

NISHANT PRAKASH LAW CLASSES

CLAT MOCK - 132

ANSWERS KEY AND EXPLANATIONS

1. Answer: B

Difficulty: Hard**Explanation:**

The “catch” that the author refers to is explicitly that while agriculture growth appears strong (lines 1–3), much of that growth stems from livestock and fisheries rather than traditional crop production. This is underscored in line 5: “Much of the seeming farm sector buoyancy ... has come from the livestock and fisheries subsectors” (lines 4–6).

- **Why B is correct:** It directly identifies the discrepancy between overall growth and the underperformance of crops, which the author highlights as the real caveat.
- **Why A is incorrect:** The passage never suggests that growth below 4 per cent is problematic; rather, it emphasizes that 3.7 per cent is an improvement over prior periods (line 1).
- **Why C is incorrect:** While irony is noted later (line 13), the “catch” here refers to growth sources, not policy misalignment.
- **Why D is incorrect:** Divergence between states (lines 17–18) is a consequence discussed much later, not the immediate “catch” introduced at line 4.

2. Answer: D

Difficulty: Medium**Explanation:**

“Buoyancy” in line 5—“seeming farm sector buoyancy”—connotes an ability to stay afloat or maintain upward momentum despite pressures.

- **Why D is correct:** “Steady resilience and ability to remain economically afloat” captures the sense of sustained upward support that buoyancy implies.
- **Why A is incorrect:** While “superficial appearance” might seem plausible, buoyancy emphasizes genuine upward lift rather than mere appearance.
- **Why B is incorrect:** Innovation-driven productivity is not the context; the passage addresses subsector-driven growth, not technological gains.
- **Why C is incorrect:** The term “buoyancy” is not about temporary fluctuation but ongoing strength in subsectors (lines 5–7).

3. Answer: C

Difficulty: Hard**Explanation:**

The overarching thrust of the passage is that while aggregate agriculture growth looks robust under the Modi government (lines 1–2), this improvement masks the stagnation of traditional

crops—growth instead being driven by livestock, fisheries, and horticulture—and that policy must realign accordingly (lines 19–23).

- **Why C is correct:** It encapsulates both the diagnostic (non-crop subsectors driving growth) and the prescriptive (realigning policy) aims.
- **Why A is incorrect:** The author acknowledges some improvement but immediately qualifies it as misleading (line 4).
- **Why B is incorrect:** While MSP is critiqued, the passage is broader, covering multiple subsectors and policy prescriptions beyond MSP alone.
- **Why D is incorrect:** The praise of specific states is illustrative, not the main point.

Reference: “Much of the seeming farm sector ... livestock and fisheries subsectors.” (line 5) – “The policy lesson here is ... enabled to do so.” (line 19)

4. Answer: B

Difficulty: Medium

Explanation:

The author argues that MSP and crop-specific interventions have supported field crops, which have underperformed (lines 14–16), and proposes their replacement with per-acre income transfers to promote market-oriented planting (lines 20–22).

- **Why B is correct:** It accurately reflects the author’s call to dispense with MSP and adopt unconditional transfers (lines 20–21).
- **Why A is incorrect:** The author does not call for expansion of MSP; in fact, they want to eliminate it.
- **Why C is incorrect:** Although MSP’s utility is questioned, the author does not dismiss its historical role entirely but wants to replace it moving forward.
- **Why D is incorrect:** There is no suggestion to extend MSP to horticulture or livestock; rather market forces for these subsectors are praised (line 15).

5. Answer: C

Difficulty: Hard

Explanation:

“Litotes” is a figure of speech in which an affirmative is expressed through negation of its opposite. The phrase “That isn’t without irony” affirms that there is irony by negating “without irony.”

- **Why C is correct:** It is the textbook example of litotes, using understatement via double negative.
- **Why A is incorrect:** Metonymy substitutes a related term (e.g., “the crown” for monarchy), which is not the case here.
- **Why B is incorrect:** Hyperbole is deliberate exaggeration; this phrase understates rather than exaggerates.
- **Why D is incorrect:** Chiasmus involves reversing word order in two related clauses (e.g., “Ask not what your country can do for you; ask what you can do for your country”), which does not apply here.

Reference: “That isn’t without irony.” (line 13)

6. Answer: B**Difficulty:** Hard**Explanation:**

Line 19's reasoning is that aligning producers' output with consumer demand—and enabling them to do so—yields better outcomes.

- **Why B is correct:** It mirrors the logic that market orientation and facilitation (instead of top-down mandates) empower success, just as farmers thrive when they meet consumer needs.
- **Why A is incorrect:** Focus on rote learning and exam prep implies narrow emphasis, not market-driven choice.
- **Why C is incorrect:** Top-down zoning is the opposite of enabling actors to respond to external conditions.
- **Why D is incorrect:** Prescribing every task detail contradicts the encouragement of autonomy and market responsiveness.

Passage Overview & Reading Approach

The passage examines India's agriculture growth over three successive decades, highlighting that recent gains (3.7 per cent under Modi) mask stagnation in traditional field crops, with livestock, fisheries and horticulture driving most of the uptick. It contrasts subsectoral performance—crops at 2.3 per cent versus fisheries at 9.1 per cent and horticulture at 3.9 per cent—and critiques how policy (MSP for rice and wheat) misaligns with market-led growth in proteins and fruits. The author urges replacing crop-specific support with per-acre income transfers and enhanced access to credit, insurance and technology. To read effectively, underline key figures (lines 1–3, 6–10), track contrasts between subsectors (lines 5–11), note policy prescriptions (lines 19–23) and distinguish explicit data from the author's recommendations.

Question-by-Question Approach

Q1 (Inference – lines 4–7): Focus on “catch” (line 4) and the explanation that buoyancy stems from livestock and fisheries (line 5–6). Infer which option pinpoints that discrepancy.

Q2 (Vocabulary – line 5): Locate “buoyancy” in “seeming farm sector buoyancy” (line 5). Eliminate choices implying mere appearance or innovation; choose the meaning of sustained uplift.

Q3 (Main Idea – lines 1–3 & 19–23): Synthesize the diagnostic (non-crop-led growth) and prescriptive (policy realignment) elements. Match the option combining both aspects.

Q4 (Author's Stance – lines 14–16 & 20–21): Contrast MSP's current focus on field crops (lines 14–16) with the recommendation to “dispense with MSP” (line 20). Identify the answer reflecting replacement of MSP with income transfers.

Q5 (Figure of Speech – line 13): “Isn't without irony” (line 13) signals understatement via double negation. Recognize litotes over other devices.

Q6 (Reasoning Pattern – line 19): Parse “unlikely to stay out ... unless ... satisfied” (line 19). Select the choice mirroring the “will not do X unless Y” conditional structure.

Logical Structure Brief

1. Premises

- **Aggregate Growth Rates:** 3.7 per cent (2014–24) vs. 3.5 per cent (2004–14) vs. 2.9 per cent (preceding 20 years) 【1–2】 .
- **Subsector Performance:** Fisheries 9.1 per cent, livestock 5.8 per cent, horticulture 3.9 per cent, field crops 1.6 per cent 【6, 9–10】 .
- **Policy Focus:** MSP and interventions directed to field crops like rice/wheat (lines 14–15).

2. Inferences

- Overall growth is buoyed by non-crop activities—traditional crops lag behind.
- Market-driven demand for protein and horticulture has outpaced government-supported field crops.

3. Conclusions

- Policy should shift from crop-specific support to per-acre income guarantees.
- Enabling market orientation via credit, insurance and technology is more effective than MSP distortions.

4. Arguments

- **For Reform:** Farmers thrive when they follow market signals (line 19).
- **Against MSP:** Current MSP skews planting decisions and fails to boost core crop growth (line 14).
- **For Income Transfers:** Unconditional per-acre payments foster risk-taking and diversification (lines 20–21).

5. Assumptions

- Market demand reliably signals profitable crops and subsectors.
- Per-acre income transfers are administratively feasible and equitably reach farmers.
- Enhancing credit and technology access will naturally follow policy refocusing.

6. Paradoxes

- **Support Misalignment:** Field crops receive MSP yet underperform; market-supported subsectors outperform without direct subsidies.
- **Intervention vs. Autonomy:** More government meddling (MSP) leads to poorer outcomes; less intervention (market forces) yields better growth.
- **Risk-Taking Incentive:** Guaranteed income aims to spur risk-taking, yet traditional support aimed to reduce risk—both use subsidy logic to encourage opposite behaviours.

7. Answer: A

Difficulty: Hard

Explanation:

The flight of one million Hutus in line 13 is cited to show how their arrival “stoked ethnic tensions” in eastern DR Congo (line 14). The passage links refugee inflows directly to growing fears among the Banyamulenge, not to humanitarian scale or recruitment.

- **Why A is correct:** It directly connects the refugees’ movement to increased ethnic tension (“This stoked ethnic tensions...” 【13–14】).

- **Why B is incorrect:** The emphasis is on political—and ethnic—consequences, not purely humanitarian scale.
- **Why C is incorrect:** There is no suggestion that Hutu refugees armed or joined M23.
- **Why D is incorrect:** Kagame’s presidency is noted in line 12, but his reception in DR Congo is not tied to this refugee movement.

8. Answer: D

Difficulty: Medium

Explanation:

“Dogged” in line 1—“has been dogged by conflict”—means to be persistently troubled over a long period.

- **Why D is correct:** It captures the sustained affliction endured by the region.
- **Why A is incorrect:** Suggests an external pursuer, which the text does not imply.
- **Why B is incorrect:** Implies heroic resistance, absent in this context.
- **Why C is incorrect:** Contradicts the notion of affliction by suggesting protection.

9. Answer: B

Difficulty: Medium

Explanation:

“Marginalised” means excluded or relegated. Its antonym is being fully included or “integrated into mainstream society.”

- **Why B is correct:** It directly opposes marginalisation with full inclusion.
- **Why A is incorrect:** Restates the concept of exclusion.
- **Why C is incorrect:** Implies limited support, not mainstream inclusion.
- **Why D is incorrect:** Distrust does not equate to inclusion.

10. Answer: C

Difficulty: Hard

Explanation:

When reporting “Rwanda accuses... – accusations which DR Congo denies” (line 18), the author maintains a balanced, factual tone without judgment or emotive language.

- **Why C is correct:** It neutrally presents both Rwanda’s charge and DR Congo’s denial.
- **Why A is incorrect:** No patronizing or dismissive language is used.
- **Why B is incorrect:** Sympathetic would imply endorsement, which is absent.
- **Why D is incorrect:** The passage lacks sensationalism or panic-driven emphasis.

11. Answer: D

Difficulty: Hard

Explanation:

Lines 7–9 note that M23’s 2012 seizure of Goma was “met with international opprobrium and accusations of war crimes and human rights violations,” leading to its withdrawal and defeat.

- **Why D is correct:** It reflects the global condemnation and serious allegations leveled against M23.
- **Why A is incorrect:** No sanctions on DR Congo are mentioned; the criticism targeted the rebels.
- **Why B is incorrect:** Integration into the army was part of a later deal, not initial support.
- **Why C is incorrect:** There is no reference to humanitarian aid to rebel-held areas.

Reference: “Shortly after its creation in 2012 ... met with international opprobrium and accusations of war crimes and human rights violations.” 【Line 7】

12 . Answer: B

Difficulty: Hard

Explanation:

Line 19’s structure—“will not do X unless Y condition is met”—is mirrored by “A student will not submit the assignment unless the professor clarifies the grading rubric.”

- **Why B is correct:** It precisely follows the “will not do X unless Y happens” pattern.
- **Why A is incorrect:** Unanimous agreement differs from a specific satisfaction condition.
- **Why C is incorrect:** Describes action taken because of positive forecast, not conditional avoidance.
- **Why D is incorrect:** Tied to cost rather than conditional assurance.

Passage Overview & Reading Approach

The passage outlines over three decades of conflict in eastern DR Congo, tracing its roots to the 1994 Rwandan genocide and subsequent refugee flows, and highlights the resurgence of the M23 rebel group. It emphasizes how ethnic tensions—fueled by historical grievances and migration—have repeatedly drawn in neighbouring states, with international actors condemning rebel actions. The core theme is the interplay of historical trauma, regional power dynamics, and conditional diplomacy (e.g., Rwanda’s stance “unless ... satisfied” in line 19). The difficulty lies in tracking chronological events, causal links, and stated versus implied motivations. As you read, annotate key dates (1994, 2009, 2012), note shifts in agency (Hutus → Banyamulenge → M23 → Rwanda), and distinguish explicit facts from inferred motives.

Question-by-Question Approach

Q7 (Inference – lines 13–14): Identify the causal link: refugees “fled across the border” (13) and “stoked ethnic tensions” (14). Focus on cause-and-effect rather than humanitarian scale or political endorsement.

Q8 (Vocabulary – line 1): Locate “dogged by conflict” (1). Contrast options for passive trouble versus active pursuit or protection. Choose the meaning that reflects prolonged affliction.

Q9 (Antonym – line 14): Understand “marginalised” as excluded. The antonym implies full inclusion—“integrated into mainstream society”—not mere support or trust.

Q10 (Tone – line 18): Observe neutral reporting: “Rwanda accuses ... which DR Congo denies” (18). No loaded adjectives or emotive cues—select the neutral, balanced option.

Q11 (Inference of Response – lines 7–9): Note “met with international opprobrium and accusations of war crimes” (7). Infer condemnation rather than sanctions, integration, or aid.

Q12 (Conditional Reasoning – line 19): Parse “will not stay out ... unless it is satisfied” (19). Match to a parallel “will not do X unless Y” structure for correct reasoning pattern.

