

AILET Logical Reasoning

Sample Paper – 8

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 students — Asha, Bhanu, Chitra, Dinesh, and Esha — appeared in an examination. The following conditions hold:

- (i) Bhanu scored more than Chitra but less than Asha.
- (ii) Dinesh scored less than Chitra.
- (iii) Esha scored more than Asha.
- (iv) No two students scored the same marks.

Who scored the second highest?

(A) Chitra



- (B) Asha
- (C) Bhanu
- (D) Esha

Q2. (Refer to the information given for Questions 1–5.)

Who scored the lowest marks?

- (A) Asha
- (B) Bhanu
- (C) Chitra
- (D) Dinesh

Q3. (Refer to the information given for Questions 1–5.)

How many students scored more marks than Bhanu?

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

Q4. (Refer to the information given for Questions 1–5.)

If a sixth student, Farhan, scored between Bhanu and Chitra, what would be Farhan's rank from the highest?

- (A) 2nd
- (B) 3rd
- (C) 4th
- (D) 5th

Q5. (Refer to the information given for Questions 1–5.)

What is Chitra's rank from the bottom?

- (A) 1st
- (B) 2nd



- (C) 3rd
- (D) 4th

Q6. [Questions 6–10: A statement is followed by an inference. Evaluate the inference and select the best option from (A)–(D) below.]

Options for Questions 6–10:

- (A) The inference definitely follows.
- (B) The inference definitely does not follow.
- (C) The inference probably follows.
- (D) The data is insufficient to determine whether the inference follows.

Statement: “In 2023, the number of cybercrime cases registered in India rose by 40% compared to 2022.”

Inference: “More people in India owned smartphones in 2023 than in 2022.”

- (A) The inference definitely follows.
- (B) The inference definitely does not follow.
- (C) The inference probably follows.
- (D) The data is insufficient to determine whether the inference follows.

Q7. (Refer to the options given in Q6.)

Statement: “The Supreme Court struck down the sedition law as unconstitutional.”

Inference: “Persons convicted solely under the sedition law may seek a review of their convictions.”

- (A) The inference definitely follows.
- (B) The inference definitely does not follow.
- (C) The inference probably follows.
- (D) The data is insufficient to determine whether the inference follows.

Q8. (Refer to the options given in Q6.)



Statement: “The literacy rate in State X increased from 72% to 84% between 2011 and 2021.”

Inference: “All schools in State X now have permanent buildings.”

- (A) The inference definitely follows.
- (B) The inference definitely does not follow.
- (C) The inference probably follows.
- (D) The data is insufficient to determine whether the inference follows.

Q9. (Refer to the options given in Q6.)

Statement: “City Y implemented a mandatory composting policy in residential areas last year.”

Inference: “The total amount of waste reaching landfills in City Y has decreased.”

- (A) The inference definitely follows.
- (B) The inference definitely does not follow.
- (C) The inference probably follows.
- (D) The data is insufficient to determine whether the inference follows.

Q10. (Refer to the options given in Q6.)

Statement: “The legal drinking age was raised from 18 to 21 in State Z in 2020.”

Inference: “Alcohol-related road accidents among young adults have decreased in State Z since 2020.”

- (A) The inference definitely follows.
- (B) The inference definitely does not follow.
- (C) The inference probably follows.
- (D) The data is insufficient to determine whether the inference follows.

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

Govind has two sons: Harsh and Ishan. Harsh is married to Jaya. They have two children — a son named Kunal and a daughter named Lata.



Ishan is unmarried and has no children.

Pointing to Kunal, Govind says, “He is the son of my elder son.” How is Kunal related to Govind?

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

Q12. (Refer to the family information given for Questions 11–13.)

How is Lata related to Ishan?

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

Q13. (Refer to the family information given for Questions 11–13.)

Jaya says, “Govind is the father of my husband.” How is Jaya related to Govind?

- (A) Daughter
- (B) Wife
- (C) Daughter-in-law
- (D) Sister-in-law

Q14. [Questions 14–17: Two statements are followed by two conclusions numbered I and II. Assuming the statements to be true (even if they differ from commonly known facts), determine which conclusion(s) follow(s) logically.]

Options for Questions 14–17:

- (A) Only Conclusion I follows.
- (B) Only Conclusion II follows.
- (C) Both Conclusions I and II follow.



(D) Neither Conclusion I nor II follows.

Statements:

- (i) Some birds are fish.
- (ii) All fish are aquatic.

Conclusions:

- I. All birds are aquatic.
- II. Some birds are aquatic.

- (A) Only Conclusion I follows.
- (B) Only Conclusion II follows.
- (C) Both Conclusions I and II follow.
- (D) Neither Conclusion I nor II follows.

Q15. (Refer to the options given in Q14.)

Statements:

- (i) No stone is metal.
- (ii) Some metals are rocks.

Conclusions:

- I. No rock is stone.
- II. Some stones are rocks.

- (A) Only Conclusion I follows.
- (B) Only Conclusion II follows.
- (C) Both Conclusions I and II follow.
- (D) Neither Conclusion I nor II follows.

Q16. (Refer to the options given in Q14.)

Statements:

- (i) All advocates are officers of the court.
- (ii) Some officers of the court are corrupt.

Conclusions:



- I. Some advocates are officers of the court.
- II. All advocates are corrupt.

