

AILET — Logical Reasoning

Sample Paper — 6

Duration: 21 Minutes | Maximum Marks: 35

Instructions

- This paper contains **35 questions** carrying **1 mark** each.
- Each question has **four options** (A, B, C, D). Choose the most appropriate answer.
- There is **no negative marking**.
- Read all questions carefully before attempting.
- For passage-based and puzzle questions, read the common information carefully before answering.

Questions 1–5: Floor Arrangement

Directions (Q. 1–5): Read the following information carefully and answer the questions given below.

Five people — Aman, Bina, Chirag, Deepa, and Elan — live on different floors of a five-storey building numbered 1 to 5, where Floor 1 is the ground floor and Floor 5 is the topmost floor. The following conditions apply:

- (i) Aman lives on an even-numbered floor.
- (ii) Bina lives immediately above Chirag.
- (iii) Deepa lives on Floor 5.
- (iv) Elan lives on Floor 1.
- (v) Aman does not live on Floor 4.

Q1. Who lives on Floor 3?

- (A) Aman
- (B) Bina
- (C) Deepa
- (D) Chirag

Q2. Who lives immediately below Bina?

- (A) Chirag
- (B) Aman
- (C) Elan
- (D) Deepa



Q3. How many floors are between Aman and Deepa?

- (A) 1
- (B) 4
- (C) 2
- (D) 3

Q4. Who lives on the topmost floor?

- (A) Aman
- (B) Deepa
- (C) Bina
- (D) Elan

Q5. If Elan and Deepa swap their floors, who now lives on Floor 1?

- (A) Aman
- (B) Chirag
- (C) Bina
- (D) Deepa

Questions 6–10: Statement and Arguments

Directions (Q. 6–10): Each question below is followed by two arguments numbered I and II. Decide which of the arguments is/are strong. Mark your answer as:

- (A) Only Argument I is strong (B) Only Argument II is strong (C) Both arguments are strong (D) Neither argument is strong

Q6. Statement: Should the voting age be reduced to 16?

Argument I: Yes, young people are significantly affected by political decisions and deserve a voice in choosing their representatives.

Argument II: Yes, many 16-year-olds demonstrate the ability to make informed and responsible decisions.

- (A) Only Argument I is strong
- (B) Only Argument II is strong
- (C) Both arguments are strong
- (D) Neither argument is strong



Q7. Statement: Should courts impose stricter penalties for environmental crimes?

Argument I: Yes, stronger deterrence is essential to protect the environment from irreversible damage.

Argument II: No, penalties should remain uniform across all offences regardless of category.

- (A) Only Argument I is strong
- (B) Only Argument II is strong
- (C) Both arguments are strong
- (D) Neither argument is strong

Q8. Statement: Should social media platforms be banned to reduce misinformation?

Argument I: No, restricting social media violates the freedom of speech of all citizens.

Argument II: Yes, all citizens spend excessive amounts of time on social media.

- (A) Only Argument I is strong
- (B) Only Argument II is strong
- (C) Both arguments are strong
- (D) Neither argument is strong

Q9. Statement: Should the government make organ donation mandatory upon death?

Argument I: Yes, mandatory organ donation will completely eliminate organ trafficking.

Argument II: No, it infringes upon individual and religious freedoms concerning the body.

- (A) Only Argument I is strong
- (B) Only Argument II is strong
- (C) Both arguments are strong
- (D) Neither argument is strong



Q10. Statement: Should legal education be made free in India?

Argument I: Yes, high fees prevent meritorious but economically weaker students from entering the legal profession.

Argument II: Yes, a larger pool of lawyers will help address the acute shortage of legal professionals in rural areas.

- (A) Only Argument I is strong
- (B) Only Argument II is strong
- (C) Both arguments are strong
- (D) Neither argument is strong

Questions 11–13: Blood Relations

Directions (Q. 11–13): Study the family information given below and answer the questions that follow.

Padma has two sons: Rohan and Salim. Rohan is married to Tina. They have two children — a daughter Usha and a son Veer. Salim is married to Wini. Their son is Xander.

Q11. How is Usha related to Xander?

- (A) Cousin
- (B) Sister
- (C) Niece
- (D) Aunt

Q12. Tina says, “Padma is the mother of my husband.” How is Padma related to Tina?

- (A) Mother
- (B) Grandmother
- (C) Aunt
- (D) Mother-in-law

Q13. How is Veer related to Salim?

- (A) Son
- (B) Nephew
- (C) Brother



(D) Grandson

Questions 14–17: Syllogisms

Directions (Q. 14–17): In each question, two statements are given followed by two conclusions. Assuming the statements to be true (even if they appear to differ from commonly known facts), decide which conclusion(s) logically follow(s).

- (A) Only Conclusion I follows (B) Only Conclusion II follows (C) Both conclusions follow
(D) Neither conclusion follows

Q14. Statements:

All cats are animals.

All animals are living beings.

Conclusions:

I. All cats are living beings.

II. Some living beings are cats.

- (A) Only Conclusion I follows
(B) Only Conclusion II follows
(C) Both conclusions follow
(D) Neither conclusion follows

Q15. Statements:

Some politicians are honest.

All honest persons are respected.

Conclusions:

I. All politicians are respected.

II. No politician is respected.

- (A) Only Conclusion I follows
(B) Only Conclusion II follows
(C) Both conclusions follow
(D) Neither conclusion follows

Q16. Statements:

All rectangles are quadrilaterals.

Some quadrilaterals are squares.



Conclusions:

- I. Some quadrilaterals are rectangles.
- II. All squares are rectangles.

- (A) Only Conclusion I follows
- (B) Only Conclusion II follows
- (C) Both conclusions follow
- (D) Neither conclusion follows

Q17. Statements:

- Some doctors are surgeons.
- No surgeon is a physician.

Conclusions:

- I. No doctor is a physician.
- II. Some doctors are not physicians.

