

ANSWERS KEY WITH EXPLANATIONS

SECTION-A: ENGLISH LANGUAGE

Passage 1:

Q1. Correct answer: C — (Difficulty: Medium; Evidence: Lines 1–2, 13–16, 17–22)

The passage frames India's **zero-duty** move as a response to **domestic shortfall** in cotton (lines 1–2) and simultaneously as **diplomatic signalling**—"optics"—towards the US at a low point in ties, with the hope of rekindling **stalled trade talks** (lines 13–16). It then pivots to the **domestic downside**: farmers held back by **technology denial**, pest pressures, and **stagnating yields**, culminating in a "double-whammy" alongside **import inundation** (lines 17–22).

- **Why A is wrong:** It overstates by calling the move a *protectionist ruse* and claims a *permanent* shutout of growers; the policy is explicitly **temporary** (lines 1, 15).
- **Why B is wrong:** The passage does note US export woes and benefit to US cotton, but it also highlights India's **own** motives: **augmenting fibre availability** and **re-export competitiveness** (lines 11–12, 15). Saying there's "little to no benefit for India" ignores these.
- **Why D is wrong:** It alleges a turn to **autarky**, whereas the measure **liberalises** cotton imports and aims at **negotiation**—the opposite of autarky (lines 13–16).

Q2. Correct answer: A — (Difficulty: Easy; Evidence: Line 13)

In context, "**optics**" means the **public/political perception** a move creates—how it *looks* diplomatically—especially "in the context of a low moment for Delhi–Washington ties" (line 13).

- **Why B is wrong:** That's the technical physics meaning; the passage uses the term **figuratively** in a political sense.
- **Why C is wrong:** Microeconomic price signals are nowhere implied by "optics."
- **Why D is wrong:** WTO legal transparency isn't the point; the author is talking about **diplomatic signalling** and **public perception**.

Q3. Correct answer: B — (Difficulty: Medium; Evidence: Lines 21, 16)

"**Inundation**" ≈ **deluge** (heavy flooding/over-supply), perfectly matching "**import inundation**" (line 21). "**Reciprocate**" means respond in kind; an **antonym** like "**snub**" (refuse to respond/ignore) fits, aligning with the author's call for the US to **reciprocate** by dropping the oil "penalty" (line 16).

- **Why A is wrong:** "Overflow" is close to inundation, but "**retaliate**" is **not** an antonym of reciprocate; retaliation is still a *response*, not the *absence* of one.
- **Why C is wrong:** "Scarcity" is the **opposite** of inundation; "mirror" is a synonym of reciprocate—so the pair is doubly wrong.
- **Why D is wrong:** "Drizzle" is the opposite of inundation; pairing it with **reciprocate** (not an antonym) makes it incorrect.

Q4. Correct answer: C — (Difficulty: Medium–Hard; Evidence: Lines 10–12, 13–16)

The passage says USDA welcomed the move; it **helps Indian textile exporters** via **cheaper, cleaner fibre**, with **95%** of imported US cotton re-exported as yarn/fabric/apparel (lines 10–12). Simultaneously, the author stresses **optics** and **willingness to negotiate**, urging the US to **reciprocate** by scrapping the oil import "penalty" (lines 13–16). Hence the inference that India seeks **industrial** and **diplomatic** gains together.

- **Why A is wrong:** No mention of **re-pegging** the rupee; currency policy is absent.
- **Why B is wrong:** The passage never promises a return to **2022 export levels**; it notes likely boosts but not guarantees (lines 9–12).

- **Why D is wrong:** The author criticises farmer **technology denial** as a problem (lines 17–22), but the policy is not depicted as *primarily punitive*; it's portrayed as a **trade and supply** measure with diplomatic overtones.

Q5. Correct answer: D — (Difficulty: Medium; Evidence: Lines 1, 10–12, 15–16)

Option **D** is grammatically clean (balanced parallelism: “aims to augment... and... signals”) and **faithful**: the duty is removed **till December 31, 2025** (line 1); it aims to **augment fibre availability** for textiles (lines 11, 15); and it signals a willingness to **resume talks** with Washington (lines 13–16).

- **Why A is wrong:** Comma splices and a **mischaracterisation**—the policy is not “aimed at rescuing US exporters only”; it also serves Indian industry and diplomacy (lines 11–16).
- **Why B is wrong:** Factually off—yields peaked **in/around 2013–14** and then fell (lines 18–19), not “were highest after 2014”; and the passage doesn't say **Washington insisted** on removal.
- **Why C is wrong:** Faulty construction (double conjunction “While... and... but”), plus muddled logic. The passage connects **duty removal**, **farmer tech denial**, and **optics**, but not in this ungrammatical way.

Q6. Correct answer: C — (Difficulty: Hard; Evidence: Lines 21–22, 18–20)

The “**double-whammy**” is **technology denial** to domestic producers **plus import inundation** that swamps their market (lines 21–22), set against falling yields and pest pressure (lines 18–20). Option **C** mirrors this structure: **blocking local fisherfolk** from modern tech **while** permitting **foreign trawlers** to flood the market—two simultaneous pressures undermining locals.

- **Why A is wrong:** A one-day car ban nudging bike-sharing isn't a dual squeeze on a producer group.
- **Why B is wrong:** That's a **double positive** (support + support), not a double **constraint**.
- **Why D is wrong:** It describes **upgrades** and **subsidies**—again support, not denial-plus-influx. Only **C** matches the passage's **two-pronged disadvantage** logic.

Passage-in-brief (4–5 lines) + How to read it - This editorial argues that India's **temporary zero-duty cotton imports** serve a dual purpose: easing a **domestic fibre shortfall** and sending **diplomatic signals** to the US—while simultaneously **hurting Indian farmers** already constrained by technology denial and pest pressures. The tone is analytical with policy nuance; difficulty is **mixed** because it weaves **data points** (production, trade values) with **normative claims** (optics, reciprocity). When reading, first map **stakeholders** (textile exporters, US sellers, Indian farmers), then track the **two-track objective** (supply management + diplomacy), and finally note the **cost side** (the “double-whammy” on farmers). Mark evaluative cues like “optics,” “reciprocate,” and “double-whammy” to distil the **main idea**.

Question-by-question: how to approach

Q1 (Main idea): Identify the **two-level policy rationale** (domestic shortage + US signalling) and the **domestic cost** (farm tech stagnation). Eliminate options that are **absolutist** (“permanent,” “autarky”) or ignore one half of the argument.

Q2 (Vocab—“optics”): Use **context clues**: placed near “low moment for Delhi–Washington ties” and “willingness to negotiate,” so it's about **public/political perception**, not physics/law/economics.

Q3 (Synonym + Antonym): Anchor on usage: “import **inundation**” ⇒ **deluge**. “For the US to **reciprocate**” ⇒ opposite is **snub** (not mirror/retaliate). Check that **both** parts of the pair work.

Q4 (Inference / stance): Synthesize two strands: (i) **industrial benefit** (cheaper, cleaner fibre; re-export loop) and (ii) **diplomatic signalling** (resume talks; drop “penalty”). Reject claims about **currency peg**, **guarantees** of 2022 volumes, or **punitive intent** toward farmers.

Q5 (Grammar + fidelity): Prefer a sentence that's **grammatically parallel** and **fact-accurate** (temporary duty removal, augment fibre availability, signal talks). Eliminate options with **comma splices**, **factual errors** (yields post-2014), or **faulty conjunctions** (“while...and...but”).

Q6 (Analogy / similar logic): Map the **structure** of “tech denial + import flood” to a parallel: **local producers blocked from modern tools while markets are swamped by outsiders**. Pick the scenario reproducing **both pressures**, not single-factor or supportive policies.

Critical-Reasoning Style Brief (GMAT/LSAT/GRE/CLAT framing)

Premises (facts presented)

- India removed the **11% duty on cotton** till **Dec 31, 2025**.
- Domestic production and sown area are **down**; projected **imports** are **record-high**.
- US cotton exports have **fallen** due to China's reduced purchases; India and others have increased buying.
- USDA **welcomes** the move; imported US cotton is largely **processed and re-exported** as yarn/fabric/apparel.

- Indian farmers face **tech stagnation** post-Bt hybrids, **pest pressure**, and **falling yields**.

Core Arguments

1. Policy Rationale (Two-track):

- **Supply-side:** Duty waiver **augments fibre availability** and lowers input costs for Indian textiles.
- **Diplomacy:** The move improves **optics** toward the US and **signals** readiness to revive trade talks; author urges US **reciprocity** (drop the “penalty” on Russian oil imports).

2. Distributional Cost:

- The same policy coincides with **technology denial** to domestic farmers and **import inundation**, worsening their competitive position—the “**double-whammy**.”

Inferences (unstated but supported)

- The government expects **short-run benefits** for the textile value chain and **diplomatic goodwill**.
- Without **technology enablement**, farmers’ **price/yield disadvantage** will persist or worsen under higher import exposure.
- The policy’s **temporariness** implies a **stop-gap** rather than a structural farm-sector fix.

Conclusions

- The duty-free window is **pragmatic** and **strategic** (domestic + diplomatic), but **incomplete** without **farm tech reform**; thus, the author implicitly advocates enabling farmers to **compete** rather than shielding them indefinitely.

Assumptions (testable/necessary)

- **Imported cotton** is indeed **cheaper/cleaner** at scale and improves **export competitiveness**.
- The US will interpret the move as **goodwill** and is capable of **reciprocating** (policy latitude on the “penalty”).
- **Tech access** (beyond Bt hybrids) would materially **raise yields** and resilience against pests.
- **Import pressure** transmits to farm-gate prices/market share in ways that hurt **domestic growers**.

Possible Paradoxes/Tensions

- **Import liberalisation** to help **exports** may **hurt local primary producers**—a growth vs. equity tension.
- Seeking **US goodwill** while calling a US measure “**unreasonable and irrational**”—cooperative signalling vs. confrontational critique.
- **Temporary** liberalisation to fix supply while **structural** farm issues remain unresolved.

Passage 2:

Q7. Correct answer: B — (*Difficulty: Medium; Evidence: Lines 5–7, 8–12, 14–15*)

Laporte’s thesis is that **Frenchmen are inflamed to daring by a pretty woman’s presence**, a chivalric “old school” spirit he claims is national (lines 5–7). He personalizes the feeling (lines 8–10), extends it to the army (lines 11–12), cites **Joan of Arc** (line 13), and speculates that a **female commander at Sedan** could have changed history (line 14), rounding off with the Sainte-Geneviève remark (line 15).

- **Why A is wrong:** It reduces causes to **strategy/logistics only**, ignoring Laporte’s central claim about **sentiment/morale** driven by feminine presence (contra lines 8–12, 14–15).
- **Why C is wrong:** He does **not** brand feminine influence as purely dangerous; he treats it as **ennobling and galvanizing** (lines 8–12, 14–15).
- **Why D is wrong:** Though he mentions **God abolished** (line 5), his solution is **romantic chivalry**, not religious revival; religion is a backdrop, not the remedy he urges.

Q8. Correct answer: A — (*Difficulty: Easy; Evidence: Line 3*)

“**Beau**” in context is a self-portrait of a **courtly admirer/gallant**—“one of the old school”—whose senses are quickened by a pretty woman (line 3). The diction and tone are affectionate and nostalgic, not cynical or rustic.

- **Why B is wrong:** A **naïve rustic** contradicts the self-aware, urbane pose (“old school,” line 3).
- **Why C is wrong:** A **soldier of fortune** centers on warfare, not courtship; Laporte stresses **adoration and gallantry** (lines 1–3, 8–10).

