: Recalling the exact text of the Preamble:
The operative part of the Preamble reads:
"...to secure to all its citizens: JUSTICE, social, economic and political; LIBERTY of thought, expression, belief, faith and worship; EQUALITY of status and of opportunity; and to promote among them all FRATERNITY assuring the dignity of the individual and the unity and integrity of the Nation."

Step 3: Fixing the order of the four ideals:
The order in the text is Justice, Liberty, Equality, Fraternity. This is worth remembering as JLEF. Note that it does not follow the French revolutionary slogan of Liberty, Equality, Fraternity, because the framers placed Justice first.

Step 4: Matching each ideal with its Roman numeral:
Justice, social, economic and political is item III.
Liberty of thought, expression, belief, faith and worship is item II.
Equality of status and of opportunity is item I.
Fraternity assuring the dignity of the individual is item IV.
Unity and integrity of the Nation is item V, and it comes last because in the Preamble it is part of the same fraternity clause, appearing after the dignity of the individual.
So the sequence is III, II, I, IV, V.

Step 5: Why the other options fail:
Option (A), V-I-II-IV-III, starts with unity and integrity and pushes justice to the end. Justice comes first in the text, not last.
Option (C), III-I-II-V-IV, starts correctly with justice but then swaps

equality ahead of liberty and puts unity and integrity ahead of fraternity. Both moves are wrong.
Option (D), I-II-IV-III-V, begins with equality, which is third in the text.

Final Answer:
The Preamble order is Justice, Liberty, Equality, Fraternity, then unity and integrity of the Nation, which is III-II-I-IV-V. The answer is option (B).

Quick Tip: Recite the Preamble text itself, not the French slogan. Justice comes first, and unity and integrity of the Nation closes the fraternity clause.

182. Which one of the following statements is correct?
Right to free and compulsory education for all children of the age of 6 to 14 years is:

(A) a fundamental right enforceable in law

(B) a fundamental duty

(C) a directive principle of state policy

(D) a fundamental right which, however, can be enforced only if the state makes an enabling legislation

Correct Answer: (A) a fundamental right enforceable in law

Solution:

Step 1: Understanding the Question:
We must place the right to free and compulsory education for children aged 6 to 14 in the correct constitutional box. The choices are

a fundamental right, a fundamental duty, a directive principle, or a fundamental right that waits on legislation.

Step 2: The relevant provision, Article 21A:
Article 21A was inserted by the Constitution (Eighty-sixth Amendment) Act, 2002. It reads that the State shall provide free and compulsory education to all children of the age of six to fourteen years in such manner as the State may, by law, determine.
It sits in Part III of the Constitution, the Part that holds the fundamental rights. That placement matters, because rights in Part III are enforceable in the Supreme Court under Article 32 and in the High Courts under Article 226. So the answer is a fundamental right enforceable in law, option (A).

Step 3: How this right moved from Part IV to Part III:
Before 2002 education appeared only in Article 45, a directive principle asking the State to provide free and compulsory education for all children until they completed the age of fourteen. Directive principles are not enforceable by any court under Article 37.
In Unni Krishnan v. State of Andhra Pradesh (1993) the Supreme Court read a right to education for children up to fourteen into the right to life under Article 21. Parliament then made it express through Article 21A, and Parliament later passed the Right of Children to Free and Compulsory Education Act, 2009. Article 45 was recast to cover early childhood care and education for children below six.

Step 4: Why the other options fail:
Option (B) confuses this with Article 51A(k), which places a duty on a parent or guardian to give education opportunities to his child between six and fourteen. That duty falls on the parent, not the State, and is a separate provision.

Option (C) states the position as it stood before 2002. Article 45 has since been amended and the right itself now lives in Part III, so this answer is out of date.
Option (D) is the tempting distractor. It seizes on the words "in such manner as the State may, by law, determine". Those words control the manner of delivery, not the existence of the right. The right became enforceable the moment Article 21A came into force; a citizen did not have to wait for the 2009 Act to approach a court.

Final Answer:
Article 21A places the right in Part III, which makes it a fundamental right enforceable in law. The answer is option (A).

Quick Tip: Find the Article number and the Part it sits in. Article 21A was inserted by the 86th Amendment into Part III, the fundamental rights chapter.

183. Affirmative action connotes:
I. Measures taken by the state to help the socially disadvantaged groups
II. Positive discrimination
III. Strict quotas for the socially and educationally backward class in school/college admissions and jobs.
Which of the above mentioned is true?

(A) I and II only

(B) II only

(C) I, II and III

(D) II and III only

Correct Answer: (C) I, II and III

Solution:

Step 1: Understanding the Question:

The question asks what affirmative action means. Three descriptions are offered and we must decide which of them the expression covers.

Step 2: What affirmative action means:

Affirmative action is the whole set of measures a State takes to improve the position of groups that history has left behind. In the Indian Constitution the enabling provisions are Article 15(4) and 15(5), which let the State make special provision for socially and educationally backward classes and for the Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes, and Article 16(4), which permits reservation in appointments for backward classes not adequately represented in State services.

Step 3: Testing statement I:

Statement I says affirmative action is measures taken by the State to help socially disadvantaged groups. That is the plain definition of the idea, so statement I is true.

Step 4: Testing statement II:

Statement II says affirmative action is positive discrimination. This is simply the other common name for the same policy, used widely in Britain and in Indian constitutional writing. The State treats people unequally on purpose, but does so to lift a disadvantaged group rather than to hurt it. So statement II is true.

Step 5: Testing statement III:

Statement III says affirmative action is strict quotas for socially and educationally backward classes in admissions and jobs. This is where

the statement overreaches. Reservation is only one tool of affirmative action, and the word "strict" makes it worse. Affirmative action also covers scholarships, fee waivers, hostels, relaxed age and marks criteria, special coaching, and free training. Equating the whole concept with strict quotas is too narrow.
Indian law also rejects strictness in quotas. In Indra Sawhney v. Union of India the Supreme Court held that reservations should ordinarily not exceed fifty per cent, kept the creamy layer out of the benefit, and barred reservation in promotions in the manner then proposed. A rigid, unlimited quota is not what affirmative action means. So statement III is not true.