- (A) Only Conclusion I follows
- (B) Only Conclusion II follows
- (C) Both conclusions follow
- (D) Neither conclusion follows

Questions 18–19: Number Series

Directions (Q. 18–19): Find the missing term in each series.

Q18. 2, 6, 12, 20, 30, ?

- (A) 42
- (B) 36
- (C) 40
- (D) 44

Q19. 3, 7, 13, 21, 31, ?

- (A) 40
- (B) 41
- (C) 43
- (D) 45



Questions 20–21: Letter Series

Directions (Q. 20–21): Find the next term in each letter series.

Q20. DG, GJ, JM, MP, ?

- (A) NQ
- (B) PS
- (C) OR
- (D) QT

Q21. Z, X, U, Q, L, ?

- (A) H
- (B) G
- (C) E
- (D) F

Questions 22–24: Coding and Decoding

Directions (Q. 22–24): In the following coding scheme, each letter of the English alphabet is assigned its ordinal position value ($A = 1, B = 2, \dots, Z = 26$). The **code** for a word is the **product** of the position values of its letters.

Q22. What is the code for the word **ACE**?

- (A) 15
- (B) 30
- (C) 20
- (D) 45

Q23. What is the code for the word **BAD**?

- (A) 4
- (B) 6
- (C) 8
- (D) 10

Q24. If the code for **CAB** is 6, what is the code for **CAD**?



- (A) 8
- (B) 12
- (C) 16
- (D) 24

Questions 25–27: Direction Sense

Directions (Q. 25–27): Study the following information and answer the questions given below.

A postman starts from Post Office P. He walks **3 km North**, then turns East and walks **4 km**, then turns South and walks **7 km**, then turns West and walks **4 km**, and finally turns North and walks **2 km**.

Q25. How far is the postman from Post Office P at the end of his journey?

- (A) 2 km
- (B) 4 km
- (C) 5 km
- (D) 7 km

Q26. In which direction is the postman from Post Office P?

- (A) North
- (B) East
- (C) South
- (D) West

Q27. What is the total distance walked by the postman?

- (A) 15 km
- (B) 18 km
- (C) 22 km
- (D) 20 km

Questions 28–31: Critical Reasoning

Directions (Q. 28–31): Each question presents an argument or a passage. Choose the best answer based on logical reasoning.



Q28. Argument: “All eyewitness testimony is unreliable because human memory is imperfect.”

Which of the following, if true, most *weakens* the above argument?

- (A) Courts routinely accept documentary evidence in addition to eyewitness accounts.
- (B) Studies show that eyewitness accuracy varies significantly by condition; in well-lit, unobstructed scenes, accuracy can exceed 85%.
- (C) The accused in the current case had no alibi.
- (D) The eyewitness knew the accused personally before the incident.

Q29. Argument: “The right to privacy should not extend to public figures since they voluntarily enter public life.”

Which of the following is the *best counter-argument*?

- (A) Public figures should not use social media platforms.
- (B) Privacy is not explicitly mentioned in the Constitution.
- (C) Public figures earn considerably more than ordinary citizens.
- (D) Public figures retain a private sphere of life in which the state and media have no legitimate interest.

Q30. Argument: “Legal aid should be expanded because justice delayed is justice denied.”

What is the *underlying assumption* of this argument?

- (A) Lack of legal aid is a major cause of delay in justice delivery.
- (B) All delay in courts is caused by a shortage of lawyers.
- (C) Legal aid lawyers are less competent than private lawyers.
- (D) Citizens are generally unaware of their legal rights.

Q31. A survey found that 70% of prisoners who completed vocational training during imprisonment were not re-arrested within five years of release.

Which of the following is the *best-supported* conclusion?

- (A) All prisoners should be required to undergo mandatory vocational training.



- (B) Vocational training is the only effective factor in reducing recidivism.
- (C) Vocational training during imprisonment is associated with reduced recidivism.
- (D) Prisoners who do not undergo vocational training will certainly re-offend.

Questions 32–33: Legal Analogies

Directions (Q. 32–33): In each question, a pair of words is given. Choose the option that best completes the analogy.

Q32. Cognizable : Non-cognizable :: Bailable : ?

- (A) Non-bailable
- (B) Compoundable
- (C) Civil
- (D) Criminal

Q33. Tort : Civil Wrong :: Crime : ?

- (A) Moral wrong
- (B) Injustice
- (C) Violation
- (D) Public wrong

Questions 34–35: Calendar and Time

Directions (Q. 34–35): Answer the following calendar and time-based questions.

Q34. If 1st January 2024 is a Monday, what day of the week will 1st January 2025 fall on? (*Note: 2024 is a leap year.*)

- (A) Tuesday
- (B) Wednesday
- (C) Thursday
- (D) Friday

Q35. A court date originally fixed for 15th March (a Friday) was postponed by exactly 3 weeks. On which day of the week will the new date fall?



- (A) Monday
- (B) Thursday
- (C) Friday
- (D) Saturday



Detailed Solutions

Q1.

Solution

Concept — Floor Arrangement: Assign people to floors by applying each condition in order, starting with absolute constraints and eliminating options.

Step 1 — Fix definite positions: Elan is on Floor 1 (condition iv). Deepa is on Floor 5 (condition iii). These are direct, unconditional assignments.

Step 2 — Place Aman: Aman lives on an even-numbered floor (condition i). Even floors in the building: 2 and 4. Condition (v) eliminates Floor 4. Therefore, Aman is on **Floor 2**.

Step 3 — Place Bina and Chirag: Remaining floors are 3 and 4. Condition (ii) states Bina is immediately above Chirag. The only valid consecutive pair from {3, 4} is Chirag = Floor 3, Bina = Floor 4.

Final arrangement: Floor 1 – Elan | Floor 2 – Aman | Floor 3 – **Chirag** | Floor 4 – Bina | Floor 5 – Deepa.