- **Why D is wrong:** A **cynical rake** who **despises** romance is the opposite of Laporte, who **embraces** it (lines 1–3).

Q9. Correct answer: C — (*Difficulty: Medium; Evidence: Lines 6, 5*)

“**Follies**” in line 6 connotes **misguided/impulsive acts** done for love; **indiscretions** captures this register. The antonym of “**abolished**” (line 5) is “**instituted**”—to establish rather than eliminate.

- **Why A is wrong:** “Prerogatives” are **rights/privileges**, not errors; “rescinded” is another word for **abolished**, not its antonym.
- **Why B is wrong:** “Prudences” are **careful acts**, antonymic to “follies”; and “founded” is close but not as precise in this policy/legal register as “**instituted**.”
- **Why D is wrong:** “Solemnities” means **ceremonies**, not mistakes; “proscribed” means **forbidden**, not the opposite of abolished.

Q10. Correct: D — (*Difficulty: Hard; Evidence: Lines 5, 8–12, 14*)

Option **D** is both **grammatically balanced** and **faithful**: Laporte says Frenchmen remain “**knights**” (line 5) and that a pretty woman’s presence rouses them (lines 8–12), culminating in the **Sedan counterfactual** (line 14). The sentence maintains logical flow without overstatement.

- **Why A is wrong:** He never advocates **rejecting** love of women; he **exalts** it (lines 6, 8–12).
- **Why B is wrong:** He doesn’t say flirtation “**invariably defeats**” the Prussians; he offers a **bet/counterfactual** (line 14), not a universal law.
- **Why C is wrong:** Grammatically flawed (dangling structure: “when he perceives ... and he smashes ... but”), and it **misreads** his point as a call to **religion**, which he does not make.

Q11. Correct: C — (*Difficulty: Easy–Medium; Evidence: Lines 13–14*)

Laporte explicitly invokes **Joan of Arc** (line 13) and then speculates that, **on the eve of Sedan** when **Marshal MacMahon was wounded**, a **pretty woman** commanding might have enabled a **breakthrough** (line 14).

- **Why A is wrong:** Trochu is mentioned **indirectly** (line 15), but not in the way the option frames (Commune isn’t referenced here).
- **Why B is wrong:** Napoleon/Josephine are **not** mentioned in the extract.
- **Why D is wrong:** The **Bastille** episode and market-women rhetoric are **absent** from the passage.

Q12. Correct answer: A — (*Difficulty: Medium; Evidence: Lines 8–12, 13–14*)

Laporte’s logic: **feminine presence** → **morale surge** → **daring beyond calculation**, sometimes enough to change outcomes (lines 8–12). He cites **Joan of Arc** and the **Sedan counterfactual** (lines 13–14). Option **A** mirrors that causal chain: an admired female figure **visits**, morale spikes, and the unit acts with **reckless boldness** leading to success.

- **Why B is wrong:** Explains victory by **logistics**, not by **sentimental/morale stimulus**.
- **Why C is wrong:** Suppressing visitors is the **inverse** of Laporte’s claim.
- **Why D is wrong:** A chaplain’s sermons promoting **sobriety/caution** don’t produce the **daring** he celebrates.

Passage-in-brief (4–5 lines) + How to read it - Colonel Laporte delivers a spirited monologue claiming that Frenchmen—himself and the army included—are roused to extraordinary daring by the presence of a pretty woman. He universalizes a personal impulse into a national trait, invoking Joan of Arc and a counterfactual about Sedan to argue that feminine inspiration can sway history. The theme blends romantic chivalry, nationalism, and morale as a force-multiplier in war. Difficulty is **mixed**: plain diction but layered with rhetoric, generalization, and counterfactuals. While reading, map (i) **claim** (feminine presence → valor), (ii) **evidence/illustration** (Joan of Arc; Sedan), (iii) **scope leap** (personal → national), and (iv) **tension** (passion vs strategy).

How to approach each question

Q7 (Main idea): - Scan topic sentences and the historical examples. Keep both halves: **feminine presence as catalyst** + **national/army-wide generalization**. Eliminate options that ignore morale or recast the piece as anti-romance or purely religious.

Q8 (Vocabulary—"beau"): Lock onto self-portrait: "old beau... old school" and the admiring tone. Choose the sense of **courtly gallant/suitor**, not rustic, mercenary, or cynical rake.

Q9 (Synonym—Antonym): Anchor to usage: "follies" = mistakes done for love → **indiscretions**; "abolished" needs the opposite action of establishing → **instituted**. Reject near-misses that don't fit both halves.

Q10 (Grammar & fidelity): Pick the sentence that is grammatically clean **and** preserves the text's claims: "knights" of love; feminine presence → daring; Sedan as a **counterfactual**. Avoid options that overstate ("invariably defeats"), misattribute religious prescriptions, or contain structural errors.

Q11 (Factual detail): Look for explicit name-drops: **Joan of Arc** and the **Sedan** episode with **MacMahon wounded**. Choose the option that mentions both the figure and the context as in the passage.

Q12 (Analogy / similar logic): Match the **structure: feminine presence → morale surge → daring action**. Prefer the scenario with a beloved actress spiking morale and prompting a bold countercharge, not logistics-only wins or visitor bans.

Extended CR Brief (GMAT/LSAT/GRE/CLAT framing)

Premises (stated facts/claims)

- Laporte is an "old beau" whose courage and energy ignite in the presence of a pretty woman.
- He generalizes this response to **Frenchmen** and the **French army**.
- Historical illustrations: **Joan of Arc**; speculative claim that, with a woman commanding at **Sedan** when **MacMahon** was wounded, the army might have broken through.
- Contrast between bureaucratic/male command (**Trochu**) and a feminine/saintly emblem (**Sainte-Geneviève**).

Core Arguments

1. **Causal thesis:** Feminine presence acts as a **catalyst** for **valor**, pushing men toward bold, even reckless devotion.
2. **National character thesis:** This chivalric impulse is **distinctively French**, persisting despite societal changes ("God... abolished").

Inferences (unstated but supported)

- **Morale/symbolism** can materially influence outcomes in war alongside strategy/logistics.
- **Charisma and desire** can coordinate group action by creating a shared emotional focal point.
- A feminine icon/leader would be **accepted** by troops as a rallying symbol.

Conclusions

- Romantic chivalry remains a **potent practical force** in French conduct; under a compelling feminine emblem, it might **alter military fortunes**.
- Effective leadership in crisis may require **symbolic ignition** (morale) as much as technical command.

Assumptions (testable/necessary)

- Soldiers' behavior is **highly elastic** to emotive stimuli like admiration/desire.
- The **collective morale spike** from feminine presence can be **large enough** to change battlefield outcomes.
- Historical troops would **follow** a woman's leadership or a feminine symbol without breakdown in discipline.
- Laporte's personal impulse is **representative** of broader French behavior (not an idiosyncrasy).

Paradoxes / Tensions

- **Reason vs passion:** Heightened daring can inspire heroism **or** cause rash action that undermines strategy.
- **Universality vs chauvinism:** Claiming a uniquely French trait risks **overgeneralization** and national stereotyping.
- **Icon vs institution:** Reliance on symbolic sparks may **mask structural weaknesses** (planning, supply, command).

Passage 3:

Q13. Correct answer: B — (*Difficulty: Medium; Evidence: [3] [4] [5] [6] [7] [8] [9] [12] [13] [14] [16]*)

Option **B** integrates the “**Next-Gen**” updates (documents, vision, security, prefecture links, supply chains, semiconductors, connectivity) with the **geopolitical subtext** (US tariffs, China talks) and the **stability signal** the leaders intended (lines [3]–[9], [12]–[16]). The passage clearly frames bilateral outputs as vehicles for a broader message of steadiness and resilience.

- **Why A is wrong:** It inflates the DPRK paragraph into the central theme and **minimises economics/connectivity** (contra [3]–[9]).
- **Why C is wrong:** The Quad is noted but not portrayed as **eclipsing** all else; it is one element among many ([7], [11]).
- **Why D is wrong:** The statement **avoids naming Pakistan** (line [10]); claiming a “decisive turn” to name-and-shame is the opposite of what happened.

Q14. Correct answer: A — (*Difficulty: Easy; Evidence: [12]*)

Subtext here means the **underlying message** beneath the overt bilateral “text.” The writer contrasts the visible deliverables (documents, MoUs, frameworks) with a **geopolitical signal**: stability in turbulent times (line [12]).

- **Why B is wrong:** A transcript is not “beneath” the text; it **is** the text.
- **Why C is wrong:** A classified annex is a document, not an **implicit theme**.
- **Why D is wrong:** A sanction is a formal act; the passage invokes **interpretive layering**, not punitive measures.

Q15. Correct answer: C — (*Difficulty: Medium; Evidence: [10] [8]*)

“**Condemning**” (line [10]) ≈ **denouncing**; both connote strong disapproval. The antonym of “**restrictions**” (line [8]) is **liberalisation**, i.e., removal/relaxation of limits. Pair **C** alone gets **both halves** right.

- **Why A is wrong:** “Ratifying” ≠ condemning; “embargo” is a **restriction**, not its opposite.
- **Why B is wrong:** “Censuring” fits condemning, but “constraints” is a **synonym**, not an antonym, of restrictions.
- **Why D is wrong:** “Lauding” is the **opposite** of condemning (the prompt asks for a **synonym**), and “limitations” again matches restrictions, not its antonym.

Q16. Correct answer: D — (*Difficulty: Hard; Evidence: [7] [3] [6] [8] [13] [14] [16]*)

Option **D** is syntactically clean (parallel series; proper subordination) and **faithful**: it references the **2008 security update** (line [7]), the “**Next-Gen**” basket (documents, prefecture links, flights—[3], [6]), **supply-chain/semiconductor** cooperation (line [8]), and situates these against **US tariffs** and **China talks** (lines [13]–[14]) to project **stability** (line [16]).

- **Why A is wrong:** Year is **2022** (not 2023) and there was **no** direct condemnation of Pakistan (lines [2], [10]).
- **Why B is wrong:** Investment **increased to \$68B** (line [4]); leaders **did** showcase bullet train and a **semiconductor factory** visit (line [9]).
- **Why C is wrong:** Ungrammatical coordination (“while ... and ... but”) and inaccurate to say tariffs were “ignored”—they form part of the **geopolitical backdrop** (lines [12]–[13]).

Q17. Correct answer: C — (*Difficulty: Medium–Hard; Evidence: [8] [13] [14] [15] [16]*)

The **economic-security** and **technology** strands—**resilient supply chains** and **semiconductors** (line [8])—sit alongside **US tariff shocks** (line [13]) and delicate **China talks** (line [14]), with Japan’s own concerns (line [15]). This package plausibly **hedges vulnerabilities** while signalling that ties **remain stable and growing** (line [16])—a calibrated posture **short of confrontation**.

- **Why A is wrong:** The omission of Pakistan’s name does **not** imply partnership; it reflects calibrated wording (line [10]).
- **Why B is wrong:** The Quad is “under a cloud” but the text does **not** predict cancellation (line [11]).
- **Why D is wrong:** The aim is **not** to revive Japan–US talks; indeed, Japan **cancelled** a Washington visit amid tensions (line [15]).

Q18. Correct answer: A — (*Difficulty: Medium; Evidence: [3] [6] [8] [12] [13] [14] [16]*)

Option **A** mirrors the passage's **surface deliverables** (MoUs, connectivity, sub-national links) paired with a **deeper signal** of **stability** to markets and partners during a **tariff shock** and **sensitive neighbour talks**—precisely the **text vs. subtext** dynamic (lines [3], [6], [8], [12]–[14], [16]).