- (A) Only Conclusion I follows.
- (B) Only Conclusion II follows.
- (C) Both Conclusions I and II follow.
- (D) Neither Conclusion I nor II follows.

Q17. (Refer to the options given in Q14.)

Statements:

- (i) All laws are rules.
- (ii) All rules are norms.

Conclusions:

- I. All laws are norms.
 - II. Some norms are laws.
- (A) Only Conclusion I follows.
 - (B) Only Conclusion II follows.
 - (C) Both Conclusions I and II follow.
 - (D) Neither Conclusion I nor II follows.

Q18. Number Series: Find the next term in the series.

7, 14, 28, 56, 112, ?

- (A) 224
- (B) 168
- (C) 200
- (D) 220

Q19. Number Series: Find the next term in the series.

100, 81, 64, 49, 36, ?

- (A) 16



- (B) 20
- (C) 30
- (D) 25

Q20. Letter Series: Find the next term in the series.

CG, EI, GK, IM, ?

- (A) JN
- (B) LN
- (C) KO
- (D) JP

Q21. Letter Series: Find the next term in the series.

A, D, I, P, Y, ?

- (A) H
- (B) J
- (C) K
- (D) L

Q22. [Questions 22–24 use the following coding rule.]

In a certain code language, each letter of a word is replaced by the letter that comes **4 places after it** in the English alphabet, with wraparound ($W \rightarrow A$, $X \rightarrow B$, $Y \rightarrow C$, $Z \rightarrow D$). For example, ACE is coded as EGI.

Using this code, how is **JUDGE** coded?

- (A) MXGJK
- (B) NXGJI
- (C) NYHKJ
- (D) NYHKI

Q23. (Refer to the coding rule given in Q22.)

Using the same code, how is **BAIL** coded?



- (A) FEMP
- (B) GEMP
- (C) FENP
- (D) FEMO

Q24. (Refer to the coding rule given in Q22.)

In the same code, **CRIME** is coded as **GVMQI**. How is **COURT** coded?

- (A) HSYVX
- (B) GSYWX
- (C) GSYVX
- (D) HTYVX

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

A lawyer starts from her office at point O. She walks **6 km West**, then turns and walks **8 km North**, then turns and walks **6 km East**, and finally turns and walks **3 km South**.

How far is she now from her starting point O (straight-line distance)?

- (A) 3 km
- (B) 8 km
- (C) 5 km
- (D) 6 km

Q26. (Refer to the information given for Questions 25–27.)

In which direction is the lawyer currently standing with respect to her starting point O?

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

Q27. (Refer to the information given for Questions 25–27.)



What is the **total distance** (not displacement) covered by the lawyer during her journey?

- (A) 17 km
- (B) 20 km
- (C) 21 km
- (D) 23 km

Q28. Critical Reasoning: Choose the option that most **strengthens** the argument.

Argument: “The proposed land acquisition law is unjust because it allows the government to acquire agricultural land without the consent of the farmers who own it.”

Which of the following, if true, most **strengthens** this argument?

- (A) The government needs large tracts of land for infrastructure development projects.
- (B) Several other countries have enacted similar land acquisition laws.
- (C) Farmers depend on agricultural land as their sole source of livelihood and income.
- (D) The law provides compensation to farmers at prevailing market rates.

Q29. Critical Reasoning: Identify the primary **assumption** underlying the argument.

Argument: “Increasing the number of women judges in family courts will improve the quality of justice delivered there.”

The above argument primarily **assumes** that:

- (A) Women judges are more educated than their male counterparts.
- (B) Women judges bring a perspective and sensitivity to family matters that improves outcomes in family disputes.
- (C) Family courts currently deliver unjust decisions in every case before them.
- (D) No male judge is capable of understanding the nuances of family law.



Q30. Critical Reasoning: Choose the option that most **weakens** the argument.

Argument: “Courts should not accept electronic evidence because it can be easily fabricated.”

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

- (A) Electronic evidence was not admissible in courts in the 19th century.
- (B) Many lawyers lack a thorough understanding of digital technology.
- (C) Courts in rural areas often lack adequate digital infrastructure.
- (D) The Indian Evidence Act already prescribes strict tests for the authentication and admissibility of electronic records, significantly reducing the risk that fabricated evidence will be accepted.

Q31. Critical Reasoning: Identify the conclusion **best supported** by the information.

Information: “All five accused were present at the scene of the crime, according to three independent eyewitnesses.”

Which conclusion is **best supported** by this information?

- (A) There is strong testimonial evidence that all five accused were present at the scene of the crime.
- (B) All five accused are definitively guilty of the crime.
- (C) The eyewitnesses must have been bribed by the prosecution.
- (D) The accused will certainly be convicted by the court.

Q32. Legal Analogy: Complete the analogy.

FIR : Cognizable offence :: Charge-sheet : ?

- (A) Bail application
- (B) Investigation completed
- (C) Acquittal
- (D) Civil suit



Q33. Legal Analogy: Complete the analogy.

Plaintiff : Civil suit :: Complainant : ?

