

AILET Logical Reasoning

Sample Paper – 7

Duration: 21 Minutes

Maximum Marks: 35

Instructions

- This paper contains **35** Multiple Choice Questions (Single Correct Answer), modelled on the Logical Reasoning section of **AILET** (All India Law Entrance Test, NLU Delhi).
- Each correct answer carries **+1 mark**. There is a penalty of **–0.25 marks** for each incorrect answer. Unattempted questions carry no penalty.
- Only **one** option is correct per question. Read each question carefully before marking.
- Syllabus: Analytical puzzles, syllogisms, blood relations, coding-decoding, series, direction sense, statement-based reasoning, and critical reasoning.
- Use of mobile phones, calculators, or any electronic gadget is strictly prohibited during the test.

Questions

Q1. Questions 1–5 are based on the following information.

Five persons — Meena, Nikhil, Omkar, Priya, and Qadir — are each assigned a unique working day (Monday to Friday) and a unique favourite colour (red, blue, green, yellow, white). The following conditions hold:

- (i) The person who works on Monday wears blue.
- (ii) Priya works exactly two working days after Nikhil (e.g., if Nikhil works on day n , Priya works on day $n + 2$).
- (iii) Meena works on Friday and her favourite colour is green.
- (iv) The person who works on Thursday wears white.
- (v) Omkar's favourite colour is red.



Q1. Which person works on Wednesday?

- (A) Meena
- (B) Nikhil
- (C) Priya
- (D) Omkar

Q2. Based on the information given above (Questions 1–5), what is Nikhil's favourite colour?

- (A) Green
- (B) Yellow
- (C) White
- (D) Blue

Q3. Based on the information given above (Questions 1–5), who works on Thursday?

- (A) Qadir
- (B) Meena
- (C) Omkar
- (D) Nikhil

Q4. Based on the information given above (Questions 1–5), what is Priya's favourite colour?

- (A) White
- (B) Yellow
- (C) Blue
- (D) Green

Q5. Based on the information given above (Questions 1–5), what is Omkar's favourite colour?



- (A) Yellow
- (B) Blue
- (C) Red
- (D) White

Q6. Questions 6–10: Statement–Assumption.

In each question below, a statement is followed by two assumptions (I and II). Decide which assumption(s) are implicit in the statement.

Options for Q6–Q10:

- (A) Only Assumption I is implicit (B) Only Assumption II is implicit
(C) Both Assumptions I and II are implicit (D) Neither Assumption I nor II is implicit

Statement: “Digital literacy programmes should be introduced in all rural schools to bridge the technology gap.”

Assumption I: All rural schools currently have adequate infrastructure to implement digital programmes immediately.

Assumption II: Urban schools do not require digital literacy programmes of any kind.

- (A) Only Assumption I is implicit
- (B) Only Assumption II is implicit
- (C) Both Assumptions I and II are implicit
- (D) Neither Assumption I nor Assumption II is implicit

Q7. Statement: “The government has launched a consumer protection helpline for citizens to report fraudulent products and services.”

Assumption I: Consumers who encounter fraud are willing to report it through such a helpline.

Assumption II: All fraudulent products will be permanently recalled from the market within one week of being reported.

- (A) Only Assumption I is implicit



- (B) Only Assumption II is implicit
- (C) Both Assumptions I and II are implicit
- (D) Neither Assumption I nor Assumption II is implicit

Q8. Statement: “Environmental impact assessments must be made mandatory before granting any industrial licence.”

Assumption I: All industries currently conduct environmental impact assessments voluntarily before commencing operations.

Assumption II: Granting industrial licences without environmental checks can cause irreversible ecological harm.

- (A) Only Assumption I is implicit
- (B) Only Assumption II is implicit
- (C) Both Assumptions I and II are implicit
- (D) Neither Assumption I nor Assumption II is implicit

Q9. Statement: “The government should enact strict data privacy laws to protect citizens from corporate surveillance.”

Assumption I: Citizens’ personal data is currently being collected by corporations without adequate consent.

Assumption II: Strict legal provisions can effectively deter corporations from unlawful data collection.

- (A) Only Assumption I is implicit
- (B) Only Assumption II is implicit
- (C) Both Assumptions I and II are implicit
- (D) Neither Assumption I nor Assumption II is implicit

Q10. Statement: “The collegium system for judicial appointments should be replaced by a transparent parliamentary committee.”

Assumption I: The current collegium system has never recommended a qualified judge for appointment to any court.



Assumption II: A parliamentary committee will always select judges solely on the basis of merit, completely free from political influence.

- (A) Only Assumption I is implicit
- (B) Only Assumption II is implicit
- (C) Both Assumptions I and II are implicit
- (D) Neither Assumption I nor Assumption II is implicit

Q11. Questions 11–13 are based on the following information.

Study the family relationships described below and answer the questions that follow.

- (i) Rajiv and Sunita are a married couple with two children — Uday (son) and Tara (daughter).
- (ii) Veena is the mother of Rajiv and has no other children.
- (iii) Wasim is the only brother of Sunita.

Q11. How is Uday related to Wasim?

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

Q12. Based on the information given above (Questions 11–13), how is Veena related to Tara?

- (A) Mother
- (B) Grandmother
- (C) Aunt
- (D) Sister

Q13. Based on the information given above (Questions 11–13), how is Tara related to Wasim?



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

Q14. Questions 14–17: Two-Statement Syllogism.

In each question, two statements are followed by two conclusions. Assuming both statements to be true (even if they appear to contradict common knowledge), decide which conclusion(s) logically follow.

Options for Q14–Q17:

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

Statements:

1. Some metals are liquids.
2. No liquid is a gas.

Conclusions:

- I. No metal is a gas.
- II. All metals are solids.

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

Q15. Statements:

1. All plastics are polymers.
2. Some polymers are ceramics.

Conclusions:

- I. Some polymers are plastics.
- II. Some ceramics are plastics.

- (A) Only Conclusion I follows



- (B) Only Conclusion II follows
- (C) Both Conclusions follow
- (D) Neither Conclusion follows

Q16. Statements:

1. No wood is glass.
2. All glass is transparent.

Conclusions:

- I. No wood is transparent.
- II. Some transparent things are glass.

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

Q17. Statements:

1. All rubies are gemstones.
2. All gemstones are valuable.

Conclusions:

- I. All rubies are valuable.
- II. Some valuable things are rubies.

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

Q18. Questions 18–19: Number Series.

Find the missing number in each series.

4, 9, 25, 49, 121, ?



- (A) 144
- (B) 156
- (C) 161
- (D) 169

Q19. 1, 8, 27, 64, ?, 216

- (A) 125
- (B) 100
- (C) 120
- (D) 150

Q20. Questions 20–21: Letter Series.