- **Why B is wrong:** No subtext or signalling—contrary to the passage's structure.
- **Why C is wrong:** Emphasises rupture and naming-and-shaming, unlike the **steadying** message here (lines [16], [10]).
- **Why D is wrong:** The passage **avoids** naming Pakistan while balancing cooperation and condemnation (line [10]); the NGO scenario miscasts the logic.

Passage-in-brief (4–5 lines) + how to read it - The passage reports a dense set of **bilateral deliverables** from the Modi–Ishiba summit—"Next-Gen" updates, \$68B investment intent with ~170 MoUs, a 2035 Vision, state–prefecture links and flights, an upgraded 2008 security partnership, and a supply-chain–semiconductor push given Chinese export limits—while **showcasing** HSR cooperation and strong language on DPRK and terrorism ([3]–[10]). The **subtext** is geopolitical: US tariff shocks, upcoming Xi talks, Japan's East China Sea worries and US trade frictions ([12]–[15]). Net message: India–Japan ties project **stability and continuity** amid turmoil ([16]). **Approach:** separate **text vs subtext**; list concrete outputs first, then infer what they **signal**; track what is named and what is **omitted** (Pakistan); watch dates, numbers, and whether claims imply **hedging** rather than escalation.

How to approach each question (1–3 lines each)

Q13 (Main idea) - Fuse **deliverables** (Next-Gen, supply chains, semiconductors, connectivity) with the **signal** of steadiness amid US tariffs and China talks → pick the option that captures **stability through bilateral updates**, not DPRK/Quad dominance. (Answer B; refs [3]–[9], [12]–[16].)

Q14 (Vocabulary: "subtext") - Read the contrast clause: "text... bilateral" vs "subtext... geopolitical" → choose **underlying/implicit message**, not transcripts/annexes/sanctions. (Answer A; ref [12].)

Q15 (Synonym–Antonym pair) - Check **both halves**: "condemning" ≈ **denouncing** (DPRK/terror), antonym of "restrictions" = **liberalisation** (removal of limits). (Answer C; refs [10], [8].)

Q16 (Grammar & fidelity) - Select the sentence that's syntactically clean **and** factually true: security-update + "Next-Gen" basket + supply-chain/semiconductor + backdrop of US tariffs and China talks → **showcasing stability**. (Answer D; refs [7], [3], [6], [8], [13]–[14], [16].)

Q17 (Inference on intent) - Infer **hedging and steadiness**: economic-security deliverables reduce vulnerability without confrontation; Quad mentioned but not determinative; omission of Pakistan ≠ partnership. (Answer C; refs [8], [13]–[16].)

Q18 (Analogy: text vs subtext) - Match surface MoUs/connectivity (text) + **stability signal** to investors/partners amid shocks (subtext). (Answer A; refs [3], [6], [8], [12]–[14], [16].)

Extended CR Brief (GMAT/LSAT/GRE/CLAT framing)

Premises (explicit facts)

- Two-day summit; prior summit in 2022; **dozen+ documents** with a "Next-Gen" focus ([1]–[3]).
- **\$68B** investment target; **~170 MoUs**; a **2035 Vision** with eight cooperation areas; state–prefecture links and **direct flights** ([4]–[6]).
- **2008 security** partnership upgraded: annual NSA dialogue, Quad/Indo-Pacific cooperation, UNSC reform ([7]).
- **Economic Security Partnership**: resilient supply chains, critical infrastructure security, **semiconductors in India** using Japanese tech; context of **Chinese rare-earth restrictions** ([8]).
- HSR collaboration showcased; leaders visited Miyagi and a semiconductor plant; **strong condemnation** of DPRK and terrorism, without naming Pakistan; Quad summit stressed ([9]–[11]).
- **Backdrop**: US tariff shock, impending **Xi** meeting (Aug 31, 2025), Japan's East China Sea concerns and US trade friction (team visit cancelled) ([12]–[15]).
- Stated **message**: ties are stable and growing amid turmoil ([16]).

Inferences (supported but unstated)

2026

- Deliverables are designed as **risk-mitigating hedges**: supply-chain diversification and semiconductor cooperation cushion shocks from tariffs or China policy shifts.
- The omission of Pakistan is likely **calibrated wording** to avoid escalation while still condemning terrorism.
- The **mix** of grassroots links, connectivity and tech cooperation **signals durability** beyond any single news cycle.

Conclusions (author's upshot)

- The summit's **core meaning** is **stability signalling** through substantive yet balanced bilateral updates—neither escalatory nor purely symbolic—amid a volatile geopolitical setting.

Core arguments (structure)

1. **Descriptive layer (text)**: wide slate of “Next-Gen” updates across economy, security, connectivity, technology.
2. **Context layer (subtext)**: US tariffs, China normalization attempt, Japan's tensions → environment of uncertainty.
3. **Interpretive layer**: therefore, the package **projects resilience** and **continuity** without direct confrontation.

Assumptions (necessary links)

- Supply-chain and semiconductor cooperation are **credible** and **implementable**, not merely hortatory.
- Markets and partners **read** such deliverables as **stability signals**.
- Avoiding explicit naming (Pakistan) **reduces diplomatic friction** without undermining deterrence messaging.

Paradoxes / tensions (and resolutions)

- **Security language vs omission of Pakistan**: resolved as **calibrated signalling**—condemn behaviour without derailing broader regional diplomacy.
- **Bilateral “text” vs geopolitical “subtext”**: resolved by understanding summits as **two-level games**—outputs serve domestic/sectoral goals while sending **external** signals.
- **Tech showcase vs tariff shock**: showcasing joint tech projects **counter-weights** trade uncertainty.

Passage 4:

Q19. Correct answer: A — (*Difficulty: Medium; Evidence: [17] [18] [19]*)

Option A reproduces the trio precisely: **35 lakh tonnes** in **2019** (taller than hills), **13 lakh tonnes** in **April 2025**, and the figure of **22 lakh tonnes** “disappeared” **over five years from 2020**. This bundle aligns word-for-word with the report's framing and timeline.

- **Why B is wrong:** It invents **25 / 10 lakh** figures and shifts the baseline to **2018**—none appear in the text.
- **Why C is wrong:** Though it keeps **35 → 13** and **22** correct, it misdates the period as “**since 2019,**” contradicting “**five years from 2020.**”
- **Why D is wrong:** All three numbers are off (**45, 20, 25**) and it claims **six years from 2019**, again contradicting the stated period. This question tests **accurate extraction** of numerals and **temporal qualifiers**—a common CLAT trap.

Q20. Correct answer: C — (*Difficulty: Medium; Evidence: “encroachments” [11]; “recharge” [22]*)

Encroachments are unauthorized **intrusions** into protected land—so **intrusions** fits as a **synonym**. The antonym of **recharge** (of aquifers) is to **drain** (remove/stanch recharge), which reverses its hydrological sense.

- **Why A is wrong:** **Annexations** are formal/sovereign acquisitions—not the same as illegal **encroachments**; **replenish** is **synonymous**, not an **antonym**, of recharge.
- **Why B is wrong:** **Infringements** could work for encroachments, but **refill** is again a **synonym** of recharge, not its antonym. Pair must be fully correct.
- **Why D is wrong:** **Invasions** are hostile entries (usually military) and **irrigate** (apply water to land) is not the logical antonym of aquifer **recharge**. Pair-questions require checking **both halves**; a single mismatch invalidates the option.

Q21. Correct answer : D — (*Difficulty: Hard; Evidence: [14] [15]*)

Option **D** is syntactically clean (correct subordination and coordination) and **faithful**: it states that, **despite being in an NCZ**, Bandhwari **continues to receive** daily waste from **Gurgaon and Faridabad ([14])** and that **leachate** is **seeping into groundwater ([15])**.

- **Why A is wrong:** Contradicts **[2]** (schools **shut**, flights **delayed**) and **[6]** (events are **warnings**, not “no warning”).
- **Why B is wrong:** Misstates **[10]** (there are **seven** districts), and **[12]** shows sacred groves were **included**, not excluded.
- **Why C is wrong:** Ungrammatical tri-conjunction (**while ... and ... but**), and it whitewashes degradation; **[11]** **[12]** **[26]** shows the Aravallis are **not** “pristine.” This item checks **grammar under facts**—you must validate **content** and **structure** together.

Q22. Correct answer : B — (*Difficulty: Easy; Evidence: [12]*)

The passage **explicitly** lists **Mangar Bani, Anangpur, Bandhwari, Khori Khurd** as having **active violations**. Option **B** repeats those four, verbatim.

- **Why A is wrong:** Mixes other NCR/Aravalli-adjacent place names **not** named here.
- **Why C is wrong:** Includes towns beyond the cited mapping (e.g., Neemrana/Alwar in Rajasthan), **not** listed in this extract.
- **Why D is wrong:** None of these sites appear in the “active violations” list in **[12]**.

This is a straight **recall** question—watch for **distractor geographies** that feel plausible but aren’t in the text.

Q23. Correct answer : A — (*Difficulty: Medium; Evidence: [15]*)

Leachate is the **polluted liquid** formed when water **percolates through waste**, dissolving/suspending contaminants and then **seeping** into soils/groundwater—exactly the danger highlighted in **[15]**.

- **Why B is wrong:** That’s **landfill gas** (methane/CO₂), not a liquid effluent.
- **Why C is wrong:** **Ash** is a solid residue from **incineration**, not a percolate formed in dumps.
- **Why D is wrong:** Describes **settled/compacted waste**, not the **liquid** contaminant.

Vocabulary tasks in CLAT often use **technical environment terms**; infer from **co-text** (“seeping into the groundwater”).

Q24. Correct answer: C — (*Difficulty: Medium–Hard; Evidence: [18] [19] [20] [21]*)

Option **C** mirrors the passage’s concern: the **visible landfill mound shrinks** but because **hazardous loads are diverted** to **quarries/forest areas** (see **[21]**), raising the question “**Where has all this waste gone?**” (**[20]**). It captures **problem displacement** rather than **problem resolution**.

- **Why A is wrong:** Rain-cleansed air is a **short-term** meteorological effect—not a deliberate **off-site transfer** of harm.
- **Why B is wrong:** Misattribution to infrastructure vs **seasonal cycles**; again, no **shifting** of the underlying hazard.
- **Why D is wrong:** It critiques ineffective **awareness** measures but lacks the **concealment-by-displacement** pattern. Analogy questions reward mapping the **structure**: here, **cosmetic improvement** hides **ecological externalisation** into protected zones.

Passage-in-brief (4–5 lines) + How to read it

This passage documents an escalating **ecological crisis** in and around Delhi, linking extreme weather (dust storms, heat, floods) to **systemic degradation** in the Aravallis. It foregrounds the **Citizens’ Reports**, which compile mapped, geo-tagged **violations**—roads, clearances, mining, waste dumping—inside **Natural Conservation Zones**. The **Bandhwari landfill** becomes the emblem of failure: despite being in an NCZ, it still receives waste; **leachate** seeps into groundwater; and an apparent reduction in the dump coincides with **off-site dumping** into quarries/forests. Difficulty is **mixed**: plain reportage with dense **numbers, locations, and environmental terms**. While reading, track (i) **figures &**

timelines (2019 → 2025; “five years from 2020”), (ii) **place names** (Mangar Bani, Anangpur, Bandhwari, Khori Khurd), (iii) **process terms** (“leachate,” “recharge”), and (iv) the logic of **displacement** (“Where has all this waste gone?”).