- (A) Writ petition
- (B) Appeal
- (C) Criminal complaint
- (D) Arbitration

Q34. [Questions 34–35: Data Sufficiency. Each question has a main question and two statements I and II. Determine whether the data in the statements, individually or together, is sufficient to answer the question.]**Options for Questions 34–35:**

- (A) Statement I alone is sufficient, but Statement II alone is not sufficient.
- (B) Statement II alone is sufficient, but Statement I alone is not sufficient.
- (C) Both Statements I and II together are sufficient, but neither alone is sufficient.
- (D) Neither Statement I alone, nor Statement II alone, nor both together are sufficient.

Question: Is person X older than person Y?

Statement I: X was born in 1990 and Y was born in 1995.

Statement II: X is taller than Y.

- (A) Statement I alone is sufficient, but Statement II alone is not sufficient.
- (B) Statement II alone is sufficient, but Statement I alone is not sufficient.
- (C) Both Statements I and II together are sufficient, but neither alone is sufficient.
- (D) Neither Statement I alone, nor Statement II alone, nor both together are sufficient.



Q35. (Refer to the options given in Q34.)

Question: Is triangle ABC a right-angled triangle?

Statement I: $AB = 3$ cm and $BC = 4$ cm.

Statement II: $AC = 5$ cm.

- (A) Statement I alone is sufficient, but Statement II alone is not sufficient.
- (B) Statement II alone is sufficient, but Statement I alone is not sufficient.
- (C) Both Statements I and II together are sufficient, but neither alone is sufficient.
- (D) Neither Statement I alone, nor Statement II alone, nor both together are sufficient.



Detailed Solutions**Q1.****Solution**

Concept — Ordering/Ranking Puzzle: Combine all conditions to build the complete order, then read off the required rank.

Step 1 — Build the ranking: From condition (i): $\text{Asha} > \text{Bhanu} > \text{Chitra}$. From condition (ii): $\text{Chitra} > \text{Dinesh}$. From condition (iii): $\text{Esha} > \text{Asha}$. Combining: $\text{Esha} > \text{Asha} > \text{Bhanu} > \text{Chitra} > \text{Dinesh}$.

Step 2 — Identify 2nd highest: Rank 1: Esha. Rank 2: **Asha**. So the second highest scorer is Asha.

Why other options are wrong:

- Option A (Chitra): Chitra is ranked 4th, not 2nd.
- Option C (Bhanu): Bhanu is ranked 3rd.
- Option D (Esha): Esha is ranked 1st (highest), not 2nd.

Final Answer: Second highest = Asha $\Rightarrow$ **B**

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

Q2.**Solution**

Concept — Ordering/Ranking Puzzle: Use the complete ranking established in Q1.

Step 1 — Complete order: $\text{Esha} > \text{Asha} > \text{Bhanu} > \text{Chitra} > \text{Dinesh}$ (five students, no ties).

Step 2 — Identify the lowest: Rank 5 (lowest) = **Dinesh**.

Why other options are wrong:

- Option A (Asha): Asha is ranked 2nd.
- Option B (Bhanu): Bhanu is ranked 3rd.
- Option C (Chitra): Chitra is ranked 4th, one above Dinesh.

Final Answer: Lowest scorer = Dinesh $\Rightarrow$ **D**

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



Q3.

Solution

Concept — Ordering/Ranking Puzzle: Count the students ranked above Bhanu.

Step 1 — Locate Bhanu: Order: Esha(1) > Asha(2) > Bhanu(3) > Chitra(4) > Dinesh(5).

Step 2 — Count students above Bhanu: Students ranked above Bhanu: Esha and Asha = 2 students.

Why other options are wrong:

- Option B (1): Only one student above Bhanu would mean Asha or Esha alone – both are above.
- Option C (3): Three would require Chitra to be above Bhanu, but Chitra is below.
- Option D (4): Four would mean only Dinesh is below Bhanu; that is not the case.

Final Answer: 2 students scored more than Bhanu $\Rightarrow$ A

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

Q4.

Solution

Concept — Ordering/Ranking Puzzle (insertion): Insert a new element at a given position in the established order.

Step 1 — Original order (5 students): Esha(1) > Asha(2) > Bhanu(3) > Chitra(4) > Dinesh(5).

Step 2 — Insert Farhan between Bhanu and Chitra: New order (6 students): Esha(1) > Asha(2) > Bhanu(3) > **Farhan(4)** > Chitra(5) > Dinesh(6).

Farhan's rank from the highest = 4th.

Why other options are wrong:

- Option A (2nd): 2nd is Asha's rank.
- Option B (3rd): 3rd is Bhanu's rank.
- Option D (5th): 5th would be Chitra's new rank, not Farhan's.

Final Answer: Farhan's rank = 4th $\Rightarrow$ C



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

Q5.

Solution

Concept — Rank from bottom: Rank from bottom = (Total students) – (Rank from top) + 1.

Step 1 — Chitra's rank from top: Order: Esha(1) > Asha(2) > Bhanu(3) > Chitra(4) > Dinesh(5). Chitra is ranked **4th from top**.

Step 2 — Convert to rank from bottom: Total students = 5. Rank from bottom = $5 - 4 + 1 = 2$.

Chitra is **2nd from the bottom** (only Dinesh is below her).

Why other options are wrong:

- Option A (1st from bottom): That would be Dinesh.
- Option C (3rd from bottom): That would be Bhanu.
- Option D (4th from bottom): That would be Asha.

Final Answer: Chitra's rank from bottom = 2nd $\Rightarrow$ **B**

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

Q6.