Step 6: Why the other options fail:
Option (B), II only, wrongly rejects statement I, which is the basic definition.
Option (C), I, II and III, wrongly accepts the overbroad statement III.
Option (D), II and III only, drops the correct statement I and keeps the wrong statement III.

Final Answer:
Statements I and II describe affirmative action correctly and statement III is too narrow, so the answer is option (A).

Quick Tip: Two statements define the idea, one confuses a single tool with the whole concept. Ask whether affirmative action means only strict quotas or a wider range of measures.

184. Identify the correct statement:

(A) Federalism implies a system of government which embodies a division of powers between a central and a number of regional authorities

(B) Federalism implies a system of government which embodies a division of powers between Legislature, Executive and Judiciary

(C) Federalism implies a system of Government which embodies Parliamentary supremacy

(D) None of these

Correct Answer: (A) Federalism implies a system of government which embodies a division of powers between a central and a number of regional authorities

Solution:

Step 1: Understanding the Question:
Four descriptions of federalism are offered and only one is right. The task is to recall what federalism actually means and then reject the descriptions that belong to other ideas.

Step 2: What federalism means:
Federalism is a system in which governmental power is divided between one central authority and several regional authorities, with each drawing its authority from the Constitution rather than from the other. The division runs vertically, from the top down to the units.
A federal system usually shows a written constitution, a division of powers through lists of subjects, supremacy of the constitution, rigidity in amendment, and an independent judiciary to police the boundary. In India this shows up in the Seventh Schedule, with the Union List, the State List, and the Concurrent List, along with Articles 245 and 246.

Step 3: Testing option (A):
Option (A) describes a division of powers between a central authority and a number of regional authorities. That is the definition of federalism, so it is correct.

Step 4: Why the other options fail:
Option (B) describes the division of powers between the Legislature, the Executive and the Judiciary. That is the separation of powers, a different doctrine associated with Montesquieu. It divides power horizontally among organs of the same government, while federalism divides power vertically between levels of government. A unitary State can have separation of powers, and a federation can be short of it, which shows the two are independent ideas.
Option (C) says federalism embodies parliamentary supremacy. This is close to the opposite of the truth. Under parliamentary supremacy, as in the United Kingdom, the legislature can make or unmake any law and no court may strike it down. A federation needs constitutional supremacy instead, because the constitution has to bind both levels and hold the line between them. If the central legislature could rewrite the division at will, the units would have no protected sphere left.
Option (D) is not available because option (A) is correct.

Final Answer:
Federalism means a division of powers between a central authority and regional authorities, so the answer is option (A).

Quick Tip: Federalism divides power between levels of government. Dividing power among Legislature, Executive and Judiciary is a different doctrine altogether.

185. Consider the following statements:
I. In a recent Supreme Court verdict pronounced by Justice Markandeya Katju and Justice Gyan Sudha Mishra, the court upheld the constitutionality of the Haj subsidy
II. Muslims are not the only beneficiaries of the secular state's generosity. Hindus have also received substantial financial support from the Government
With reference to the statements mentioned above, which of the following is correct?

(A) I only

(B) II only

(C) Both I and II

(D) Neither I nor II

Correct Answer: (C) Both I and II

Solution:

Step 1: Understanding the Question:
Two statements are made about the Supreme Court's Haj subsidy decision of 2012. We must check each against what the court actually did and said.

Step 2: The decision being referred to:
The case is Union of India v. Rafique Shaikh Bhikan, decided in 2012 by a bench of Justice Aftab Alam and Justice Ranjana Prakash Desai. The judgment held that the Haj subsidy should be progressively reduced and done away with entirely within ten years, and that the money would be better spent on the education and social development of the community.

Step 3: Testing statement I:
Statement I says the court upheld the constitutionality of the Haj subsidy. The court did not do that. It directed the subsidy to be phased out over a decade. A direction to abolish a benefit is not an endorsement of it. So statement I is not correct.

Step 4: Testing statement II:
Statement II says Muslims are not the only beneficiaries of the secular State's generosity and that Hindus have also received substantial financial support from the Government. This reflects what was said in the discussion around the case, where the point was made that governments also subsidise the Kailash Mansarovar Yatra and support other pilgrimages and religious institutions. The State's spending on pilgrimage is not confined to one community. So statement II is correct.

Step 5: Why the other options fail:
Option (A), I only, keeps the false statement and drops the true one.
Option (C), Both I and II, is wrong because statement I misdescribes the ruling.
Option (D), Neither I nor II, is wrong because statement II is a fair statement of the position.

Final Answer:
Only statement II is correct, so the answer is option (B).

Quick Tip: Recall what the 2012 Haj subsidy judgment actually directed. The court ordered the subsidy phased out within ten years rather than approving it.

186. X, a married woman, agreed to live in adultery with B and also agreed to serve him as his housekeeper. In return, B agreed to pay X Rs. 500 per month for living in adultery and Rs. 500 per month for housekeeping. The agreement is

(A) Valid

(B) Void

(C) Void as to the first object but valid with respect to the second object

(D) Unlawful as being opposed to public policy

Correct Answer: (B) Void

Solution:

Step 1: Understanding the Question:
X promises two things: to live in adultery with B and to keep house for him. B promises two payments, Rs. 500 a month for the first and Rs. 500 a month for the second. We must decide the fate of the whole agreement.

Step 2: The rule on unlawful objects, Section 23:
Section 23 of the Indian Contract Act says the consideration or object of an agreement is unlawful if it is forbidden by law, defeats the provisions of any law, is fraudulent, involves injury to person or property, or is immoral or opposed to public policy. Every agreement whose object or consideration is unlawful is void.
An agreement by a married woman to live in adultery is plainly immoral, so this object is unlawful. Housekeeping, taken alone, is a perfectly lawful service.

Step 3: The rule on mixed objects, Section 24:

Section 24 handles exactly this situation. It says that if any part of a single consideration for one or more objects, or any one or any part of several considerations for a single object, is unlawful, the agreement is void.
So the question becomes whether the lawful part can be cut away from the unlawful part. Severance is allowed only when the two parts are truly separate and independent. If they are woven into a single bargain, the whole thing falls.