How to approach each question (1–3 lines each)

Q19 (Factual—Bandhwari numbers) - Lift the **exact trio**: 2019 **35 lakh tonnes** (taller than hills) → **April 2025: 13 lakh tonnes** → **22 lakh tonnes** “disappeared” **over five years from 2020**. Cross-check digits + timeframe (lines [17] [18] [19]).

Q20 (Synonym—Antonym) - Map meanings in context: **encroachments** ≈ **intrusions** on protected land; antonym of aquifer **recharge** is **drain** (the opposite hydrological direction). Validate both halves (lines [11] [22]).

Q21 (Grammar & fidelity) - Choose the sentence that’s syntactically clean **and** matches facts: Bandhwari is in an **NCZ**, **still receives daily waste**, and **leachate** is **seeping** into groundwater (lines [14] [15]). Eliminate items that contradict schools/flight delays or the “seven districts” detail (lines [2] [10]).

Q22 (Factual—sites with active violations) - Select the **verbatim quartet**: **Mangar Bani, Anangpur, Bandhwari, Khori Khurd**. Beware plausible NCR distractors not listed in the mapping (line [12]).

Q23 (Vocabulary in context—“leachate”) - Use co-text “**seeping into groundwater**”: pick the **contaminated liquid** formed by percolation through waste carrying pollutants (line [15]). Reject gas/ash/compaction distractors.

Q24 (Analogy / similar logic) - Match the **displacement** structure: visible landfill reduction achieved by **dumping hazardous waste into protected quarries/forests**—a cosmetic “fix” that exports harm (lines [18] [20] [21]).

Extended CR Brief (GMAT/LSAT/GRE/CLAT framing)

Premises (explicit statements)

- **Extreme weather** in NCR: dust storm, >45°C heat, frequent downpours, flooding, closures/delays (lines [1]–[4]).
- These are **warnings**, connected to the **Aravallis** (lines [5]–[7]).
- **Citizens’ Reports** compile mapped, geo-tagged **violations** in **seven** Aravalli districts (lines [8]–[11]).
- **Active violations** at **Mangar Bani, Anangpur, Bandhwari, Khori Khurd** (line [12]).
- **Bandhwari**: in an **NCZ**, **still receives waste daily**; **leachate** into groundwater; **open burning** (lines [13]–[16]).
- Numbers: **2019 = 35 lakh t**, **April 2025 = 13 lakh t**, **22 lakh t** “disappeared” **from 2020** (lines [17]–[19]).
- Reports find **hazardous waste** dumped into **mining quarries/forest areas** in Gurugram/Faridabad Aravallis (line [21]).
- Aravalli zones **recharge** NCR’s water and are **critical wildlife habitats** (line [22]).
- In **Mangar Bani**, encroachment includes **religious structures** and **real estate**, plus **fresh roads** (lines [23]–[26]).

Core Argument(s)

1. **Causal/diagnostic**: A pattern of **institutional failure** and **illegal intrusions** into NCZs is degrading the Aravallis, undermining **water recharge** and **ecosystems**, thereby **exacerbating urban vulnerability** (heat, floods, air) (lines [6]–[7] [11] [22]).
2. **Symbol/emblem**: **Bandhwari** typifies mismanagement—**illegal persistence**, **toxic leakage**, and a **suspicious reduction** masking **off-site dumping** (lines [13]–[16] [18]–[21]).

Inferences (unstated but supported)

- The **apparent landfill “improvement”** is likely **illusory** if waste is being **shifted** into protected landscapes (lines [18]–[21]).
- **Regulatory enforcement** is uneven/ineffective given active violations inside **NCZs** (lines [11]–[12]).
- Continued **encroachment** threatens **aquifer recharge**, worsening **water stress**/heat-flood cycles (line [22]).
- **Aerial/geo-tag evidence** implies violations are **current and traceable**, not merely historical (lines [9] [12] [26]).

Conclusions

- Without **robust enforcement**, **transparent waste accounting**, and **protection of NCZs**, Delhi’s **climate-risk exposure** will intensify.
- Bandhwari demands **forensic audits and remediation**; Aravalli protection requires **halt of encroachments**, removal of **hazardous dumping**, and **restoration** measures.

Assumptions (testable/necessary)

2026

- **Displacement** of waste into quarries/forests is **ecologically worse** (toxicity + hydrology) than contained, engineered management.
- **NCZ status** should confer **actual protection**, not merely nominative zoning.
- **Leachate pathways** connect Bandhwari to **groundwater** used in NCR, implying **public health** risk.
- **Mapped violations** reflect **systemic patterns**, not isolated exceptions.

Paradoxes / Tensions

- **Visible success vs hidden harm**: shrinking the landfill pile while **exporting toxins** into recharge zones.
- **Sacred groves** (Mangar Bani) vs **religious encroachment**: devotional justifications used to **occupy** protected forests.
- **Development optics** (roads, real estate) vs **NCZ mandates**: growth narratives colliding with **legal protections**.
- **Emergency weather** vs **routine governance**: repeated “warnings” met with **status-quo violation**.

SECTION B: - CURRENT AFFAIRS (INCLUDING GENERAL KNOWLEDGE)

Q25. Correct option: C (Hard). The **power** to block public access to online information sits in **Section 69A of the IT Act, 2000**, and the **process** is laid out in the **2009 Blocking Rules**. Requests are examined by a committee led by the **Designated Officer** with representatives from **Law & Justice, Home Affairs, Information & Broadcasting, and CERT-In**, which then recommends action; orders must record reasons, and there’s provision for review. Options A and B mispair the wrong statutes/rules and describe advisory or technical panels not contemplated in law. Option D cites frameworks that do not exist as a governing pair for blocking decisions.

Q26. Correct option: A (Easy). **BharatNet** is a **Department of Telecommunications (DoT)** programme under the **Ministry of Communications**, funded via the **Universal Service Obligation Fund (USOF)** and implemented through **BBNL/BSNL and other agencies**. It targets fibre to **2.5 lakh Gram Panchayats** and functions as the national middle/aggregation layer, with last-mile taken up by service providers and states. Choices B–D misplace ownership (MeitY/NIC, I&B/Prasar Bharati, or MHA) and misconstrue the programme’s architecture.

Q27. Correct option: B (Medium). As of September 2025, **Jitin Prasada** is the **Minister of State for Electronics & IT** and also **MoS for Commerce & Industry**. This is reflected across multiple official portals (MeitY/NIC, STPI, Commerce). Option A is outdated—**Rajeev Chandrasekhar** held MoS (MeitY) until mid-2024. Options C and D misattribute the portfolio.

Q28. Correct option: C (Hard). The **Karnataka High Court (Feb 2022)** struck down provisions of the **Karnataka Police (Amendment) Act, 2021** that banned online games with stakes, removing the blanket prohibition and creating a regulatory gap until later policy moves in 2025. **Telangana** had already enacted a sweeping 2017 prohibition; **Andhra Pradesh** criminalised online gambling in 2020; **Tamil Nadu’s** targeted law regulating real-money rummy/poker was **upheld by the Madras High Court in 2025**, not “undisturbed and unchallenged,” but certainly **sustained**—so D is incorrect on stability claims.

Q29. Correct option: D (Hard). Industry associations warned the Union government of **~₹20,000 crore in annual tax-revenue at risk** if a **blanket ban** pushed users to offshore/unregulated platforms (reducing **GST/TDS** capture). Options A and B are undercounts or partial measures tied to specific periods/assumptions; Option C confuses **gross sector revenue** with **tax receipts**. The **₹20,000 crore** estimate appears consistently in recent industry representations covered by national business media.

Q30. Correct option: A (Difficulty: Easy). “**NISAR**” expands to **NASA–ISRO Synthetic Aperture Radar**, referencing the joint Earth-observation mission by NASA and ISRO that uses SAR techniques to measure subtle surface changes. This is the official project name and appears across NASA mission pages and outreach material. **B** invents a purely Indian

reconnaissance program that doesn't exist here. **C** reframes NISAR as a paperwork repository, not a satellite. **D** mislabels it as a generic research/telecom platform—NISAR is a radar-imaging Earth science observatory, not a comms satellite.

Q31. Correct option: C (Difficulty: Medium). NISAR launched on ISRO's GSLV (flight F16, Mk II configuration) from the Satish Dhawan Space Centre on **30 July 2025**. NASA and ISRO both report the GSLV vehicle and date; tracking/launch-log sites corroborate the Mk II config and F16 designation. **A** (PSLV-XL) is a lighter launcher typically used for many Earth-obs sats but not this mission. **B** (LVM3/GSLV Mk III) is India's heavy-lift vehicle used for missions like Chandrayaan-2 and beyond; it wasn't used here. **D** (Falcon 9 rideshare) is incorrect; the mission launched from India, not the US.

Q32. Correct option: D (Difficulty: Medium). India signed the **Artemis Accords** in **June 2023** at a ceremony in Washington, D.C., becoming the **27th signatory**. This places India formally in the civil-space exploration norms initiative led by NASA and the US State Department. **A** and **B** are wrong years/events; **C** (2024) doesn't match the documented signing date. Knowing the correct year helps distinguish static policy facts from evolving mission news.

Q33. Correct option: B (Difficulty: Easy). The **Sendai Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction (2015–2030)** is the UN's primary roadmap to reduce disaster risk and losses, adopted at the **Third UN World Conference** in **Sendai, Japan** (March 2015). It sets **seven global targets** and **four priorities** and is coordinated by **UNDRR**; Earth-observation data (like NISAR's) supports monitoring and risk governance. **A** (Paris Agreement) focuses on climate change; **C** (New Urban Agenda) covers sustainable cities; **D** (Addis Ababa) concerns development finance.

Q34. Correct option: A (Difficulty: Hard). NISAR's signature capability is its **dual-frequency SAR: L-band (~25 cm wavelength)** from NASA and **S-band (~10 cm)** from ISRO, operated together to capture complementary surface signals—L-band penetrates vegetation/soil better; S-band is sensitive to surface/structural features. This pairing enables global, systematic mapping with centimeter-scale change detection and underpins its 12-m reflector and wide swath design. **B** falsely claims tri-frequency plus radiometry; **C** describes an optical/hyperspectral telescope, not SAR; **D** mixes scatterometry and laser altimetry—unrelated instruments for this mission.

Q35. Correct option: C (Difficulty: Medium). The **work-share** is: **NASA supplied the L-band radar and communications systems; ISRO supplied the S-band radar, spacecraft bus, and the GSLV launch**. This division is documented by NASA/JPL and ISRO and reflects complementary technical strengths. **A** swaps the radars and launcher. **B** incorrectly assigns NASA the bus and ISRO the L-band, and suggests a Falcon 9 launch. **D** claims NASA built both radars and minimizes ISRO's role to ground segment only, which is factually wrong.

Q36. Correct option: A (Difficulty: Easy). India marks its **79th Independence Day** in 2025 because observances are counted inclusively from the first celebration in 1947. This is confirmed on the Government's **Know India** portal for "Independence Day Celebration 2025," which labels the year's observance as the 79th. Options **B** and **D** undercount by ignoring the inclusive convention used for national day observances; simply subtracting years ($2025 - 1947 = 78$) yields the anniversary, not the count of celebrations. **C** (80th) is a round-up with no basis. (Core detail present in source text — [REDACTED].)

Q37. Correct option: D (Difficulty: Medium). The Red Fort ceremony includes a **21-gun salute** by an Indian Army ceremonial battery, precisely timed with the unfurling of the tricolour and the National Anthem. The **PIB (Ministry of Defence)** programme note for the 79th Independence Day specifies the saluting battery and the 21-gun sequence with indigenous 105 mm Light Field Guns. **A** (19 guns) and **B** (17) are not prescribed for this occasion, and **C** (25 guns) is incorrect in both number and application.