Solution

Concept — Statement-Inference (Probably Follows): Assess the logical strength of the link between the statement and the inference.

Step 1 — Analyse the link: A 40% rise in registered cybercrime cases correlates with greater digital activity. More smartphones $\rightarrow$ more online users $\rightarrow$ larger potential for cybercrime. The trend is consistent with higher smartphone ownership.

Step 2 — Test for certainty: However, cybercrimes could also rise due to more sophisticated attacks, improved police reporting, or targeted institutional hacks — not only because more individuals own smartphones. The link is plausible but not definitive.

Why other options are wrong:

- Option A: "Definitely follows" overstates the certainty; other causes exist.



- Option B: “Definitely does not follow” is too strong; the correlation is real and plausible.
- Option D: Insufficient data is not the right label — there is a probable (but not definitive) link.

Final Answer: Inference probably follows $\Rightarrow$ C

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

Q7.

Solution

Concept — Statement-Inference (Definitely Follows): A struck-down law loses constitutional validity, directly affecting convictions based solely on it.

Step 1 — Legal effect of striking down a law: When the Supreme Court declares a law unconstitutional, it is void ab initio — it loses legal force. Convictions resting solely on that law no longer have a valid legal basis.

Step 2 — Apply to the inference: Persons convicted *solely* under the sedition law can argue that the legal basis for their conviction has been eliminated. They may seek review (e.g., appeal or curative petition). This follows directly and necessarily from the statement.

Why other options are wrong:

- Option B: “Definitely does not follow” is incorrect — the legal path to review is a direct consequence.
- Option C: “Probably follows” understates the certainty; the right to seek review is a definitive legal consequence.
- Option D: The data is not insufficient — the legal principle is clear.

Final Answer: Inference definitely follows $\Rightarrow$ A

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



Q8.

Solution

Concept — Statement-Inference (Definitely Does Not Follow): No logical connection exists between literacy rate and school building infrastructure.

Step 1 — What literacy rate measures: Literacy rate measures the percentage of the population that can read and write. It is influenced by teaching quality, adult literacy programmes, enrolment rates, and socioeconomic factors — not directly by whether school buildings are permanent.

Step 2 — Evaluate the inference: “All schools have permanent buildings” is an infrastructure claim. Even if every school had temporary structures (tents, mobile classrooms), the literacy rate could still rise through quality teaching. The two variables are unrelated. The inference *definitely does not follow*.

Why other options are wrong:

- Option A: “Definitely follows” is wrong — no causal link exists.
- Option C: “Probably follows” is also wrong — there is no positive correlation to invoke.
- Option D: The data is not “insufficient”; the connection simply does not exist.

Final Answer: Inference definitely does not follow $\Rightarrow$ **B**

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

Q9.

Solution

Concept — Statement-Inference (Insufficient Data): A policy being implemented does not guarantee its intended outcomes without data on enforcement and actual results.

Step 1 — What the statement establishes: City Y enacted a mandatory composting policy in residential areas. This is a legislative/regulatory action.

Step 2 — What the inference claims: The inference says total landfill waste *has decreased*. To conclude this, we would need: (a) evidence of effective enforcement, (b) data showing organic waste (the target) was previously landfill-bound, (c) assurance that other waste streams did not increase to offset any reduction.

None of this data is provided in the statement alone.

Why other options are wrong:



- Option A: “Definitely follows” ignores enforcement gaps and other waste types.
- Option B: “Definitely does not follow” is too strong — composting can reduce landfill waste if implemented.
- Option C: “Probably follows” overstates the available evidence.

Final Answer: Data is insufficient $\Rightarrow$ D

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

Q10.

Solution

Concept — Statement-Inference (Probably Follows): A higher minimum drinking age typically reduces alcohol access for younger adults, which often reduces associated accidents.

Step 1 — General principle: Raising the legal drinking age restricts legal access for those aged 18–20. Research in public health and road safety consistently shows that this measure correlates with reductions in alcohol-related accidents among young adults.

Step 2 — Qualification: The inference is not certain: enforcement may be lax, illegal procurement may continue, or accidents may have decreased due to unrelated factors (e.g., road improvements). Hence, “probably follows” rather than “definitely follows.”

Why other options are wrong:

- Option A: “Definitely follows” is too strong; enforcement and other variables matter.
- Option B: “Definitely does not follow” ignores the well-established correlation.
- Option D: The data is not insufficient; there is a plausible and known causal mechanism.

Final Answer: Inference probably follows $\Rightarrow$ C

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



Q11.

Solution

Concept — Blood Relations: Trace the family tree step by step to find the relationship.

Step 1 — Build the family tree:

- Govind → Sons: Harsh, Ishan.
- Harsh + Jaya → Children: Kunal (son), Lata (daughter).

Step 2 — Identify Kunal's relation to Govind: Govind's elder son = Harsh. Kunal is Harsh's son. Therefore: Kunal is Govind's son's son = **Grandson**.

Why other options are wrong:

- Option A (Son): Kunal is one generation below Govind's sons.
- Option B (Nephew): Nephew applies to sibling's son; Govind is the grandfather, not an uncle.
- Option C (Brother): Kunal is not of the same generation as Govind.

Final Answer: Kunal is Govind's Grandson ⇒ D

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

Q12.