Identify the next term in each series.

A, C, F, J, O, ?

- (A) T
- (B) U
- (C) V
- (D) W

Q21. Z, W, S, N, H, ?

- (A) B
- (B) Z
- (C) A
- (D) C

Q22. Questions 22–24: Coding–Decoding.

In a special coding system, each **consonant** is assigned a value equal to its position among the consonants of the English alphabet:

B = 1, C = 2, D = 3, F = 4, G = 5, H = 6, J = 7, K = 8, L = 9, M = 10,



$N = 11, P = 12, Q = 13, R = 14, S = 15, T = 16, V = 17, W = 18, X = 19, Y = 20$

Each **vowel** is assigned its position among the vowels:

$A = 1, E = 2, I = 3, O = 4, U = 5$.

The **code** for a word is the **sum** of the values of all its letters.

Q22. What is the code for **LAMP**?

- (A) 28
- (B) 30
- (C) 31
- (D) 32

Q23. Using the same coding system described in Q22, what is the code for **FINE**?

- (A) 20
- (B) 22
- (C) 24
- (D) 26

Q24. Using the same coding system described in Q22, what is the code for **BOND**?

- (A) 17
- (B) 19
- (C) 21
- (D) 23

Q25. Questions 25–27 are based on the following information.

A vehicle starts from point P. It first travels **5 km North**, then turns right and travels **12 km East**, then turns right and travels **5 km South**, and finally turns right and travels **7 km West**.



Q25. What is the straight-line distance between the vehicle's current position and the starting point P?

- (A) 7 km
- (B) 12 km
- (C) 5 km
- (D) 13 km

Q26. Based on the information given above (Questions 25–27), in which direction is the vehicle currently facing after completing all four legs of the journey?

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

Q27. Based on the information given above (Questions 25–27), if the vehicle now travels an additional **5 km** in the direction it is currently facing, how far will it be from the starting point P?

- (A) At point P (0 km from the starting point)
- (B) 5 km North of P
- (C) 10 km West of P
- (D) 5 km South of P

Q28. Questions 28–31: Critical Reasoning.

Q28. *Identify the primary flaw in the following argument.*

“In the case of *Rylands v. Fletcher*, the court imposed strict liability on a landowner whose reservoir burst and flooded a neighbouring mine. Therefore, in the present case, the factory owner should also be held strictly liable because, like the defendant in *Rylands*, harm was caused to a neighbour.”



- (A) It ignores the financial capacity of the factory owner to pay compensation.
- (B) It assumes the two situations are legally similar without establishing that the essential elements of strict liability are present in the current case.
- (C) It relies on a judicial ruling that has since been overturned by a higher court.
- (D) It fails to consider whether the harm was caused intentionally by the factory owner.

Q29. *Which of the following arguments has the same logical structure as the argument below?*

“In criminal law, the prosecution bears the burden of proving the accused’s guilt beyond reasonable doubt. In the present trial, the prosecution failed to prove that the accused was present at the scene of the crime. Therefore, the accused must be acquitted.”

- (A) Since the defendant did not disprove the plaintiff’s claims, the court must rule in the plaintiff’s favour.
- (B) The company was found liable for environmental pollution because aggrieved residents filed a formal complaint against it.
- (C) In civil law, the plaintiff must establish their case on a balance of probabilities. Since the plaintiff failed to produce any documentary evidence of the alleged contract, the court should rule in favour of the defendant.
- (D) Because the accused had a prior conviction for a similar offence, the court presumed guilt in the current case.

Q30. *Identify the underlying assumption in the following argument.*

“Industries engaged in hazardous activities must be held strictly liable for any harm caused, regardless of negligence. The chemical factory must therefore compensate the farmers for their crop damage, even though all prescribed safety protocols were strictly followed by the factory.”



- (A) The factory was aware of the potential risk to the farmers' crops before commencing its operations.
- (B) The farmers did not contribute to the damage through any negligence on their part.
- (C) Chemical factories are inherently more dangerous than all other types of industrial establishments.
- (D) The operation of the chemical factory falls within the legal definition of a "hazardous activity."

Q31. *Which statement is the logical conclusion of the following argument?*

"Under criminal law, an act alone does not constitute a criminal offence unless it is accompanied by a guilty mind (*mens rea*). Nalini took her colleague's pen from the desk, genuinely believing it to be her own pen. Therefore, _____."

- (A) Nalini cannot be held criminally liable for theft.
- (B) Nalini should return the pen and apologise to her colleague.
- (C) The colleague should have labelled her pen clearly to avoid such confusion.
- (D) Nalini's act constitutes theft but not robbery.

Q32. Questions 32–33: Legal Analogies.

Choose the option that best completes the analogy.

Plaintiff : Defendant :: Prosecution : ?

- (A) Judge
- (B) Defence
- (C) Witness
- (D) Jury

Q33. Bail : Custody :: Acquittal : ?

- (A) Appeal



- (B) Pardon
- (C) Conviction
- (D) Sentence

Q34. Questions 34–35: Logical Venn Diagram.

In a survey of professionals, three overlapping sets were identified. The number of people in each region of the Venn diagram is as follows:

- **Set L** (Lawyers only, not P or A): 10 people
- **Set P** (Professors only, not L or A): 8 people
- **Set A** (Authors only, not L or P): 6 people
- L and P only (not A): 5 people
- P and A only (not L): 4 people
- L and A only (not P): 3 people
- All three sets (L, P, and A): 2 people

Q34. How many people belong to **exactly two** of the three sets?

- (A) 9
- (B) 10
- (C) 11
- (D) 12

Q35. Based on the information given above (Questions 34–35), how many people belong to **at least one** of the three sets?

- (A) 38
- (B) 35
- (C) 40
- (D) 42



Detailed Solutions

Q1.

Solution

Concept — Scheduling Puzzle: Assign each of the five persons to a unique day (Mon–Fri) and a unique colour using the given constraints systematically.

Step 1 — Fix the known assignments: From clue (iii): Meena → Friday, Green. From clue (v): Omkar → Red. From clue (i): Monday person → Blue. From clue (iv): Thursday person → White.

Step 2 — Apply the Priya–Nikhil constraint: Clue (ii) says Priya works exactly two days after Nikhil. Possible pairs: Nikhil=Mon→Priya=Wed; Nikhil=Tue→Priya=Thu; Nikhil=Wed→Priya=Fri. Since Meena occupies Friday, the third pair is eliminated. If Nikhil=Tue and Priya=Thu, then Priya wears white (clue iv) and the remaining persons (Omkar or Qadir) must take Monday (blue). But Omkar wears red (clue v), not blue, so Omkar cannot be on Monday – contradiction. Therefore Nikhil=Monday (wears blue) and Priya=Wednesday. The remaining days (Tue, Thu) go to Omkar and Qadir. Since Omkar wears red but Thursday requires white, Omkar ≠ Thursday, so Omkar=Tuesday (red) and Qadir=Thursday (white). Priya gets the only remaining colour: yellow. **Wednesday → Priya.**

Why other options are wrong:

- Option A: Meena works on Friday, not Wednesday.
- Option B: Nikhil works on Monday, not Wednesday.
- Option C: Correct – Priya works on Wednesday.
- Option D: Omkar works on Tuesday, not Wednesday.