Step 4: Applying the rule, and the case on these facts:
These facts are drawn from Alice Mary Hill v. William Clarke, where the court held that the whole agreement was void. The reasoning is that the two promises were not really separable. The housekeeping was part of one composite arrangement, tied to the immoral cohabitation, and B would not have taken her as housekeeper apart from that arrangement. Splitting the money into two sums of Rs. 500 does not turn one bargain into two.
Because the unlawful part cannot be severed, Section 24 applies and the entire agreement is void.

Step 5: Why the other options fail:
Option (A), Valid, is out at once. An agreement to live in adultery is immoral, and Section 23 makes such an agreement void.
Option (C) is the trap. It assumes the two objects can be severed and the housekeeping half saved. Severance fails here because the promises form one indivisible bargain, which is precisely what the court held on these facts.
Option (D) states a reason rather than the legal result asked for. The question asks what the agreement is, and the answer under Sections 23 and 24 is that it is void. Immorality is the ground; void is the consequence. Between a ground and a consequence, the option that

names the status of the agreement is the better answer.

Final Answer:
The unlawful object cannot be severed from the lawful one, so under Section 24 the whole agreement is void. The answer is option (B).

Quick Tip: Ask whether the lawful housekeeping promise can be cut away from the immoral one. Section 24 makes the whole agreement void when the unlawful part cannot be severed.

187. Ramu applied for the post of Director in an organization. The governing body of the organization passed a resolution appointing him to the post. After the meeting, one of the members of the governing body informed him privately of the resolution. Subsequently, the resolution was rescinded. Ramu claims damages. Which one of the following is the correct legal proposition in the case?

(A) Ramu cannot claim damages as he had not resigned from his existing post in anticipation of getting the appointment letter

(B) Ramu cannot claim damages as there was no formal communication

(C) Ramu can claim damages as governing body cannot rescind the resolution once passed

(D) Ramu can claim damages as there was private communication

Correct Answer: (B) Ramu cannot claim damages as there was no formal communication

Solution:

Step 1: Understanding the Question.
Ramu applied for a post, which is an offer made to the organization.

The governing body passed a resolution appointing him, which is the mental act of accepting that offer. The question asks whether a binding contract came into existence, because damages can only be claimed if there was a contract that the organization then broke.

Step 2: Key Rule.
An acceptance has no legal effect until it is communicated to the offeror. Communication must come from the acceptor or from someone the acceptor has authorised to communicate it. Information leaking out through an unauthorised person is not communication of acceptance at all. Until acceptance is properly communicated, the accepting party is free to change its mind and withdraw the resolution.

Step 3: Applying the Rule to Ramu.
The governing body never sent Ramu any appointment letter or any official intimation. What reached him was a private whisper from one member, acting on his own and not on the instructions of the body. That member had no authority to convey the decision. So in the eye of the law, the acceptance stayed locked inside the meeting room.
Since acceptance was never communicated by an authorised channel, no contract was formed. With no contract, there is no breach, and with no breach, there is nothing to award damages for. This is the reasoning of the well known decision in Powell v. Lee, where a school's managers selected a headmaster and one manager privately told him so, and the court held there was no binding contract.

Step 4: Why the other options fail.
Option (A) is wrong because the case does not turn on whether Ramu acted on the news or suffered loss. Even if he had resigned his old job, he still could not sue, because the defect is the absence of a contract,

not the absence of loss.
Option (C) is wrong because a resolution passed in a meeting is only an internal decision of the body. Until it is communicated, the body can freely rescind it. A resolution is not a promise to the outside world.
Option (D) reverses the law. Private, unauthorised communication is precisely what does not count. It cannot be the ground for claiming damages.

Final Answer:
Ramu cannot claim damages because the acceptance was never formally communicated to him, so no contract came into being.
Option (B) is correct.

Quick Tip: Ask who told Ramu, and whether that person had any authority to speak for the governing body. Acceptance that is never properly communicated forms no contract.

188. The Railway authorities allowed a train to be over crowded. In consequence, a legitimate passenger Mr. X got his pocket picked. Choose the appropriate answer:

(A) Mr. X can sue the Railway authorities for the loss suffered

(B) Mr. X cannot sue because he had given his consent to travel in a over-crowded train

(C) Mr. X cannot sue railway authorities because there was no infringement of his legal right and mere fact that the loss was caused does not give rise to a cause of action

(D) None of these

Correct Answer: (C) Mr. X cannot sue railway authorities because there was no infringement of his legal right and mere fact that the loss was caused does not give rise to a cause of action

Solution:

Step 1: Understanding the Question.
Mr. X clearly lost money. The question is whether that loss, by itself, lets him sue the Railway authorities. In tort law, loss and legal wrong are two different things, and only a legal wrong is actionable.

Step 2: The Rule of Damnum Sine Injuria.
Damnum sine injuria means damage without the violation of a legal right. Where a person suffers real loss but no legal right of his has been infringed, no suit lies. The opposite rule, injuria sine damno, means violation of a legal right without any actual loss, and that is actionable. So the test is never how much a person lost, it is whether a legal right of his was broken.

Step 3: Applying the Rule.
A passenger has no legal right that the compartment he travels in must carry only a fixed number of people, and overcrowding a train is not in itself the violation of any right vested in a particular passenger. The person who actually wronged Mr. X is the pickpocket, who committed both a crime and a tort against him.
The Railways did not steal from Mr. X and did not owe him a duty to guarantee that no thief would board. The loss and the overcrowding are connected only loosely, through the free criminal act of a third party. So the damage is real but the injury, in the legal sense, is absent. This is a textbook case of damnum sine injuria, and this fact pattern reflects the reasoning applied in the Nizam's State Railway

case.

Step 4: Why the other options fail.
Option (A) assumes that loss alone creates a right to sue. It does not, because the Railways broke no legal right of Mr. X.
Option (B) rests on consent. Consent is the wrong ground here. A passenger who boards a crowded train does not thereby consent to being robbed, so the defence of volenti non fit injuria does not fit the facts. The suit fails on the absence of injuria, not on consent.
Option (D) is ruled out because option (C) already states the correct position.