Q38. Correct option: B (Difficulty: Hard). For 2025, the Centre planned to honour **50 of Delhi's better-performing Swachhta Karamcharis**, each **with a spouse**. Zonal offices were asked to nominate **five workers** (three women, two men) and send details to **DEMS HQ**, the nodal agency compiling the final list. PTI's report (carried by outlets like *ThePrint*) explicitly details the nomination mix and DEMS HQ role. **A**, **C**, and **D** describe plausible invitee sets seen in other contexts, but they do not reflect the specific 2025 guest protocol at Red Fort.

Q39. Correct option: C (Difficulty: Medium). **Pingali Venkayya** proposed a tricolour design in **1921**, which evolved—through subsequent modifications—into the flag **adopted on 22 July 1947** by the Constituent Assembly. Government sources recount Venkayya's role in the flag's evolution, and standard references echo this attribution. **A** (Nandalal Bose) was pivotal for the **Constitution's** calligraphy/illustration, not for designing the national flag. **B** (Tagore) inspired patriotic iconography but is not credited as the flag's designer. **D** (Sarojini Naidu) is similarly not cited as the designer in official records.

Q40. Correct option: D (Difficulty: Easy). The Ashoka Chakra at the flag's centre bears **24 spokes**, representing the **Dharma Chakra**—derived from the **Sarnath Lion Capital**. This is codified on Government portals describing national symbols and the Flag Code. **A** (16), **B** (18), and **C** (32) are numerologically neat but incorrect with respect to official symbolism and design.

Q41. Correct option: A (Difficulty: Medium). The Red Fort programme concludes with the **release of tri-coloured balloons** after the Prime Minister's address and the second rendition of the National Anthem—an element featured in 2025 programme rundowns and media advisories. Options **B**, **C**, and **D** are not part of the official 2025 Red Fort conclusion. The IAF's flower-petal shower occurs earlier, at flag-hoisting; laser shows and extended march-pasts aren't listed in the concluding slot.

Q42. Correct option: A (Difficulty: Easy). India's tally stands at **44 World Heritage properties** after the *Maratha Military Landscapes of India* was added in July 2025. UNESCO's official article on the new inscription explicitly calls it "**India's 44th World Heritage property**", resolving any confusion about whether serial components are counted as one property (they are). **B** is outdated (43 was the figure **before** this addition). **C** inflates the total by miscounting serial components as separate sites—UNESCO counts a serial property as a **single** entry. **D** incorrectly assumes more than one Indian inscription in 2025.

Q43. Correct option: D (Difficulty: Hard). The property is a **serial nomination of 12 forts**, **11 in Maharashtra** and **1 in Tamil Nadu (Gingee)**, deliberately spanning varied terrains—**hill, coastal, island, plateau**—to demonstrate Maratha strategic depth and logistical planning. UNESCO's listing and news releases state both the **count** and **geographic spread** unequivocally. **A** reduces the number and wrongly places the out-of-state fort in **Goa**. **B** invents **Karnataka** components. **C** contradicts the inclusion of **Gingee (Tamil Nadu)**.

Q44. Correct option: B (Difficulty: Easy). UNESCO is headquartered in **Paris**, at **7 Place de Fontenoy (75007)**—often called **UNESCO House**. This is basic static GK; the official UNESCO pages list the address and visitor info. **A** (Geneva) and **C** (Vienna) host other UN offices; **D** (New York) is the UN Secretariat HQ, not UNESCO.

Q45. Correct option: C (Difficulty: Hard). **Sinhagad (Kondhana)**, despite its iconic place in Maratha history, **is not** among the **12** inscribed forts. UNESCO and Government/press lists enumerate **Raigad, Rajgad, Shivneri, Pratapgad, Panhala, Vijaydurg, Lohagad, Salher, Sindhudurg, Suvarnadurg, Khanderi, and Gingee**—none of which is Sinhagad. **A**, **B**, and **D** are all genuine components of the serial property.

Q46. Correct option: D (Difficulty: Medium). The inscription cites **Criteria (iv) & (vi)**—(iv) for **outstanding examples of military architecture/landscapes** and (vi) for **associative value** linked to events, traditions and ideas of universal

significance. UNESCO's property page shows the formal criteria, making **A**, **B**, and **C** inaccurate: the site is **cultural**, not mixed or natural, and it isn't listed under (vi) alone.

Q47. Correct option: A (Difficulty: Easy). The **first Indian inscriptions (1983)** included **Ajanta Caves, Ellora Caves, Agra Fort, and Taj Mahal**. Selecting **Ajanta Caves** satisfies "among the first" wording. **B (Konark)** came in **1984**, **C (Khajuraho)** in **1986**, and **D (Chhatrapati Shivaji Terminus)** much later in **2004**. UNESCO's country page and Ajanta's WHC page confirm the dates.

Q48. Correct option: A (Difficulty: Easy). **Chişinău** is the **capital of Moldova**, its largest city and administrative, economic and transport hub. Standard references (e.g., Britannica) and country profiles confirm the status and spelling variants (Kishinev/Kishinau). **B (Bălţi)** is a major city but not the capital. **C (Tiraspol)** is the centre of the Transnistria region and not Moldova's capital. **D (Cahul)** is an important southern city, again not the capital.

Q49. Correct option: D (Difficulty: Easy). The ISA was **launched at COP21 in Paris (2015) by India and France** to catalyse solar deployment, reduce costs, and mobilise finance—verified by the UNFCCC's official note and contemporaneous reporting. **A** wrongly substitutes the UK; **B** suggests a France-only origin and defers India's role to COP22; **C** moves the launch to New York's UNGA week, which is incorrect.

Q50. Correct option: B (Difficulty: Hard). Coverage by national agencies shows **Ambassador Ana Taban** handing the **Instrument of Ratification** to **P. S. Gangadhar, Joint Secretary (Economic Diplomacy), MEA**, who is the **Head of Depository** for the ISA Framework Agreement—in **New Delhi**. **A** elevates the meeting to ministerial/FS level; **C** shifts the venue to ISA HQ and misidentifies the receiving official; **D** reframes it as a ministerial with additional dignitaries not recorded.

Q51. Correct option: C (Difficulty: Easy). The ISA Secretariat is hosted at **Surya Bhawan, NISE Campus, Gwal Pahari, Gurugram (Haryana)** under a Host Country Agreement with India. The official ISA site lists the HQ address; ISA Assembly/contacts pages mirror the same. **A** confuses ISA with **IRENA** (Abu Dhabi). **B** incorrectly places ISA within the UN Geneva complex; ISA is treaty-based, not a UN organ. **D** cites UNESCO House (Paris), which was the **launch city**—not the headquarters.

Q52. Correct option: D (Difficulty: Medium). ISA programmes span **agriculture, health, mini-grids, rooftops, e-mobility & storage, solar parks, heating/cooling, PV battery & waste, and green hydrogen**, plus **finance at scale**—all focused on accelerating **solar**. Fossil exploration/coal peakers/gas pipelines are **outside** ISA's mandate, so **D** is the correct "NOT" choice. **A–C** reflect published programme tracks and financing initiatives.

SECTION C: - LEGAL REASONING

Q53. Correct Answer: D Difficulty: Hard

Explanation: Option D is correct as the Customs Act and the IPC offences involve different legal ingredients (see line 11). The legal test is whether the "offence" is the same in law, not merely in fact. The court in *Leo Roy v Superintendent District Jail* confirmed that distinct legal ingredients justify separate prosecution even if arising from the same transaction.

- **Option A** is incorrect because the overlap of facts is insufficient.
- **Option B** wrongly assumes any punishment precludes further prosecution, which is legally inaccurate.
- **Option C** fails to consider the distinction in legal ingredients.

Q54. Correct Answer: C Difficulty: Hard

Explanation: Option C is correct. A departmental inquiry is administrative in nature and does not count as a “prosecution” for the purposes of Article 20(2) (see line 13). The case *S.A. Venkataraman v Union of India* confirms that criminal prosecution can follow departmental penalties.

- **Option A** wrongly equates disciplinary action with criminal trial.
- **Option B** misinterprets “same conduct” as “same offence,” which the courts reject.
- **Option D** applies the wrong test by focusing on factual overlap, not legal ingredients.

Q55. Correct Answer: C Difficulty: Hard

Explanation: Option C is correct. Appeals are treated as a continuation of the same case, not a new proceeding (see line 15). Article 20(2) does not bar the state from appealing an acquittal.

- **Option A** is incorrect as it wrongly classifies an appeal as a new prosecution.
- **Option B** ignores the procedural continuity of the appellate process.
- **Option D** misreads Article 20(2) to include appeal as fresh jeopardy.

Q56. Correct Answer: B Difficulty: Hard

Explanation: Option B is correct. The passage (see line 16) clarifies that continuing offences—where each day of non-compliance constitutes a new offence—can be punished daily without violating double jeopardy. This is also reflected in *Mohammad Ali v Sri Ram Swaroop*.

- **Option A** wrongly assumes the same offence is being punished again.
- **Option C** contradicts the logic of continuing offences.
- **Option D** invents a condition (new financial year) not required under the law.

Q57. Correct Answer: C Difficulty: Hard

Explanation: Option A is incorrect as it confuses factual overlap with legal identity. Option B is incorrect because the prior proceeding did result in punishment. Option C is correct. If the Disaster Management Act provision involves different elements (for example, endangering public health), it can still be pursued separately (see line 11).

- **Option A** wrongly equates same event with same offence.
- **Option B** fails as punishment has already occurred.
- **Option D** is inaccurate since the legal test is ingredients, not fact repetition.

Q58. Correct Answer: C Difficulty: Medium-Hard

Explanation: Option C is correct. The passage clarifies that courts assess whether the *offence* is the same in law, not whether the facts or narratives are identical (see line 10). This makes the doctrine precise and limited, not a blanket protection.

- **Option A** incorrectly suggests absolute protection, which the courts have never accepted.
- **Option B** wrongly interprets the test as factual overlap.
- **Option D** ignores the distinction between civil and criminal liability clearly outlined in line 14.

Passage Summary and Comprehension Strategy

This passage discusses **double jeopardy**, a constitutional protection enshrined in **Article 20(2)** of the Indian Constitution, which bars repeated prosecution and punishment for the **same offence**. It delves into doctrinal boundaries by distinguishing between **same offence vs. same facts**, **judicial prosecution vs. departmental inquiry**, and **continuing offences vs. repeated punishment**. The passage also draws on judicial decisions to explain these distinctions.

Approach to Reading the Passage

- Focus on the **doctrinal distinction** between *legal offence* and *factual overlap*. Courts emphasize **legal ingredients**, not narrative similarity.
- Take note of **exceptions and clarifications**—such as appeals, departmental proceedings, and continuing offences—as these show the calibrated limits of the protection.

- Identify the **threshold conditions**: (i) prior prosecution by a court/tribunal and (ii) punishment for the same legal offence.
- Recognize that the **passage demands conceptual clarity**; its difficulty lies not in complex vocabulary but in legal subtlety and doctrinal nuance.

Question-wise Strategy and Approach

Q53 (Vineet – Customs & IPC)

This question requires comparing two statutes (Customs Act vs IPC) and determining whether they criminalize the *same legal conduct*. The correct approach is to examine **distinct legal ingredients**, not shared facts. The focus should be on the **legal character** of the offence, not its narrative context.

Q54 (Rohini – Departmental inquiry vs criminal prosecution)

A critical distinction must be made between **administrative proceedings** and **criminal trials**. This question tests the test-taker's ability to understand that **Article 20(2)** is triggered only after a **judicial prosecution**, not internal disciplinary action.