Why other options are wrong:

- Option A: Aman is on Floor 2, not Floor 3.
- Option B: Bina is on Floor 4, not Floor 3.
- Option C: Deepa is on Floor 5, not Floor 3.
- Option D: **Correct** — Chirag occupies Floor 3.

Final Answer: Chirag lives on Floor 3 $\Rightarrow$

[Go Back to Q1](#)

Q2.

Solution

Concept — Floor Arrangement: Use the established arrangement from Q1 to identify adjacency.

Step 1 — Recall arrangement: Floor 1 – Elan, Floor 2 – Aman, Floor 3 – Chirag, Floor 4 – Bina, Floor 5 – Deepa.

Step 2 — Identify the person immediately below Bina: Bina is on Floor 4. The floor immediately below Floor 4 is Floor 3. The person on Floor 3 is **Chirag**.



Why other options are wrong:

- Option A: **Correct** — Chirag (Floor 3) is immediately below Bina (Floor 4).
- Option B: Aman is on Floor 2, two floors below Bina.
- Option C: Elan is on Floor 1, three floors below Bina.
- Option D: Deepa is on Floor 5, above Bina.

Final Answer: Chirag lives immediately below Bina $\Rightarrow$ A

Answer: (A) [Go Back to Q2](#)

Q3.

Solution

Concept — Floor Arrangement: Count only the floors strictly between two people (not including the floors they themselves occupy).

Step 1 — Identify positions: Aman is on Floor 2; Deepa is on Floor 5.

Step 2 — Count floors between them: Floors strictly between Floor 2 and Floor 5 are Floor 3 and Floor 4. The count is **2 floors**.

Why other options are wrong:

- Option A: 1 floor would mean only one floor lies between them, which is incorrect (Floors 3 and 4 both lie between them).
- Option B: 4 is the count of other people, not the floor difference.
- Option C: **Correct** — Floors 3 and 4 are the two floors between Floor 2 (Aman) and Floor 5 (Deepa).
- Option D: 3 floors between them would require Deepa to be on Floor 6, which does not exist.

Final Answer: 2 floors are between Aman and Deepa $\Rightarrow$ C

Answer: (C) [Go Back to Q3](#)



Q4.

Solution

Concept — Floor Arrangement: The topmost floor in a 5-storey building is Floor 5.

Step 1 — Recall: Condition (iii) directly states that Deepa lives on Floor 5. The arrangement confirms: Floor 5 – Deepa.

Why other options are wrong:

- Option A: Aman is on Floor 2.
- Option B: **Correct** — Deepa lives on Floor 5, the topmost floor.
- Option C: Bina is on Floor 4.
- Option D: Elan is on Floor 1, the ground floor.

Final Answer: Deepa lives on the topmost floor $\Rightarrow$ **B**

Answer: (B) [Go Back to Q4](#)

Q5.

Solution

Concept — Floor Arrangement: Apply a hypothetical swap and identify the new occupant of the specified floor.

Step 1 — Original positions: Elan = Floor 1, Deepa = Floor 5. All other residents remain unchanged.

Step 2 — After the swap: Elan moves to Floor 5. Deepa moves to Floor 1. The person now on Floor 1 is **Deepa**.

Why other options are wrong:

- Option A: Aman remains on Floor 2; unaffected by the swap.
- Option B: Chirag remains on Floor 3; unaffected by the swap.
- Option C: Bina remains on Floor 4; unaffected by the swap.
- Option D: **Correct** — Deepa, after swapping with Elan, now occupies Floor 1.

Final Answer: After the swap, Deepa lives on Floor 1 $\Rightarrow$ **D**

Answer: (D) [Go Back to Q5](#)



Q6.

Solution

Concept — Statement and Arguments: A strong argument is directly relevant, logically sound, and grounded in substantive reasoning rather than emotion or exaggeration.

Step 1 — Evaluate Argument I: “Young people are significantly affected by political decisions and deserve a voice.” Political decisions on education policy, environmental regulation, and taxation directly shape the futures of those aged 16. This is a specific, relevant, and sound argument. **Strong.**

Step 2 — Evaluate Argument II: “Many 16-year-olds demonstrate the ability to make informed and responsible decisions.” This addresses the primary concern (capability) and is supported by developmental research on civic competence. It provides an independent, substantive reason. **Strong.**

Why other options are wrong:

- Option A: Argument II is equally strong; A is incomplete.
- Option B: Argument I is equally strong; B is incomplete.
- Option C: **Correct** — Both arguments are relevant and strong.
- Option D: Both arguments have clear merit; D is incorrect.

Final Answer: Both arguments are strong $\Rightarrow$

Answer: (C) [Go Back to Q6](#)

Q7.

Solution

Concept — Statement and Arguments: Evaluate whether each argument provides a specific, proportionate, and logically grounded reason in support of or against the statement.

Step 1 — Evaluate Argument I: “Stronger deterrence is essential to protect the environment from irreversible damage.” Environmental crimes often cause lasting, irreparable harm (deforestation, pollution of water bodies). Stricter deterrence is a well-established mechanism in criminal law theory. **Strong.**

Step 2 — Evaluate Argument II: “Penalties should remain uniform across all offences regardless of category.” This ignores the basic principle that the severity of penalties is and should be calibrated to the nature, gravity, and social impact of



offences. Uniform penalties for all crimes is neither legally sound nor practically justified. **Weak.**

Why other options are wrong:

- Option A: **Correct** — Only Argument I provides a strong, relevant justification.
- Option B: Argument II is logically weak; B is incorrect.
- Option C: Argument II is weak; both cannot be strong.
- Option D: Argument I is clearly strong; D is incorrect.

Final Answer: Only Argument I is strong $\Rightarrow$ A

Answer: (A) [Go Back to Q7](#)

Q8.

Solution

Concept — Statement and Arguments: Weak arguments are those that are overstated, irrelevant to the core issue, or fail to address the specific question.