Logical Structure Brief

1. Premises:

- **Historical Genocide (1994):** 800,000 Tutsis killed (11).
- **Refugee Flight:** One million Hutus into DR Congo (13).
- **Ethnic Tensions:** Banyamulenge feel threatened (14).
- **Rebel Activity:** M23’s advances met with global condemnation (7–9).
- **Regional Security Logic:** Rwanda’s non-intervention conditional on FDLR threat elimination (19).

2. Inferences:

- Refugee influx directly worsens local ethnic hostilities.
- Past peace deals’ failures legitimize renewed rebel claims.
- International censure can force rebel withdrawal.

3. Conclusions:

- Sustainable peace requires addressing root threats (FDLR) and mistrust, not merely military deterrence.
- Conditional diplomacy (“unless ... satisfied”) is central to regional stability.

4. Arguments:

- **For M23’s grievances:** Unfulfilled agreements justify reluctance to disarm.
- **Against M23’s tactics:** War-crime accusations demonstrate their illegitimacy.
- **Rwanda’s security stance:** Proactive intervention is warranted until threat abates.

5. Assumptions:

- Refugees inherently alter power balances and provoke conflict.
- International opprobrium translates into tangible pressure on rebels.
- Rwanda acts primarily out of self-defense rather than expansionism.

6. Paradoxes:

- **Protector vs. Aggressor:** Rwanda decries FDLR threats yet is accused of backing rebels.
- **History vs. Present:** Peace accords meant to end cycles of violence instead lend their dates (M23–23 March 2009) as rebel legitimacy.
- **Intervention Logic:** Non-intervention depends on assurance of safety, but intervention may be necessary to achieve that assurance—creating a catch-22.

13. Answer: D (Main Idea – Hard)

Difficulty: Hard

Explanation:

- The passage first details how social media and the Internet undercut young Indians’ reading habits (lines 1–3, 7–9) and then strongly advocates reinstating book reading in

daily routines for its cognitive and personal growth benefits (lines 12–13, 20–23), matching option D.

- **Why A is incorrect:** Family TV/newspaper bonding is a minor mention (lines 7–9), not the central thrust.
- **Why B is incorrect:** No discussion of publishing industry impacts.
- **Why C is incorrect:** Newspaper reading is only briefly addressed at the end (lines 30–32).

14. Answer: A (Vocabulary – Medium)

Difficulty: Medium

Explanation:

- “Tedious” in line 31 describes newspaper presentation as dull and draining (“tedious and tiring”), fitting choice A.
- **Why B is incorrect:** Tedious is the opposite of “emotionally engaging.”
- **Why C is incorrect:** It refers to mental boredom, not physical exertion.
- **Why D is incorrect:** In-depth analysis may be rigorous but not inherently boring.

15. Answer: D (Inference – Medium)

Difficulty: Medium

Explanation:

- The “Instant Maggi” metaphor (line 4) implies youth favor quick, convenient solutions in all areas of life, including media consumption, aligning with D.
- **Why A is incorrect:** No claim about nutritional quality.
- **Why B is incorrect:** It’s about convenience culture, not equating cooking and reading times.
- **Why C is incorrect:** The metaphor targets immediacy, not digital culinary advice.

16. Answer: A (Grammar – Hard)

Difficulty: Hard

Explanation:

- “Given that books make people happy.” (line 14) is a dependent clause without a main verb, making it a sentence fragment (A).
- **Why B is incorrect:** Line 12’s modifier correctly describes “habit.”
- **Why C is incorrect:** The indirect question in line 15 is grammatically acceptable.
- **Why D is incorrect:** Line 28 maintains consistent tense.

17. Answer: C (Author’s Stance & Tone – Hard)

Difficulty: Hard

Explanation:

- The author repeatedly frames social media as undermining intellectual habits (lines 1–3, 7–9) and prescribes corrective measures—daily book reading—showing a critical stance, as in C.
- **Why A is incorrect:** The language is normative, not neutral.
- **Why B is incorrect:** No praise for digital platforms appears.
- **Why D is incorrect:** The remedy is replacement, not blending.

18. Answer: B (Similar Logic/Reasoning – Medium)

Difficulty: Medium

Explanation:

- Both lines use a concession structure (“No matter how...,” “Regardless of how...”) to assert that despite technological progress, a traditional practice retains value. Option B mirrors this.
- **Why A is incorrect:** Predicts disappearance rather than permanence.
- **Why C is incorrect:** Draws a causal outcome, not an enduring-value concession.
- **Why D is incorrect:** Prescribes abandonment rather than sustaining superiority.

Passage Overview & Reading Approach

The passage laments how easy access to the Internet and social media (“Facebook, Instagram, WhatsApp,” lines 1–3) has supplanted book reading among young Indians, contrasting their instant-gratification habits (“Instant Maggi,” line 4) with the diligence of older generations (lines 6–7). It outlines the cognitive, emotional, and practical benefits of regular reading (lines 20–25) and ends with strategies to rekindle newspaper and book-reading habits in children (lines 30–32). To tackle the passage, first map its two halves—(a) diagnosis of a digital distraction problem, (b) prescription for renewed reading discipline—and underline key contrasts (generations, media types) and recommendations (daily scheduling, innovative ideas).

Question-by-Question Approach

Q13 (Main Idea): Identify the overarching “diagnosis → prescription” pattern: social media’s disruptive effect (lines 1–3, 7–9) followed by calls to re-embed reading (lines 12–13, 20–23). The correct option must capture both.

Q14 (Vocabulary): Locate “tedious” modifying “factual presentation in newspapers” (line 31). Eliminate definitions relating to suspense or effort; focus on “boring/monotonous.”

Q15 (Inference – line 4): Interpret “Instant Maggi is a part of the young generation” metaphorically—connect it to convenience culture pervading reading and daily life (line 5).

Q16 (Grammar – line 14): Spot the lone dependent clause “Given that books make people happy.” (line 14). Recognize a sentence fragment requires a finite verb.

Q17 (Author’s Stance & Tone): Track evaluative language (“should,” “will always remain,” lines 13, 22) and repeated contrast between digital distractions and reading benefits to determine a critical stance toward social media.

Q18 (Similar Logic – line 22): Analyze the concessive structure introduced by “No matter how popular...” (line 22). Find the option using a parallel concession (“Regardless of...”).

Logical Structure Brief

1. Premises

- **Digital Distraction:** Social media platforms and smartphones dominate youth routines (lines 1–3, 7–9).
- **Generational Contrast:** Older generation found purpose through diligent book reading (lines 6–7).
- **Enduring Benefits:** Reading bolsters health, knowledge, focus, imagination, and life-skills (lines 20–29).

2. Inferences

- Instant online habits (“Instant Maggi,” line 4) reflect a broader impatience that undermines reading.
- Even factual content (newspapers) is neglected unless made engaging (lines 30–32).

3. Conclusions

- Reinstating daily reading—books and newspapers—is crucial for cognitive and emotional development.
- Passive digital consumption must be offset by structured reading schedules.

4. Arguments

- **For Reading:** It improves focus (line 25), knowledge (line 20), and life-skills (lines 26–27).
- **Against Digital Monoculture:** Social media erodes attention spans and family rituals (lines 7–9).
- **For Innovation:** Creative methods can make newspapers appealing to youth (line 32).

5. Assumptions

- Children’s habits, once formed (line 32), will persist into adulthood.
- Reading benefits universally translate into personal and professional success.
- Digital habits are malleable through educational interventions.

6. Paradoxes

- **Effort Paradox:** Facilitating reading (by making it easier) requires more initial effort and creativity.
- **Choice Paradox:** In an age of abundant information, meaningful engagement (books) declines.
- **Innovation Paradox:** Innovative strategies are needed to promote an old-fashioned habit (newspaper reading).

19. Answer: B (Inference – Hard)

Explanation:

- **Why B is correct:** Lines 15–19 reveal Sylvia’s dark history—she feasted on an ex-nurse until she bled to death (“exsanguination after a night of Sylvia’s gluttony,” line 15)—and her thrill at the smell of blood (line 18) confirms she seeks to harvest blood for herself.
- **Why A is incorrect:** Her delight in blood and murderous past contradict any compassionate motive.

- **Why C is incorrect:** No mention of safety inspection; her clandestine entry and past violence imply malice.
- **Why D is incorrect:** There is no reference to investigating thefts or evidence-gathering beyond her obsession with blood.

20. Answer: B (Vocabulary – Medium)

Explanation:

- **Why B is correct:** “Exsanguination” means bleeding to death or severe blood loss, fitting the context of the nurse dying from blood loss (line 15).
- **Why A is incorrect:** Cleaning equipment is “decontamination,” not exsanguination.
- **Why C is incorrect:** Drawing blood samples is “phlebotomy,” not exsanguination.
- **Why D is incorrect:** Unconsciousness due to shock is “syncope” or “coma,” not exsanguination.

21. Answer: A (Tone – Medium)

Explanation:

- **Why A is correct:** Lines 1–4 describe Sylvia’s stealthy, measured movements—waiting, peeping, listening—which create a tense, suspenseful atmosphere.
- **Why B is incorrect:** There is no levity; the passage underscores caution.
- **Why C is incorrect:** There is no regret; Sylvia exhibits purposeful determination.
- **Why D is incorrect:** The text narrates her actions rather than teaching methods.

22. Answer: B (Figure of Speech – Hard)

Explanation:

- **Why B is correct:** Comparing her spectacles to a “myopic goldfish” injects a dash of absurd humor, highlighting the comical incongruity of a fearsome predator disguised as a timid, near-sighted fish.
- **Why A is incorrect:** The simile is playful rather than signaling deep insecurity.
- **Why C is incorrect:** A goldfish is emblematic of poor vision, not clarity.
- **Why D is incorrect:** Goldfish are not symbolically cold-blooded predators; the comparison emphasizes appearance, not temperament.

23. Answer: D (Grammar/Usage – Hard)

Explanation:

- **Why D is correct:** “Sudden bright light bursts from the room.” lacks an article before “sudden bright light.” It would be more grammatical as “A sudden bright light bursts...” or “Suddenly, bright light bursts...”
- **Why A is incorrect:** Line 3’s participial phrase correctly modifies Sylvia’s action.
- **Why B is incorrect:** The clause in line 7 is properly constructed.
- **Why C is incorrect:** Line 16’s participial opener is acceptable.

24. Answer: A (Similar Logic/Reasoning – Hard)

Explanation:

- **Why A is correct:** Both scenarios follow a meticulous four-step covert-sequence: observe/wait until safe, perform the illicit act (unlock/lower), and then restore the scene (lock panel/case) to avoid detection.
- **Why B is incorrect:** Skipping class involves a simple decision, not a multi-step covert strategy.
- **Why C is incorrect:** Checking weather is preparatory but lacks the final resealing or concealment step.
- **Why D is incorrect:** Stopping at a light and texting lacks the staged clandestine procedure.

Passage Overview & Reading Approach

The passage portrays Dr. Sylvia Kraujas's covert infiltration of a hospital phlebotomy suite to satisfy her gruesome obsession with blood. It weaves meticulous, suspenseful descriptions of her stealthy entry (lines 1–4), her gleeful anticipation (lines 18–19), and her escape amid pursuit (lines 20–23). The theme centers on the deadly duality of a trusted physician turned predator. Its difficulty arises from tracking chronological suspense, subtle hints of her past atrocity (line 15), and shifts between external action and internal delight. As you read, annotate the sequence of her actions, note descriptive cues to her true nature, and distinguish surface dialogue from underlying menace.

Question-by-Question Approach

Q19 (Inference – lines 15–19): Spot Sylvia's backstory ("exsanguination," line 15) and her sensory delight in blood (line 18). Infer her vampiric intent rather than benevolence or inspection.

Q20 (Vocabulary – line 15): Locate "exsanguination" in context of the nurse's death. Choose the meaning that fits fatal blood loss.

Q21 (Tone – lines 1–4): Assess the atmosphere created by verbs like "peeps," "listening intently," and "silently lowering"—tone is suspenseful and tense.

Q22 (Figure of Speech – line 7): Identify the goldfish simile: it casts her disguise as absurdly comical, highlighting the contrast between her appearance and lethal nature.

Q23 (Grammar/Usage – line 20): Examine sentence structure. The missing article in "Sudden bright light bursts..." marks the error—recognize correct article usage.

Q24 (Similar Logic – lines 1–4): Map the four-step covert procedure (wait, ensure safety, act, conceal). Match it to a parallel multi-step illicit sequence.

Logical Structure Brief**1. Premises**

- **Stealth Entry:** Sylvia navigates the ceiling void, reseals the panel, and listens for warning signals (lines 1–4).
- **Disguise & Movement:** She dons medical attire to blend in and proceeds through the ward (lines 5–9).
- **Murderous Past:** An ex-nurse died after Sylvia's blood feast (line 15).
- **Blood Obsession:** She revels in the aroma of fresh blood (line 18).

2. Inferences

- Her meticulous approach and past violence imply predatory motives, not medical care.
 - Sensory descriptions (aroma of blood, male sweat) signal her true intent and imminent danger.
3. **Conclusions**
- Sylvia exploits her medical identity to commit illicit, violent acts.
 - The hospital's naïveté (bad signage, oblivious staff) facilitates her crimes.
4. **Arguments**
- **For Suspense:** Detailed procedural narration heightens tension and underscores her professionalism.
 - **For Menace:** Juxtaposition of clinical setting and primal delight in blood creates unsettling dissonance.
5. **Assumptions**
- The hospital's staff remain unaware of her true nature despite clues.
 - A well-executed disguise and careful planning guarantee her temporary impunity.
6. **Paradoxes**
- **Healer vs. Killer:** A doctor uses her trusted role to prey on patients.
 - **Visibility vs. Concealment:** Bright clinical environment contrasts with her hidden ceiling-laid approach.
 - **Order vs. Chaos:** The orderly hospital plan (line 15) led to anarchy when Sylvia strikes.