Final Answer: Priya is assigned Wednesday in the schedule. ⇒ C

Answer: (C) [Go Back to Q1](#)



Q2.

Solution

Concept — Scheduling Puzzle: Use the complete assignment table derived in Q1 to read off Nikhil's colour.

Step 1 — Recall the full table:

Person	Day	Colour
Nikhil	Monday	Blue
Omkar	Tuesday	Red
Priya	Wednesday	Yellow
Qadir	Thursday	White
Meena	Friday	Green

Step 2 — Read Nikhil's colour: Nikhil is on Monday. The Monday person wears blue (clue i). Therefore Nikhil's colour is **Blue**.

Why other options are wrong:

- Option A: Green belongs to Meena (Friday, clue iii).
- Option B: Yellow belongs to Priya (Wednesday, by elimination).
- Option C: White belongs to Qadir (Thursday, clue iv).
- Option D: Correct – Blue is Nikhil's colour (Monday person wears blue, clue i).

Final Answer: Nikhil works on Monday and wears blue. $\Rightarrow$ D

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

Q3.

Solution

Concept — Scheduling Puzzle: Use the full assignment table from Q1 to identify who works on Thursday.

Step 1 — Identify Thursday: From the table: Thursday $\rightarrow$ Qadir, White.

Step 2 — Verify: Qadir is the only person not placed on Mon/Tue/Wed/Fri, so Qadir must take Thursday. The Thursday person wears white (clue iv), which is consistent with Qadir having no prior colour assignment.

Why other options are wrong:

- Option A: Correct – Qadir works on Thursday.



- Option B: Meena works on Friday (clue iii), not Thursday.
- Option C: Omkar works on Tuesday (established in Q1), not Thursday.
- Option D: Nikhil works on Monday (established in Q1), not Thursday.

Final Answer: Qadir is assigned Thursday in the schedule. $\Rightarrow$ A

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

Q4.

Solution

Concept — Scheduling Puzzle: Determine Priya's colour by process of elimination after assigning all other colours.

Step 1 — List the four assigned colours:

- Blue $\rightarrow$ Nikhil (Monday, clue i)
- Red $\rightarrow$ Omkar (clue v)
- White $\rightarrow$ Qadir (Thursday, clue iv)
- Green $\rightarrow$ Meena (clue iii)

Step 2 — Find Priya's colour: Five colours (red, blue, green, yellow, white) are each assigned to one person. After the four assignments above, the only remaining colour is **Yellow**. So Priya wears yellow.

Why other options are wrong:

- Option A: White belongs to Qadir (Thursday person, clue iv).
- Option B: Correct – Yellow is the only colour not yet assigned; it goes to Priya.
- Option C: Blue belongs to Nikhil (Monday person, clue i).
- Option D: Green belongs to Meena (clue iii).

Final Answer: Priya's favourite colour is yellow. $\Rightarrow$ B

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



Q5.

Solution

Concept — Scheduling Puzzle: Omkar's colour is given directly by one of the clues – no deduction required.

Step 1 — Recall clue (v): The problem explicitly states “Omkar's favourite colour is red.”

Step 2 — Confirm consistency: Omkar is assigned Tuesday. Tuesday is neither Monday (blue) nor Thursday (white), and Omkar is not Meena (green). Red is fully consistent and uncontested.

Why other options are wrong:

- Option A: Yellow belongs to Priya (Wednesday).
- Option B: Blue belongs to Nikhil (Monday, clue i).
- Option C: Correct – Red is Omkar's colour (stated directly in clue v).
- Option D: White belongs to Qadir (Thursday, clue iv).

Final Answer: Omkar's favourite colour is red, as stated in condition (v). $\Rightarrow$ C

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

Q6.

Solution

Concept — Statement–Assumption: An implicit assumption is something the statement takes for granted and without which the statement would be pointless or illogical. Assumptions must be reasonable minimal inferences, not overstatements or contradictions.

Step 1 — Analyse Assumption I: “All rural schools currently have adequate infrastructure to implement digital programmes immediately.” The statement calls for digital literacy to be *introduced* – this implies a current gap and a need for action, not that infrastructure already exists. Assumption I directly contradicts the spirit of the statement and is far too strong an overstatement. **Not implicit.**

Step 2 — Analyse Assumption II: “Urban schools do not require digital literacy programmes of any kind.” The statement targets rural schools specifically but says nothing whatsoever about urban schools. Silence on urban schools is not equivalent to assuming they need no such programmes. This is an unwarranted extrapolation beyond the statement's scope. **Not implicit.**



Why other options are wrong:

- Option A: Assumption I overstates existing infrastructure readiness; the statement implies a lack of it, not its presence.
- Option B: Assumption II makes an unsupported sweeping claim about urban schools not covered by the statement.
- Option C: Neither assumption is valid, so both cannot simultaneously be implicit.
- Option D: Correct – Neither assumption is implicitly made by the statement.

Final Answer: Neither Assumption I nor Assumption II is implicit in the statement.

⇒ D

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

Q7.

Solution

Concept — Statement–Assumption: A consumer helpline is only purposeful if people are willing to use it. The implicit assumption must be the minimal prerequisite for the action in the statement to be sensible.

Step 1 — Analyse Assumption I: “Consumers who encounter fraud are willing to report it through such a helpline.” A consumer protection helpline is entirely useless if no consumer will report fraud. The statement launching the helpline *pre-supposes* that at least some consumers will use it. This is a necessary, reasonable, minimal precondition for the helpline to serve any purpose. **Implicit.**

Step 2 — Analyse Assumption II: “All fraudulent products will be permanently recalled from the market within one week of being reported.” This is an extremely specific, guaranteed, time-bound outcome. The statement makes no such claim about the speed or completeness of action taken after reports. This goes far beyond what the statement assumes or promises. **Not implicit.**

Why other options are wrong:

- Option A: Correct – Only Assumption I is a necessary precondition for the helpline to make sense.
- Option B: Assumption II is an unsupported overstatement about guaranteed outcomes not mentioned in the statement.
- Option C: Both cannot be correct because Assumption II is clearly not implicit.



- Option D: Assumption I is definitively implicit; the answer cannot be “neither.”