Step 1 — Evaluate Argument I: “Restricting social media violates the freedom of speech of all citizens.” Freedom of speech is not an absolute right and is subject to reasonable restrictions under law. Moreover, claiming it violates speech rights “of all citizens” is an overgeneralization. The argument does not specifically address misinformation. **Weak.**

Step 2 — Evaluate Argument II: “All citizens spend excessive amounts of time on social media.” This is entirely irrelevant to the question of whether social media should be banned to reduce misinformation. Time spent on platforms has no logical bearing on whether a ban is an appropriate misinformation remedy. Additionally, “all citizens” is factually exaggerated. **Weak.**

Why other options are wrong:

- Option A: Argument I is overstated and not directly relevant to misinformation; not strong.
- Option B: Argument II is entirely irrelevant to the statement’s subject matter.
- Option C: Neither argument is strong.
- Option D: **Correct** — Neither argument provides a strong, relevant justification.

Final Answer: Neither argument is strong $\Rightarrow$ D



Answer: (D) [Go Back to Q8](#)

Q9.

Solution

Concept — Statement and Arguments: Absolute claims (“completely eliminate”) typically weaken an argument because they are rarely justified and are easy to disprove.

Step 1 — Evaluate Argument I: “Mandatory organ donation will completely eliminate organ trafficking.” While mandatory donation may reduce trafficking, claiming it will “completely eliminate” it is an extreme, unsubstantiated assertion. Trafficking could persist through other means. **Weak.**

Step 2 — Evaluate Argument II: “It infringes upon individual and religious freedoms concerning the body.” Bodily autonomy is a fundamental right, and many religious traditions hold specific beliefs about the sanctity of the body after death. This raises a genuine constitutional and ethical concern directly relevant to the statement. **Strong.**

Why other options are wrong:

- Option A: Argument I uses the absolute term “completely,” making it an overstatement and thus weak.
- Option B: **Correct** — Only Argument II is strong.
- Option C: Argument I is weak; both cannot be strong.
- Option D: Argument II is clearly strong on constitutional and ethical grounds.

Final Answer: Only Argument II is strong $\Rightarrow$ **B**

Answer: (B) [Go Back to Q9](#)

Q10.

Solution

Concept — Statement and Arguments: Both arguments must independently and directly support the statement with specific, substantive reasons.

Step 1 — Evaluate Argument I: “High fees prevent meritorious but economically weaker students from entering the legal profession.” This directly addresses equity and access in legal education. It highlights a concrete barrier and is directly relevant



to the proposal. **Strong.**

Step 2 — Evaluate Argument II: “A larger pool of lawyers will help address the acute shortage of legal professionals in rural areas.” This provides an independent, societal rationale — legal access in underserved regions is a well-documented challenge in India. **Strong.**

Why other options are wrong:

- Option A: Argument II is equally strong and independent; A is incomplete.
- Option B: Argument I is equally strong; B is incomplete.
- Option C: **Correct** — Both arguments are relevant, specific, and strong.
- Option D: Both arguments have clear merit; D is incorrect.

Final Answer: Both arguments are strong $\Rightarrow$

Answer: (C) [Go Back to Q10](#)

Q11.

Solution

Concept — Blood Relations: Trace the relationship through the family tree by identifying the connecting link between two people.

Step 1 — Identify Usha’s lineage: Usha is the daughter of Rohan. Rohan is a son of Padma.

Step 2 — Identify Xander’s lineage: Xander is the son of Salim. Salim is also a son of Padma.

Step 3 — Determine the relationship: Rohan and Salim are brothers (both sons of Padma). Children of two siblings are **cousins**. Therefore, Usha (Rohan’s daughter) and Xander (Salim’s son) are cousins.

Why other options are wrong:

- Option A: **Correct** — Usha and Xander are first cousins.
- Option B: Sister implies the same parents; Usha and Xander have different parents (Rohan vs. Salim).
- Option C: Niece describes a sibling’s daughter from the perspective of an uncle/aunt; Usha is not Xander’s niece.
- Option D: Aunt is a generation above; Usha and Xander belong to the same generation.



Final Answer: Usha is Xander's cousin $\Rightarrow$ A

Answer: (A) [Go Back to Q11](#)

Q12.

Solution

Concept — Blood Relations: Translate the speaker's statement to identify the relationship from the speaker's perspective.

Step 1 — Identify Tina's husband: Tina is married to Rohan. Therefore, Tina's husband = Rohan.

Step 2 — Padma's relation to Rohan: Padma is the mother of Rohan (stated directly in the passage: "Padma has two sons: Rohan and Salim").

Step 3 — Padma's relation to Tina: The mother of one's husband is one's **mother-in-law**.

Why other options are wrong:

- Option A: Mother implies biological parenthood; Padma is not Tina's biological mother.
- Option B: Grandmother would require an additional generation between Padma and Rohan, which does not exist.
- Option C: Aunt implies a sibling's parent; this relationship does not apply here.
- Option D: **Correct** — Padma is Tina's mother-in-law.

Final Answer: Padma is Tina's mother-in-law $\Rightarrow$ D

Answer: (D) [Go Back to Q12](#)

Q13.

Solution

Concept — Blood Relations: Determine how a person in one nuclear family relates to a member of their parent's sibling's family.

Step 1 — Identify Veer's parents: Veer is the son of Rohan and Tina.

Step 2 — Relationship between Rohan and Salim: Rohan and Salim are brothers (both sons of Padma).



Step 3 — Determine relationship: Salim's brother's son is Salim's **nephew**. Therefore, Veer is Salim's nephew.

Why other options are wrong:

- Option A: Son would require Veer to be Salim's direct child; Veer is Rohan's child.
- Option B: **Correct** — Veer is Salim's nephew.
- Option C: Brother implies the same parents and the same generation; Veer is one generation below Salim.
- Option D: Grandson would require Salim to be Veer's grandfather; Padma is Veer's grandmother.