Q55 (Kartik – Appeal from acquittal)

This hinges on understanding **procedural continuity**. The test-taker should recognize that **an appeal is part of the same prosecution**, not a fresh one. The strategy here is to distinguish between the **mode of challenge** (appeal) and a **new prosecution**.

Q56 (Zahra – Continuing offence under Companies Act)

Here, the test-taker must apply the concept of **continuing offence**. The correct approach is to recognize that **each day of violation** gives rise to a fresh offence and thus does not offend double jeopardy. This needs precise recall of the passage's explicit treatment of continuing defaults.

Q57 (Vishal – IPC and Disaster Management Act)

The test is whether **two laws punishing the same incident** necessarily offend Article 20(2). The correct strategy is to assess whether **each statute contains distinct legal ingredients**. This demands both doctrinal and statutory analysis.

Q58 (Passage-based – Core doctrine)

This question tests understanding of the **central interpretive theme**. The test-taker should recall that courts emphasize whether **the legal offence is the same**, not whether facts are overlapping. This requires a synthesis of the entire passage.

Legal Principles from the Passage (in Pointers)

1. **Constitutional Protection under Article 20(2):**
No person shall be prosecuted and punished for the **same offence** more than once.
2. **Judicial Threshold for Double Jeopardy to Apply:**
 - There must have been a **prior prosecution before a court or judicial tribunal**.
 - The person must have been **punished in that proceeding**.
 - The subsequent proceeding must relate to the **same offence**, not just the **same facts**.
3. **Legal Test of "Same Offence":** The **ingredients of the offences must match** in law. Overlapping narratives or facts do not trigger double jeopardy.
4. **Departmental/Administrative Proceedings Are Excluded:** Disciplinary or departmental actions (like dismissal from service) are **not judicial prosecutions**, hence not covered by Article 20(2).
5. **Civil and Criminal Proceedings May Co-Exist:** Since they serve **different legal purposes**, a civil suit may continue even after a criminal prosecution on the same set of facts.
6. **Appeals Are Not Fresh Prosecutions:** An **appeal from acquittal** is treated as a **continuation** of the original prosecution, not a violation of Article 20(2).
7. **Continuing Offences Doctrine:** Where an offence continues over time (e.g., daily non-compliance), **each day constitutes a separate offence**, permitting **daily penalties**.
8. **Illustrative Case Law:**
 - *S.A. Venkataraman v Union of India* – Departmental inquiry not equivalent to prosecution.
 - *Leo Roy v Superintendent, District Jail* – Customs and IPC offences are distinct in law.

Q59. Correct Answer: (A) Ramesh may succeed in an adverse possession claim as his possession was continuous, hostile, and open for more than 12 years. [Difficulty: Hard]

Explanation:

Under Indian law (Article 65 of the Limitation Act, 1963, and settled Supreme Court precedents like *Karnataka Board of Wakf v. Govt. of India* (2004)), adverse possession requires continuous, open, hostile, and exclusive possession for 12 years or more against the true owner.

Here:

- Ramesh entered in 2010, erected a boundary wall and installed a tube well, and cultivated the land openly and exclusively.
- His possession continued till 2024 = 14 years, satisfying the 12-year requirement.
- Hostility here does not mean animosity, but rather possession *without owner's permission*.

Therefore, (A) is the most accurate.

Why the other options are wrong:

(B) "Claim will fail as he was aware the land belonged to Mr. Yadav and hence acted in bad faith."

- Wrong, because good faith is irrelevant. Even if Ramesh knew the land belonged to Yadav, adverse possession is valid as long as it is hostile, open, and continuous. The doctrine protects possession over ownership due to the statute of limitation, not the possessor's state of mind.

(C) "Mr. Yadav will succeed since he did not expressly permit Ramesh."

- Incorrect. Lack of permission strengthens adverse possession, because permissive possession (like tenancy or license) cannot ripen into adverse possession. The fact that Yadav never consented doesn't help him once 12 years have passed.

(D) "Occupation was not adverse since it was on agricultural land and cannot be claimed against a private individual."

- Misleading. Adverse possession can be claimed against private individuals, including agricultural landowners, unless statutory exceptions (like government land) apply. There is no bar on agricultural land being the subject of adverse possession.

Q60. Correct Answer: (B) Her claim will fail because permissive possession cannot ripen into adverse possession [Hard]

Explanation:

For adverse possession to succeed, the possession must be:

1. Hostile (against the rights of the true owner, without permission).
2. Open and notorious (visible to the public/owner).
3. Exclusive (no sharing with the owner).
4. Continuous for at least 12 years (for private property, under the Limitation Act, 1963).

Here, Sonal entered in 2012 with the oral permission of the owner. That makes her initial occupation permissive, not hostile. Even if she stayed until 2023 (11 years), her possession remained permissive unless she clearly repudiated the owner's title and the owner was aware of such hostility. Since this never happened, adverse possession cannot arise.

Thus, (B) is legally correct.

Why the other options are wrong:

(A) "Sonal's claim is valid since she used the property openly and continuously for over 11 years."

- Wrong, because the period is 11 years, which is less than the required 12 years. Even apart from time, her occupation was permissive.

(C) "She may succeed since the owner made no efforts to evict her for over a decade."

- Incorrect. Mere inaction by the owner is not enough. If the possession started with permission, silence cannot convert it into adverse possession unless Sonal openly denies the owner's rights.

(D) "The length of possession alone makes the claim of adverse possession sustainable in her favour."

- False. Duration by itself is not enough. The nature of possession (hostile vs permissive) is equally essential.

Q61. C. [Difficulty: Medium] Explanation:

For adverse possession to succeed, the claimant must prove:

1. Actual possession (physical control),
2. Hostile/Adverse possession (*animus possidendi* – intention to possess against the true owner),
3. Continuous and uninterrupted possession for at least 12 years (in case of private property, per the Limitation Act, 1963).

In Abdul's case, his initial entry was lawful, being a tenant under the landlord. Even after expiry of the lease, unless he makes an explicit hostile claim denying the landlord's title, his possession remains a continuation of the earlier permissive possession. Courts have consistently held that tenant's possession after lease expiry is not automatically adverse—there must be clear evidence of repudiation of the landlord's ownership and assertion of hostile title.

- Option A is wrong because mere non-payment of rent and holding over is not enough; intention to possess adversely must be proved.
- Option B is wrong because possession does not automatically turn adverse after 12 years without hostile intent.
- Option D is wrong because landlord's inaction alone cannot convert permissive tenancy into adverse possession.

Thus, Abdul cannot succeed in his claim for adverse possession.

Q62 — Correct Answer: B Difficulty: Hard

Line Reference: Line 17–18 (criticism and limits; adverse possession not to defeat true owners unfairly).

- **Correct (B):** Government can repossess because generally, adverse possession claims are weak against public land. Courts insist on strict proof and rarely allow it against the state.
- **Incorrect (A):** No rule requires formal notice; possession must be visible and notorious, not notified (line 9).
- **Incorrect (C):** Long use is not enough — hostility against the rightful titleholder (here, the state) must be proved with high threshold.
- **Incorrect (D):** Wrong because unclaimed land doesn't "automatically" confer ownership; the doctrine is a defence, not an independent title.

Q63 — Correct Answer: C Difficulty: Hard

Line Reference: Line 11–12 (possession must be hostile, not permissive).

- **Correct (C):** Ajay cannot claim adverse possession unless he clearly denied the uncle's ownership. Family or consensual arrangements generally bar hostility unless repudiation occurs.
- **Incorrect (A):** Too generous. Payment of taxes or renovations may show control but not hostility unless coupled with denial of title.
- **Incorrect (B):** Correct in principle that initial family entry was permissive, but the question asks the strongest legal position: family consent blocks adverse possession unless expressly denied.
- **Incorrect (D):** Incorrect generalisation; no universal bar on family disputes. Courts examine hostility, not relation.

Q64 — Correct Answer: (A) Difficulty: Medium

- (A) is accurate: adverse possession is justified as a doctrine of limitation and certainty of title — penalising owners who sleep on their rights and protecting those who possess land openly and continuously.
- (B) is wrong: good faith or mistake of ownership is not required (*Karnataka Board of Wakf*).
- (C) is wrong: economic productivity or efficiency is irrelevant; the doctrine is about limitation, not utilitarian use.
- (D) is wrong: adverse possession applies against both private and government land (though the period for the State is longer — 30 years).

1) Passage Summary & Reading Approach

The passage deals with the **doctrine of adverse possession** under Indian property law, where a non-owner may acquire ownership through **continuous, hostile, and open possession** for a statutory period (12 years under the Limitation Act, 1963). It explains the essentials — **continuity, publicity, exclusivity, hostility, and animus possidendi (intention to possess)** — and distinguishes adverse possession from **permissive possession** under lease or license. It also highlights the tension: critics see it as rewarding trespassers, while defenders say it ensures certainty in land titles and discourages absentee ownership.

Approach for reading:

- Identify the **core doctrine** (statutory basis + Latin maxim).
- Note the **conditions required** to prove adverse possession.
- Pay attention to **exclusions and limits** (e.g., permissive entry, family relationships, government land).
- Recognise the **judicial clarifications** (Wakf Board case, Annakili case).
- Expect questions to test whether possession meets all legal ingredients, not just duration.

2) Question-Specific Approach

Q59 (Ramesh v Yadav — agricultural land)

Approach: Check if the **full statutory period** of hostile possession is complete. The test is whether Ramesh had uninterrupted, open, hostile occupation for over 12 years (line 7–10).

Q60 (Sonal — permissive possession)

Approach: Ask whether the initial occupation was **permissive**. If possession started with consent (oral permission), it cannot ripen into adverse possession unless expressly hostile later (line 11).

Q61 (Abdul — tenant after lease expiry)

Approach: Distinguish between possession starting under a **tenancy** and later becoming hostile. The key is whether Abdul clearly denied the landlord's title (line 12).

Q62 (Radha — government land)

Approach: Examine if adverse possession applies against **state property**. Courts impose strict limits here, as the doctrine is not meant to transfer public land easily (line 18–20).

Q63 (Ajay — family property)

Approach: Determine if occupation was **permissive due to family arrangement**. Courts usually presume consent in family cases unless hostility is explicitly shown (line 11).

Q64 (Doctrinal justification)

Approach: Look for the **policy rationale** underlying the doctrine — discouraging absentee ownership, ensuring certainty in titles, and encouraging productive land use (line 19–20).

3) Legal Principles from the Passage

1. **Statutory Basis:** Section 27 of the Limitation Act, 1963 extinguishes the true owner's title if adverse possession continues for 12 years.
2. **Latin Maxim:** *Vigilantibus non dormientibus jura subveniunt* — the law helps the vigilant, not those who sleep on their rights.
3. **Essentials of Adverse Possession:**
 - Possession must be **actual, continuous, exclusive, and uninterrupted** (line 7).
 - Possession must be **open and notorious**, giving notice to the owner (line 8).
 - Possession must be **hostile** to the true owner's interests, not permissive (line 9–11).
 - **Animus possidendi** — intention to possess and exclude the true owner — is critical (line 14).
4. **Permissive Possession:** Entry by lease, license, or family arrangement cannot amount to adverse possession (line 11).
5. **Judicial Clarifications:**
 - *Karnataka Board of Wakf v Government of India* — possession must show continuity, publicity, and extent sufficient to notify the true owner (line 13).
 - *Annakili v A Vedanayagam* — hostile intention and animus possidendi are indispensable (line 14).