Final Answer:
No legal right of Mr. X was infringed, so his loss gives him no cause of action against the Railways. Option (C) is correct.

Quick Tip: Loss alone is not enough to sue. Ask which legal right of Mr. X the Railways actually broke, and remember the maxim damnum sine injuria.

189. Z is carried off by a tiger. X fires at the tiger, knowing that the shot might kill Z, but with no intention to kill Z, and in good faith trying to save Z. X's shot, however, gives Z a mortal wound. Choose the correct option:

(A) X has committed an offence of a grievous nature.

(B) X has no moral duty to save Z therefore he can be held liable.

(C) X has not committed any offence, as the act was in good faith and for the benefit of Z.

(D) None of the above

Correct Answer: (C) X has not committed any offence, as the act was in good faith and for the benefit of Z.

Solution:

Step 1: Understanding the Question.
X fired a shot that ended up mortally wounding Z. On the bare facts, X caused Z's death. The question is whether the surrounding circumstances take X's act out of the definition of an offence. This is a question about the general exceptions in the Indian Penal Code, which convert what would otherwise be a crime into no offence at all.

Step 2: The Rule Being Tested.
The Penal Code protects an act done in good faith for the benefit of another person, even without that person's consent, where the situation makes it impossible to obtain consent and the act is done to prevent a greater harm. Good faith here means the act was done with due care and attention, and not to cause the harm that resulted. The protection covers exactly the case where a rescuer risks hurting the very person he is trying to save.

Step 3: Applying the Rule to X.
Check each ingredient against the facts.
Was the act done for Z's benefit? Yes. Z was being carried off by a tiger and would almost certainly have died. Firing at the tiger was Z's only chance.
Was it done in good faith? Yes. The facts say X fired trying to save Z, not to harm him.
Was there an intention to kill Z? No. The facts expressly say X had no intention to kill Z. Knowledge that the shot might hit Z is not the same as intending to hit him.

Could consent have been asked for? No. Z was in the tiger's jaws, and there was no time for anything.
Every ingredient is met, so X commits no offence. These very facts are the illustration attached to the Penal Code provision that protects acts done in good faith for a person's benefit without consent.

Step 4: Why the other options fail.
Option (A) ignores the exception entirely. It looks only at the outcome, a mortal wound, and labels it grievous. But the general exceptions operate precisely on acts that do cause harm.
Option (B) is confused on two counts. It says X had no moral duty to save Z, and then concludes X is liable. Liability does not arise from the absence of a duty to rescue. The exception protects a volunteer rescuer whether or not he was obliged to act.
Option (D) is ruled out because option (C) is a correct statement of the law.

Final Answer:
X committed no offence because his act was done in good faith and for Z's benefit. Option (C) is correct.

Quick Tip: Separate knowledge of a risk from intention to cause harm. The Penal Code protects an act done in good faith for another person's benefit when consent cannot be obtained.

190. Ms. Usha wants to file a suit against Bhagyalaxmi Theatre praying for a permanent injunction (stay order) restraining the theatre from running the film named "Jai Santoshi Maa". Her contention is that the film hurt her religious feelings and sentiments as Goddess Saraswati, Laxmi and Parvati were depicted as jealous and were ridiculed.

(A) She cannot file a suit because injury to religious feelings is not a legally recognized right.

(B) She cannot file a suit because the Theatre has a fundamental right to speech and expression.

(C) She can file a suit as injury to religious feelings has been legally recognized as a right (injuria sine damnum)

(D) It is a case of complete judicial discretion.

Correct Answer: (A) She cannot file a suit because injury to religious feelings is not a legally recognized right.

Solution:

Step 1: Understanding the Question.
Ms. Usha feels hurt by how the film shows three goddesses, and she wants the court to stop the theatre from screening it. A civil court will grant an injunction only if she can show that some legal right of hers is being violated. So the real question is whether hurt religious feelings amount to the violation of a legal right.

Step 2: The Rule Being Tested.
The maxim damnum sine injuria covers harm suffered without any legal right being broken, and such harm gives no cause of action. Hurt sentiment, mental distress and offence at what someone else says or shows are real, but the law does not treat them as legal rights that a private person can enforce by suit. The right must exist in law before a

court can protect it.

Step 3: Applying the Rule.
Ms. Usha has no legal right that a film must portray deities in a manner she approves of. Her feelings were hurt, which is genuine harm, but the harm sits outside the set of interests that the law recognises as rights. Since there is no injuria, there is nothing for an injunction to protect, and the suit does not lie.
These facts come from Ushaben v. Bhagyalaxmi Chitra Mandir, where the court refused an injunction against "Jai Santoshi Maa" and held the case to be one of damnum sine injuria. The court also pointed out that anyone offended by the film was free simply not to watch it.

Step 4: Why the other options fail.
Option (B) reaches the right outcome by the wrong route. Freedom of speech under Article 19(1)(a) binds the State, and it is subject to reasonable restrictions. It is not the reason a private suit between two private parties fails. The suit fails because Usha has no legal right, not because the theatre holds a trump card.
Option (C) is wrong twice over. Injury to religious feelings has not been recognised as a legal right, and the maxim is misapplied. Injuria sine damnum means a legal right broken without any actual loss, which is the exact opposite of Usha's position. Her situation is damnum sine injuria.
Option (D) is wrong because whether a cause of action exists is a question of law, not a matter left to the free discretion of the judge.

Final Answer:
Hurt religious sentiment is not a legally recognised right, so Ms. Usha cannot maintain the suit. Option (A) is correct.

Quick Tip: Ask which legal right of Ms. Usha the theatre has broken. Hurt sentiment is real harm, but harm without a broken right is damnum sine injuria.