Final Answer: Only Assumption I is implicit in the statement. $\Rightarrow$ A

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

Q8.

Solution

Concept — Statement–Assumption: Making something mandatory implies it is not already being done voluntarily; there must also be a harm-prevention rationale for the mandatory requirement.

Step 1 — Analyse Assumption I: “All industries currently conduct environmental impact assessments voluntarily before commencing operations.” If all industries already do this voluntarily, there would be no need to make it mandatory – the statement would be pointless. Assumption I actually *contradicts* the very premise of the statement. **Not implicit.**

Step 2 — Analyse Assumption II: “Granting industrial licences without environmental checks can cause irreversible ecological harm.” The statement calls for mandatory assessments before licensing *because* skipping them poses a risk. This harm-prevention rationale is the exact underlying justification for the policy. Without this assumption, there is no reason to impose the requirement. **Implicit.**

Why other options are wrong:

- Option A: Assumption I is the opposite of what the statement implies – mandatory means it is NOT already done voluntarily.
- Option B: Correct – Only Assumption II provides the necessary justification for the mandatory requirement.
- Option C: Assumption I contradicts the statement, so both cannot be implicit.
- Option D: Assumption II is clearly implicit; the answer cannot be “neither.”

Final Answer: Only Assumption II is implicit in the statement. $\Rightarrow$ B

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



Q9.

Solution

Concept — Statement–Assumption: A call for protective legislation assumes both that the problem exists (justifying intervention) and that law can address it effectively (making the intervention worthwhile).

Step 1 — Analyse Assumption I: “Citizens’ personal data is currently being collected by corporations without adequate consent.” The statement calls for laws to “protect citizens from corporate surveillance,” which presupposes that such surveillance and inadequate-consent data collection is currently happening. Without this assumption, there is no problem to solve and no reason to enact the law. **Implicit.**

Step 2 — Analyse Assumption II: “Strict legal provisions can effectively deter corporations from unlawful data collection.” Enacting laws is meaningful only if those laws are expected to work. The statement’s call for legislation implicitly assumes that legal intervention will be effective in deterring the problem. Without this assumption, the entire proposal is futile. **Implicit.**

Why other options are wrong:

- Option A: Only Assumption I – Assumption II is equally necessary; without it, the proposed law serves no purpose.
- Option B: Only Assumption II – Assumption I is equally necessary; it identifies the problem that justifies the law.
- Option C: Correct – Both assumptions are implicit and necessary.
- Option D: Both assumptions are clearly needed; the answer cannot be “neither.”

Final Answer: Both Assumptions I and II are implicit in the statement. ⇒ C

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

Q10.

Solution

Concept — Statement–Assumption: A reform proposal only needs to assume that the current system has *some* shortcomings, not that it has *never* worked. Similarly, the proposed alternative need not be assumed to be perfect – only better or more transparent.

Step 1 — Analyse Assumption I: “The current collegium system has never rec-



commended a qualified judge for appointment to any court.” This is an extreme, absolute claim. The statement merely advocates reform for greater transparency; it does not assume the collegium has never made a valid appointment. This is a gross overstatement far beyond what the reform proposal requires. **Not implicit.**

Step 2 — Analyse Assumption II: “A parliamentary committee will always select judges solely on the basis of merit, completely free from political influence.” The statement calls for a more transparent process but does not claim the proposed committee will be flawless or entirely free from politics. Claiming an absolute guarantee of merit-only selection is not assumed. **Not implicit.**

Why other options are wrong:

- Option A: Assumption I is an extreme absolute (“never”) and is not a necessary implication of a reform proposal.
- Option B: Assumption II claims absolute perfection (“always,” “completely”) for the proposed system, which far exceeds what the statement assumes.
- Option C: Neither assumption is valid; both are overstatements of what the reform proposal implies.
- Option D: Correct – Neither assumption is implicitly made by the statement.

Final Answer: Neither Assumption I nor Assumption II is implicit in the statement.

⇒ D

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

Q11.

Solution

Concept — Blood Relations: Trace the family tree step by step. Uday is the son of Rajiv and Sunita. Wasim is Sunita’s only brother, making Wasim Uday’s maternal uncle – and from Wasim’s perspective, Uday is his nephew.

Step 1 — Build the family tree:

- Rajiv + Sunita → children: Uday (son), Tara (daughter)
- Veena = Rajiv’s mother (Uday’s paternal grandmother)
- Wasim = Sunita’s brother (Uday’s maternal uncle)

Step 2 — Find Uday’s relation to Wasim: Wasim is the brother of Sunita, who is Uday’s mother. Therefore Wasim is Uday’s maternal uncle. Conversely, from Wasim’s perspective, Uday is the son of his sister Sunita, which makes Uday Wasim’s **nephew**.



Why other options are wrong:

- Option A: Correct – Uday is Wasim's nephew (son of Wasim's sister Sunita).
- Option B: Son – Uday is not Wasim's son; there is no parent-child relationship between them.
- Option C: Brother – They are from different generations and different family branches.
- Option D: Uncle – This is the reverse; Wasim is Uday's uncle, not the other way around.

Final Answer: Uday is the nephew of Wasim. $\Rightarrow$ A

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

Q12.

Solution

Concept — Blood Relations: Veena is Rajiv's mother. Tara is Rajiv's daughter. A person's parent's parent is their grandparent.

Step 1 — Establish the chain of links: Veena $\rightarrow$ mother of Rajiv. Rajiv $\rightarrow$ father of Tara.

Step 2 — Connect Veena to Tara: Veena is the mother of Rajiv, and Rajiv is the father of Tara. Therefore Veena is Tara's **paternal grandmother**.

Why other options are wrong:

- Option A: Mother – that would mean Veena directly gave birth to Tara; Sunita is Tara's mother, not Veena.
- Option B: Correct – Veena is the grandmother (Rajiv's mother, Tara's paternal grandmother).
- Option C: Aunt – that would require Veena to be a sibling of Rajiv or Sunita; she is Rajiv's mother.
- Option D: Sister – they are two generations apart; a generational relationship, not a sibling one.

Final Answer: Veena is Tara's grandmother. $\Rightarrow$ B

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



Q13.

Solution

Concept — Blood Relations: Tara is the daughter of Sunita. Wasim is Sunita's brother. From Wasim's perspective, Tara is his sister's daughter – his niece.

Step 1 — Trace the link: Wasim → brother of Sunita. Sunita → mother of Tara.

Step 2 — Determine the relationship: Wasim is the brother of Tara's mother (Sunita). Therefore Wasim is Tara's maternal uncle, and Tara is Wasim's **niece**.