Current Affairs (Including General Knowledge)

25. Correct Answer: C

Explanation: The **Global Alliance Against Hunger and Poverty**, launched at the Rio G20 Summit 2024, has the goal of:

- Reaching **500 million people** in low and lower-middle-income countries with **cash transfer programs by 2030**.
- Expanding **school meals** to **150 million children** in vulnerable countries.

Why the others are incorrect:

- **A:** Talks about global taxation and digital monopolies—topics not covered by this Alliance.
- **B:** Reforestation and rural unemployment, though important, are not part of the Alliance's focus.
- **D:** Universal health insurance and financial literacy were not part of the stated goals of this Alliance.

26. Correct Answer: C

Explanation: The **central theme** of the G20 Summit 2024 in **Rio de Janeiro** was:

"Building a Just World and a Sustainable Planet"

This theme underscores inclusive development and sustainable environmental practices.

Why the others are incorrect:

- **A, B, and D** are fabricated themes not connected to the 2024 Summit.

27. Correct Answer: A

Explanation: The **three key priorities** of the 2024 Declaration were:

1. **Social inclusion** and fighting **poverty/hunger**.
2. **Sustainable development** and **climate action**.
3. **Reforming global governance institutions** (like the UN and MDBs).

Why the others are incorrect:

- **A** (arms trade and PMGs) was **not** among the top three priorities.
- **B, C, and D** were explicitly mentioned in the declaration.

28. Correct Answer: C

Explanation:

- The G20 began as a **ministerial forum** in **1999**, following the 1997–99 Asian Financial Crisis.
- **Leader-level summits began in 2008** after the global financial crisis.

Why the others are incorrect:

- **A:** Incorrect because summits did not begin in 1999.
- **B:** The summits are held annually, not biannually.
- **D:** There is no record of a 2007 IMF–World Bank merger leading to G20 summits.

29. Correct Answer: D

Explanation: The **2024 Rio Summit** was **historically significant** because it was the **first time the African Union (AU)** participated as a **full member** of the G20. This marked a shift towards more **inclusive global governance**.

Why the others are incorrect:

- **A, B, C:** These statements are inaccurate and not based on the Summit's actual outcomes.

30. Correct Answer: B

Explanation: The **G20** consists of:

- **19 countries + the European Union**, and also includes representation from:
 - **International Monetary Fund (IMF)**
 - **World Bank**

Why the others are incorrect:

- **A:** ASEAN is not a full G20 member.
- **C:** G20 has 19 countries, not 17.
- **D:** There's no rotating system of 5 developing countries.

31. Correct Answer: C

Explanation:

Article 6.4 establishes a **centralized UN-administered system** for emissions offsetting and carbon credit trading. This system will allow countries and private actors to generate and trade emission reduction credits under transparent global governance.

- **A** is a description of Article 6.2, not 6.4.
- **B** incorrectly implies deregulation, whereas 6.4 is a formal mechanism.
- **D** falsely claims exemptions; it does not grant automatic immunity.

32. Correct Answer: C

Explanation:

The NCQG aims to raise climate finance to **USD 300 billion annually by 2035**, led by **developed countries**, while also mobilizing up to **USD 1.3 trillion** from all sources to support developing countries in mitigation and adaptation.

- **A** is incorrect; developed country obligations are integral.
- **B** adds unverified elements about burden sharing.
- **D** confuses climate finance with carbon market mechanisms.

33. Correct Answer: D

Explanation:

India rejected the NCQG because it **shifted responsibility** from developed countries to "all actors," violating the principle of **climate justice** and **Article 9 of the Paris Agreement**, which places the onus on developed nations for climate finance.

- **A** is unrelated to finance.
- **B** misrepresents the rationale.
- **C** is not India's stated concern.

34. Correct Answer: C

Explanation:

The **Facilitative Working Group (FWG)** was established at **COP24 in Katowice** to support indigenous communities through the **Local Communities and Indigenous Peoples Platform (LCIPP)** in integrating traditional knowledge with climate policy.

- **A, B, and D** refer to COPs with different thematic focuses.

35. Correct Answer: D**Explanation:**

The **30th UN Climate Conference (COP30)** will be held in **Belém, Brazil** in **November 2025**. Belém, situated in the Amazon region, is symbolic of Brazil's role in addressing deforestation and climate governance.

- **A, B, and C** are incorrect locations; none of them have been selected as COP30 hosts.

36. Correct Answer: A**Explanation:**

NavIC (Navigation with Indian Constellation) comprises **7 operational satellites**, specifically **3 in Geostationary Orbit (GEO)** and **4 in Geosynchronous Orbit (GSO)**. It provides precise positioning over India and 1,500 km beyond its borders.

- **B** is incorrect because 24-satellite MEO systems like GPS are global, unlike NavIC which is regional.
- **C** wrongly describes polar orbit satellites, which are not part of NavIC.
- **D** confuses NavIC with solar missions like Aditya-L1, which deal with Lagrangian points.

37. Correct Answer: C**Explanation:**

The **PSLV-C37** mission of 2017 is globally recognized for launching **104 satellites** in one go — the highest number ever in a single mission.

- **A** is a solar mission, not related to satellite count.
- **B** was India's first lunar mission but didn't achieve a record in satellite deployment.
- **D** is India's first interplanetary mission, but not related to the record in this context.

38. Correct Answer: C**Explanation:**

GSLV-F15 was the **17th flight of GSLV**, and importantly, the **11th to use an indigenous cryogenic engine**, underscoring India's technological advancement in space propulsion.

- **A** is incorrect — India's human spaceflight will use Gaganyaan's specific variant.
- **B** is outdated — early GSLV versions used Russian cryogenic stages, not F15.

- **D** confuses GSLV with SSLV (Small Satellite Launch Vehicle), which is designed for small payloads.

39. Correct Answer: B

Explanation:

The upcoming **Shukrayaan mission** is ISRO's proposed **Venus mission**, focusing on the planet's surface and atmosphere. It is still in the planning phase.

- **A** is a mission for studying X-ray polarization in space.
- **C** is India's solar mission.
- **D** focuses on ocean monitoring and is part of India's Earth Observation Satellite program.

40. Correct Answer: A

Explanation:

Lagrangian Point L1 is a unique spot in space where the **gravitational pull of the Earth and the Sun** balance with the centrifugal force experienced by a satellite, allowing it to stay in a fixed position **without expending fuel**. This makes it ideal for solar observation.

- **B** incorrectly describes interstellar orbits, which are irrelevant to L1.
- **C** mischaracterizes L1 as unstable, which is incorrect; it's one of the five semi-stable points.
- **D** refers to orbital mechanics for planetary entry, unrelated to Lagrange points.

41. Correct Answer: D

Explanation:

The Kumbh Mela is held based on complex **astrological calculations involving the positions of Jupiter, the Sun, and the Moon**. These determine when the specific celestial alignment occurs at each location. The **12-year Jupiter cycle** is a key component.

- **A** omits Jupiter, making it incomplete.
- **B** inaccurately connects the Mela only to lunar eclipses and Magh month.
- **C** references Mars, which is not a determinant in Kumbh scheduling.

42. Correct Answer: C

Explanation:

The river associated with **Ujjain** is **Kshipra**, not Godavari. Godavari is linked to **Nashik-Trimbakeshwar**.

- **A, B, and D** correctly associate the cities with their respective rivers.
- **C** is incorrect in matching Ujjain with Godavari.

43. Correct Answer: B

Explanation:

Mythology holds that drops of **amrita** fell at **four locations: Haridwar, Prayagraj, Ujjain, and Nashik-Trimbakeshwar** during Jayant's celestial flight. These four sites now host the Kumbh Mela.

- **A, C, and D** overstate or understate the traditional number.

44. Correct Answer: D**Explanation:**

While **Skanda Purana** is often **cited** in support of Kumbh Mela's antiquity, there is **no extant version** that explicitly links all four sites with the current form of the festival. However, **D** correctly reflects the scholarly interpretation that **Magh Mela at Prayag** may have been **rebranded as Kumbh Mela post-1857**.

- **A** is incorrect since Skanda Purana doesn't clearly describe the Mela format as known today.
- **B** misrepresents Xuanzang's vague description.
- **C** exaggerates the Rig Veda's content.

45. Correct Answer: C**Explanation:**

Adi Shankaracharya is widely believed to have **institutionalized the concept of periodic religious gatherings for ascetics and scholars**. His effort to unify Hindu philosophical schools led to the formation of **akhadas**, which play a central role in the Mela today.

- **A** is unrelated to Shankaracharya.
- **B** falsely connects the Kumbh with Buddhism.
- **D** inaccurately attributes calendrical reforms to him.

46. Correct Answer: D**Explanation:**

The **Maha Kumbh** occurs **once every 12 years**, while the **Ardh-Kumbh** is held **every 6 years** at **only Haridwar and Prayagraj**.

- **A** incorrectly states intervals.
- **B** is wrong because Ardh-Kumbh is not held at all four locations.
- **C** oversimplifies the distinction.

47. Correct Answer: C**Explanation:**

The Indus Waters Treaty allocates the **western rivers — Indus, Jhelum, and Chenab — to Pakistan**, giving it control over approximately **80% of the Indus basin's waters**. India retains rights to **non-consumptive uses** on these rivers.

- **A** is incorrect as Sutlej, Ravi, and Beas are eastern rivers allocated to India.
- **B** incorrectly includes the Ganga, which is not part of the Indus system.
- **D** wrongly includes the Yamuna and Satluj together, the former being outside the IWT framework.

48. Correct Answer: B

Explanation:

The **Indus Waters Treaty was signed in 1960 in Karachi**, Pakistan, after nine years of negotiations and was **mediated by the World Bank**.

- **A** is incorrect because the treaty was not signed in New Delhi.
- **C** is incorrect; while Lahore is a Pakistani city, the treaty was not finalized there.
- **D** is wrong because Geneva had no role in the signing of the IWT.

49. Correct Answer: A

Explanation:

India is **permitted limited non-consumptive use** of the western rivers. These include **navigation, agriculture, and hydroelectricity**, provided they **do not obstruct the natural river flow**, and adhere to treaty-specified **design and operational constraints**.

- **B** is wrong as the IWT restricts India's use on western rivers.
- **C** is incorrect because flood control is not an unrestricted purpose under IWT.
- **D** is incorrect as India does not have exclusive rights over Jhelum and Chenab.

50. Correct Answer: D

Explanation:

India has cited a **"fundamental change in circumstances"** — particularly the persistent issue of **cross-border terrorism** — as justification for **suspending the IWT**. This rationale aligns with **Article 62 of the Vienna Convention**.

- **A** and **B** are unrelated to India's legal and strategic reasoning.
- **C** is a general developmental issue but not cited in the context of the treaty suspension.

51. Correct Answer: C

Explanation:

Pakistan is **highly dependent** on the **Indus river system for agriculture, power, and drinking water**. The suspension of the IWT affects Pakistan's water security, **threatening irrigation, urban water supplies, and power generation** — all of which are crucial for its economy.

- **A** and **D** are speculative and not directly linked to IWT's impact.
- **B** is incorrect; while tensions may rise, diplomatic collapse has not occurred.

52. Correct Answer: A

Explanation:

Article 62 of the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties allows a state to **withdraw from or modify a treaty** if there is a **fundamental change in circumstances** not foreseen at the time of signing.

- **B, C, and D** either do not exist in this context or relate to unrelated treaty provisions.

53. Answer: A (Difficulty: Hard)

Neha succeeds under Section 13(1)(i) because adultery requires “consensual intercourse ... with another who is not his/her spouse,” that it “has to be voluntary” (lines 1–2), that the marriage be “valid and subsisting at the time of the commission of the act” (line 3), and that “there has to be enough circumstantial evidence” (line 4). Amit’s overnight stay in the private suite, corroborated by CCTV footage and daily affectionate voice notes, provides robust circumstantial proof of voluntary physical intimacy. Option B is incorrect because the statute does not demand direct proof of penetration—“consensual intercourse” encompasses a range of sexual intimacy once supported by reliable circumstantial evidence. Option C is wrong as there is no requirement that the third party acknowledge the married status or the act itself beyond the married person’s conduct. Option D misplaces weight on Amit’s self-serving “work-related” explanation, which cannot override clear circumstantial evidence of intimacy.

54. Answer: A (Difficulty: Extremely Hard)

Sunita prevails on mental cruelty because the passage defines cruelty to include “insults in front of friends and family, mental pressure to undergo abortion etc.” and confirms that “mental cruelty is harder to prove in a court of law” yet was upheld in *Balram Prajapati v. Susheela Bai* (“court granted divorce on the ground of mental cruelty,” line 6). Option B is incorrect since the absence of physical violence does not negate mental cruelty once objective humiliating conduct and coercion are proven. Option C wrongly insists on physical assault, contrary to the *Balram Prajapati* precedent. Option D excludes forced misrepresentation to parents from “unprecedented behaviour,” but the passage explicitly includes mental pressure tactics—such as compelling false statements—as part of cruelty.

55. Answer: B (Difficulty: Extremely Hard)

Karan’s petition fails because, although Renu’s unexplained absence exceeds two years—“voluntarily leaves unexplained, and does not come back for a continuous period of two or more years” (line 7)—desertion also demands an intention permanently to abandon marital obligations (“renouncing the marital obligations,” line 7). Option A is incorrect for equating mere absence with desertion. Option C mistakenly requires proof of intent at the exact moment of departure rather than considering the totality of conduct and circumstances. Option D misreads the case of *Bipin Chander Jaisinghbhai Shah v. Prabhawati*: a spouse’s refusal to admit the deserter does not negate voluntariness if the initial departure was indeed voluntary.