Solution

Concept — Blood Relations: Determine Lata's relationship to Ishan by tracing the family links.

Step 1 — Identify the connection: Lata is the daughter of Harsh. Ishan is Harsh's brother (both are sons of Govind).

Step 2 — Apply the relationship rule: A brother's daughter is a **Niece**. Therefore, Lata is Ishan's niece.

Why other options are wrong:

- Option B (Daughter): Ishan has no children; Lata is Harsh's daughter, not Ishan's.
- Option C (Sister): Sister would mean they share the same parents; they do not.
- Option D (Cousin): Cousin applies to children of one's parent's siblings; Lata



is herself the child of Ishan's sibling.

Final Answer: Lata is Ishan's Niece $\Rightarrow$ A

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

Q13.

Solution

Concept — Blood Relations: Work backwards from the clue given in the statement.

Step 1 — Decode the statement: Jaya says: "Govind is the father of my husband." Jaya's husband = Harsh (established from the family data). Govind is Harsh's father.

Step 2 — Determine Jaya's relation to Govind: Jaya is the wife of Govind's son (Harsh). Therefore, Jaya is Govind's **daughter-in-law**.

Why other options are wrong:

- Option A (Daughter): Jaya is married into the family; she is not Govind's biological daughter.
- Option B (Wife): Govind's wife is not mentioned; Jaya is Harsh's wife.
- Option D (Sister-in-law): Sister-in-law would apply to Govind's wife's sister or Govind's sibling's wife.

Final Answer: Jaya is Govind's Daughter-in-law $\Rightarrow$ C

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

Q14.

Solution

Concept — Syllogism (I + A type): Combine a particular affirmative with a universal affirmative using the standard syllogism rules.

Step 1 — Classify the statements: S1: Some birds are fish (I-type: particular affirmative).

S2: All fish are aquatic (A-type: universal affirmative).

Middle term = fish.

Step 2 — Apply the I + A rule: I + A gives an I-type conclusion: "Some birds are aquatic."



Conclusion II: Some birds are aquatic → **Valid** ✓

Step 3 — Test Conclusion I: “All birds are aquatic” requires ALL birds to be fish (for transitivity). But S1 says only *some* birds are fish. So the universal conclusion does not follow.

Conclusion I: All birds are aquatic → **Invalid** ×

Why other options are wrong:

- Option A: Conclusion I alone does not follow; it over-generalises.
- Option C: Both cannot follow because Conclusion I is invalid.
- Option D: Conclusion II does validly follow, so “Neither” is wrong.

Final Answer: Only Conclusion II follows ⇒ B

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

Q15.

Solution

Concept — Syllogism (E + I type): Apply the E + I syllogism rule and check what genuinely follows.

Step 1 — Classify the statements: S1: No stone is metal (E-type: universal negative).

S2: Some metals are rocks (I-type: particular affirmative).

Middle term = metal.

Step 2 — Apply the E + I rule: E + I gives an O-type conclusion: “Some rocks are not stones.” This is the only valid syllogistic conclusion from these premises.

Step 3 — Test each conclusion: Conclusion I: “No rock is stone” (E-type) → This is stronger than the valid O-type conclusion “Some rocks are not stones.” We cannot universalise; some rocks could still be stones (no premise rules this out).

Invalid ×

Conclusion II: “Some stones are rocks” → Stones are excluded from metals (S1). S2 only tells us some metals are rocks; it says nothing about stones overlapping with rocks. **Invalid** ×

Why other options are wrong:

- Option A: Conclusion I is invalid (too strong a claim).
- Option B: Conclusion II is invalid (no premise links stones to rocks).
- Option C: Neither conclusion follows, so Both is wrong.



Final Answer: Neither conclusion follows $\Rightarrow$ D

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

Q16.

Solution

Concept — Syllogism (A + I type): An A-type statement allows partial (I-type) conversion; an I-type middle premise limits universalisation.

Step 1 — Classify the statements: S1: All advocates are officers of the court (A-type).

S2: Some officers of the court are corrupt (I-type).

Middle term = officers of the court.

Step 2 — Test Conclusion I: “Some advocates are officers of the court.” From S1, by partial (I-type) conversion: “Some officers of the court are advocates” $\equiv$ “Some advocates are officers of the court.” **Valid** ✓

Step 3 — Test Conclusion II: “All advocates are corrupt.” S2 says only *some* OoC are corrupt. Those “some” corrupt OoC may not include any advocate; the overlap is not established. The universalisation fails. **Invalid** ×

Why other options are wrong:

- Option B: Conclusion II (all advocates are corrupt) does not follow.
- Option C: Both cannot follow because Conclusion II is invalid.
- Option D: Conclusion I does validly follow, so “Neither” is wrong.

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

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

Q17.

Solution

Concept — Syllogism (A + A type / Transitivity): Two universal affirmatives give a universal affirmative conclusion by the chain (Barbara) rule.

Step 1 — Apply transitivity: S1: All laws are rules. S2: All rules are norms. By the A + A = A rule: All laws are norms. **Conclusion I: All laws are norms** $\rightarrow$ **Valid** ✓

Step 2 — Test Conclusion II: “Some norms are laws.” From Conclusion I (All



laws are norms), by I-type conversion: "Some norms are laws." **Valid** ✓

Why other options are wrong:

- Option A: Only I follows is incomplete; Conclusion II also follows.
- Option B: Only II follows is incomplete; Conclusion I also follows.
- Option D: "Neither" is wrong; both conclusions are valid.