Final Answer: Veer is Salim's nephew $\Rightarrow$ B

Answer: (B) [Go Back to Q13](#)

Q14.

Solution

Concept — Syllogism: A universal affirmative (A-type) proposition can be chained transitively; its simple conversion yields a particular affirmative (I-type) proposition.

Step 1 — Evaluate Conclusion I (All cats are living beings): All cats $\subseteq$ animals (Statement 1). All animals $\subseteq$ living beings (Statement 2). By transitivity: All cats $\subseteq$ living beings. **Conclusion I follows.**

Step 2 — Evaluate Conclusion II (Some living beings are cats): Since all cats are living beings and the set of cats is non-empty, the set of living beings contains at least some cats. By simple conversion of the A-type proposition: Some living beings are cats. **Conclusion II follows.**

Why other options are wrong:

- Option A: Conclusion II also follows; A is incomplete.
- Option B: Conclusion I also follows; B is incomplete.
- Option C: **Correct** — Both conclusions logically follow from the given statements.
- Option D: Both conclusions follow; D is incorrect.

Final Answer: Both conclusions follow $\Rightarrow$ C



Answer: (C) [Go Back to Q14](#)

Q15.

Solution

Concept — Syllogism: A particular affirmative (I-type) premise restricts conclusions; we cannot extend findings about “some” to “all” or “none.”

Step 1 — Valid inference from the statements: Some politicians are honest (I-type) + All honest persons are respected (A-type) $\Rightarrow$ Some politicians are respected (I-type). This is the only valid conclusion.

Step 2 — Evaluate Conclusion I (All politicians are respected): The first statement only tells us that *some* politicians are honest. We cannot extend this to *all* politicians. **Conclusion I does not follow.**

Step 3 — Evaluate Conclusion II (No politician is respected): This contradicts the valid inference above — some politicians (those who are honest) are indeed respected. **Conclusion II does not follow.**

Why other options are wrong:

- Option A: “Some” cannot justify “all”; Conclusion I is too broad.
- Option B: Conclusion II is directly refuted by the valid inference.
- Option C: Neither conclusion follows; C is incorrect.
- Option D: **Correct** — Neither Conclusion I nor Conclusion II logically follows.

Final Answer: Neither conclusion follows $\Rightarrow$ **D**

Answer: (D) [Go Back to Q15](#)

Q16.

Solution

Concept — Syllogism: Simple conversion of a universal affirmative (A-type) proposition is valid only as a particular affirmative (I-type). A particular affirmative (I-type) cannot be universally distributed.

Step 1 — Evaluate Conclusion I (Some quadrilaterals are rectangles): Statement 1 says all rectangles are quadrilaterals (A-type). Converting an A-type proposition gives an I-type: Some quadrilaterals are rectangles. **Conclusion I follows.**



Step 2 — Evaluate Conclusion II (All squares are rectangles): Statement 2 says some quadrilaterals are squares (I-type). There is no direct relationship established between squares and rectangles in the given statements. This conclusion would require outside knowledge and cannot be derived from the premises. **Conclusion II does not follow.**

Why other options are wrong:

- Option A: **Correct** — Only Conclusion I follows by valid conversion.
- Option B: Conclusion II introduces a relationship not present in the premises.
- Option C: Conclusion II does not logically follow; C is incorrect.
- Option D: Conclusion I clearly follows; D is incorrect.

Final Answer: Only Conclusion I follows $\Rightarrow$ A

Answer: (A) [Go Back to Q16](#)

Q17.

Solution

Concept — Syllogism: When some members of a set belong to a group that is entirely excluded from another set, a particular negative conclusion about the first set follows.

Step 1 — Evaluate Conclusion I (No doctor is a physician): Only *some* doctors are surgeons. There may be doctors who are not surgeons, and those doctors could still be physicians. We cannot conclude that *no* doctor is a physician. **Conclusion I does not follow.**

Step 2 — Evaluate Conclusion II (Some doctors are not physicians): From Statement 1, some doctors ARE surgeons. From Statement 2, no surgeon is a physician. Therefore, those surgeon-doctors are definitely not physicians. At least some doctors (namely, those who are surgeons) are not physicians. **Conclusion II follows.**

Why other options are wrong:

- Option A: Conclusion I overgeneralises from “some” to “none”; it does not follow.
- Option B: **Correct** — Only Conclusion II follows.
- Option C: Conclusion I does not follow; C is incorrect.
- Option D: Conclusion II clearly follows from the chain of reasoning above.



Final Answer: Only Conclusion II follows $\Rightarrow$ **B**

Answer: (B) [Go Back to Q17](#)

Q18.

Solution

Concept — Number Series: Recognise the underlying formula or pattern governing the terms and apply it to find the next term.

Step 1 — Identify the pattern:

$$2 = 1 \times 2, \quad 6 = 2 \times 3, \quad 12 = 3 \times 4, \quad 20 = 4 \times 5, \quad 30 = 5 \times 6$$

Each term is of the form $n(n+1)$ where $n = 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, \dots$

Step 2 — Compute the next term: For $n = 6$: $6 \times 7 = 42$.

Why other options are wrong:

- Option A: **Correct** — $6 \times 7 = 42$.
- Option B: $36 = 6^2$; this follows the squares pattern, not $n(n+1)$.
- Option C: 40 does not equal $n(n+1)$ for any integer n (since $6 \times 7 = 42$ and $5 \times 6 = 30$).
- Option D: $44 = n(n+1)$ has no integer solution between 6 and 7.

Final Answer: The next term is 42 $\Rightarrow$ **A**

Answer: (A) [Go Back to Q18](#)

Q19.

Solution

Concept — Number Series: Examine the differences between consecutive terms to reveal a secondary pattern.

Step 1 — Compute first differences:

$$7 - 3 = 4, \quad 13 - 7 = 6, \quad 21 - 13 = 8, \quad 31 - 21 = 10$$

The differences are 4, 6, 8, 10 — an arithmetic sequence increasing by 2 each time.