56. Answer: A (Difficulty: Extremely Hard)

Akshay succeeds because conversion to another religion “against the wishes of their spouse” is itself a ground for divorce (line 9), and the statute contains no provision barring relief for delay. Option B is incorrect as equitable laches is not recognized under Section 13(1)(iv). Option C’s insistence on public conversion adds a non-statutory requirement; the passage

does not demand publicity once the act is undisputed. Option D wrongly posits that mutual consent divorce is the exclusive remedy post-conversion, ignoring the explicit conversion ground.

57. Answer: A (Difficulty: Medium)

Rahul and Sanya satisfy Section 13B because they have lived separately for one year — “wait for one year from date of marriage ... living separately for one or more year” (line 10)—and have jointly petitioned. Option B is incorrect: there is no statutory six-month cooling-off period; that shorter interval is a judicial practice, not legislative text. Option C introduces a hardship waiver that the statute does not provide. Option D misstates the separation requirement as two years, contrary to the clear one-year mandate.

58. Answer: C (Difficulty: Medium)

The essentials of adultery under Section 13(1)(i) are voluntariness (“has to be voluntary,” line 2), valid subsistence of the marriage (“valid and subsisting,” line 3), and sufficiency of circumstantial evidence (“enough circumstantial evidence,” line 4). Option C’s direct eyewitness-only requirement contradicts the passage’s sanctioning of circumstantial proof. Option A correctly identifies voluntariness; B correctly identifies validity/subsistence; and D correctly distinguishes actual intercourse from mere invitation or preparation.

Passage Overview & Reading Approach

The passage outlines the statutory grounds for divorce under Section 13 of the Hindu Marriage Act, 1955, detailing five key categories—adultery, cruelty (physical and mental), desertion, conversion, and mutual consent. Test takers should note the precise legal elements for each ground (e.g., voluntariness and circumstantial evidence for adultery; continuous two-year intent for desertion). Given the similarity of terms, focus on the defined essentials in each subsection, underline signal phrases (“has to be voluntary,” “valid and subsisting,” “continuous period of two or more years,” etc.), and map fact patterns directly to those elements. Expect medium to high difficulty due to overlapping definitions—eliminate distractors that add non-statutory requirements or misstate case law.

Question 53 (Adultery) - This question tests identification of the three essentials of adultery—voluntary intercourse, valid subsistence of marriage, and circumstantial evidence. Approach by ticking off each element against Amit’s overnight hotel stay, CCTV proof, and voice notes; eliminate options demanding unsupported requirements (like third-party admissions).

Question 54 (Mental Cruelty) - Here you must distinguish physical cruelty from mental cruelty and apply the Balram Prajapati precedent. Focus on whether Sunita’s repeated insults and coercion to abort satisfy “unprecedented behaviour.” Dismiss choices insisting on physical violence.

Question 55 (Desertion) - This problem examines the dual requisites of unexplained absence for two years *and* intent to abandon marital obligations. Confirm Renu’s continuous absence, then ask whether intent can be inferred solely from non-communication. Eliminate answers that equate absence with intent or misapply the case law on prevented return.

Question 56 (Conversion) - Test whether conversion “against the wishes of the spouse” is itself a ground with no laches or publicity requirement. Look for statutory text and disregard options importing laches or exclusivity of mutual consent divorce.

Question 57 (Mutual Consent) - Requires matching separation and petition-timing against Section 13B's one-year separation rule. Recognize there is no statutory six-month cooling-off or two-year requirement; discard options that misstate waiting periods or introduce hardship waivers.

Question 58 (Passage-Based) - Assesses comprehension of the adultery definition's essentials. Identify which element is *not* required—note the passage's explicit endorsement of circumstantial evidence and absence of any direct-eyewitness mandate. Exclude distractors that contradict the text.

Legal Principles in the Passage

- **Adultery (Section 13(1)(i))**: Consensual intercourse by a married person with a non-spouse; must be voluntary; marriage valid and subsisting; circumstantial evidence sufficient.
- **Cruelty (Section 13(1)(i))**: Physical cruelty (violence) or mental cruelty (insults, unprecedented behaviour, coercion to abort); case law recognizes mental cruelty without physical violence.
- **Desertion (Section 13(1)(iii))**: Voluntary, unexplained departure without consent; continuous absence of two or more years; intent to renounce marital obligations required.
- **Conversion (Section 13(1)(iv))**: Change of religion by a spouse against the other's wishes; private or public conversion equally grounds; no statutory delay bar.
- **Divorce by Mutual Consent (Section 13B)**: Joint petition after one year of marriage plus one year of continuous separation; no additional statutory cooling-off or hardship waivers.

59. Answer: D (*Difficulty: Extremely Hard*)

Lakshmi's challenge will fail because the CGST Act's mandatory electronic invoicing and the SVAT Act's exemption can be harmoniously construed—compliance with CGST does not preclude use of SVAT's procedural carve-out. The passage stresses that repugnancy arises only when statutes are "fully inconsistent and absolutely irreconcilable" and produce "ridiculous consequences" when applied together (lines 3–4). Here, meeting CGST's invoicing requirement while relying on SVAT's exemption poses no logical or procedural impossibility. Option A incorrectly treats any threshold gap as irreconcilable; B wrongly assumes the exemption nullifies CGST's mandate; C misapplies automatic parliamentary override.

60. Answer: A (*Difficulty: Medium*)

Under the passage, "the burden of proof for repugnancy is on the party challenging the law" (line 6). The Trust must show the two deadlines are impossible to satisfy simultaneously—that they are "fully inconsistent and absolutely irreconcilable" (line 7). A May versus July renewal schedule presents only a procedural timing conflict, not an impossible dual compliance scenario. Therefore, the Trust bears the burden and cannot establish repugnancy. Option B

incorrectly shifts the burden to the State; C overstates the conflict as irreconcilable; D ignores that the challenger must first carry its burden.

61. Answer: C (Difficulty: Extremely Hard)

The passage instructs courts to seek harmonious construction whenever feasible, even if provisions appear inconsistent (“courts must interpret the laws in a way that allows competing laws to coexist peacefully,” line 7). Here, GreenTech can view state-mandated recycling by 2023 as an interim step toward the broader national effluent-treatment requirement by 2025. Option A prematurely declares repugnancy; B and D improperly invoke Article 254 to invalidate or displace the state law without exploring harmonization.

62. Answer: C (Difficulty: Extremely Hard)

Article 254(1) contemplates repugnancy only where statutes on the Concurrent List produce “fully inconsistent and absolutely irreconcilable” obligations (line 7). Accreditation and curriculum standards, while related to education, address distinct regulatory concerns and can operate side by side. Option A overstates incompatibility; B wrongly asserts any Concurrent List overlap triggers repugnancy; D misclassifies the domain issue as ultra vires rather than assessing repugnancy.

63. Answer: A (Difficulty: Hard)

The passage clarifies that clear contradictions—such as one statute requiring an action and another forbidding it—invoke repugnancy, but overlapping offences with different penalties may coexist (line 10). Although imprisonment and fine differ, both penalties can be applied to the same conduct, and neither provision prohibits the other. Therefore, no repugnancy arises under the harmonious-construction doctrine. Option A misreads the “do” versus “don’t” illustration; B repeats that error; D mischaracterizes the offences as distinct when they overlap.

64. Answer: C (Difficulty: Medium)

Statement C is the only choice misaligned with the passage. The text emphasizes that mere inconsistency—even in Concurrent List laws—does not automatically trigger repugnancy; courts must first attempt harmonious construction, and strict repugnancy arises only when statutes are “fully inconsistent and absolutely irreconcilable” (lines 7–8). Statements A and B correctly state the Article 254(1) threshold and burden of proof; D accurately notes that overlapping offences with divergent penalties need not be repugnant.

Passage Overview & Reading Approach

The passage explains the doctrine of repugnancy under Article 254 of the Indian Constitution, which resolves conflicts between central and state statutes. It emphasizes that repugnancy arises only when two laws are “fully inconsistent and absolutely irreconcilable,” making harmonious construction impossible (lines 3–4, 7). Readers should note key signal phrases—“burden of proof,” “presumed constitutional,” “Concurrent List,” and examples like “do” versus “don’t”—and focus on whether statutes can coexist or produce absurd outcomes. Expect moderate to high difficulty as questions hinge on subtle distinctions between irreconcilable conflict and mere inconsistency, as well as on procedural versus substantive clashes.

Question-Specific Approaches

Q59: Examine whether CGST's mandatory invoicing over ₹50,000 and SVAT's ₹75,000 exemption are truly irreconcilable or can be harmonized under the "ridiculous consequences" test (lines 3–4).

Q60: Identify who bears the "burden of proof for repugnancy" (line 6) and determine if the May/July deadlines create an impossible dual-compliance scenario as required by "fully inconsistent and absolutely irreconcilable" (line 7).

Q61: Apply the harmonious-construction principle ("courts must interpret ... to coexist peacefully," line 7) to see if effluent-recycling by 2023 can be treated as a precursor to treatment by 2025 rather than a conflict.

Q62: Check whether accreditation and curriculum standards fall within "distinct domains" on the Concurrent List (line 9) and avoid presuming any inconsistency automatically triggers repugnancy.

Q63: Focus on the Supreme Court's holding that "overlapping offences with different penalties may coexist without repugnancy" (line 10) rather than treating penalty variation as a "do" versus "don't" conflict.

Q64: Contrast each statement against the passage's core tenets: the high threshold of "fully inconsistent and absolutely irreconcilable" (line 7), the challenger's burden of proof (line 6), and the presumption of constitutionality.

Legal Principles from the Passage

- **Doctrine of Repugnancy (Art. 254):** Applies when central and state statutes within concurrent domains cannot be reconciled.
- **Threshold for Repugnancy:** Laws must be "fully inconsistent and absolutely irreconcilable," producing absurd or impossible simultaneous application.
- **Harmonious Construction:** Even under conflict, courts must strive to interpret statutes so they can coexist peacefully.
- **Presumption of Constitutionality:** All laws are presumed valid; the onus is on the challenger to prove repugnancy.
- **Burden of Proof:** Lies with the party alleging repugnancy.
- **Concurrent List Scope:** Only statutes on Concurrent List subjects can potentially conflict; distinct but allied domains do not trigger repugnancy.
- **"Do" vs. "Don't" Conflict:** Clear contradictions (one law commands, another prohibits) invoke repugnancy.
- **Overlapping Offences:** Coexisting statutes criminalizing the same conduct with different penalties do not necessarily create repugnancy if simultaneous compliance is possible.

65. Answer: C (Difficulty: Medium)

In **Gujarat State Financial Corp. v Lotus Hotels**, the Supreme Court held that where a “clear promise ... is acted upon” by the promisee, the doctrine of promissory estoppel binds government instrumentalities and mandamus relief may issue (lines 4–7). Lotus Hotels incurred liabilities based on the sanction letter, establishing reliance and inequity if disbursement is withdrawn. Option A wrongly elevates unverified letters over the prior contractual promise; B falsely asserts estoppel cannot bind public bodies; D overgeneralizes administrative consistency without the reliance component.

66. Answer: A (Difficulty: Extremely Hard)

The passage makes clear that a Finance Minister’s statement on the floor “did not meant a promise or any form of representation to the assessee,” and thus cannot ground estoppel (line 10). Option A correctly applies this limitation. Option B overbroadly bars all policy announcements from estoppel, C misuses reliance absent intent to promise, and D incorrectly prioritizes administrative consistency over the need for a binding representation.

67. Answer: D (Difficulty: Extremely Hard)

In **Express Newspapers Pvt. Ltd. v Union of India**, the Supreme Court prevented mala fide executive forfeiture, emphasizing that executive actions “within the scope of [authority]” but tainted by “mala fide intention” cannot be enforced through equitable estoppel (lines 13–16). Option D captures both the bad-faith element and reliance on the lease. Option A ignores equity’s role in curbing executive overreach; B demands an explicit promise beyond ministerial approval; C omits the crucial mala fide factor.

68. Answer: B (Difficulty: Hard)

The doctrine “operates where the promise ... is within the scope of law” and the promisee “acted in accordance with the promise” (line 3). GreenStay’s land purchase and construction demonstrate reliance, and rescission creates inequity. Option B correctly applies these criteria. Option A mischaracterizes administrative circulars as per se non-binding; C improperly allows budget cuts to nullify a lawful promise; D overstates administrative consistency without addressing scope and reliance.

69. Answer: A (Difficulty: Extremely Hard)

Per **Union of India v Ganesh Rice Mills**, political assurances or oral statements by ministers do “not meant a promise or any form of representation” for estoppel purposes (line 10). Option A correctly applies this rule. Option B misplaces reliance and fairness above the necessity for a legal promise; C overlooks equitable relief when a genuine promise exists; D overextends equity to every government assurance regardless of its legal status.

70. Answer: D (Difficulty: Medium)

The passage explicitly states that promissory estoppel is “based on obligation or equity and is not based on vested right” (line 8), and makes no mention of consideration as an essential. Options A (clear promise), B (scope of law), and C (reliance) all reflect core elements. Option D adds a non-statutory requirement of consideration or vested rights and is therefore not essential.