Final Answer: Both Conclusions I and II follow $\Rightarrow$ C

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

Q18.

Solution

Concept — Number Series (Geometric Progression): Each term is obtained by multiplying the previous term by a constant ratio.

Step 1 — Identify the pattern: $14 \div 7 = 2$, $28 \div 14 = 2$, $56 \div 28 = 2$, $112 \div 56 = 2$. Constant ratio = $\times 2$ (geometric sequence with $r = 2$).

Step 2 — Find the next term: $112 \times 2 = 224$.

Why other options are wrong:

- Option B (168): $112 + 56 = 168$ misapplies an additive rule.
- Option C (200): No arithmetic or geometric rule produces 200 here.
- Option D (220): No consistent rule produces 220.

Final Answer: Next term = 224 $\Rightarrow$ A

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

Q19.

Solution

Concept — Number Series (Descending Perfect Squares): Each term is a perfect square, decreasing by one integer at a time.

Step 1 — Identify the pattern: $100 = 10^2$, $81 = 9^2$, $64 = 8^2$, $49 = 7^2$, $36 = 6^2$. The series lists n^2 for $n = 10, 9, 8, 7, 6, \dots$

Step 2 — Find the next term: Next: $n = 5 \Rightarrow 5^2 = 25$.

Why other options are wrong:



- Option A (16): $16 = 4^2$; that would skip a term ($5^2 = 25$ comes before 4^2).
- Option B (20): 20 is not a perfect square.
- Option C (30): 30 is not a perfect square and breaks the pattern.

Final Answer: Next term = 25 $\Rightarrow$ D

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

Q20.

Solution

Concept — Letter Series (Paired Letters, +2 shift each): Both letters in each pair advance by 2 positions in the alphabet.

Step 1 — Map positions: CG (3,7) $\rightarrow$ EI (5,9) $\rightarrow$ GK (7,11) $\rightarrow$ IM (9,13) $\rightarrow$?

Step 2 — Apply the rule: First letter: $I + 2 = K$ (position 11). Second letter: $M + 2 = O$ (position 15). Next term = **KO**.

Why other options are wrong:

- Option A (JN): J is $I + 1$ and N is $M + 1$; the shift is +1, not +2.
- Option B (LN): L is $I + 3$; incorrect first letter.
- Option D (JP): J = $I + 1$ and P = $M + 3$; neither shift is consistent.

Final Answer: Next term = KO $\Rightarrow$ C

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

Q21.

Solution

Concept — Letter Series (Positions are Perfect Squares): The alphabetical positions of the letters follow the sequence of perfect squares.

Step 1 — Find positions: A = $1 = 1^2$, D = $4 = 2^2$, I = $9 = 3^2$, P = $16 = 4^2$, Y = $25 = 5^2$.

Step 2 — Find the next position: Next: $6^2 = 36$. Since the alphabet has only 26 letters, wrap around: $36 - 26 = 10$. Position 10 = **J**.

Why other options are wrong:

- Option A (H): H is position 8; $36 - 26 \neq 8$.



- Option C (K): K is position 11; not the result of $36 - 26$.
- Option D (L): L is position 12; also incorrect.

Final Answer: Next term = J $\Rightarrow$ **B**

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

Q22.

Solution

Concept — Coding-Decoding (+4 letter shift): Replace each letter with the letter 4 positions ahead (wraparound after Z).

Step 1 — Apply the code to JUDGE:

- J (10) +4 = N (14)
- U (21) +4 = Y (25)
- D (4) +4 = H (8)
- G (7) +4 = K (11)
- E (5) +4 = I (9)

Step 2 — Combine: JUDGE $\rightarrow$ NYHKI.

Why other options are wrong:

- Option A (MXGJK): M = J + 3, incorrect first letter shift.
- Option B (NXGJI): X = U + 3, incorrect second letter; G = D + 3, incorrect third.
- Option C (NYHKJ): J at the end is wrong; E + 4 = I, not J.

Final Answer: JUDGE $\rightarrow$ NYHKI $\Rightarrow$ **D**

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



Q23.

Solution

Concept — Coding-Decoding (+4 letter shift): Apply the same rule: each letter advances by 4 positions.

Step 1 — Apply the code to BAIL:

- B (2) +4 = F (6)
- A (1) +4 = E (5)
- I (9) +4 = M (13)
- L (12) +4 = P (16)

Step 2 — Combine: BAIL → FEMP.

Why other options are wrong:

- Option B (GEMP): G = B + 5, incorrect first-letter shift.
- Option C (FENP): N = I + 5, incorrect third letter.
- Option D (FEMO): O = L + 3, incorrect last letter.

Final Answer: BAIL → FEMP ⇒ A

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

Q24.

Solution

Concept — Coding-Decoding (+4 letter shift): Verify the given example, then apply the rule to the target word.

Step 1 — Verify CRIME → GVMQI: C(3)+4 = G(7), R(18)+4 = V(22), I(9)+4 = M(13), M(13)+4 = Q(17), E(5)+4 = I(9). Result: GVMQI ✓

Step 2 — Apply to COURT:

- C (3) +4 = G (7)
- O (15) +4 = S (19)
- U (21) +4 = Y (25)
- R (18) +4 = V (22)
- T (20) +4 = X (24)

COURT → GSYVX.