Why other options are wrong:

- Option A: Daughter – Tara is not Wasim's daughter; she is his sister's daughter, making her his niece.
- Option B: Sister – They are from different generations and different family branches; they cannot be siblings.
- Option C: Correct – Tara is Wasim's niece (daughter of his sister Sunita).
- Option D: Aunt – This is the reverse; Wasim would be Tara's uncle, not the other way around.

Final Answer: Tara is the niece of Wasim. ⇒ C

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

Q14.

Solution

Concept — Syllogism: When the first premise is a particular affirmative (Some A are B, I-type) and the second is a universal negative (No B is C, E-type), no universal conclusion can be drawn about A and C. Check both conclusions for validity.

Step 1 — Test Conclusion I (No metal is a gas): From the premises, *some* metals are liquids, and no liquid is a gas. The metals that are liquids are definitely not gases. However, the remaining metals (those that are *not* liquids) are not covered by the premises – they might or might not be gases. We cannot universally conclude that *no* metal is a gas from a particular premise. Conclusion I requires a universal conclusion from a particular starting point, which is logically invalid. **Does not follow.**

Step 2 — Test Conclusion II (All metals are solids): The premises discuss metals, liquids, and gases. The term “solids” does not appear in either premise. Introducing an entirely new term (solids) that is absent from the premises violates the



basic rules of syllogistic reasoning. **Does not follow.**

Why other options are wrong:

- Option A: Conclusion I cannot be universally established from a particular-type premise (Some metals are liquids).
- Option B: Conclusion II introduces “solids,” a term outside the scope of the given premises entirely.
- Option C: Neither conclusion follows, so both cannot be correct.
- Option D: Correct – Neither Conclusion I nor Conclusion II follows.

Final Answer: Neither conclusion follows from the given statements. $\Rightarrow$ D

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

Q15.

Solution

Concept — Syllogism: “All plastics are polymers” (A-type) combined with “Some polymers are ceramics” (I-type). Apply conversion rules: converting an A-type statement yields an I-type.

Step 1 — Test Conclusion I (Some polymers are plastics): From “All plastics are polymers” (A-type), by simple conversion ($A \rightarrow I$), we obtain “Some polymers are plastics.” This is a valid logical step – if every plastic is a polymer, then at least some polymers (namely all the plastics) are plastics. **Follows.**

Step 2 — Test Conclusion II (Some ceramics are plastics): The premises tell us that some polymers are ceramics and all plastics are polymers. The ceramics overlap with *some* polymers, but that subset of polymers need not coincide with the subset that consists of plastics. There is no guarantee the “plastics subset” and the “ceramics subset” of polymers overlap. **Does not follow.**

Why other options are wrong:

- Option A: Correct – Only Conclusion I follows (by valid A-type conversion).
- Option B: Conclusion II cannot be derived; the two particular subsets within polymers (plastics and ceramics) need not overlap.
- Option C: Both cannot be correct since Conclusion II is logically invalid here.
- Option D: Conclusion I clearly follows by conversion; “neither” is wrong.

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

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



Q16.

Solution

Concept — Syllogism: “No wood is glass” (E-type) + “All glass is transparent” (A-type). Assess what can be validly concluded about wood and transparent things.

Step 1 — Test Conclusion I (No wood is transparent): No wood is glass (E-type), and all glass is transparent (A-type). Combining these tells us that wood is excluded from the glass category, and glass is fully inside the transparent category. However, “transparent” is a broader category – it can include non-glass items (water, certain plastics, etc.). Wood could potentially overlap with transparent things through a non-glass route not covered by these premises. We cannot assert that absolutely no wood is transparent. **Does not follow.**

Step 2 — Test Conclusion II (Some transparent things are glass): From “All glass is transparent” (A-type), by simple conversion we get “Some transparent things are glass.” This is valid: all glass qualifies as transparent, so among transparent things, at least those that are glass exist. **Follows.**

Why other options are wrong:

- Option A: Conclusion I is invalid – transparency is not exclusive to glass, so wood could be transparent through other means not excluded by the premises.
- Option B: Correct – Only Conclusion II follows (valid A-type conversion).
- Option C: Conclusion I does not follow, so both cannot be correct.
- Option D: Conclusion II clearly follows; “neither” is wrong.

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

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

Q17.

Solution

Concept — Syllogism (Barbara form): “All rubies are gemstones” (A-type) + “All gemstones are valuable” (A-type). Two universal affirmatives with a common middle term yield a universal affirmative conclusion by the Barbara syllogism: All A are B; All B are C $\Rightarrow$ All A are C.

Step 1 — Test Conclusion I (All rubies are valuable): All rubies are gemstones, and all gemstones are valuable. By transitivity (Barbara syllogism): every ruby is a gemstone, and every gemstone is valuable, therefore every ruby is valuable. **Follows.**



Step 2 — Test Conclusion II (Some valuable things are rubies): From Conclusion I (All rubies are valuable, A-type), by simple conversion of the A-type we obtain “Some valuable things are rubies” (I-type). This is valid: since all rubies are valuable, those rubies exist among the valuable things, so some valuable things are rubies. **Follows.**

Why other options are wrong:

- Option A: Only Conclusion I – but Conclusion II also follows directly by conversion of Conclusion I.
- Option B: Only Conclusion II – but Conclusion I follows directly from the Barbara form and should not be excluded.
- Option C: Correct – Both Conclusions I and II follow.
- Option D: Both conclusions follow from valid syllogistic reasoning; “neither” is incorrect.

Final Answer: Both Conclusions I and II follow from the given statements. $\Rightarrow$ C

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

Q18.

Solution

Concept — Number Series (Squares of Primes): Identify the pattern by expressing each term as the square of a prime number.

Step 1 — Identify the pattern:

$$4 = 2^2, \quad 9 = 3^2, \quad 25 = 5^2, \quad 49 = 7^2, \quad 121 = 11^2$$

The sequence is the squares of successive prime numbers: 2, 3, 5, 7, 11, ...

Step 2 — Find the next term: The next prime after 11 is **13**. Therefore the next term is:

$$13^2 = 169$$

Why other options are wrong:

- Option A: $144 = 12^2$, but 12 is not a prime number (composite: $12 = 4 \times 3$).
- Option B: 156 is not a perfect square at all.
- Option C: 161 is not a perfect square ($12^2 = 144$, $13^2 = 169$, neither equals 161).
- Option D: Correct – $13^2 = 169$, and 13 is the next prime after 11.



Final Answer: The next term in the series is 169 (square of the next prime, 13).

⇒ D

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

Q19.

Solution

Concept — Number Series (Perfect Cubes): Identify the pattern as consecutive perfect cubes.

Step 1 — Identify the pattern:

$$1 = 1^3, \quad 8 = 2^3, \quad 27 = 3^3, \quad 64 = 4^3, \quad ? = 5^3, \quad 216 = 6^3$$

Each term is the cube of consecutive natural numbers.