191. Match schedule one and two and choose the appropriate answer:

Schedule I	Schedule II
i. Concurrent list	1. Constitution of Japan
ii. Rule of Law	2. Constitution of Ireland
iii. Directive Principle of State Policy	3. British Constitution
iv. Procedure established by law	4. Constitution of Australia

(A) i-1, ii-2, iii-3, iv-4

(B) i-2, ii-4, iii-3, iv-1

(C) i-1, ii-3, iii-4, iv-2

(D) i-4, ii-3, iii-2, iv-1

Correct Answer: (D) i-4, ii-3, iii-2, iv-1

Solution:

Step 1: Understanding the Question.

The framers of the Indian Constitution borrowed features from several countries. This question asks which foreign constitution each of four features came from. Work through the four items one by one, then read off the option that matches all four.

Step 2: Match item i, the Concurrent list.

India divides legislative power into three lists, Union, State and Concurrent. The Concurrent List lets both Parliament and the State legislatures make laws on the same subjects. This scheme was taken

from the Constitution of Australia, which has its own concurrent field of legislation. So i goes with 4.

Step 3: Match item ii, the Rule of Law.
The Rule of Law means that everyone, including the government, is under the ordinary law of the land and no one is above it. The idea comes from the unwritten British Constitution, worked out by Dicey. India also draws its parliamentary system, single citizenship and writs from the same source. So ii goes with 3.

Step 4: Match item iii, the Directive Principles of State Policy.
The Directive Principles in Part IV set goals for the State that the courts cannot enforce. They were taken from the Constitution of Ireland, which itself borrowed the idea from Spain. So iii goes with 2.

Step 5: Match item iv, Procedure established by law.
Article 21 uses the phrase "procedure established by law" rather than the American "due process of law". This exact wording was lifted from the Constitution of Japan. So iv goes with 1.

Step 6: Read off the option.
The matching is i-4, ii-3, iii-2, iv-1.
Option (A) gives 1, 2, 3, 4, which puts the Concurrent list in Japan and the Rule of Law in Ireland, both wrong.
Option (B) gives 2, 4, 3, 1, which sends the Concurrent list to Ireland and the Rule of Law to Australia, both wrong.
Option (C) gives 1, 3, 4, 2, which is right only for the Rule of Law and wrong on the other three.
Option (D) gives 4, 3, 2, 1, which matches every item.

Final Answer:
The correct matching is i-4, ii-3, iii-2, iv-1, so option (D) is correct.

Quick Tip: Anchor the two you are sure of first: "procedure established by law" points to Japan and the Directive Principles point to Ireland. That alone leaves one option standing.

192. P, Q and R made a joint promise to give S a sum of Rs.3000. S recovered the whole amount from P. Q was declared insolvent and cannot give anything. Which statement out of the following is correct?

(A) P cannot get anything from R.

(B) P can recover Rs.1000 from R.

(C) P can recover Rs.1500 from R

(D) P can recover Rs.2000 from R.

Correct Answer: (C) P can recover Rs.1500 from R

Solution:

Step 1: Understanding the Question.
P, Q and R promised S the same sum of Rs. 3000 together, so they are joint promisors. S chose to squeeze the entire amount out of P alone. The question is how much P can now claw back from R, given that Q is insolvent and can pay nothing.

Step 2: The Rules Being Tested.
The Contract Act sets out two rules for joint promisors.
First, the promisee may compel any one or more of the joint promisors to perform the whole promise. So S was entitled to recover the full Rs. 3000 from P alone, and P cannot complain about that.

Second, the promisor who has performed can compel the other joint promisors to contribute equally. If any one of them cannot pay, the remaining solvent promisors share that defaulter's share equally between themselves.

Step 3: Work out the shares if everyone were solvent.
There are three joint promisors and the debt is Rs. 3000.

$$\text{Equal share} = \frac{3000}{3} = 1000$$

So in the normal course, P, Q and R would each bear Rs. 1000. Having paid the whole Rs. 3000, P would recover Rs. 1000 from Q and Rs. 1000 from R.

Step 4: Adjust for Q's insolvency.
Q is insolvent and can pay nothing, so his Rs. 1000 share cannot be collected. That deficiency does not fall on P alone. It is shared equally by the solvent promisors, who are P and R.

$$\text{Extra load on each solvent promisor} = \frac{1000}{2} = 500$$

So R's total burden becomes his own share plus his half of Q's default.

$$\text{R's liability} = 1000 + 500 = 1500$$

P's own final burden is likewise Rs. 1500. Check the total: 1500 borne by P plus 1500 recovered from R gives Rs. 3000, which matches the sum actually paid to S.

Step 5: Why the other options fail.

Option (A) is wrong because the right of contribution among joint promisors is expressly given by statute. P is not left carrying the whole debt.
Option (B) stops at the equal one third share of Rs. 1000 and forgets to spread Q's default. It would leave P bearing Rs. 2000 and R only Rs. 1000, which is not equal treatment of the two solvent promisors.
Option (D) overshoots by loading Q's entire Rs. 1000 default onto R. The statute splits a defaulter's share among the solvent promisors, and P is a solvent promisor too, so P must bear half of it.

Final Answer:
P can recover Rs. 1500 from R.

Rs. 1500

Quick Tip: Q is insolvent, so only two solvent promisors are left to carry Rs. 3000 between them. Split the whole debt between P and R equally.

193. X went to Y's house and forgot his bag which contained 1 kg sweets. Y's children consumed the sweets. Decide the liability of Y.

(A) Y is bound to pay the price of sweets to X

(B) Y is not bound to pay anything

(C) Y is bound to pay half the price of sweets.

(D) Y would not have to pay anything because X loves Y's children.

Correct Answer: (B) Y is not bound to pay anything

Solution:

Step 1: Understanding the Question.

X left his bag of sweets behind at Y's house by mistake. Y never asked for the bag and never agreed to keep it. Y's children then ate the sweets. The question is whether Y owes X anything even though there was no agreement between them.

Step 2: The Rule Being Tested.

The Contract Act creates certain relations that resemble those created by contract, even where no actual agreement exists. One of them covers the finder of goods. A person who finds goods belonging to another and takes them into his custody is subject to the same duties as a bailee. A bailee must take reasonable care of the goods and must not make unauthorised use of them. He is bound to return them to the owner or to compensate the owner if he cannot.

Step 3: Applying the Rule to Y.