6. **Policy Justification:** Doctrine promotes certainty in land titles, discourages absentee owners, and ensures land is productively used (line 19–20).
7. **Criticism:** Doctrine rewards trespassers and punishes negligent owners (line 17–18).

Q65 — Correct Answer: D Difficulty: Hard

Line Reference: Lines 6–9 (Quashing on compromise in commercial disputes, but serious allegations like forgery must be scrutinized)

- **Explanation:** Courts allow quashing of criminal proceedings based on compromise in civil-commercial matters but do **not** extend this to serious crimes involving public elements like forgery. The High Court must assess if the **ingredients of forgery** are made out and whether the dispute is truly civil in flavour.
- **A** is overly simplistic and fails to consider the nature of the alleged offence.
- **B** is too rigid and doesn't reflect the court's discretion to evaluate allegations.
- **C** demands proof at this stage, which is incorrect — only prima facie ingredients matter.

Q66 — Correct Answer: B Difficulty: Medium-Hard

Line Reference: Lines 4–6 (Court examines whether allegations, taken at face value, disclose an offence)

- **Explanation:** The court does not adjudicate the emotional backdrop of the case. Instead, it must assess if the **elements of cheating (fraudulent inducement)** and criminal intimidation are met **on the face of the complaint**.
- **A** and **C** misapply the test by evaluating the emotional or relational aspect.
- **D** is wrong since the court's power under Section 482 extends to post-charge sheet stage (line 10).

Q67 — Correct Answer: A Difficulty: Hard

Line Reference: Lines 4 and 10–11 (FIR can be quashed if allegations do not disclose a cognizable offence)

- **Explanation:** Satire may be protected speech unless it **crosses the threshold of a cognizable offence**. If the FIR lacks the essential elements of incitement, then the FIR is liable to be quashed.
- **B** and **C** improperly assume the necessity of a trial.
- **D** is incorrect since public concern does not override procedural safeguards.

Q68 — Correct Answer: A Difficulty: Medium-Hard

Line Reference: Line 5 (If even accepted in full, the allegations do not make out a known offence)

- **Explanation:** Defamation requires **specific allegations**, dates, and context. Vague claims, even if humiliating, don't automatically satisfy the legal ingredients.
- **B** and **D** ignore the threshold legal test before proceeding to trial.
- **C** is flawed as legal sufficiency cannot be overridden by cultural sensitivity alone.

Q69 — Correct Answer: B Difficulty: Hard

Line Reference: Line 9–10 (Quashing justified if FIR is manifestly tainted by mala fides or vengeance)

- **Explanation:** The absence of any material showing **intentional falsity**, coupled with the **timing of the FIR**, strongly suggests mala fides. Courts quash such retaliatory prosecutions to prevent abuse.
- **A** applies a rigid reading of the statute without regard to context.
- **C** and **D** incorrectly defer to trial where no prima facie case exists.

Q70 — Correct Answer: C Difficulty: Medium-Hard

Line Reference: Line 5 (Allegations must disclose ingredients of offence; property disputes may not be criminal)

- **Explanation:** Mere **unlawful occupation** after termination of tenancy doesn't automatically amount to criminal trespass unless there is **intent to intimidate, insult or annoy**. Here, the line between civil and criminal is blurred, so the FIR should not be quashed at this stage.
- **A** misstates the law — landlord-tenant disputes can, in some contexts, involve criminality.

- B is premature; ingredients of intent must be evident in FIR.
- D is overly broad — **not all unlawful occupation** is criminal trespass.

1) Passage Summary and Reading Approach

The passage discusses the **inherent power of the High Court under Section 482 of the Code of Criminal Procedure to quash criminal proceedings** that constitute an abuse of process or where the **continuation would be unjust**. This power is **extraordinary and preventive**, not curative, and must be exercised **sparingly**. The passage lists **five broad judicially recognized grounds** on which FIRs may be quashed and clarifies that courts do not conduct a mini-trial but only ask whether the **basic ingredients of any offence are made out on the face of the allegations**. It also explains situations where quashing is appropriate due to **settlements** in civil or private disputes, while cautioning against extending this to **serious public offences**.

Reading Strategy for Test-Takers:

- **Isolate the core legal threshold:** whether the FIR discloses the **basic ingredients of any cognizable offence**.
- Understand the **five recurring grounds** where quashing is typically allowed (absurdity, non-cognizable offence, legal bar, etc.).
- Watch for **exceptions and balancing principles**, like non-quashing in serious public offences or allegations of mala fide intent.
- Don't confuse procedural stage (FIR, charge sheet, trial) — **quashing is permitted even after charge sheet filing**.
- Distinguish **civil disputes dressed as criminal cases** from genuine criminality — especially where compromise is involved.

2) Question-Wise Approach and Strategy

Q65 (Parag – Forgery & Civil Dispute)

This question tests whether **settlement in a civil-commercial dispute** allows quashing when allegations of **forgery** are involved. The correct approach is to **check for public dimension**—forgery affects society at large and often resists quashing even if parties settle (Lines 10–12).

Q66 (Aryan – Romantic Relationship & Cheating)

This question focuses on **whether allegations arising from a failed personal relationship amount to criminal cheating**. Approach it by testing whether **ingredients of cheating (fraudulent intent at inception)** are made out (Lines 4–6).

Q67 (Veer – Satirical Speech & Public Disorder)

This tests whether **speech acts**, like satire, can be subject to criminal proceedings. The key is whether the **FIR discloses a cognizable offence** that justifies a criminal investigation under Section 156 CrPC (Line 6).

Q68 (Renu – Vague FIR & Witchcraft Allegations)

Here, the strategy is to evaluate whether an FIR should be quashed when it **fails to meet the basic requirement of specificity**. Vague or improbable FIRs that **don't disclose an offence on their face** may be quashed (Lines 5–6).

Q69 (Whistleblower – Retaliatory FIR under Section 211 IPC)

This question tests **abuse of criminal process and mala fides**. Focus on whether the **FIR appears retaliatory** and if there's any evidence to support the accusation of making a false charge (Lines 9–10).

Q70 (Landlord-Tenant Dispute & Criminal Trespass)

This addresses **civil disputes being converted into criminal charges**, especially regarding **possession and trespass**. The approach is to **check whether criminal intent is clearly alleged**, as criminal trespass requires **intent to intimidate/annoy** (Line 5).

3) Legal Principles Mentioned in the Passage (Enumerated)

Core Doctrine

1. **Section 482 CrPC** empowers the High Court to:
 - Prevent **abuse of the process of court**, and
 - Secure the **ends of justice**.
2. This power is **inherent, extraordinary**, and exercised **sparingly**.

3. **No mini-trial** is conducted at the quashing stage — the High Court merely checks if **allegations, taken at face value, disclose the basic ingredients of any offence** (Line 4).

Recognised Grounds for Quashing (Line 5–8)

Courts have repeatedly upheld quashing in the following situations:

4. **No offence disclosed** even if all allegations are fully accepted as true.
5. **Allegations are absurd or inherently improbable**, so no prudent person could believe them.
6. **Lack of jurisdiction**: where allegations do not disclose a **cognizable offence**, or if the case is non-cognizable and there's no magistrate's order (Section 155(2)).
7. **Existence of a statutory bar**: where the law bars prosecution or provides a more appropriate alternative mechanism.
8. **Mala fide prosecution**: if the FIR is **motivated by vengeance**, personal vendetta, or other improper purposes.

Compromise and Settlement (Line 9–12)

9. FIR can be quashed on the basis of a **genuine compromise**, especially in:
 - **Commercial disputes**,
 - **Matrimonial disputes**,
 - **Private complaints with no public interest**.
10. However, compromise does **not justify quashing** in:
 - **Grave offences**,
 - **Offences involving public interest** (e.g., forgery, terrorism, sexual assault).
11. Even after **charge sheet is filed**, courts can exercise this power **if prima facie offence is not disclosed**.

Supplementary Remedies (Line 13–14)

12. **Section 156(3) CrPC**: Allows the Magistrate to direct investigation.
13. **Section 200 CrPC**: Permits filing a **private complaint**.
14. **Section 211 IPC**: Punishes **false accusations** made knowingly.
15. **Section 250 CrPC**: Provides **compensation** when the magistrate finds the accusation lacked reasonable cause.

Q71 → Correct Answer: C Difficulty: Hard

Explanation: The brand made a **quantifiable promise of weight loss backed by "science"** without any valid substantiation. The cited "science" was a non-peer-reviewed blog post, which fails the standard for **reasonable basis of claims** (Lines 4–5). The endorser did not verify the scientific validity and only used the product for a week, failing to exercise **due diligence** (Line 6). Both are liable.

- **A** is incorrect: Physical harm is not necessary for a misleading ad to be actionable (Line 5). Misrepresentation alone suffices.
- **B** is incorrect: Use of the product does not shield endorsers from liability. The law requires **verification**, not mere usage (Line 6).
- **D** is incorrect: The ad made a **factual claim** ("Drop 5 kilos in 7 days"), not a vague aspiration. Claims with **quantified outcomes** are **not puffery** (Line 5).

Q72 → Correct Answer: B Difficulty: Medium-Hard

Explanation: The furniture website created **false urgency** by artificially resetting countdown timers. Such **dark patterns** nudge consumers into hurried decisions by manufacturing scarcity (Lines 8–9). The Act recognizes this as **unfair trade practice**, especially where no disclosure about algorithmic manipulation is made.

- **A** is incorrect: Consent is irrelevant when consumer decision-making is **distorted** (Line 7).
- **C** is incorrect: Promotional puffery must not cross into **factual misrepresentation**, especially where **actual urgency is simulated**.
- **D** is incorrect: Commercial speech is protected but **subject to regulation** when it **misleads or deceives** (Line 4).

Q73 → Correct Answer: B Difficulty: Hard

Explanation: The toothpaste claim of “99.9% plaque removal” was based on **in vitro tests**, not real-world clinical trials. The disclaimer was insufficient and buried in fine print. Misleading **scientific claims**, especially without proper consumer understanding, amount to **unfair trade practices** (Lines 4–5).

- **A** is incorrect: Technical disclosures must be **clear, accessible, and not misleading**. Hidden footnotes don’t cure deception (Line 6).
- **C** is incorrect: Consumer law **can regulate scientific claims** if they are used in **marketing** and are **misleading** (Line 5).
- **D** is incorrect: Even if the product is effective, **false or exaggerated claims** remain actionable under the Act (Line 5).

Q74 → Correct Answer: C Difficulty: Medium-Hard

Explanation: The guarantee of “24-hour delivery” was contradicted by widespread delays, and the disclaimer was only added later. This is a **classic example of omission of material facts**, as the **limitations (PIN-code restrictions)** were not originally disclosed (Line 5).

- **A** is incorrect: Liability arises from **misleading the consumer**, not from whether delays were “beyond control” (Line 4).
- **B** is incorrect: Post-facto disclaimers **do not retroactively cure** misleading claims (Line 5).
- **D** is incorrect: The eventual delivery does not absolve the seller of **liability for the initial deception** (Line 4).

Q75 → Correct Answer: C Difficulty: Hard

Explanation: The company fabricated a **non-existent endorsement** and admitted it. The endorser also **did not verify the legitimacy** of the claim. Both are liable under the Act (Line 6), which mandates that **endorsements must be substantiated** and that **endorsers must conduct due diligence** (Line 6).

- **A** is incorrect: CCPA has clear powers to penalise **endorsers** along with the brand (Line 6).
- **B** is incorrect: Payment is **not a necessary condition** for liability. The focus is on whether the endorser acted responsibly (Line 6).
- **D** is incorrect: Actionable unfair practices are based on **likelihood to mislead**, not on whether a consumer **was “compelled”** to rely (Line 4).