Passage Overview & Reading Approach

The passage defines Promissory Estoppel as a promise which “is intended to create legal relations” and “is acted upon” by the promisee, making it “binding ... if it would be inequitable to allow [the promisor] to go back upon it” (line 1). It stresses administrative action be marked by “certainty, predictability and consistency” (line 2) and that the doctrine operates only where the promise “is within the scope of law” and the promisee has “act[ed] in accordance with the promise” (line 3). Key cases—**Lotus Hotels**, **Ganesh Rice Mills**, and **Express Newspapers**—illustrate its application (lines 4–7, 10–16). Takers should highlight the statutory elements (promise, scope, reliance, inequity) and note distinctions between binding promises and mere political statements.

Question-Specific Approaches

Q65: Map each element of estoppel—clear promise (lotus hotels loan), scope of law, reliance by petitioner, and inequity upon reneging (lines 4–7)—to decide enforceability against the State.

Q66: Focus on whether a ministerial statement on the floor of the House qualifies as a promise or representation within the doctrine (“did not meant a promise...,” line 10) to determine estoppel’s applicability.

Q67: Examine whether the State’s executive action (lease forfeiture) was within authority but tainted by mala fide intent, invoking estoppel to prevent fraud (“politically motivated ... mala fide intention,” line 16).

Q68: Test the general principle that estoppel applies only if the promise “is within the scope of law” (line 3) and the promisee “acted upon” it (line 1), then evaluate inequity.

Q69: Compare political statements or assurances not intended to create legal relations (line 10) against genuine contractual promises to distinguish where estoppel fails.

Q70: Isolate the passage’s core ingredients—promise, legal scope, reliance, inequity—and identify which listed element does **not** feature in the doctrine as described.

Legal Principles from the Passage

- **Elements of Promissory Estoppel:** (1) Clear promise intended to create legal relations, (2) Promise within the scope of law, (3) Promisee’s reliance on that promise, (4) Inequity in allowing the promisor to renege.
- **Administrative Certainty:** Estoppel promotes “certainty, predictability and consistency” in government action (line 2).
- **Scope of Law:** Only promises within legal authority bind the State (line 3).
- **Enforcement Against Government:** A writ of mandamus may enforce contractual promises when estoppel applies (Lotus Hotels, lines 4–7).
- **Limitation—Political Statements:** Floor-of-the-House statements are not promissory (Ganesh Rice Mills, lines 10–11).
- **Scope—Executive Acts:** Estoppel prevents mala fide or fraudulent exercise of executive power (Express Newspapers, lines 13–16).
- **Equity Over Vested Rights:** Estoppel is equitable, not based on vested rights (line 8), balancing individual and public interests (line 9).

71. Correct Option: C

Omega was intentionally deceived by Apex's promise of a non-existent 50% discount—an act of fraud (Section 17), which requires proof of dishonest intent (line 1) and knowingly false statements (line 4). This fraud induced Omega to enter the contract (line 5). Hence Omega may rescind the contract and claim damages for losses suffered under Section 17. Option A is incorrect because it describes misrepresentation, not fraud; damages for fraud do not depend on the defendant's belief (line 1). Option B is wrong: specific performance cannot compel Apex to honour a false promise that never legally existed (line 4). Option D is incorrect: negligence claims do not apply where intentional deception occurred (line 5).

72. Correct Option: C

BetaBuild's reliance on outdated municipal records and the resulting incorrect assurance about heritage restrictions constitutes misrepresentation under Section 18, as it stems from an honest mistake rather than deliberate deceit; the contract is therefore voidable, allowing rescission but not necessarily damages absent bad faith. Option A (fraud) is inapplicable because there was no dishonest intent or knowledge of falsity as required by Section 17. Option B (neither doctrine) is incorrect since even innocent errors vitiate consent under misrepresentation. Option D (estoppel) misreads the passage: public-record errors invoke misrepresentation, not equitable estoppel.

73. Correct Option: B

Innovate Labs' understatement of Gamma's royalty share was based on a genuine belief in Gamma's published figures—an innocent misrepresentation (line 2, line 7, line 8). Gamma must pay the correct 5% additional royalty, but cannot claim damages for fraud as no intent to deceive existed. Option A is wrong: this is not fraud. Option C is incorrect as misrepresentation does not void the entire royalty structure, only corrects the terms. Option D is incorrect because punitive damages require fraudulent intent under Section 17, not innocent mistakes.

74. Correct Option: A

Epsilon's three-month concealment of the misdelivery constitutes fraudulent concealment—intentional deception to prevent supply delays—fulfilling the dishonest intent requirement under Section 17 (line 1, line 4). DeltaEx may rescind and claim damages for resulting losses. Option B is incorrect: specific performance cannot remedy fraudulent concealment. Option C misclassifies deliberate concealment as innocent misrepresentation under Section 18, ignoring Epsilon's dishonest intent. Option D is wrong: misdelivery does not absolve liability when concealment amounts to fraud.

75. Correct Option: C

Terra Builders acted on honest instructions from Zeta, without any intent to mislead about seismic ratings—thus, this is an innocent misrepresentation under Section 18 (line 2, line 7). Zeta's remedy is rescission, not damages for fraud. Option A is incorrect: Terra lacked knowledge of required specifications and had no mala fide intent. Option B misapplies caveat emptor; contractual interpretation and misrepresentation law override buyer's sole responsibility. Option D is wrong: frustration applies only to supervening impossibility, not to contractual defects arising from misrepresentation.

76. Correct Option: C

The correct choice is C, because fraud under Section 17 entails deliberate deceit—knowingly making false statements or concealing material facts to secure an unfair contractual advantage—whereas misrepresentation under Section 18 arises from honest mistakes or negligence without any mala fide intent (lines 1–2, 7). Unlike Option A, which mistakenly swaps the burdens of proof by suggesting that fraud requires only negligence and misrepresentation demands proof of intent, the Act clearly assigns intent to fraud and innocent error to misrepresentation. Option B errs in its portrayal of remedies: the passage explains that fraud permits both rescission and damages, whereas misrepresentation—absent bad faith—is typically limited to rescission, not punitive relief. Finally, Option D ignores the fundamental role of intent, wrongly asserting that both doctrines hinge on reckless disregard; in fact, the presence or absence of dishonest intent is the very distinction that defines fraud versus misrepresentation.

77. Correct Option: D

The correct answer is **D**, because under Section 17 (fraud) and Section 18 (misrepresentation) both types of defective consent make a contract **voidable** at the aggrieved party's election, but **only fraud** carries an additional right to **claim damages** for losses suffered (Section 17: "aggrieved party ... is also entitled to claim damages" – line 5), whereas misrepresentation typically allows rescission **without** automatic entitlement to damages in the absence of mala fide intent (line 2). Options A, B, and C are incorrect because they misstate the statutory consequences: A is wrong since misrepresentation does permit rescission just like fraud, so it does offer the right to void the contract; B is incorrect as misrepresentation does not require proof of negligence for any remedy—rescission alone suffices, and fraud does not condition remedies on indemnity clauses; C is false because fraudulent contracts are not enforceable without rescission—in fact, they are voidable and subject to both rescission and damages, not "expressly enforceable" as stated.

Passage Summary & Reading Approach (4–5 lines):

The passage contrasts **fraud** (Section 17) and **misrepresentation** (Section 18) under the Indian Contract Act, 1872, emphasizing that both vitiate consent but differ in **intent**, **knowledge**, and **remedies**. Fraud requires **dishonest intent**—knowingly false statements or concealment—entitling the victim to **rescission** and **damages**. Misrepresentation arises from **honest error** without intent to deceive; it makes the contract voidable but generally allows only **rescission**, not damages. When reading, first pinpoint whether a scenario shows **intentional deception** or an **innocent mistake**, then map to the correct **section**, identify the appropriate **remedy**, and note the **burden of proof**.

2) Question-by-Question Approach (1–3 lines each):

- **Q71 (Fraudulent Discount Promise):**
Spot the sales manager's **intentional misstatement** about discounts and no belief in its truth—hallmarks of fraud. Link to Section 17 and recall that fraud → rescission + damages.
- **Q72 (Erroneous Municipal Records):**
Note BetaBuild's reliance on outdated records with **no intent to deceive**. This is a

classic misrepresentation under Section 18, allowing rescission but no damages absent bad faith.

- **Q73 (Understated Royalties):**
Identify Innovate's **innocent error** in reading financials. Under Section 18, correct the royalty share and pay interest—no fraud damages because there was no mala fide intent.
- **Q74 (Concealed Misdelivery):**
Epsilon's three-month concealment of the mix-up shows **deliberate deceit**, fitting Section 17 fraud. The remedy is rescission plus damages for losses caused by the concealment.
- **Q75 (Missing Seismic Specs):**
Notice Terra followed Zeta's specs **in good faith**, unaware of omissions. This is misrepresentation (Section 18): voidable contract, rescission available, but no fraud damages.
- **Q76 (Doctrine Distinction):**
Compare definitions: fraud = deliberate falsehood; misrepresentation = honest mistake. Intent is the key differentiator—focus on Sections 17 vs. 18.
- **Q77 (Remedy Difference):**
Both doctrines allow **voiding** the contract, but only **fraud** carries an **additional right to damages** for losses (Section 17), whereas misrepresentation generally does not.

3) Legal Principles from the Passage (in pointers):

- **Definition of Fraud (Section 17):**
 - Intentional deception to secure unfair advantage.
 - Includes knowingly false statements, concealment of facts, promises without intent to perform.
 - **Essence:** Dishonest intent and knowledge of falsity.
- **Definition of Misrepresentation (Section 18):**
 - False statements made **without intent** to deceive.
 - Arises from honest mistakes, negligence, or misunderstandings.
 - **Essence:** Inadvertent error with genuine belief in truth.
- **Effect on Consent:**
 - Both fraud and misrepresentation **vitiates consent**, rendering the contract **voidable** at the election of the aggrieved party.
- **Remedies for Fraud:**
 - **Rescission** of the contract (undoing the agreement).
 - **Damages** for losses suffered, because of the deliberate deception.
- **Remedies for Misrepresentation:**
 - **Rescission** of the contract.
 - **No automatic damages**, unless additional negligence or statutory provision applies.
- **Burden of Proof:**
 - In fraud, the claimant must prove **dishonest intent**—that the false statement was made knowingly or recklessly.
 - In misrepresentation, no need to prove intent—only that a false statement was made.

- **Contractual Basis Not Required:**
 - Both doctrines apply **even in absence** of a separate written agreement external to the contract itself.
- **Mala Fide vs. Bona Fide:**
 - Fraud requires **mala fide** (bad faith).
 - Misrepresentation can be **bona fide** (good faith).
- **Voidable vs. Void:**
 - Contracts affected by fraud or misrepresentation are **voidable**, not automatically void; the aggrieved party must elect to rescind.
- **Equitable Principles:**
 - These doctrines reflect the Act's underlying commitment to **justice and equity**, ensuring no party profits unfairly at another's expense.
- **Practical Distinctions:**
 - **Fraud** carries **heavier legal consequences** (damages + rescission).
 - **Misrepresentation** is treated more **leniently** due to absence of dishonest intent.
- **Illustrative Examples:**
 - Falsely promising authority to sell property—fraud.
 - Relying on outdated land records—misrepresentation.
- **Purpose of Sections 17 & 18:**
 - To protect parties from **unfair advantages** taken by intentional or inadvertent falsehoods, preserving the integrity of contractual relations.

78. Correct Option: C

Under the Act, an assembly of five or more whose purpose changes to resisting lawful orders (a prohibited objective) becomes unlawful (line 1). Once the objective shifts, all present members are liable, regardless of individual action (line 2). Option A wrongly limits liability to promoters. Option B ignores that mere presence, after object change, suffices. Option D is incorrect because the assembly's shift to resisting police orders constitutes use of force, not property damage.

79. Correct Option: D

Encouraging others to join an unlawful assembly is punishable as membership, even without physical presence (line 3). The three echoing the incitement thus face liability. Option A misstates rioting: incitement alone isn't rioting without violence (line 5). Option B incorrectly applies unlawful assembly to the entire group despite no coordinated action. Option C ignores the statutory punishment for encouragement.

80. Correct Option: A

When a lawful gathering's object shifts to violence, the principle of constructive liability makes all members present equally guilty of ensuing offences, regardless of physical participation (line 4). Option B misapplies constructive liability only to active perpetrators. Option C is wrong because passivity cannot absolve liability after object change. Option D contradicts the rule that lawfulness ends when the object changes (line 1).

81. Correct Option: B

Rioting requires that any member's use of violence in pursuit of an unlawful objective

makes all members guilty of rioting (line 5). Here, the rock-thrower's violence transforms the assembly's objective, implicating the five workers. Option A limits rioting to the perpetrator alone, against the collective nature of the offence. Option C mistakenly excludes mere encouragement, despite its inclusion. Option D ignores that illegal force, not the legitimacy of wage demands, defines rioting.

82. Correct Option: B

Whether the original assembly's character changes upon part splitting is irrelevant; any offence by a subgroup in furtherance of an unlawful object implicates the entire assembly present when the offence occurred (line 4). Option A wrongly confines liability to vandals. Option C misinterprets that members at the time of offence are liable. Option D incorrectly penalizes peaceful marchers absent facilitation or encouragement.

83. Correct Option: C

Constructive liability holds all members of an unlawful assembly equally guilty for offences committed to further the common unlawful object, irrespective of personal involvement (line 4). Option A contradicts collective liability. Option B adds a voting requirement not in the text. Option D incorrectly grants exemption to non-violent participants, against the passage's clear group accountability.

84. Correct Option: C

An unlawful assembly is defined by a prohibited common object among five or more, whereas rioting is the specific offence when any member uses violence to pursue that object, with all members guilty (line 5). Option A misdefines unlawful assembly as irrespective of objective. Option B misstates that rioting hinges on threats to government institutions. Option D ignores that violence is the distinguishing element for rioting.