The bag was left in Y's house, so it came into Y's custody. From that moment Y stood in the position of a finder of goods and owed X the duties of a bailee, whether he liked it or not. The obligation is fixed by law, not by agreement, so Y cannot escape it by saying he never promised to look after the bag.

Y's duty was to keep the sweets safe and hand the bag back to X. Instead the sweets were eaten by his children, who were in his house and under his control. The goods can no longer be returned. When a bailee cannot return the goods because they were consumed or destroyed through unauthorised use in his keeping, he must compensate the owner for their value.

So Y must pay X the price of one kilogram of sweets.

Step 4: Why the other options fail.

Option (B) assumes no liability can arise without an agreement. That

is wrong, because the finder's duty is imposed by law under the head of quasi contract. Y did not have to promise anything for the duty to attach.
Option (C) has no basis anywhere. There is no rule that splits the value of consumed goods in half. The bailee either returns the goods or pays their full value.
Option (D) mistakes affection for law. Whether X is fond of Y's children has nothing to do with Y's legal duty. Fondness is not consent, and X never gave the sweets to the children.

Final Answer:
Y held the sweets as a finder with the duties of a bailee, and the sweets were consumed in his keeping, so he must pay X their price. Option (A) is correct.

Quick Tip: Y made no promise, but the Contract Act still imposes duties on a person into whose custody another's goods fall. Think finder of goods and bailee.

194. Which one of the following is not correct?

(A) Freedom of speech and expression includes freedom of press.

(B) Right to life and personal liberty includes right to carry on any trade and profession

(C) Right to equality includes the principles of natural justice

(D) Freedom of conscience includes the wearing and carrying of kirpans by the Sikhs

Correct Answer: (B) Right to life and personal liberty includes right to carry on any trade and profession

Solution:

Step 1: Understanding the Question.

This is a negative question. Three of the four statements are accepted propositions about fundamental rights, and one of them is wrong. The task is to find the odd one out, so test each statement against the Article it belongs to.

Step 2: Test statement (A).

Article 19(1)(a) guarantees freedom of speech and expression. The Constitution does not mention the press by name, but the Supreme Court has consistently held that freedom of the press is part of Article 19(1)(a), because the press is simply a means by which citizens speak and receive information. Romesh Thappar and Sakal Papers both say so. This statement is correct.

Step 3: Test statement (B).

Article 21 protects life and personal liberty. The right to practise any profession or to carry on any occupation, trade or business is guaranteed separately by Article 19(1)(g), not by Article 21. These are two different rights, placed in different Articles, and subject to different restrictions. Article 19(1)(g) can be restricted only by reasonable restrictions in the interest of the general public, while Article 21 requires a procedure established by law.

It is true that Article 21 has been read to include the right to livelihood, as in Olga Tellis, but the right to livelihood is a much narrower idea than the right to carry on any trade and profession. Locating the latter inside Article 21 misstates the scheme of Part III. So this statement is not correct.

Step 4: Test statement (C).

Article 14 guarantees equality before the law and equal protection of the laws. The Supreme Court in Maneka Gandhi read Article 14 as striking at arbitrariness, and held that natural justice, the rule against bias and the right to be heard, flows out of Article 14. Arbitrary State action is by its nature unequal action. This statement is correct.

Step 5: Test statement (D).
Article 25 guarantees freedom of conscience and the right freely to profess, practise and propagate religion. Explanation I to Article 25 says in plain words that the wearing and carrying of kirpans shall be deemed to be included in the profession of the Sikh religion. This is written into the Constitution itself, so the statement is correct.

Step 6: Pick the odd one out.
Statements (A), (C) and (D) are all sound. Only (B) misplaces a right, putting Article 19(1)(g) inside Article 21.

Final Answer:
The statement that is not correct is (B), so option (B) is the answer.

Quick Tip: Tag each statement with its Article. One of them files the freedom of trade and profession under Article 21 instead of where it actually belongs.

195. Y makes an attempt to steal some jewels by breaking open a box and finds, after opening the box, that there is no jewel in it. Choose the appropriate answer.

(A) Y is not guilty of attempt to theft because the box was empty.

(B) Y is guilty of attempt to commit theft.

(C) Y is guilty of trespass.

(D) Y is not guilty of any offence.

Correct Answer: (B) Y is guilty of attempt to commit theft.

Solution:

Step 1: Understanding the Question.

Y broke open a box meaning to take the jewels inside, and the box turned out to be empty. He therefore took nothing. The question is whether the emptiness of the box saves him from criminal liability for attempt.

Step 2: The Rule Being Tested.

An attempt is made up of two things, a guilty intention to commit the offence and an act done towards committing it that goes beyond mere preparation. The offence of attempt is complete once those two elements exist. Whether the attempt succeeded is irrelevant, because if it had succeeded the charge would be the full offence and not an attempt at all.

The law also deals with impossible attempts. Where a person does everything he set out to do, and fails only because of some fact he did not know, he is still guilty of the attempt. The Penal Code carries this as an illustration, using the example of a man who puts his hand into another's pocket meaning to steal, and finds the pocket empty. He is guilty of attempting theft.

Step 3: Applying the Rule to Y.

Take the two elements in turn.

Intention: Y set out to steal jewels. The facts say so plainly, so the guilty mind is present.
Act beyond preparation: Y did not stop at planning or at buying tools. He actually broke open the box. That is an overt act aimed straight at taking the jewels, and it is the last thing he could do before laying hands on them. It is well past mere preparation.
Both elements are made out, so the attempt is complete. The emptiness of the box is a fact Y knew nothing about. It defeated his plan, but it did not touch his intention or his act. So Y is guilty of attempt to commit theft.

Step 4: Why the other options fail.
Option (A) treats impossibility as a defence. It is not. If an empty container excused the wrongdoer, every thief who picked a barren pocket would walk free even though he did exactly what a successful thief does.
Option (C) is off the point. Trespass is not what the facts describe, since nothing tells us Y entered any property unlawfully, and in any case the charge that fits his conduct is attempt to theft.
Option (D) ignores both his intention and his overt act. Y did far more than think about stealing. He broke the box open.