Step 2 — Find the next term: Next difference = $10 + 2 = 12$. Next term = $31 + 12 =$



43.

Why other options are wrong:

- Option A: 40 implies a difference of 9 from 31; the pattern requires the next difference to be 12.
- Option B: 41 implies a difference of 10, repeating the previous difference rather than increasing by 2.
- Option C: **Correct** — $31 + 12 = 43$.
- Option D: 45 implies a difference of 14, skipping 12 in the arithmetic progression.

Final Answer: The next term is 43 $\Rightarrow$ CAnswer: (C) [Go Back to Q19](#)

Q20.

Solution**Concept — Letter Series:** Analyse the pattern in both components of each pair to determine the rule for progression.**Step 1 — Observe the pairs:** DG, GJ, JM, MP. In each pair, both letters advance by +3 positions to produce the next pair. Also note that the second letter of each pair becomes the first letter of the next pair: $G \rightarrow G$, $J \rightarrow J$, $M \rightarrow M$, $P \rightarrow P$.**Step 2 — Apply the rule to find the next pair:**

$$\text{First letter: } M + 3 = P \quad \text{Second letter: } P + 3 = S$$

Next pair: **PS**.**Why other options are wrong:**

- Option A: NQ implies $M + 1 = N$ and $P + 1 = Q$; the shift is +1, not the required +3.
- Option B: **Correct** — $M + 3 = P$, $P + 3 = S$ gives PS.
- Option C: OR implies $M + 2 = O$ and $P + 2 = R$; the shift is +2, not +3.
- Option D: QT implies $M + 4 = Q$ and $P + 4 = T$; the shift is +4, not +3.

Final Answer: The next pair is PS $\Rightarrow$ BAnswer: (B) [Go Back to Q20](#)

Q21.

Solution

Concept — Letter Series: Assign ordinal positions to letters and compute the differences between consecutive terms to reveal the pattern.

Step 1 — Assign positions and compute differences:

$$Z(26), X(24), U(21), Q(17), L(12)$$

$$26 - 24 = 2, \quad 24 - 21 = 3, \quad 21 - 17 = 4, \quad 17 - 12 = 5$$

The differences are $-2, -3, -4, -5$ — decreasing by 1 each step.

Step 2 — Find the next term: Next difference = -6 . $12 - 6 = 6$. Position 6 in the alphabet is F.

Why other options are wrong:

- Option A: H = position 8; this would imply a difference of -4 , repeating an earlier difference.
- Option B: G = position 7; this would imply a difference of -5 , repeating the previous step.
- Option C: E = position 5; this would imply a difference of -7 , skipping -6 in the pattern.
- Option D: **Correct** — F = position 6; $12 - 6 = 6$, applying the next difference of -6 .

Final Answer: The next letter is F $\Rightarrow$ D

Answer: (D) [Go Back to Q21](#)

Q22.

Solution

Concept — Coding and Decoding: Apply the stated rule: code = product of ordinal position values of all letters in the word.

Step 1 — Assign position values: A = 1, C = 3, E = 5.

Step 2 — Compute the product:

$$1 \times 3 \times 5 = 15$$



Why other options are wrong:

- Option A: **Correct** — $1 \times 3 \times 5 = 15$.
- Option B: $30 = 2 \times 3 \times 5$; this would arise only if A were treated as position 2 (B).
- Option C: $20 = 1 \times 4 \times 5$; this would require C to be at position 4 (D), which is incorrect.
- Option D: $45 = 3 \times 3 \times 5$; this would require A to be at position 3 (C), which is incorrect.

Final Answer: The code for ACE is 15 $\Rightarrow$ A

Answer: (A) [Go Back to Q22](#)

Q23.

Solution

Concept — Coding and Decoding: Apply the same product rule consistently.

Step 1 — Assign position values: B = 2, A = 1, D = 4.

Step 2 — Compute the product:

$$2 \times 1 \times 4 = 8$$

Why other options are wrong:

- Option A: $4 = 1 \times 1 \times 4$; this would arise if B were treated as position 1 (A).
- Option B: $6 = 1 \times 2 \times 3$; this does not match B(2), A(1), D(4).
- Option C: **Correct** — $2 \times 1 \times 4 = 8$.
- Option D: $10 = 1 \times 2 \times 5$; D is at position 4, not 5.

Final Answer: The code for BAD is 8 $\Rightarrow$ C

Answer: (C) [Go Back to Q23](#)



Q24.

Solution

Concept — Coding and Decoding: Verify the coding rule using the given example, then apply it to the new word.

Step 1 — Verify the rule using CAB: $C = 3, A = 1, B = 2$. Product $= 3 \times 1 \times 2 = 6$. This matches the stated code of 6, confirming the product-of-positions rule.

Step 2 — Compute the code for CAD: $C = 3, A = 1, D = 4$. Product $= 3 \times 1 \times 4 = 12$.

Why other options are wrong:

- Option A: $8 = 2 \times 1 \times 4$ (BAD); does not correspond to CAD.
- Option B: **Correct** — $3 \times 1 \times 4 = 12$.
- Option C: $16 = 4 \times 1 \times 4$; this would require C to be at position 4 (D).
- Option D: $24 = 3 \times 2 \times 4$; this would require A to be at position 2 (B).

Final Answer: The code for CAD is 12 $\Rightarrow$ B

Answer: (B) [Go Back to Q24](#)

Q25.

Solution

Concept — Direction Sense: Track the postman's position using a coordinate system. Take North and East as positive directions.

Step 1 — Trace each leg of the journey:

- Start at Post Office P: $(0, 0)$
- 3 km North: $(0, 3)$
- 4 km East: $(4, 3)$
- 7 km South: $(4, 3 - 7) = (4, -4)$
- 4 km West: $(4 - 4, -4) = (0, -4)$
- 2 km North: $(0, -4 + 2) = (0, -2)$

Step 2 — Calculate distance from P: Final position $(0, -2)$. Distance $= \sqrt{0^2 + (-2)^2} = 2$ km.