1) Passage Summary & Reading Approach (4–5 lines):

The passage defines an **unlawful assembly** as five or more persons with a common unlawful purpose—using or threatening force against the state or to commit offences (lines 1–2). It explains that a peaceful gathering becomes unlawful if its objective shifts into prohibited categories, triggering **collective liability** for all members (lines 1–4). If any member employs violence, the assembly commits **rioting**, making every participant guilty (line 5). To read effectively, first chart the **three key concepts**—unlawful assembly, constructive liability, rioting—then note how each builds on the previous, and track the shift from individual acts to group accountability. Focus on the **definitions**, the **conditions** that transform lawfulness into criminality, and the **scope of liability**—central to answering nuanced questions on who is punishable and why.

2) Question-by-Question Approaches (1–3 lines each):

- **Q78 (Who counts as unlawful assembly?):**
Identify the moment the objective “changes to resist lawful orders” (line 2) and apply that to all present members, per the definition in lines 1–2.
- **Q79 (Liability for incitement):**
Look at “encourages others ... is punishable as though they were a member” (line 3); determine who “encouraged” and treat them as members.

- **Q80 (Constructive liability for changed purpose):**
Locate the rule “assembly ... becomes unlawful if its common object changes” and “every person ... is held equally guilty” (line 4) to include even passive members.
- **Q81 (Group rioting charges):**
Note “if any member ... uses force ... all members are guilty of rioting” (line 5) to extend rioting liability across the group.
- **Q82 (Split-off subgroup offence):**
Rely on “offence committed ... in furtherance of the group’s common object” (line 4) to decide whether the entire original group shares liability.
- **Q83 (Define constructive liability):**
Match the phrase “every person ... is held equally guilty” (line 4) to the notion of constructive liability.
- **Q84 (Distinguish unlawful assembly vs. rioting):**
Contrast the definitions: assembly’s prohibited object (lines 1–2) vs. rioting’s requirement of actual violence (line 5).

3) Legal Principles from the Passage (in pointers):

- **Unlawful Assembly Definition:**
 - Five or more persons sharing a common objective in prohibited categories (line 1).
 - Prohibited purposes include use/threat of criminal force against government or to commit offences (line 1).
- **Lawful to Unlawful Transition:**
 - A gathering that begins lawfully becomes unlawful if its object changes to a prohibited one (lines 1–2).
- **Encouragement Liability:**
 - Anyone who hires, engages, promotes, or encourages joining is punishable as a member, even if absent (line 3).
- **Constructive Liability:**
 - If an offence is committed by any member in furtherance of the unlawful object, **every member present** is equally guilty, regardless of personal participation (line 4).
- **Rioting Definition and Group Liability:**
 - When any member uses violence to pursue the unlawful object, **all members** are guilty of rioting—a specific offence (line 5).
- **Scope of Collective Criminality:**
 - Liability extends not just to active perpetrators but to instigators and facilitators (lines 3–4).
- **Deterrence Objective:**
 - Collective accountability serves as a deterrent against group-based criminal conduct and preserves public order (last line).
- **Progressive Framework:**
 - The law moves from identifying prohibited purposes, to recognizing transformation of the group’s objective, to imposing escalating liabilities—from unlawful assembly to constructive liability to rioting.
- **Public Order Protection:**

- These principles underscore the state's interest in preventing group violence and maintaining public peace.
- **No Distinction of Degree:**
 - Group members share equal guilt for collective actions, emphasizing solidarity in liability.

85. Answer: C

The Supreme Court's framework is fundamentally premised on the notion that language and representation in visual media significantly shape societal attitudes and the self-perception of persons with disabilities. By highlighting that terms like "cripple" and "spastic" perpetuate negative self-image and discriminatory attitudes, the Court clearly relies on the idea that how disabilities are portrayed has real, lasting impacts. Options A, B, and D are inconsistent with the passage: the focus is not on medical interventions (A), nor is the Court asserting absolute artistic freedom (B), and there is no suggestion that documentaries are exempt from oversight (D).

86. Answer: D

From the passage's emphasis on "nothing about us, without us" and the Court's directive to involve persons with disabilities in content creation, it follows that such involvement is expected to yield more accurate portrayals and reduce stigma. There is no mention of criminal sanctions for derogatory language (A), the RPwD Act does not prohibit portrayals outright (B), and the passage repeatedly stresses the importance of addressing social barriers rather than downplaying them in favor of medical conditions (C).

87. Answer: A

The guideline to involve persons with disabilities embodies the principle of "nothing about us, without us" and logically empowers accurate representation. This conclusion follows directly from the passage's insistence that creators include PwDs in assessment and production. In contrast, Option B misconstrues the breadth of "social barriers," Option C directly contradicts the instruction to avoid terms like "suffering," and Option D conflates an unrelated statute with the Court's media-focused guidelines.

88. Answer: B

Underlying the Court's instruction to avoid individualising language such as "victim" and "afflicted" is the assumption that such terms perpetuate negative stereotypes by focusing solely on the impairment and ignoring the social barriers that disable individuals. The passage makes clear that the problem lies not merely in physical conditions but in the social contexts that marginalise PwDs. Options A and C are refuted by the Court's very rationale, and Option D is at odds with the directive that creators do bear responsibility for how their language shapes public perception.

89. Answer: C

The rationale for the Court's guidelines is strengthened most by evidence showing that recurring exposure to derogatory labels fosters internalised stigma and social exclusion among PwDs. This empirical support validates the Court's concern about the profound impact of language on dignity and identity. Options A and D are irrelevant to the specific

issue of language and stigma, while Option B, by suggesting media portrayals have no effect on attitudes, would actually undermine rather than reinforce the Court's reasoning.

90. Answer: A

The argument that the terms “afflicted” and “victim” should be avoided is most weakened if, in fact, a majority of persons with disabilities themselves prefer these descriptors as accurate reflections of their experiences. Such a finding would undercut the Court's claim that these terms are universally harmful. Options B, C, and D fail to directly challenge the premise that individualising language is detrimental: B addresses social barriers, C focuses on practical production concerns, and D calls for broader legal reform rather than disputing the specific language guideline.

Passage Summary & Reading Approach

The passage outlines a Supreme Court ruling that introduces guidelines to eliminate derogatory stereotypes of persons with disabilities (PwDs) in films and documentaries. It emphasises how language and portrayal shape both public attitudes and the self-image of PwDs, calling for the avoidance of terms like “cripple,” “spastic,” “victim,” and “suffering.” Creators must adopt the “nothing about us, without us” principle by involving PwDs in content development to ensure accuracy and dignity. When reading, test takers should note (1) the Court's underlying rationale—language's impact on stigma—(2) the key terminology the guidelines target, and (3) the participatory remedy they prescribe. The difficulty lies in distinguishing subtly different legal models (medical, social, human-rights) and mapping them onto specific doctrinal claims in the text.

Question-Wise Approach Notes

- **Q85 (Premise Identification):**
Approach: Identify the foundational statement the framework rests on. Scan for explicit “because...” language explaining why the guidelines exist. Here, focus on statements linking representation to societal attitudes.
- **Q86 (Inference):**
Approach: Look for what must be true if the premises hold. Inferences aren't directly stated but follow logically—spot the Court's participatory mandate (“nothing about us...”) and infer its intended effect.
- **Q87 (Conclusion):**
Approach: Find what logically follows given the guidelines. Conclusions restate consequences embedded in the text. Match the participatory principle to its practical outcome.
- **Q88 (Assumption):**
Approach: Identify unstated beliefs that must hold for the guideline to make sense. Here, ask: why avoid “victim”? What belief about language and barriers underlies that directive?
- **Q89 (Strengthen):**
Approach: Choose new information that best supports the Court's rationale. Seek empirical evidence about the effects of derogatory language, since that is the Court's core concern.

- **Q90 (Weaken):**

Approach: Introduce a fact that most directly undercuts the guideline's premise. Find an alternative reality that contradicts the Court's claim about harm caused by individualising terms.

Elaborate Brief on Logical Elements

- **Premises:**
 1. Language in media shapes societal attitudes toward PwDs.
 2. Terms like "cripple," "spastic," "victim" foster stigma and negative self-image.
 3. Social barriers, not merely impairments, disable individuals.
 4. Involving PwDs in content creation yields more accurate, respectful portrayals.
- **Inferences:**
 1. Participatory inclusion of PwDs will reduce stereotyping.
 2. Avoiding derogatory terms will lessen internalised stigma.
 3. The human rights model obliges both state and private actors to facilitate inclusion.
- **Conclusions:**
 1. Creators must end mocking portrayals and adopt respectful language.
 2. The "nothing about us, without us" principle is central to authentic representation.
 3. Existing disability statutes provide the legal backdrop but media guidelines fill a gap.
- **Arguments:**
 1. **Core Argument:** Negative media language perpetuates discrimination; guidelines are needed to protect dignity and identity.
 2. **Supporting Argument:** Empirical and legal models (medical vs social vs human-rights) converge on the need for societal change beyond medical treatment.
- **Assumptions:**
 1. Audiences internalise and replicate media stereotypes.
 2. PwDs can meaningfully contribute to creative decisions.
 3. Legal guidelines will influence industry practice absent criminal penalties.
- **Paradoxes & Tensions:**
 1. **Artistic Freedom vs. Social Responsibility:** Balancing creative license with protection of vulnerable groups.
 2. **Medical vs. Social Models:** The tension between framing disability as a personal health issue and as a socially constructed barrier.
 3. **Abstract Rights vs. Practical Implementation:** The human-rights model's aspirational scope versus the challenge of enforcing guidelines in diverse media industries.

91. Answer: A

The author's argument rests on the premise that genuine creativity in writing emerges from personal experience and emotional insight—dimensions inherently tied to human consciousness and which AI, lacking true feelings or consciousness, cannot authentically

reproduce. This premise is foundational: it explains why innovative writers who bring emotional depth and novel perspectives remain irreplaceable. Option B is incorrect because the author explicitly denies that all formulaic writers will “inevitably” be replaced; rather, they face a heightened risk. Option C is directly refuted by the text’s assertion that AI “doesn’t feel” and lacks consciousness. Option D misrepresents the industry’s stance: the passage acknowledges the continued value of human writing, not its wholesale devaluation. Thus, A captures the key assumption supporting the entire argument.

92. Answer: B

From the passage’s clear division between “innovators” and “formulaic” writers, one can infer that the risk of replacement by AI correlates strongly with a writer’s originality and depth. The text repeatedly contrasts the two writer types, warning that derivative writers “might find AI encroaching on their territory” because AI can handle unoriginal content efficiently. Option A is incorrect: while the author mentions AI assisting with research, they do not claim it negates human researchers’ roles. Option C is unsupported; the author notes AI cannot yet master nuance, tone, and cultural references. Option D is wrong because the passage distinguishes how “innovative” and “formulaic” writers will benefit differently from AI—so they will not benefit equally.

93. Answer: C

The passage concludes that innovative writers who “push boundaries, challenge norms, and introduce perspectives” will maintain their value even as AI advances, because these contributions hinge on genuine creativity. Option A is too absolute—while human nuance remains important, the passage does not claim formulaic writing is “entirely immune” to automation. Option B is irrelevant to the writing-AI discussion. Option D overstates AI’s limitations; although AI “doesn’t feel,” the author concedes it can still generate superficial content that “reads well at a glance,” so it is not “useless” even for simple tasks. Hence, C accurately captures the author’s concluding claim about innovators’ enduring value.

94. Answer: D

The claim that “for innovators, AI is more of a tool than a threat” presupposes that innovative writers’ value derives mainly from qualities—originality and emotional depth—that AI cannot duplicate. Option A is incorrect since the author explicitly describes AI assisting innovators with research and idea organization. Option B misstates AI’s current capabilities: the passage admits AI can suggest alternative phrasings and organize ideas. Option C is false because the author warns formulaic content *can* be produced by AI. Only Option D articulates the necessary assumption that drives the distinction between innovators (whose value lies in uniquely human traits) and formulaic writers.

95. Answer: A

A study showing that best-selling authors rely centrally on personal experiences and emotional journeys—the very elements AI cannot authentically simulate—directly reinforces the author’s claim that innovative writers remain irreplaceable. This evidence underscores the unique human contributions that shield innovators from replacement. Option B, indicating readers can’t distinguish AI from human work on routine topics, actually undermines the argument’s distinction. Option C is counterproductive to the author’s view, since evidence that AI can now mimic emotional resonance would blur the

innovator/formulaic divide. Option D is tangential, speaking to budget cuts rather than the nature of AI versus human creativity.

96. Answer: A

The correct answer is A, because if AI-generated content routinely fails to meet the consistency and coherence standards inherent in formulaic writing—prompting editors to favor human-authored drafts—then formulaic writers would retain their competitive edge and the author’s claim that AI uniquely threatens them would collapse. Option B actually reinforces the author’s point by showing AI’s mastery of formulaic patterns. Option C, suggesting readers distrust human writing in favor of AI, would imply innovators and formulaic writers alike are at risk rather than singling out formulaic work. Option D’s legal requirement for human bylines protects all writers equally and therefore does nothing to undermine the specific vulnerability of formulaic authors the author identifies.

Passage Summary & Reading Approach

The author—a publishing veteran turned AI observer—argues that AI’s threat to writers hinges on originality: pioneering, emotionally resonant writers remain irreplaceable, while formulaic authors risk displacement as AI masters routine content. Writing is portrayed not as mere text-assembly but as the conveyance of human experience, nuance, and voice—qualities beyond AI’s consciousness. Yet even formulaic work demands subtlety in tone, context, and cultural reference. When reading, test takers should track the central distinction between “innovative” and “derivative” writers, note the examples illustrating AI’s strengths and limits, and map each claim back to the author’s core thesis about human creativity vs. machine mimicry. The difficulty arises in untangling closely related ideas (e.g., “tool vs. threat,” “derivative vs. original”) and attributing each statement to premise, inference, or conclusion.