Why other options are wrong:



- Option A (HSYVX): $H = C + 5$, incorrect first letter.
- Option B (GSYWX): $W = U + 6$, incorrect third letter.
- Option D (HTYVX): $H = C + 5$, $T = O + 5$; both wrong.

Final Answer: COURT $\rightarrow$ GSYVX $\Rightarrow$ C

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

Q25.

Solution

Concept — Direction Sense (Coordinate Tracing): Track position on a 2-D grid (East= $+x$, North= $+y$) and apply the distance formula.

Step 1 — Trace the journey: Start: $O = (0, 0)$.

- 6 km West: $(-6, 0)$
- 8 km North: $(-6, 8)$
- 6 km East: $(0, 8)$
- 3 km South: $(0, 5)$

Final position: $(0, 5)$.

Step 2 — Straight-line distance from O: $d = \sqrt{(0-0)^2 + (5-0)^2} = \sqrt{25} = 5$ km.

Why other options are wrong:

- Option A (3 km): Difference of the last two movements; not straight-line distance from O.
- Option B (8 km): The 8 km North was partially cancelled by 3 km South; net = 5 km.
- Option D (6 km): The 6 km West was fully cancelled by 6 km East; no East-West displacement.

Final Answer: Straight-line distance from O = 5 km $\Rightarrow$ C

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



Q26.

Solution

Concept — Direction Sense: Compare final coordinates with the starting point to determine direction.

Step 1 — Final position relative to O: Final position: $(0, 5)$; starting point O: $(0, 0)$. x -displacement = 0 (no net East-West movement). y -displacement = $+5$ (net 5 km North).

Step 2 — Determine direction: Since $x = 0$ and $y > 0$, the lawyer is directly North of O.

Why other options are wrong:

- Option B (South): Displacement is positive (North), not negative.
- Option C (East): No net East-West displacement; $x = 0$.
- Option D (West): No net West displacement.

Final Answer: Direction from O = North $\Rightarrow$ **A**

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

Q27.

Solution

Concept — Direction Sense (Total Distance): Distance is the sum of all individual segments walked, regardless of direction.

Step 1 — List the segments:

- Segment 1: 6 km (West)
- Segment 2: 8 km (North)
- Segment 3: 6 km (East)
- Segment 4: 3 km (South)

Step 2 — Sum all segments: Total distance = $6 + 8 + 6 + 3 = 23$ km.

Why other options are wrong:

- Option A (17 km): $17 = 6 + 8 + 3$; omits the third segment (6 km East).
- Option B (20 km): $20 = 6 + 8 + 6$; omits the last segment (3 km South).
- Option C (21 km): No combination of the four segments sums to 21.

Final Answer: Total distance = 23 km $\Rightarrow$ **D**



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

Q28.

Solution

Concept — Critical Reasoning (Strengthen): A strengthening option must directly support the argument's conclusion.

Step 1 — Identify the argument's core: The argument claims the law is *unjust* because it acquires agricultural land *without farmer consent*. The assumed harm: farmers lose something vital.

Step 2 — Evaluate Option C: "Farmers depend on agricultural land as their sole source of livelihood and income." This directly amplifies the injustice: taking away a person's *only* means of survival without consent is a severe harm. This most strongly supports the "unjust" claim.

Why other options are wrong:

- Option A: Justifies the government's need — this *weakens* the argument, not strengthens it.
- Option B: Normalises the law by showing other countries do the same — this *weakens* by implication.
- Option D: Market-rate compensation mitigates the injustice — this *weakens* the "unjust" claim.

Final Answer: Strongest support for injustice claim = Option C $\Rightarrow$ **C**

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

Q29.

Solution

Concept — Critical Reasoning (Assumption): An assumption is an unstated premise without which the argument fails.

Step 1 — Structure of the argument: Premise: More women judges in family courts. Conclusion: Quality of justice there will improve.

For this conclusion to follow, there must be a bridge: *why* would women judges improve outcomes specifically in family courts?

Step 2 — Identify the necessary assumption: Option B states that women judges bring a perspective and sensitivity to family matters that improves out-



comes. Without this assumption, the premise (more women judges) does not lead to the conclusion (better justice). This is the *necessary* bridge.

Why other options are wrong:

- Option A: Educational superiority is not assumed or needed; competence, not degrees, is implied.
- Option C: “Every case” is extreme and not required — the argument is about improvement, not that all current decisions are unjust.
- Option D: “No male judge is capable” is too extreme; the argument does not say this.

Final Answer: Primary assumption = Option B $\Rightarrow$ **B**

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

Q30.

Solution

Concept — Critical Reasoning (Weakeners): A weakening option must attack the argument’s premise, reasoning, or conclusion.

Step 1 — Core of the argument: Premise: Electronic evidence can be easily fabricated. Conclusion: Courts should not accept electronic evidence.

The argument assumes that courts cannot adequately detect fabricated electronic evidence.

Step 2 — Why Option D weakens: Option D states that the Indian Evidence Act already provides strict tests for authentication and admissibility of electronic records. If courts must apply rigorous authentication tests before accepting such evidence, fabricated evidence is unlikely to pass those tests — directly undermining the argument’s rationale.