Step 2 — Find the missing term: The missing term corresponds to $n = 5$:

$$5^3 = 125$$

Why other options are wrong:

- Option A: Correct – $5^3 = 125$.
- Option B: $100 = 10^2$ is a perfect square, not the fifth perfect cube.
- Option C: 120 is not a perfect cube ($4^3 = 64$, $5^3 = 125$).
- Option D: 150 is not a perfect cube ($5^3 = 125$, $6^3 = 216$; 150 lies between them but is not a cube).

Final Answer: The missing term is 125 ($= 5^3$). ⇒ A

Answer: (A) [Go Back to Q19](#)

Q20.

Solution

Concept — Letter Series (Increasing Gap): Map each letter to its position in the alphabet and look for an arithmetic pattern in the differences between consecutive terms.

Step 1 — Map letters to positions:

$$A = 1, \quad C = 3, \quad F = 6, \quad J = 10, \quad O = 15$$



Step 2 — Compute the differences:

$$3 - 1 = 2, \quad 6 - 3 = 3, \quad 10 - 6 = 4, \quad 15 - 10 = 5$$

The differences form the sequence 2, 3, 4, 5, ..., increasing by 1 each step. The next difference is 6. So the next position is:

$$15 + 6 = 21 \Rightarrow \text{Letter U}$$

Why other options are wrong:

- Option A: T is at position 20 (gap of 5 from O), but the pattern requires the next gap to be 6.
- Option B: Correct – U is at position 21, which is $15 + 6$.
- Option C: V is at position 22, implying a gap of 7 – one step ahead in the gap sequence.
- Option D: W is at position 23, implying a gap of 8 – two steps ahead of the correct gap.

Final Answer: The next letter in the series is U (position 21). $\Rightarrow$ **B**

Answer: (B) [Go Back to Q20](#)

Q21.

Solution

Concept — Letter Series (Decreasing by Increasing Amount): Map each letter to its alphabet position and find the pattern of subtraction between consecutive terms.

Step 1 — Map letters to positions:

$$Z = 26, \quad W = 23, \quad S = 19, \quad N = 14, \quad H = 8$$

Step 2 — Compute the differences (how much is subtracted each step):

$$26 - 23 = 3, \quad 23 - 19 = 4, \quad 19 - 14 = 5, \quad 14 - 8 = 6$$

The differences are 3, 4, 5, 6, ..., increasing by 1 each step. The next subtraction is 7. So the next position is:

$$8 - 7 = 1 \Rightarrow \text{Letter A}$$



Why other options are wrong:

- Option A: B is at position 2; that would require subtracting only 6 from H(8), but the pattern demands 7.
- Option B: Z is at position 26; subtracting 7 from H(8) gives 1, not 26.
- Option C: Correct – A is at position 1 ($8 - 7 = 1$).
- Option D: C is at position 3; that would require subtracting only 5 from H(8), which breaks the pattern.

Final Answer: The next letter in the series is A (position 1). $\Rightarrow$ C

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

Q22.

Solution

Concept — Coding–Decoding: Apply the consonant/vowel positional value system described in the question and sum the values of all letters.

Step 1 — Identify individual values for LAMP:

- **L** (consonant): Consonants in order – B(1), C(2), D(3), F(4), G(5), H(6), J(7), K(8), L(9). So L = 9.
- **A** (vowel): Vowels in order – A(1). So A = 1.
- **M** (consonant): Continuing – M(10). So M = 10.
- **P** (consonant): Continuing – N(11), P(12). So P = 12.

Step 2 — Sum the values:

$$9 + 1 + 10 + 12 = 32$$

Why other options are wrong:

- Option A: 28 – likely results from using standard alphabet positions (L=12, A=1, M=13, P=16 = 42; or a different error set).
- Option B: 30 – off by 2, possibly assigning L=7 or P=10 instead of the correct values.
- Option C: 31 – off by 1, a small arithmetic error in summing.
- Option D: Correct – $9 + 1 + 10 + 12 = 32$.

Final Answer: The code for LAMP is 32. $\Rightarrow$ D

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



Q23.

Solution

Concept — Coding–Decoding: Apply the same consonant/vowel positional value system to FINE.

Step 1 — Identify individual values for FINE:

- **F** (consonant): B(1), C(2), D(3), F(4). So $F = 4$.
- **I** (vowel): A(1), E(2), I(3). So $I = 3$.
- **N** (consonant): ... K(8), L(9), M(10), N(11). So $N = 11$.
- **E** (vowel): A(1), E(2). So $E = 2$.

Step 2 — Sum the values:

$$4 + 3 + 11 + 2 = 20$$

Why other options are wrong:

- Option A: Correct – $4 + 3 + 11 + 2 = 20$.
- Option B: 22 – likely results from miscounting N's consonant position (e.g., $N=13$ instead of 11).
- Option C: 24 – a larger error, possibly mixing up vowel and consonant systems for I or E.
- Option D: 26 – even further off; perhaps using standard alphabet positions for some letters ($F=6$ would give $6+3+11+2=22$, still not 26).

Final Answer: The code for FINE is 20. $\Rightarrow$ A

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

Q24.

Solution

Concept — Coding–Decoding: Apply the consonant/vowel positional value system to BOND.

Step 1 — Identify individual values for BOND:

- **B** (consonant): B is the first consonant. $B = 1$.
- **O** (vowel): A(1), E(2), I(3), O(4). So $O = 4$.
- **N** (consonant): $N = 11$ (as established in Q23).
- **D** (consonant): B(1), C(2), D(3). So $D = 3$.



Step 2 — Sum the values:

$$1 + 4 + 11 + 3 = 19$$

Why other options are wrong:

- Option A: 17 – likely results from assigning N=9 (wrong consonant position) instead of N=11.
- Option B: Correct – $1 + 4 + 11 + 3 = 19$.
- Option C: 21 – possibly from using the standard alphabet position of O (O=15) instead of the vowel position (O=4).
- Option D: 23 – a larger error, perhaps using alphabet positions for multiple letters.

Final Answer: The code for BOND is 19. $\Rightarrow$ **B**

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

Q25.

Solution

Concept — Direction Sense: Track the vehicle's position after each leg using a coordinate system. Let P = (0, 0), North increases the y -coordinate, East increases the x -coordinate, South decreases y , and West decreases x .

Step 1 — Trace each leg:

- Start: (0, 0)
- 5 km North: $(0, 0 + 5) = (0, 5)$
- 12 km East: $(0 + 12, 5) = (12, 5)$
- 5 km South: $(12, 5 - 5) = (12, 0)$
- 7 km West: $(12 - 7, 0) = (5, 0)$

Final position: (5, 0) – exactly 5 km due East of P.