Question-Wise Approach Notes

- **Q91 (Premise Identification):**
Approach: Scan for the foundational claim the entire argument rests on. Here, locate the statement about creativity’s human roots—this underpins the “innovative vs. formulaic” divide.
- **Q92 (Inference):**
Approach: Ask “what must be true if the author’s classification holds?” Identify the implied consequence for derivative writers versus innovators.
- **Q93 (Conclusion):**
Approach: Determine which outcome the author directly endorses as a logical endpoint—spot the assertion about innovators’ enduring value.
- **Q94 (Assumption):**
Approach: Uncover the unstated belief connecting “innovators → tool” by AI; ask what quality of innovators makes AI assistive rather than threatening.
- **Q95 (Strengthen):**
Approach: Look for evidence that bolsters the key distinction—find data showing that human-only attributes (e.g., personal emotional journeys) remain beyond AI’s reach.

- **Q96 (Weaken):**

Approach: Introduce a fact that undercuts the central claim—identify a scenario in which AI fully replicates formulaic writing, thereby narrowing the gap between “derivative” and “innovative.”

Elaborate Brief on Logical Elements

- **Premises:**

1. AI can generate pattern-based, coherent content quickly.
2. Innovative writing depends on genuine human creativity, emotion, and consciousness.
3. Formulaic writing relies on established templates and predictable structures.
4. Readers value authentic voice, nuance, and personal connection.

- **Inferences:**

1. Writers lacking originality face greater substitution risk as AI masters routine patterns.
2. Involving AI in research and drafting assists innovators without replacing their core role.
3. AI’s inability to feel or think like humans limits its capacity for truly novel expression.

- **Conclusions:**

1. Innovative writers remain irreplaceable and will continue to hold value.
2. Formulaic writers must adapt or risk displacement by AI tools.
3. AI is best conceived as an augmentation tool for creative professionals.

- **Arguments:**

1. **Core Argument:** The replaceability of writers by AI is not universal but depends on the depth and originality of their work.
2. **Supporting Argument:** AI’s technical ability to mimic patterns does not extend to authentic emotional or experiential depth.

- **Assumptions:**

1. Human consciousness and subjective experience are indispensable for genuine creativity.
2. AI lacks any latent form of sentience or emotional understanding capable of original thought.
3. The publishing and reading markets will continue to favor authenticity over pure efficiency.

- **Paradoxes & Tensions:**

1. **Tool vs. Threat:** AI simultaneously empowers and endangers writers, depending on their style.
2. **Efficiency vs. Depth:** What makes AI efficient (pattern replication) is precisely what makes it shallow.
3. **Universal Access vs. Exclusive Insight:** Democratization of content creation through AI may dilute the very nuance that distinguishes human artistry.

97. Answer: B

A foundational premise of the author’s critique is that our intense focus on historical debates—whether about nationalism or the Emergency—stems from an inability to imagine

alternative futures. The passage explicitly notes that “we are litigating the past partly because we are at a dead end when it comes to imagining the future,” which underlies the entire argument against endless boundary-setting over past figures. Option A is incorrect because the author does not claim history is *primarily* inspirational; rather, they stress its misuse as political armament. Option C is wrong: the paper emphasises that nationalism’s definition and moral valence shift across time and context. Option D misreads the argument: ethical concerns are elevated, not relegated, and the critique centers on ethical as well as intellectual failures in historical debates.

98. Answer: D

From the discussion of admired figures—Nehru, Gandhi, Ambedkar—and the warning that invoking them without fresh thinking risks substituting their judgments for our own, we can infer that overemphasis on these figures can block the creation of novel political visions. The author’s call to ask “Are the debates we are having the ones the next generation ought to inherit?” implies that clinging to past frameworks hinders new approaches. Option A is incorrect: though Nehru is mentioned, the author never dismisses his relevance entirely. Option B is too narrow, as the passage acknowledges multiple reasons “roads not taken” remain closed. Option C is unfounded: the ethical worry the author raises about present divisions is intimately connected to how we debate history, so it’s not unrelated.

99. Answer: C

The author argues that merely sorting nationalisms into “good” and “bad” categories does not expand our political imagination but rather reinforces nationalism’s grip. Hence, the logical conclusion is that this boundary-setting exercise fails to advance our capacity for fresh thinking. Option A is incorrect because the author does not advocate abandoning historical inquiry altogether—only its uncritical replay. Option B overstates the argument: the paper criticises certain debates as ethically fraught but does not label all boundary-setting discussions inherently unethical. Option D is irrelevant; while the Emergency is mentioned, there is no claim that its diagnosis was fundamentally flawed by nostalgia.

100. Answer: A

The claim that we “cannot build a future by relying perpetually on the crutches of whichever figure we admire” presupposes that modern crises require frameworks adapted to contemporary realities, not unmodified past solutions. Option B is too extreme: the author acknowledges we can “draw from” past thinkers, so they do see some relevance. Option C is false: the paper warns explicitly that moral clarity about past ideologies does *not* guarantee sound politics today. Option D is unrelated; free speech and other ethical debates are presented as requiring fresh diagnoses, not untouched by historical context.

101. Answer: B

Surveys demonstrating that countries emphasizing future-oriented discourse over historical debates achieve higher political innovation directly bolster the author’s contention that an excessive past focus stifles imaginative policymaking. This empirical backing validates the core claim. Option A is incorrect because it suggests deep historical engagement alone yields cohesion—an idea antithetical to the author’s warning that such engagement can ossify thought. Option C, while highlighting polarization, does not speak to the hindrance of

political imagination. Option D directly contradicts the argument by promoting past revisiting as a solution rather than a barrier.

102. Answer: C

If historical cases can be shown where nations that frequently debated their past went on to pioneer innovative futures, this evidence would undermine the author's assertion that litigating history impedes forward-looking imagination. It would demonstrate that past focus and future innovation can coexist. Option A actually supports the author's position by suggesting historical debate fosters critical thinking, which is not the same as visionary future planning. Option B is too neutral: showing no *impact* is neither a strong counterexample nor a direct challenge. Option D addresses ethical issue isolation but does not affect the central claim about the relation between historical debate and future vision.

Passage Summary & Reading Approach

The author critiques our obsession with past debates—especially around Indian nationalism and historical figures like Nehru and Gandhi—as a symptom of imaginative paralysis about the future. Drawing on Murakami's meditation on time, the passage argues that endless boundary-setting over “good” versus “bad” nationalisms enforces the very horizon we seek to escape. Three dangers follow: flawed political diagnoses, failure to historicise even our heroes properly, and ethical neglect of present-day divisions. Test-takers should focus on the central tension between past fixation and future creativity, note each of the three dangers and how they differ, and pay attention to how examples of admired figures both illuminate and constrain thinking.

Question-Wise Approach Notes

- **Q97 (Premise Identification):**
Approach: Locate the foundational claim explaining why historical debates dominate contemporary discourse. Look for explicit statements linking past-focus to present-day dead ends.
- **Q98 (Inference):**
Approach: Infer unstated consequences of relying on past figures. Ask: if endless invocation of icons is problematic, what must logically follow about imagining new visions?
- **Q99 (Conclusion):**
Approach: Identify the outcome the author wants you to accept. Look for what the text says about boundary-setting over nationalism and its (lack of) effect on political imagination.
- **Q100 (Assumption):**
Approach: Uncover the hidden belief that underpins the warning against “crutches” of admired figures. Ask: why can't we simply reuse past frameworks for modern crises?
- **Q101 (Strengthen):**
Approach: Choose evidence that most directly supports the claim that focusing on history hinders future innovation. Seek data contrasting future-oriented discourse with historical immersion.

- **Q102 (Weaken):**

Approach: Introduce a fact that contradicts the idea that litigating the past stifles forward-thinking. Find real-world cases where historical debate co-occurred with creative, novel policy outcomes.

Elaborate Brief on Logical Elements

- **Premises:**

1. Intense debates over historical nationalism signal a “dead end” in imagining the future.
2. Boundary-setting over “good” vs. “bad” nationalisms reinforces the same horizon rather than transcending it.
3. Admired figures, though inspirational, are insufficient substitutes for contemporary thought.

- **Inferences:**

1. Overreliance on past icons leads to intellectual stagnation.
2. Effective future-oriented politics requires novel frameworks, not recycled ones.
3. Ethical debates over current issues demand fresh diagnoses, not just historical analogy.

- **Conclusions:**

1. Mere moral sorting of nationalisms fails to expand political imagination.
2. Historical inquiry must be balanced with forward-looking creativity.
3. The next generation should inherit questions suited to present challenges, not unexamined legacies.

- **Arguments:**

1. **Core Argument:** Fixation on past debates impoverishes our capacity to craft new political visions.
2. **Supporting Argument:** Even “good” nationalisms carried blind spots; thus, past examples cannot guarantee virtuous outcomes.

- **Assumptions:**

1. Novel political challenges cannot be met using unmodified historical templates.
2. Intellectual rigor demands historicising figures, not idolising them.
3. Ethical deliberation about present-day issues is undermined by endless historical litigation.

- **Paradoxes & Tensions:**

1. **Memory vs. Innovation:** How to honour history without letting it become a prison.
2. **Inspiration vs. Dependency:** Thoughtful engagement with icons risk turning into intellectual crutches.
3. **Ethical Urgency vs. Historical Fixation:** Debating past wrongs may distract from resolving urgent contemporary divisions.

103. Answer: C

The author repeatedly emphasises that weaknesses at any point in the SOP chain—from question-setting through strongroom storage to invigilation—create opportunities for

malpractice, undermining the exam's integrity. This notion is the bedrock of the argument: without airtight procedures at every step, irregularities inevitably occur. Option A, while true about NEET's scale, is contextual background rather than the core premise. Option B overstates parental motives, which the passage notes but does not use to ground its governance argument. Option D reflects the coaching centres' hypothesis about rank distributions, but the author treats that as a consequence, not the foundational premise.

104. Answer: D

The passage details how both primary and backup question papers were accessed and misdistributed—"How were both sets ... accessed almost simultaneously?"—signalling major lapses in paper security protocols. From this, we can infer serious procedural failures in safeguarding exam materials. Option A is unsupported: although media coverage helped brands, there's no claim of lasting reputational damage. Option B is false: the passage states no extra time was initially given, and grace marks were later scrapped. Option C contradicts the text, which describes investigations as ongoing yet unresolved.

105. Answer: C

Given the cascade of errors—from wrong paper distribution to undone grace marks—the author concludes that only a thorough investigation of every link (paper setters, banks' strongrooms, invigilators, etc.) can determine whether these were malpractices or mere mistakes. Option A is speculative and beyond the passage's scope. Option B misallocates responsibility: the author distributes accountability across all SOP stakeholders, not just coaching centres. Option D is unargued; the author criticises SOP failures rather than arguing for the model's abolition.

106. Answer: A

The insistence that "there cannot be any weak link in the chain" assumes that a single point of failure can taint the entire process and compromise fairness. Without this belief, the author could tolerate isolated lapses rather than demanding total compliance. Option B is irrelevant—the passage never ranks security levels of primary vs. backup papers. Option C misattributes the cause of score inflation solely to leakage, ignoring the broader SOP context. Option D conflicts with the text, which shows coaching centres vigorously seeking to expose any governance failures.

107. Answer: B

A whistle-blower report confirming multiple unauthorised, unlogged accesses to the backup question-paper bank directly reinforces the claim that poor SOP compliance facilitates malpractice. This evidence underlines the systemic nature of weak links. Option A, by isolating the incident, weakens rather than strengthens the idea of pervasive compliance failures. Option C speaks to grace-mark uniformity—a downstream effect—not SOP security. Option D focuses on coaching centres' legal tactics, which does not substantiate procedural lapses in exam administration.

108. Answer: D

If independent investigations unanimously found no substantive wrongdoing—and attributed irregularities to innocent human errors unrelated to SOP design—this would directly challenge the author's assertion that weak SOP links are the root of malpractice. It

suggests that even with proper SOPs, human fallibility can still cause errors, undermining the argument's central claim. Option A, despite proving compliance, still acknowledges leakage, which doesn't weaken the link between SOP and malpractice. Option B legitimises grace marks procedure, but does not address paper security. Option C shifts blame to printing, yet printing is part of the SOP chain; procedural rigor would include accurate press labeling, so this does not undermine the need for strong SOPs.

Passage Summary & Reading Approach

The passage examines governance failures during this year's NEET exam—score inflation, misdistribution of primary and backup question papers, withheld extra time, and scrapped grace marks—to argue that any weak link in the Standard Operating Procedure (SOP) chain jeopardises exam integrity. High stakes (multicore fees, parental prestige) amplify vulnerability to malpractice, demanding foolproof protocols from paper setters to invigilators. Test-takers should focus on the central theme of SOP fragility, track concrete failures (wrong paper distribution, unauthorized access), and note how each example illustrates the argument that only a comprehensive investigation can uncover substantive wrongdoing. Difficulty lies in discerning the multi-step causal chain and mapping examples to abstract governance principles.