Final Answer:
Y had the intention to steal and did an overt act beyond preparation, so he is guilty of attempt to commit theft. Option (B) is correct.

Quick Tip: Failure is built into every attempt, so it cannot be a defence. Ask only about Y's intention and whether his act went past mere preparation.

196. A lady wanted to get a railway ticket but finding a crowd near the ticket window at the station, asked Raju, who was near the window, to get a ticket for her and handed him money for the same. Raju took the money and instead of getting the ticket, ran away with it. What offence has been committed by Raju?

(A) No offence

(B) Criminal breach of trust

(C) Criminal misappropriation

(D) Theft

Correct Answer: (B) Criminal breach of trust

Solution:

Step 1: Understanding the Question.
The lady handed her own money to Raju for one specific purpose, buying her a ticket. Raju kept the money and ran. All four options sit close to one another, so the way to separate them is to ask how the property came into Raju's hands, and what he did after that.

Step 2: The definitions being compared.
Theft means dishonestly taking movable property out of another's possession without that person's consent. The key word is taking. The property must be removed against the owner's will.
Criminal misappropriation means dishonestly misappropriating or converting to one's own use property that came into the accused's possession innocently or by chance, such as goods he found lying about. There is no entrustment in it.
Criminal breach of trust means that a person entrusted with property, or with dominion over property, dishonestly misappropriates it or uses it in violation of the direction under which the trust was to be

discharged. The special ingredient here is entrustment.

Step 3: Applying the definitions to Raju.
Start with how the money reached Raju. The lady handed it over herself, willingly, with her eyes open. She chose him and gave him the money. So there was no taking without consent, and theft is ruled out at once.
Was it a chance finding? No. Raju did not stumble on the money lying on the platform. It was placed in his hands deliberately, so the situation is not one of innocent or accidental possession.
What the lady did was hand over money with a direction attached, buy a ticket and bring it back. That is entrustment in the plainest sense, property given to another to be dealt with in a particular way.
When Raju ran off with the money instead of buying the ticket, he dishonestly used the property in violation of the very direction under which he received it. That completes criminal breach of trust.

Step 4: Why the other options fail.
Option (A) is plainly wrong. Running away with money handed over for a purpose is dishonest and cannot be no offence.
Option (C) fails because misappropriation covers property that reaches the accused innocently or by accident, with no direction attached. Here the money came with a clear instruction, which pushes the case into the entrustment provision.
Option (D) fails because the lady consented to Raju having the money. Theft needs a taking out of possession without consent, and there was no taking at all.

Final Answer:
The money was entrusted to Raju for a stated purpose and he

dishonestly kept it, so he committed criminal breach of trust. Option (B) is correct.

Quick Tip: Ask how the money reached Raju's hands. She gave it to him herself, with an instruction attached, which rules out any taking without consent.

197. The Right to Equality is guaranteed by:

(A) Article 14 to 18

(B) Article 14

(C) Article 14 and 15

(D) Article 14, 15 and 16

Correct Answer: (A) Article 14 to 18

Solution:

Step 1: Understanding the Question.
The question asks which Articles of the Constitution make up the Right to Equality. Part III of the Constitution groups the fundamental rights under headings, and the Right to Equality is one such heading. So the task is to recall the full span of Articles sitting under that heading.

Step 2: List the Articles under the heading.
The heading "Right to Equality" in Part III runs from Article 14 to Article 18. Take them one by one.
Article 14 gives equality before the law and the equal protection of the laws to every person.
Article 15 bars discrimination on grounds of religion, race, caste, sex

or place of birth, and allows special provisions for women, children and backward classes.
Article 16 gives equality of opportunity in matters of public employment, along with the power to reserve posts for backward classes.
Article 17 abolishes untouchability and forbids its practice in any form.
Article 18 abolishes titles, other than military and academic distinctions.
Each of these works towards the same goal, removing an inequality, so all five belong under the one heading.

Step 3: Match against the options.
Only option (A), Articles 14 to 18, covers the entire group.

Step 4: Why the other options fail.
Option (B) names only Article 14. That Article is the general equality clause and the heart of the group, but the Right to Equality is a cluster and not a single Article, so this is incomplete.
Option (C) names Articles 14 and 15 and stops there. It leaves out equality of opportunity in public employment, the abolition of untouchability and the abolition of titles, all of which are equality provisions.
Option (D) names Articles 14, 15 and 16. This is the most tempting distractor because these three are the most litigated equality Articles. But it drops Articles 17 and 18, which sit under the same heading in the text of the Constitution.

Final Answer:
The Right to Equality is guaranteed by Articles 14 to 18, so option (A) is correct.

Quick Tip: Recall where the next heading, Right to Freedom, begins in Part III. The equality group ends just before it.

198. Mr. Samay was severely hurt while working in his factory and fell unconscious. He was rushed to a hospital by his fellow workers. In the hospital (at emergency/casualty ward) the doctors opined that he should be operated immediately. While conducting preliminary examinations, he was found to be HIV positive. The doctors are in a dilemma regarding what should they do first:

(A) Doctors should operate first

(B) Doctors should inform his family members

(C) Doctors should inform his employers

(D) Doctors should not inform anyone because it would violate patient's right of privacy

Correct Answer: (A) Doctors should operate first

Solution:

Step 1: Understanding the Question.
Read the last line of the stem carefully. The doctors are in a dilemma about what they should do first. So the question is one of priority, not of whether the other steps are ever taken. Mr. Samay is unconscious, he needs an immediate operation, and he has just been found HIV positive.

Step 2: The competing interests.
Two things are pulling against each other. On one side is Mr. Samay's

right to life under Article 21, which the doctors serve by operating at once. On the other side is his right to privacy about his HIV status, and the ordinary rule that consent must be taken before an operation.

Step 3: Rank the interests.

The right to life stands above everything else, because every other right depends on the person being alive. A doctor in a casualty ward has a duty to preserve the life of a patient brought in with a serious injury, and the Supreme Court in Parmanand Katara said that this duty comes before every formality.