Step 2 — Calculate distance from P:

$$\text{Distance} = \sqrt{(5 - 0)^2 + (0 - 0)^2} = \sqrt{25} = 5 \text{ km}$$

Why other options are wrong:

- Option A: 7 km – this is only the distance of the last westward leg, not the final displacement from P.



- Option B: 12 km – this is the eastward leg distance, not the net east-west displacement (which is $12 - 7 = 5$ km).
- Option C: Correct – 5 km is the straight-line distance from the starting point P.
- Option D: 13 km – this would arise from a right triangle with legs 5 and 12, but the north/south legs cancel out exactly, leaving no vertical component.

Final Answer: The vehicle is 5 km from the starting point P. $\Rightarrow$ C

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

Q26.

Solution

Concept — Direction Sense: The direction a vehicle faces after completing its journey is the direction of its *last* movement. Track each turn carefully.

Step 1 — Trace the directions:

- The vehicle starts by moving North (initial direction: North).
- Turns *right* $\Rightarrow$ now faces **East** (travels 12 km East).
- Turns *right* $\Rightarrow$ now faces **South** (travels 5 km South).
- Turns *right* $\Rightarrow$ now faces **West** (travels 7 km West).

Step 2 — Identify the final facing direction: After the third right turn, the vehicle faces West and completes its final leg travelling West. It ends the journey facing West.

Why other options are wrong:

- Option A: North – that was the initial direction of travel, before any turns were made.
- Option B: East – that was the direction after the first right turn.
- Option C: South – that was the direction after the second right turn.
- Option D: Correct – West is the direction after the third (final) right turn.

Final Answer: The vehicle is facing West after completing all four legs. $\Rightarrow$ D

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



Q27.

Solution

Concept — Direction Sense: The vehicle is at $(5, 0)$ facing West. An additional 5 km West subtracts 5 from the x -coordinate.

Step 1 — Current state: Position = $(5, 0)$, facing West.

Step 2 — Move 5 km West:

$$(5, 0) \xrightarrow{5 \text{ km West}} (5 - 5, 0) = (0, 0) = P$$

The vehicle arrives exactly at the starting point P. Distance from P = 0 km.

Why other options are wrong:

- Option A: Correct – The vehicle ends up exactly at P, 0 km from the starting point.
- Option B: 5 km North of P – moving West from $(5, 0)$ only changes the x -coordinate; there is no change in the y -coordinate, so a northward displacement is impossible.
- Option C: 10 km West of P – this would require the vehicle to be at $(10, 0)$ before moving, but it is at $(5, 0)$.
- Option D: 5 km South of P – moving West does not affect the y -coordinate at all; the vehicle cannot end up south of P.

Final Answer: The vehicle returns to point P (0 km from the starting point). $\Rightarrow$

A

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

Q28.

Solution

Concept — Critical Reasoning (Flaw Identification): The argument draws an analogy between *Rylands v. Fletcher* and the present case. The flaw lies in assuming legal similarity without verifying that the essential elements for strict liability under *Rylands* are satisfied in the current case.

Step 1 — Analyse the argument's structure: (1) In *Rylands v. Fletcher*, strict liability was imposed because a reservoir burst and caused harm to a neighbour. (2) In the present case, a factory caused harm to a neighbour. (3) Therefore, strict liability should apply here too. The argument leaps from “harm was caused to a neighbour” to “strict liability applies.”



Step 2 — Identify the flaw: Strict liability under *Rylands v. Fletcher* requires specific elements: (i) non-natural use of land, (ii) accumulation of something likely to do mischief, (iii) escape of that thing, and (iv) consequent damage. The argument identifies only superficial similarity (harm to a neighbour) without establishing whether these elements exist in the factory case. This is a **false analogy** – two situations cannot be treated as legally identical without showing the relevant legal requirements are met.

Why other options are wrong:

- Option A: The factory owner's financial capacity is irrelevant to the legal question of whether strict liability applies.
- Option B: Correct – The flaw is assuming legal similarity based on superficial facts without establishing the essential elements of strict liability.
- Option C: *Rylands v. Fletcher* has not been overturned; this premise is factually incorrect and was not raised in the argument.
- Option D: Strict liability under *Rylands* is precisely about liability *regardless* of intent; so intentionality is not the missing element in a strict liability analysis.

Final Answer: The primary flaw is assuming the two situations are legally similar without establishing the necessary elements of strict liability. ⇒ **B**

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

Q29.

Solution

Concept — Critical Reasoning (Parallel Argument): Identify the logical structure of the original argument, then find the option that replicates that exact structure.

Step 1 — Abstract the original structure: (1) A legal rule places the *burden of proof* on Party X. (2) Party X *failed* to discharge that burden on a specific point. (3) Therefore, the *outcome favours Party Y* (the opposing party). This is the “burden of proof + failure to meet it ⇒ favourable outcome for the other side” structure.

Step 2 — Match each option:

- (A) Places burden on the defendant to disprove (reversal of the usual burden); wrong structure.
- (B) Liability from filing a complaint, not from burden-of-proof failure; wrong structure.



- (C) “In civil law, the **plaintiff** must establish the case on balance of probabilities [burden]. Since the **plaintiff failed** to produce documentary evidence [failure to discharge burden], the court rules for the **defendant** [outcome for opposing party].” This exactly mirrors the original structure.
- (D) Prior conviction used to presume guilt; this is about character evidence, not burden-of-proof failure; wrong structure.

Why other options are wrong:

- Option A: Reverses the burden by placing it on the defendant, which is the opposite of the original structure.
- Option B: Derives liability from a complaint being filed, not from the failure to discharge a legal burden.
- Option C: Correct – Identical logical structure: burden on plaintiff, failure to meet it, defendant wins.
- Option D: Presumes guilt from prior conviction rather than reasoning from burden-of-proof failure.

Final Answer: Option C has the same logical structure as the original argument.

⇒ C

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

Q30.

Solution

Concept — Critical Reasoning (Underlying Assumption): The argument applies a legal rule (strict liability for hazardous activities) to a specific factory. The bridge that connects the rule to the conclusion is the unstated assumption that the factory’s operation qualifies as a “hazardous activity.”

Step 1 — Identify the rule and the conclusion: Rule: Industries engaged in hazardous activities must be held strictly liable for harm, regardless of negligence. Conclusion: The chemical factory must compensate the farmers (despite following all safety protocols). The rule applies only to “hazardous activities”; the conclusion applies it to this specific factory.

Step 2 — Identify the gap (the assumption): The argument never explicitly states that the chemical factory’s operations constitute a “hazardous activity” under the law. This is the **hidden link** that makes the rule applicable. Without this assumption, the rule cannot reach the conclusion.