Why other options are wrong:

- Option A: Historical inadmissibility is irrelevant to current policy — does not weaken.
- Option B: Lawyers’ lack of digital knowledge could actually support the argument (they may not detect fakes) — not a weakener.
- Option C: Rural infrastructure issues are a separate concern and do not weaken the fabrication argument.

Final Answer: Strongest weakener = Option D $\Rightarrow$ **D**



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

Q31.

Solution

Concept — Critical Reasoning (Best-Supported Conclusion): Select the conclusion that is directly and modestly supported by the given information — neither over-reaching nor under-reading it.

Step 1 — Analyse the information: Three *independent* eyewitnesses all place all five accused at the crime scene. “Independent” means no coordination, which increases reliability. Three witnesses is a substantial number.

Step 2 — Match to conclusions: Option A: “Strong testimonial evidence” — the three independent witnesses constitute exactly this. The word “strong” is proportionate; it does not claim certainty of guilt or conviction. **Best supported.**

Why other options are wrong:

- Option B: Presence at a scene $\neq$ guilt; many other factors (intent, act, identity of perpetrator) determine guilt.
- Option C: Bribery is an unsupported assumption; nothing in the information suggests it.
- Option D: “Certainly convicted” is far too strong; courts evaluate all evidence, credibility, and law.

Final Answer: Best-supported conclusion = Option A $\Rightarrow$ **A**

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

Q32.

Solution

Concept — Legal Analogy: Identify the structural relationship between the first pair, then apply it to the second pair.

Step 1 — Decode the first pair: FIR (First Information Report) : Cognizable offence. An FIR is the document lodged to initiate police action for a *cognizable offence* — the FIR marks the *beginning* of the criminal justice process. FIR is the document associated with (or triggered by) a cognizable offence.

Step 2 — Apply to second pair: Charge-sheet : ? A charge-sheet is the document filed by the police to formally accuse a person *after* investigation is completed.



It marks the *end* of the investigation phase. The corresponding counterpart is “**Investigation completed.**”

Why other options are wrong:

- Option A (Bail application): A bail application is filed by the accused, unrelated to charge-sheet filing.
- Option C (Acquittal): Acquittal follows trial; charge-sheet precedes trial.
- Option D (Civil suit): A charge-sheet is a criminal law document; civil suit is a different domain.

Final Answer: Charge-sheet : Investigation completed $\Rightarrow$ **B**

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

Q33.

Solution

Concept — Legal Analogy: Match the role of a party to the type of legal proceeding they initiate.

Step 1 — Decode the first pair: Plaintiff : Civil suit. A *plaintiff* is the party who brings a civil suit (initiates civil litigation).

Step 2 — Apply to second pair: Complainant : ? A *complainant* is the person who lodges a complaint in criminal proceedings — specifically a **criminal complaint** (under CrPC/BNSS). The complainant initiates criminal cognizance by filing a complaint before a magistrate or the police.

Why other options are wrong:

- Option A (Writ petition): Filed by a *petitioner* in constitutional/administrative matters, not a complainant.
- Option B (Appeal): Filed by an *appellant* against an order/judgment, not by a complainant.
- Option D (Arbitration): Initiated by a *claimant/applicant* in an alternative dispute resolution forum.

Final Answer: Complainant : Criminal complaint $\Rightarrow$ **C**

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



Q34.

Solution

Concept — Data Sufficiency: Test each statement independently, then together, to see if the question can be answered.

Step 1 — Test Statement I alone: “X was born in 1990 and Y was born in 1995.” $1990 < 1995$, so X was born earlier $\Rightarrow$ X is older than Y. The question is answered with a definite Yes. **Statement I alone is sufficient.**

Step 2 — Test Statement II alone: “X is taller than Y.” Height has no bearing on age. Statement II does not answer the question. **Insufficient.**

Step 3 — Conclusion: Statement I alone suffices; Statement II alone does not. Answer: A.

Why other options are wrong:

- Option B: Statement II (height) cannot determine age.
- Option C: We do not need both; S1 alone is sufficient.
- Option D: S1 alone is sufficient, so “neither” is wrong.

Final Answer: Statement I alone is sufficient $\Rightarrow$ A

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

Q35.

Solution

Concept — Data Sufficiency (Pythagorean Theorem): A triangle is right-angled if and only if $a^2 + b^2 = c^2$ for some arrangement of its sides.

Step 1 — Test Statement I alone: $AB = 3$ cm, $BC = 4$ cm. We do not know AC . Without the third side, we cannot verify the Pythagorean condition. **Insufficient alone.**

Step 2 — Test Statement II alone: $AC = 5$ cm. We have only one side; AB and BC are unknown. **Insufficient alone.**

Step 3 — Test both together: $AB = 3$, $BC = 4$, $AC = 5$. Check: $AB^2 + BC^2 = 9 + 16 = 25 = 5^2 = AC^2$. By the converse of the Pythagorean theorem, triangle ABC is right-angled at B. The question is answered definitively. **Both together are sufficient.**

Why other options are wrong:



- Option A: S1 alone is not sufficient (third side missing).
- Option B: S2 alone is not sufficient (two sides missing).
- Option D: Together they are sufficient, so “neither” is wrong.

Final Answer: Both statements together are sufficient $\Rightarrow$ C

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



Answer Key

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