Why other options are wrong:

- Option A: **Correct** — The postman is exactly 2 km from Post Office P.



- Option B: 4 km would result if the final 2 km northward segment were not walked.
- Option C: 5 km would arise if there were an east-west displacement at the end, but the final x -coordinate is 0.
- Option D: 7 km is the length of one segment (southward), not the final displacement.

Final Answer: The postman is 2 km from Post Office P $\Rightarrow$ A

Answer: (A) [Go Back to Q25](#)

Q26.

Solution

Concept — Direction Sense: Use the final coordinates relative to the starting point to determine the direction.

Step 1 — Final position: From Q25, the postman ends at $(0, -2)$. Post Office P is at $(0, 0)$.

Step 2 — Determine the direction: The y -coordinate is -2 (negative $\Rightarrow$ South of P). The x -coordinate is 0 (same as P, so no East-West displacement). The postman is due **South** of Post Office P.

Why other options are wrong:

- Option A: North requires $y > 0$; the final $y = -2 < 0$.
- Option B: East requires $x > 0$; the final $x = 0$.
- Option C: **Correct** — The postman is due South of P.
- Option D: West requires $x < 0$; the final $x = 0$.

Final Answer: The postman is South of Post Office P $\Rightarrow$ C

Answer: (C) [Go Back to Q26](#)



Q27.

Solution

Concept — Direction Sense: Total distance walked is the arithmetic sum of all individual segments, regardless of direction. This is distinct from displacement (shortest path from start to finish).

Step 1 — Add all segments:

$$3 + 4 + 7 + 4 + 2 = 20 \text{ km}$$

Step 2 — Distinguish from displacement: The displacement (from Q25) is 2 km, but the total path length walked is 20 km.

Why other options are wrong:

- Option A: 15 km omits two of the five segments.
- Option B: 18 km omits the final 2 km northward segment.
- Option C: 22 km adds an extra 2 km beyond the total that was walked.
- Option D: **Correct** — $3 + 4 + 7 + 4 + 2 = 20 \text{ km}$.

Final Answer: The total distance walked is 20 km $\Rightarrow$ D

Answer: (D) [Go Back to Q27](#)

Q28.

Solution

Concept — Critical Reasoning (Weakening): A weakener provides evidence or reasoning that directly undermines the argument's conclusion or a key premise on which it depends.

Step 1 — Identify the argument's claim: The argument makes a universal claim — "ALL eyewitness testimony is unreliable." The justification is that human memory is imperfect.

Step 2 — Evaluate Option B: "Studies show that eyewitness accuracy varies significantly by condition; in well-lit, unobstructed scenes, accuracy can exceed 85%." This directly challenges the universality of the claim by presenting empirical evidence that eyewitness testimony can be highly reliable under appropriate conditions. It weakens the blanket assertion most effectively.

Why other options are wrong:



- Option A: Courts accepting documentary evidence says nothing about whether eyewitness testimony is reliable or unreliable.
- Option B: **Correct** — Provides direct empirical evidence against the universal claim that all eyewitness testimony is unreliable.
- Option C: The accused having no alibi is a case-specific fact irrelevant to the general reliability of eyewitness testimony.
- Option D: The witness knowing the accused personally introduces ambiguity but does not directly challenge the universal reliability claim.

Final Answer: Option B most weakens the argument $\Rightarrow$ B

Answer: (B) [Go Back to Q28](#)

Q29.

Solution

Concept — Critical Reasoning (Counter-Argument): The best counter-argument directly challenges the logic or premise of the original argument rather than raising irrelevant points.

Step 1 — Identify the original argument's premise: "By voluntarily entering public life, public figures forfeit their right to privacy entirely." The argument assumes that the act of entering public life constitutes a complete and blanket waiver of privacy.

Step 2 — Evaluate Option D: "Public figures retain a private sphere of life in which the state and media have no legitimate interest." This directly challenges the premise by asserting that entering public life waives only a *partial* right to privacy (in their public role), not the entirety of it. It is legally and philosophically grounded. **Best counter-argument.**

Why other options are wrong:

- Option A: Whether public figures use social media is irrelevant to the right-to-privacy argument.
- Option B: The absence of an explicit constitutional mention does not resolve the normative debate about privacy rights.
- Option C: Income level has no logical bearing on privacy entitlements.
- Option D: **Correct** — Directly refutes the premise that voluntary entry into public life negates all privacy rights.

Final Answer: Option D is the best counter-argument $\Rightarrow$ D



Answer: (D) [Go Back to Q29](#)

Q30.

Solution

Concept — Critical Reasoning (Underlying Assumption): An assumption is an unstated premise that bridges the stated evidence and conclusion, without which the argument collapses.

Step 1 — Map the argument: Premise: “Justice delayed is justice denied.” Conclusion: “Legal aid should be expanded.” For this conclusion to follow from this premise, there must be an unstated link between the absence of legal aid and delays in justice.

Step 2 — Identify the assumption: The argument implicitly assumes that **lack of legal aid is a major cause of delay in justice delivery**. Without this assumption, expanding legal aid would have no necessary connection to preventing justice from being delayed.

Why other options are wrong:

- Option A: **Correct** — This is the precise bridge assumption linking the premise to the conclusion.
- Option B: “All delay” is too strong and absolute; the argument does not require this extreme assumption.
- Option C: Legal aid lawyers being less competent would actually undermine the argument’s conclusion.
- Option D: Citizen awareness of legal rights is a separate issue not logically necessary for the argument to work.

Final Answer: The underlying assumption is Option A $\Rightarrow$ A

Answer: (A) [Go Back to Q30](#)



Q31.

Solution

Concept — Critical Reasoning (Inference from Survey Data): A valid conclusion from survey data must stay within the bounds of what the data actually shows. Survey data demonstrates correlation, not causation, and cannot justify absolute or universal claims.