Why other options are wrong:

- Option A: The factory's prior awareness of risk is irrelevant – strict liability does not depend on the defendant's knowledge of risk; it applies regardless.
- Option B: Contributory negligence by the farmers is not what the argument assumes; the rule imposes liability on the factory regardless of the victim's conduct.
- Option C: The argument does not assume chemical factories are *more dangerous than all other industries* – it only needs this particular factory to meet the legal threshold of "hazardous activity."
- Option D: Correct – The key hidden assumption is that this factory's operations fall within the legal definition of a "hazardous activity," thereby triggering the strict liability rule.

Final Answer: The underlying assumption is that the factory's operation legally qualifies as a "hazardous activity." ⇒ D

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

Q31.

Solution

Concept — Critical Reasoning (Logical Conclusion): The argument invokes the fundamental criminal law principle: an act alone does not make a person guilty unless accompanied by a guilty mind (*mens rea*). The maxim is *actus non facit reum nisi mens sit rea*.

Step 1 — Identify the elements: Nalini took the pen (*actus reus* – the physical act exists). However, she genuinely believed it was her own pen (no dishonest intention = no *mens rea*).

Step 2 — Apply the legal principle: Without *mens rea*, no criminal offence is committed even if the act itself caused harm or was objectively wrong. Theft requires a dishonest intention to permanently deprive another of their property. Since Nalini lacked this intent, she cannot be held criminally liable for theft.

Why other options are wrong:

- Option A: Correct – Nalini lacked *mens rea* and therefore cannot be criminally liable for theft; this is the direct legal conclusion.
- Option B: Returning the pen and apologising is a moral or civil remedy, not the logical legal conclusion from the *mens rea* principle stated in the argument.



- Option C: Whether the colleague labelled the pen is entirely irrelevant to the legal analysis of *mens rea*.
- Option D: Nalini's act cannot constitute theft (which requires dishonest intent), and robbery (which requires force or fear) is not in question at all; this option is doubly incorrect.

Final Answer: Nalini cannot be held criminally liable for theft, as she lacked *mens rea*. $\Rightarrow$ A

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

Q32.

Solution

Concept — Legal Analogy: Identify the relationship between the first pair and apply the same relationship to complete the second pair.

Step 1 — Analyse the first pair (Plaintiff : Defendant): In a civil case, the Plaintiff initiates the legal action and the Defendant responds to it. They are the two *opposing adversarial parties* – one who brings the case and one who answers it.

Step 2 — Apply to the second pair (Prosecution : ?): In a criminal case, the Prosecution brings the case on behalf of the state (analogous to the Plaintiff). The opposing side that responds and defends the accused is the **Defence** (analogous to the Defendant). So: Prosecution : Defence.

Why other options are wrong:

- Option A: Judge – A neutral adjudicator who decides the case; not an adversarial counterpart to the Prosecution.
- Option B: Correct – Defence is the adversarial counterpart to the Prosecution, just as the Defendant is to the Plaintiff.
- Option C: Witness – A participant who gives testimony; not the opposing party in the proceedings.
- Option D: Jury – A fact-finding body; not the opposing party to the Prosecution.

Final Answer: Prosecution : Defence (the adversarial counterpart in criminal proceedings). $\Rightarrow$ B

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



Q33.

Solution

Concept — Legal Analogy: Identify the relationship as a pair of legal opposites (antonyms in legal context) and apply the same relationship to the second pair.

Step 1 — Analyse the first pair (Bail : Custody): Bail and Custody are legal opposites concerning pre-trial status. Bail = release from detention (freedom); Custody = detention (confinement). They represent the two mutually exclusive outcomes of a bail hearing.

Step 2 — Apply to the second pair (Acquittal : ?): Acquittal is a trial verdict of *not guilty* – the accused is cleared and discharged. The direct legal opposite of Acquittal (in terms of trial verdict) is **Conviction** – a finding of *guilty*. Just as Bail and Custody are opposite outcomes of a bail hearing, Acquittal and Conviction are opposite outcomes of a trial.

Why other options are wrong:

- Option A: Appeal – a subsequent legal process to challenge a verdict; not the opposite of Acquittal.
- Option B: Pardon – an executive act of clemency granted after conviction; not a trial verdict and not the opposite of Acquittal.
- Option C: Correct – Conviction is the direct opposite of Acquittal (guilty vs. not guilty verdict).
- Option D: Sentence – the punishment that follows a conviction; it is a consequence of Conviction, not its opposite.

Final Answer: Bail : Custody :: Acquittal : Conviction. $\Rightarrow$ **C**

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

Q34.

Solution

Concept — Venn Diagram: “Exactly two sets” means people who appear in precisely two of the three circles – belonging to one two-way intersection region, but *not* the centre (all-three) region.

Step 1 — Identify the “exactly two” regions and their counts:

- L and P only (not A): 5 people
- P and A only (not L): 4 people
- L and A only (not P): 3 people



(The all-three region of 2 people belongs to *three* sets, not exactly two, so it is excluded.)

Step 2 — Sum the three “exactly two” regions:

$$5 + 4 + 3 = 12$$

Why other options are wrong:

- Option A: 9 – sums only two of the three pairwise regions (e.g., $5 + 4 = 9$), missing the L-and-A-only region.
- Option B: 10 – an arithmetic error; $5 + 4 + 3$ does not equal 10.
- Option C: 11 – another arithmetic error in summing the three regions.
- Option D: Correct – $5 + 4 + 3 = 12$ people belong to exactly two of the three sets.

Final Answer: 12 people belong to exactly two of the three sets. $\Rightarrow$ D

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

Q35.

Solution

Concept — Venn Diagram: “At least one set” means everyone who is in one or more of the three sets – the total of all seven non-empty regions in the Venn diagram.

Step 1 — List all seven regions and their counts:

- L only (not P, not A): 10
- P only (not L, not A): 8
- A only (not L, not P): 6
- L and P only (not A): 5
- P and A only (not L): 4
- L and A only (not P): 3
- All three (L, P, and A): 2

Step 2 — Sum all seven regions:

$$10 + 8 + 6 + 5 + 4 + 3 + 2 = 38$$

Why other options are wrong:



- Option A: Correct – $10 + 8 + 6 + 5 + 4 + 3 + 2 = 38$.
- Option B: 35 – leaves out one region, e.g., omitting the all-three (2) and one of the single-set regions ($38 - 3 = 35$).
- Option C: 40 – overcounts by 2, perhaps adding the all-three region twice.
- Option D: 42 – a larger overcount, possibly double-counting some intersection regions.

Final Answer: 38 people belong to at least one of the three sets. $\Rightarrow$ A

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



Answer Key

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