Consent is not an obstacle here. Mr. Samay is unconscious and cannot give it, and the law permits treatment given in good faith for the benefit of a person who cannot consent, where the situation makes it impossible to obtain consent and delay would be dangerous. This is the same principle as an act done in good faith for another's benefit.

The HIV finding does not change the ranking either. It affects the precautions the surgical team takes, but it is not a reason to hold up an operation that is needed to keep the man alive. Refusing or delaying treatment because a patient is HIV positive would be discrimination on top of the harm.

So the first thing to do is operate. Informing anyone else can wait until the patient is out of danger.

Step 4: Why the other options fail.

Option (B) is not wrong as an eventual step, since a family would ordinarily be told about a patient. But it cannot come first. Locating the family and speaking to them takes time that a severely injured, unconscious man does not have.

Option (C) is wrong on a much stronger ground. The employer has no business knowing that Mr. Samay is HIV positive. Telling an employer risks the man losing his job and his standing, and it serves

no medical purpose at all.
Option (D) answers a different question. The stem asks what the doctors should do first, and this option speaks only about disclosure while saying nothing about the operation. Privacy is a real value, but it does not compete with saving a life, and complete silence is not the rule either, since disclosure to a person at genuine risk can be justified, as the courts recognised in Mr. X v. Hospital Z.

Final Answer:
The right to life outranks every other consideration, so the doctors should operate first. Option (A) is correct.

Quick Tip: The stem asks what comes first, not what is eventually done. Rank the interests and ask which one cannot survive a delay.

199. Match the schedule I and II and choose the appropriate answer:

Schedule I	Schedule II
i. Republic	1. Head of the state is elected by the people
ii. Secular	2. State does not recognize any religion as religion of the state
iii. Democracy	3. The government which gets authority from the will of the people

(A) i-1, ii-2, iii-3

(B) i-1, ii-3, iii-2

(C) i-2, ii-3, iii-1

(D) i-3, ii-2, iii-1

Correct Answer: (A) i-1, ii-2, iii-3

Solution:

Step 1: Understanding the Question.

Three words from the Preamble have to be matched with their meanings. Take each term, state what it means in its own right, and then find the description that fits.

Step 2: Match item i, Republic.

A republic is a State whose head of the State is not a hereditary monarch but a person chosen by the people, directly or through their representatives. The contrast is with a monarchy, where the crown passes by birth. In India the President is elected, which is why India is a republic. The description that speaks of the head of the state being elected by the people is number 1. So i goes with 1.

Step 3: Match item ii, Secular.

A secular State has no religion of its own. It neither adopts a State religion nor favours or penalises any faith, and it treats all religions alike. The description saying the State does not recognise any religion as the religion of the State is number 2. So ii goes with 2.

Step 4: Match item iii, Democracy.

Democracy means government by the people, where the authority to govern flows from the will of the people expressed through elections and is answerable to them. The description about a government that draws its authority from the will of the people is number 3. So iii goes with 3.

Step 5: Read off the option.

The matching is i-1, ii-2, iii-3, which is option (A).

Option (B) swaps Secular and Democracy, giving the secular State the

meaning of popular authority and democracy the meaning of no State religion. Both are plainly wrong.
Option (C) makes Republic mean the absence of a State religion and Democracy mean an elected head of the State, which mixes up all three terms.
Option (D) makes Republic mean government by popular will and Democracy mean an elected head of the State. This is the closest distractor, because a republic and a democracy do overlap in practice, but a republic is defined by how the head of the State is chosen, while democracy is defined by where the government's authority comes from.

Final Answer:
The correct matching is i-1, ii-2, iii-3, so option (A) is correct.

Quick Tip: Pin down "Secular" first, since only one description can fit it. Then remember that Republic is about how the head of the State is chosen.

200. In which of the following cases can a Constitutional amendment be passed just by a simple majority in Parliament?

(A) Election matters

(B) Change in the name and boundaries of states

(C) Powers of the President

(D) None of the above

Correct Answer: (B) Change in the name and boundaries of states

Solution:

Step 1: Understanding the Question.
The Constitution can be changed in three different ways, and each way needs a different level of support in Parliament. The question asks which of these subjects can be altered by a simple majority alone, meaning a majority of the members present and voting, the same threshold as an ordinary law.

Step 2: The three routes of amendment.
The first route is by simple majority. A set of provisions can be changed by an ordinary law passed like any other Bill. Article 4 states that a law made under Article 2 or Article 3 shall not be deemed to be an amendment of the Constitution for the purposes of Article 368, even though it alters the First and Fourth Schedules.
The second route is a special majority under Article 368(2), meaning a majority of the total membership of each House and at least two thirds of the members present and voting. Most of the Constitution falls here.
The third route is a special majority plus ratification by the legislatures of not less than one half of the States. This covers the federal provisions, such as the election of the President, the distribution of legislative powers between the Union and the States, the Supreme Court and High Courts, and Article 368 itself.

Step 3: Test option (B).
Article 3 lets Parliament form a new State, alter the area or boundaries of a State, or change the name of a State. Article 4 then says such a law is not an amendment under Article 368. So Parliament can redraw the map of India by an ordinary Bill passed by a simple majority, without any two thirds figure and without asking a single State legislature to ratify it. The State concerned is only sent the Bill for its views, and Parliament is not bound by them. This is the

route the paper is pointing at, and it matches option (B).

Step 4: Test the other options.
Option (C) is clearly out. The powers of the President are set out in the body of the Constitution, and altering them needs a special majority under Article 368. Anything touching the election of the President even needs State ratification on top. This is nowhere near a simple majority.
Option (A) is the tempting one. Parliament can pass ordinary election laws, such as the Representation of the People Act, by simple majority. But an ordinary election law is not a constitutional amendment at all, and the question asks specifically about a constitutional amendment. Changing the constitutional provisions on elections, such as those in Part XV, needs a special majority under Article 368. So option (A) does not answer the question asked.
Option (D) fails because option (B) is a genuine and well settled instance.

Final Answer:
A change in the name and boundaries of States is made by simple majority under Articles 3 and 4, so option (B) is correct.

Quick Tip: Article 4 says in so many words that a law altering State names or boundaries is not an amendment for the purposes of Article 368.