Question-Wise Approach Notes

- **Q103 (Premise Identification):**
Approach: Look for the foundational claim about why NEET's credibility falters. Identify statements tying weak SOP links to malpractice rather than background context or consequences.
- **Q104 (Inference):**
Approach: Determine what logically follows from descriptions of paper-set access failures. Spot the implied severity of procedural lapses in safeguarding exam materials.
- **Q105 (Conclusion):**
Approach: Ask what the author believes is required to resolve the SOP failures. Isolate statements about the necessity of thorough investigation versus other remedies or model changes.
- **Q106 (Assumption):**
Approach: Identify the unstated belief that motivates the claim against any weak link. Consider why the author insists on zero tolerance for SOP lapses.
- **Q107 (Strengthen):**
Approach: Choose new evidence reinforcing the link between poor SOP compliance and malpractice. Seek concrete reports of unauthorized protocol breaches.
- **Q108 (Weaken):**
Approach: Find a fact that undermines the argument that SOP weaknesses cause malpractice. Introduce outcomes showing errors despite strict SOP adherence or unrelated human error.

Elaborate Brief on Logical Elements

- **Premises:**

1. NEET's high stakes (cost, prestige) make it vulnerable to irregularities.
 2. SOPs govern every exam step—from question setting to admissions.
 3. Any weak link in this chain can trigger malpractice and chaos.
- **Inferences:**
 1. Simultaneous access to primary and backup papers implies serious security breaches.
 2. Panic over wrong paper distribution reflects inadequate contingency protocols.
 3. Scrapped grace marks reveal reactive, not planned, governance responses.
 - **Conclusions:**
 1. Only a comprehensive investigation can distinguish errors from malpractices.
 2. NEET's integrity demands airtight SOP compliance at every stage.
 3. Accountability must extend across all stakeholders—not just exam centres.
 - **Arguments:**
 1. **Core Argument:** Weak SOP links—from printing presses to strongrooms—fatally compromise exam fairness.
 2. **Supporting Argument:** Concrete failures (wrong papers, unauthorized access) exemplify systemic vulnerability.
 - **Assumptions:**
 1. A single SOP breach can invalidate the entire examination process.
 2. Malpractice occurs only through procedural failures, not random chance.
 3. Media coverage and coaching-centre politics do not substitute for formal investigation.
 - **Paradoxes & Tensions:**
 1. **Visibility vs. Verification:** Public uproar highlights flaws, but only private investigations yield proof.
 2. **Centralisation vs. Control:** A unified exam model magnifies stakes and scale, yet magnifies the impact of any weak link.
 3. **Reactive vs. Proactive Governance:** Emergency fixes (grace marks) illustrate reactive governance, contrasting with the need for proactive, foolproof SOPs.

109. Answer: C

Difficulty: Hard

Explanation:

- **Vault revenue:** Vault units occupy 20% of 60,000 m² = 12,000 m² total; base rent ₹350/m² ⇒ 12,000 × 350 = ₹4,200,000 (line 2).
- **Total base rent revenue:**
 - Standard: 50% of 60,000 m² = 30,000 m² × ₹100 = ₹3,000,000
 - Climate-Controlled: 30% = 18,000 m² × ₹180 = ₹3,240,000
 - Vault: ₹4,200,000
 - Sum = ₹10,440,000 (line 2).
- **Vault's percentage share:** (4,200,000 / 10,440,000) × 100 ≈ 40.229% → **40.23%**.
- **Why A (20%) is incorrect:** 20% is area share, not revenue share; vault's higher rent/m² yields a larger revenue share (line 2).
- **Why B (30.5%) is incorrect:** That miscalculates by ignoring one of the tiers.

- **Why D (50%) is incorrect:** Only possible if vault rent far exceeded other tiers; it does not.

110. Answer: A

Difficulty: Medium

Explanation:

- **Average unit areas:** Standard = (50% of 60,000 m²) / 60 = 500 m²; Climate = (30% of 60,000 m²) / 40 = 450 m² ¶line 1–2¶.
- **Base rents:** Standard = 500 m² × ₹100 = ₹50,000; Climate = 450 m² × ₹180 = ₹81,000 ¶line 2¶.
- **Combined base rent:** ₹50,000 + ₹81,000 = ₹131,000.
- **After 8% discount:** 131,000 × 0.92 = ₹120,520 ¶line 3¶.
- **Why B (₹122,640) is incorrect:** That applies a 6% discount, not the stipulated 8% for 12–23 month leases ¶line 3¶.
- **Why C (₹118,760) is incorrect:** No discount rate in the passage yields this figure.
- **Why D (₹124,320) is incorrect:** Reflects only ~5% discount, contrary to the 8% given.

111. Answer: C

Difficulty: Hard

Explanation:

- **Vault unit area:** 20% of 60,000 m² across 20 units → 600 m² per Vault unit ¶line 2¶.
- **Peak-season surcharge:** ₹20/m² in Oct–Dec ¶line 4¶.
- **Per-unit surcharge:** 600 m² × ₹20 = ₹12,000/month.
- **Why A (₹8,000) is incorrect:** Assumes 400 m² area.
- **Why B (₹10,000) is incorrect:** Implies surcharge of ₹16.67/m².
- **Why D (₹14,000) is incorrect:** Assumes either higher rate or larger area; neither applies.

112. Answer: C

Difficulty: Easy

Explanation:

- **Climate-Controlled unit area:** 450 m² ¶line 2¶.
- **Energy levy:** ₹50/m² per month ¶line 5¶.
- **Per-unit levy:** 450 × 50 = ₹22,500.
- **Why A (₹15,000) is incorrect:** That uses 300 m² (Standard area), not 450 m².
- **Why B (₹18,000) is incorrect:** Assumes 360 m².
- **Why D (₹25,000) is incorrect:** Uses 500 m² (also wrong unit type).

113. Answer: B

Difficulty: Medium

Explanation:

- **Handling fee:** 4 pallets × ₹75 = ₹300/month ¶line 6¶.
- **Climate base rent:** 450 m² × ₹180 = ₹81,000 ¶line 2¶.
- **After 8% discount:** 81,000 × 0.92 = ₹74,520 ¶line 3¶.
- **Fee as percent:** (300 / 74,520) × 100 ≈ 0.4026% → **0.4%**.
- **Why A (0.2%) is incorrect:** That would be ₹150 against ₹74,520; fee is ₹300.
- **Why C (0.6%) is incorrect:** Implies fee ~₹447.

- **Why D (1.0%) is incorrect:** Would require fee ~₹745.

114. Answer: C

Difficulty: Hard

Explanation:

- **Deposits per unit (undiscounted):**
 - Standard: $500 \text{ m}^2 \times ₹100 = ₹50,000$
 - Climate: $450 \text{ m}^2 \times ₹180 = ₹81,000$
 - Vault: $600 \text{ m}^2 \times ₹350 = ₹210,000$ [lines 2–3].
- **Totals:**
 - Standard: $60 \times 50,000 = 3,000,000$
 - Climate: $40 \times 81,000 = 3,240,000$
 - Vault: $20 \times 210,000 = 4,200,000$
 - Sum = **₹10,440,000.**
- **Why A (₹8,440,000) is incorrect:** Omits a unit class or miscalculates area.
- **Why B (₹9,740,000) is incorrect:** Partial total, likely ignoring Climate units.
- **Why D (₹11,040,000) is incorrect:** Overstates average deposit per unit.

Passage Overview & Reading Approach

The passage outlines how Greenfield Warehouses leases 120 storage units—Standard, Climate-Controlled, and Secure Vault—across a 60,000 m² park to 45 clients, specifying base rents per m², area shares, lease-term discounts, peak-season surcharges, energy levies, insurance premiums, and handling fees. Test takers should first determine each unit class's area and base rent revenue, then layer on discounts, surcharges, or fees in the order they're introduced (discount before surcharge, surcharge before energy charge, etc.). Pay attention to whether an adjustment is percentage-based or flat-rate, and always anchor your calculation to the correct unit area. Sequencing and clear annotation of line references (e.g., "discount" from line 3, "surcharge" from line 4) will help avoid errors when multiple steps interact.

Question-Wise Approaches

- **109. Vault revenue share:** Compute total base rent for each class (area \times rate from line 2), sum them, and then find Vault's proportion—tests percentage of a subgroup within a total.
- **110. Combined discounted rent:** Derive average unit area for Standard and Climate (line 2), calculate each base rent, sum, then apply the 8% long-term discount (line 3)—tests weighted sums plus percentage reduction.
- **111. Peak-season surcharge per Vault:** Use Vault's per-unit area (line 2) \times ₹20/m² surcharge (line 4)—straight multiplication assessing surcharge applications.
- **112. Energy levy per Climate unit:** Multiply Climate unit area (line 2) by the ₹50/m² energy charge (line 5)—direct area \times rate computation.
- **113. Handling fee percentage:** Total handling fee (4 pallets \times ₹75 from line 6) divided by net Climate rent after 8% discount (line 3) and expressed as a percentage—tests small-fee ratio to larger base.
- **114. Total security deposit:** For each class, multiply unit count by (area \times base rate from lines 2–3), then sum across all 120 units—tests aggregation of multiple class-specific calculations.

115. Answer: C

Difficulty: Medium

Explanation:

- Compute weighted cost by inventory-by-cost shares:
 - Alpha Tech: $40\% \times ₹18,000 = ₹7,200$
 - Beta Devices: $35\% \times ₹15,500 = ₹5,425$
 - Gamma Gadgets: $25\% \times ₹12,200 = ₹3,050$ [line 1–2].
- Sum: $₹7,200 + ₹5,425 + ₹3,050 = ₹15,675$.
- Why A, B, D are incorrect: They do not match the precise weighted sum of ₹15,675.

116. Answer: D

Difficulty: Medium

Explanation:

- Marked price: $₹15,500 \times 1.30 = ₹20,150$ [line 3].
- Percentage over cost: $(20,150 - 15,500) / 15,500 \times 100 = 30.00\%$.
- Why A (₹19,600; 26.45%) and B (₹20,000; 28.57%) apply incorrect rates or bases; C (29.84%) miscalculates the exact percentage.

117. Answer: A

Difficulty: Easy

Explanation:

- Gamma Gadgets marked price: $₹12,200 \times 1.20 = ₹14,640$ [line 3].
- 10% Spring Sale discount: $14,640 \times 0.90 = ₹13,176$.
- Why B, C, D are incorrect: They do not equal the precise 10% reduction on the ₹14,640 marked price.

118. Answer: A

Difficulty: Medium

Explanation:

- Alpha Tech marked price: $₹18,000 \times 1.25 = ₹22,500$ [line 3].
- Spring discount: $₹22,500 \times 0.10 = ₹2,250$
- Flat flash-sale reduction: ₹1,000
- Total discount: $₹2,250 + ₹1,000 = ₹3,250$ per unit.
- Why B, C, D are incorrect: They sum incorrect combinations of percentage and flat reductions.

119. Answer: C Difficulty: Easy

Explanation:

- Gamma Gadgets marked price: $₹12,200 \times 1.20 = ₹14,640$ [line 3].
- 15% Autumn discount: $14,640 \times 0.85 = ₹12,444$.
- Why A, B, D are incorrect: They do not match the precise discounted amount of ₹12,444.

120. Answer: B (Easy)

Explanation:

- Gamma Gadgets marked price: $₹12,200 \times 1.20 = ₹14,640$ [line 3].

- **Restocking fee:** 5% of the marked price $\rightarrow 14,640 \times 0.05 = \text{₹}732$.
- **Why A (₹600) is incorrect:** That assumes a 4.1% fee instead of 5%.
- **Why C (₹750) is incorrect:** That would be 5.125% of the marked price.
- **Why D (₹900) is incorrect:** That equals a 6.15% fee, not the specified 5% [line 4].

Passage Overview & Reading Approach

The passage describes Uniform Mart's pricing and revenue model across three suppliers—Alpha Tech, Beta Devices, and Gamma Gadgets—detailing cost prices, markups, seasonal discounts, flash-sale reductions, overheads, restocking fees, clearance losses, and bulk rebates. Test takers should note the hierarchy of operations: start with base cost, apply markup to get the marked price, then layer on percentage discounts or flat reductions, and finally account for additional fees or rebates. Pay close attention to which adjustments apply in which scenarios (e.g., Spring vs. Autumn sales, flash-sale days, corporate orders). The difficulty lies in sequencing multiple percentage and absolute adjustments correctly and in weighting cost-share proportions for combined calculations. As you read, mentally map each supplier's "pipeline" from cost \rightarrow marked price \rightarrow net price \rightarrow additional fees, so you can trace any question's required figure step by step.

Question-Wise Approaches

- **115. Weighted average cost price:** Identify each supplier's cost \times its inventory share, sum the products, and divide by total share (which is 100%). This tests your skill with weighted averages.
- **116. Marked price & percentage over cost:** Compute Beta's marked price by applying its 30% markup, then calculate the percentage increase over its cost. Sequence matters: markup first, then percentage formula.
- **117. Spring Sale net price:** Find Gamma's marked price (20% markup), then apply the 10% Spring-Sale discount. Ensure you discount the correct marked figure before any flash-sale.
- **118. Effective flash-sale discount per unit:** For Alpha Tech on a flash-sale day, compute the 10% Spring-Sale reduction on its marked price, then add the flat ₹1,000 unit discount. Sum those two to get total per-unit discount.
- **119. Autumn Clearance net price:** Take Gamma's marked price and apply the 15% Autumn discount. No further fees or rebates here—just a straightforward percentage reduction.
- **120.** To tackle Question 120, begin by determining Gamma Gadgets' marked price: take its cost price of ₹12,200 and apply the 20 percent markup to arrive at ₹14,640. Next, note that the passage specifies returns incur a restocking fee equal to 5 percent of the marked price. Multiply ₹14,640 by 0.05 to compute the fee—₹732 per unit. Since this yields a whole-rupee figure, no additional rounding is needed. By following this sequence—deriving the marked price from cost, identifying the correct percentage rate, and then applying it—you ensure an accurate calculation of the restocking fee.