Step 1 — What does the data show? 70% of prisoners who completed vocational training were not re-arrested within 5 years. This is a correlation between training and reduced re-arrest rates.

Step 2 — Evaluate Option C: “Vocational training during imprisonment is associated with reduced recidivism.” This accurately reflects the survey finding using appropriate correlation language (“associated with”) and avoids overstating causation. **Best-supported.**

Why other options are wrong:

- Option A: “All prisoners should undergo mandatory training” is a policy prescription going well beyond what the survey data supports.
- Option B: “Only effective factor” cannot be established — many other variables (age, support networks, employment) may also influence recidivism.
- Option C: **Correct** — Uses appropriately cautious correlation language consistent with survey findings.
- Option D: “Certainly re-offend” is an absolute prediction not supported by any data in the passage.

Final Answer: Option C is the best-supported conclusion ⇒ C

Answer: (C) [Go Back to Q31](#)

Q32.

Solution

Concept — Legal Analogies: Identify the precise relationship between the first pair and apply the identical relationship to the second pair.

Step 1 — Identify the relationship: Cognizable and Non-cognizable are complementary antonyms within the legal classification of criminal offences (cognizable offences allow police arrest without a warrant; non-cognizable offences require a magistrate’s order). The relationship is: $X : \textit{opposite of } X$ within the same classification system.



Step 2 — Apply to Bailable: The direct complement of Bailable within the same bail classification system is **Non-bailable**. Bailable offences allow bail as a matter of right; non-bailable offences require judicial discretion.

Why other options are wrong:

- Option A: **Correct** — Non-bailable is the direct antonym of Bailable within the same classification, mirroring Cognizable:Non-cognizable.
- Option B: Compoundable refers to the ability of parties to settle an offence privately; this is a different classification dimension.
- Option C: Civil is a category of law (as opposed to criminal), not a complementary term within the bail classification.
- Option D: Criminal is also a broad category of law, not the antonym of Bailable.

Final Answer: Bailable : Non-bailable $\Rightarrow$ A

Answer: (A) [Go Back to Q32](#)

Q33.

Solution

Concept — Legal Analogies: The relationship is definitional — the first term is a legal category and the second term is its legal definition.

Step 1 — Identify the relationship: A “Tort” is legally defined as a “Civil Wrong” — a wrong committed against a private individual (not the state), for which a civil remedy is available. The relationship is: legal term : its legal definition.

Step 2 — Apply to Crime: In legal theory, a “Crime” is defined as a **Public Wrong** — an act that offends against the state and society as a whole, which is why the state (not the individual victim) prosecutes it. This is the standard jurisprudential definition distinguishing crimes from torts.

Why other options are wrong:

- Option A: Moral wrong is an ethical concept, not the legal definition of crime. Not all crimes are moral wrongs and vice versa.
- Option B: Injustice is a general normative term, not the technical legal definition of crime.
- Option C: Violation is too vague — it can refer to any breach of rule or norm.
- Option D: **Correct** — A Crime is a Public Wrong; the state prosecutes on behalf of society.



Final Answer: Crime is a Public Wrong $\Rightarrow$ **D**

Answer: (D) [Go Back to Q33](#)

Q34.

Solution

Concept — Calendar: To find the day of the week one year later, count the total days in the intervening year and find the remainder when divided by 7.

Step 1 — Determine the number of days in 2024: 2024 is a leap year (divisible by 4 and by 400 check is not needed since it is not a century year). A leap year has 366 days.

Step 2 — Calculate the day shift:

$$366 = 52 \times 7 + 2$$

There are 52 complete weeks and **2 extra days**.

Step 3 — Apply the shift: 1 January 2024 is Monday. Adding 2 days: Monday $\rightarrow$ Tuesday $\rightarrow$ **Wednesday**.

Why other options are wrong:

- Option A: Tuesday would result from a shift of 1 day (non-leap year with 365 days: $365 = 52 \times 7 + 1$).
- Option B: **Correct** — Wednesday results from Monday + 2 days (leap year, 366 days).
- Option C: Thursday would result from a shift of 3 days, not applicable here.
- Option D: Friday would result from a shift of 4 days, not applicable here.

Final Answer: 1st January 2025 falls on Wednesday $\Rightarrow$ **B**

Answer: (B) [Go Back to Q34](#)



Q35.

Solution

Concept — Calendar: Postponement by an exact multiple of 7 days (whole weeks) leaves the day of the week unchanged.

Step 1 — Identify the original date and day: 15th March, a Friday.

Step 2 — Calculate the new date: 3 weeks = $3 \times 7 = 21$ days. New date: 15 March + 21 days = 5 April.

Step 3 — Determine the day of the week: Since 21 days = 3 complete weeks (an exact multiple of 7), the day of the week is identical to the original. The new court date (5 April) falls on **Friday**.

Why other options are wrong:

- Option A: Monday would require a non-whole-week postponement (e.g., 17 days from Friday).
- Option B: Thursday is one day before Friday; this would arise from a postponement of $21 - 1 = 20$ days.
- Option C: **Correct** — 21 days = 3 exact weeks, preserving the day of the week as Friday.
- Option D: Saturday is one day after Friday; this would arise from a postponement of $21 + 1 = 22$ days.

Final Answer: The new court date falls on Friday $\Rightarrow$ C

Answer: (C) [Go Back to Q35](#)



Answer Key

Q	Ans	Q	Ans	Q	Ans	Q	Ans	Q	Ans
1	D	2	A	3	C	4	B	5	D
6	C	7	A	8	D	9	B	10	C
11	A	12	D	13	B	14	C	15	D
16	A	17	B	18	A	19	C	20	B
21	D	22	A	23	C	24	B	25	A
26	C	27	D	28	B	29	D	30	A
31	C	32	A	33	D	34	B	35	C