Q76 → Correct Answer: B Difficulty: Medium-Hard

Explanation: Undisclosed use of filters to exaggerate “before-after” outcomes is a **form of visual deception**. The Act covers **manipulative presentation and design**, and such tactics can distort consumer expectations (Lines 4 and 8).

- **A** is incorrect: The threshold for deception is **not harm**, but whether the **visuals mislead** the average consumer (Line 5).
- **C** is incorrect: Creativity in advertising is not exempt from **truthful representation** standards (Line 5).
- **D** is incorrect: Absence of harm doesn’t shield an ad from being misleading if it **inflates product results** (Line 6).

Q77 → Correct Answer: A Difficulty: Hard

Explanation: The platform manipulated search results by **prioritising sponsored listings** without clear disclosure. A vague note in a collapsible FAQ does **not satisfy the standard of explicit, front-end transparency** required under the Act (Lines 8–9). Such interface designs are classified as **dark patterns**.

- **B** is incorrect: The **absence of false claims** does not mean absence of **consumer manipulation** (Line 8).
- **C** is incorrect: Platforms are liable for **how they present product rankings**, even if they are not the sellers (Line 8).
- **D** is incorrect: Consumer rankings and their **presentation are regulated** under the Act when **they mislead** (Line 8).

1. Passage Summary and Reading Approach

This passage explains the **concept of unfair trade practices (UTPs)** under **Section 2(47) of the Consumer Protection Act, 2019**, focusing on how deceptive, manipulative, or misleading conduct by businesses—especially in **advertising and digital commerce**—is regulated. It emphasizes that the **test is functional**: would an average consumer, acting prudently, be misled? The Central Consumer Protection Authority (CCPA) has strong powers to stop unfair practices, **penalise violators**, and ensure **corrective and deterrent action**. Key examples include **false endorsements, dark patterns, and manipulative urgency tactics**. The law extends to **e-commerce**, tackling issues like sponsored content, undisclosed filters, and fake scarcity.

Reading Strategy for CLAT:

- **Focus on the statutory test**: would an average consumer be misled?
- **Note the difference between harm and deception**—a product need not be harmful for a practice to be unfair.
- Pay attention to **specific illustrations**: misleading slogans, fake endorsements, false scarcity, exaggerated results.
- **Track the enforcement mechanism**: the CCPA's powers and remedies matter.
- Understand that **both substance and presentation** (design, filters, search rankings) are scrutinised.

2. Question-Specific Approach and Strategy

Q71 – Misleading slogan & lack of scientific basis (weight-loss claim) Approach: Ask if the claim is **quantifiable, verifiable, and substantiated**. Is the endorser liable for failing to verify? This is a **classic misleading ad** under the Act. Test for due diligence and whether a claim would mislead a prudent consumer.

Q72 – False urgency and algorithmic scarcity Approach: Check if the urgency was **artificially created** and whether it influenced consumer decision-making. The question tests your understanding of **dark patterns** and how **interface manipulation** can distort autonomy.

Q73 – Scientific claim with fine print disclaimer - Approach: Assess whether the **consumer understands** what “in vitro” means and whether the product claim is misleading. Focus on **material omission** and the insufficiency of **fine print** when the main claim is bold and broad.

Q74 – Delivery guarantee contradicted by practice - Approach: Identify if a **material term** (24-hour delivery) was misleading and whether **post-facto disclaimers** help. The correct approach is to test the **timing and visibility** of disclaimers—were they part of the original promise?

Q75 – Fake endorsement by non-existent entity - Approach: Determine the liability of both the brand and endorser when the endorsement is fabricated. The question tests your understanding of **endorser responsibility** and **fabricated third-party validation**.

Q76 – Use of filters in “before-after” fairness ad - Approach: Evaluate whether **undisclosed editing** counts as a misleading visual claim, even without health risks. Understand that **visual deception** can mislead just as much as verbal or written statements.

Q77 – Sponsored listings & hidden disclosures - Approach: Ask if the disclosure about sponsorship is **clear and front-facing** or **hidden in a footnote**. Tests your knowledge of **platform liability** and the role of **transparency in ranking or review systems**.

3. Legal Principles from the Passage (with Headings)

Definition and Scope of Unfair Trade Practices (Section 2(47), CPA 2019)

- UTPs include misleading advertisements, false representations, concealment of material facts, deceptive pricing, and more.
- The **test is functional**: would the average consumer, acting with ordinary prudence, be misled?

Misleading Advertisements

- A claim is misleading if it omits material facts, exaggerates efficacy, or lacks a reasonable basis.
- **Quantified guarantees** without evidence (e.g., “Drop 5 kilos in 7 days”) are regulated.
- Disclaimers must be **clear, visible, and not buried in fine print**.

Endorser Liability (Section 21 CPA + CCPA Guidelines)

- Endorsers are liable if they fail to **exercise due diligence** to verify claims before promoting them.
- Even **use of the product** is insufficient if the claim is unsubstantiated.

- Payment or intent is **not necessary** for liability—**lack of verification suffices**.

CCPA Powers (Section 18 CPA)

- The Central Consumer Protection Authority can:
 - Order discontinuation or correction of misleading ads,
 - Direct **corrective advertising**,
 - **Impose fines** (₹10 lakhs for first offence, ₹50 lakhs for repeat),
 - Proceed against endorsers,
 - Order product **recall or reimbursement**.

Digital Economy & E-Commerce Fairness

- **Dark patterns**, false urgency (e.g., “Only 3 left!”), and countdown resets are regulated.
- Platforms must provide **clear disclosures** around sponsored content, paid rankings, and affiliate links.
- Even **interface design** can mislead if it nudges users into decisions they wouldn’t have made otherwise.

Omissions = Misrepresentations

- Omitting key facts (e.g., testing method, limitations on delivery) is **as actionable** as outright falsehoods.

Visual Manipulation and Filters

- **Undisclosed image filters** or manipulations in “before-after” claims (e.g., fairness creams) are misleading.
- Ads must not **exaggerate outcomes**, whether via text or image.

Q78. Correct Answer: B Difficulty: Hard

Line Reference: Lines 6–8 Explanation:

Indian courts have repeatedly held that **post-employment non-compete clauses**, no matter how senior the role or how sensitive the information accessed, are **unenforceable under Section 27**. The law does not recognize “reasonableness” as a defence (unlike UK/US). In *Percept D Mark* and others, courts struck down such clauses, reinforcing the idea that the right to livelihood cannot be curtailed by contract.

- **A** is incorrect because even access to trade secrets does not override the statutory prohibition against post-employment restraints (Line 7).
- **C** is incorrect because enforceability does not depend on whether misuse occurred; the clause is void on its face.
- **D** is incorrect because voluntariness does not validate a contract that is void by statute.

Q79. Correct Answer: A Difficulty: Medium-Hard

Line Reference: Lines 9–11 Explanation:

Courts have upheld **in-term non-compete and exclusivity clauses** in commercial arrangements such as franchises, joint ventures, and distribution deals. In *Gujarat Bottling Co. v. Coca-Cola*, such clauses were found valid because they facilitate mutual obligations, and parties negotiate as equals. The clause here merely prevents YumWay from promoting rivals **during** the contract term.

- **B** is incorrect: In-term restraints are allowed when they support the commercial intent of the agreement.
- **C** is wrong: Geographic limitation is not a requirement for validity under Section 27 if the restraint is during the term.
- **D** is incorrect because compensation for exclusivity is not a condition for enforceability under Indian law.

Q80. Correct Answer: B Difficulty: Medium

Line Reference: Line 13–14 Explanation:

Indian courts have **upheld narrowly tailored non-solicitation clauses** that prevent poaching of key personnel or customers. These are not viewed as blanket restraints on trade, particularly where they do not prevent employment but restrict **inducement** or **active solicitation**.

- **A** is incorrect: The clause does not prevent Ananya or the ex-colleagues from working—it merely limits direct solicitation.
- **C** is irrelevant: The legal validity doesn’t hinge on employee category.

- **D** is incorrect: Intention or inducement amount is not the basis for determining enforceability under Section 27.

Q81. Correct Answer: D Difficulty: Medium-Hard

Line Reference: Line 11–12 **Explanation:**

Section 27 allows a statutory exception for **sale of goodwill**, where the seller may agree to refrain from competing for a **reasonable period and area**. A 4-year India-wide restriction in a highly specialized field like textbook publishing is likely to be seen as reasonable. The buyer is entitled to protect the goodwill they purchased.

- **A** is incorrect: Time length is not unreasonable per se; reasonableness is context-specific.
- **C** is incorrect: Violation doesn't require identical products—similar market impact suffices.
- **B** is irrelevant: Enforcement lies before civil courts, not consumer forums.

Q82. Correct Answer: B Difficulty: Hard

Line Reference: Lines 6–8 **Explanation:**

Post-employment non-compete clauses are **generally void in Indian law**, irrespective of the industry or role. Even in fintech, where sensitive data is involved, the correct legal route is through **confidentiality agreements**, not employment bans. The right to livelihood is paramount.

- **A** is incorrect: Sensitive data can be protected through less restrictive means.
- **C** is irrelevant: Actual loss is not the legal standard for determining voidness under Section 27.
- **D** is incorrect: Payment does not validate an otherwise void clause.

Q83. Correct Answer: B Difficulty: Medium-Hard

Line Reference: Line 13 **Explanation:**

Confidentiality clauses are enforceable, even post-contract, because they protect trade secrets—not trade. They do not restrain the party from engaging in competing businesses, but only from disclosing **proprietary data**.

- **A** is incorrect: Indian courts uphold confidentiality obligations beyond employment or collaboration, even if long-term.
- **C** is incorrect: While duration helps interpretation, lack of a specific term does not void the clause.
- **D** is incorrect: Patent protection is separate from contract law obligations.

Q84. Correct Answer: C Difficulty: Medium

Line Reference: Line 10 **Explanation:**

In-term commercial restraints in franchise/distribution agreements are valid where they **facilitate the core purpose of collaboration**. Courts consistently uphold such terms when they **do not extend beyond the contract duration**.

- **A** is incorrect: Geographic scope is less relevant when the restraint applies during contract term.
- **B** is irrelevant: Market position of the brand has no bearing on legal validity.
- **D** is incorrect: Post-termination restraint is irrelevant to evaluating in-term clause.

1. Passage Summary & Reading Strategy

This passage explores the **legal status of restrictive covenants under Indian contract law**, especially through the lens of **Section 27 of the Indian Contract Act, 1872**, which renders void any agreement that imposes a restraint of trade. The passage contrasts how **employment contracts** and **commercial agreements** are treated differently. Courts are **strict** with post-employment restrictions (such as non-compete clauses), typically declaring them void, but are **more tolerant** of **in-term restraints** and commercial exclusivity agreements. The passage also discusses exceptions—like confidentiality clauses and sale of goodwill—where certain restrictions are permitted.

Reading Approach for the Passage

- Focus on the **statutory default**: all restraints of trade are void **unless** a specific exception applies.
- Distinguish between **employment** and **commercial contexts**: post-employment non-competes are generally void; in-term exclusivity clauses in commercial relationships may be valid.

- Note that **not all covenants are treated equally**—enforceability depends on the **timing** (during vs after relationship) and the **subject matter** (non-compete vs confidentiality).
- Watch for **judicial precedent** (e.g., *Niranjan Golikari*, *Gujarat Bottling*, *Percept D Mark*) to ground interpretive rules.

2. Question-Wise Strategy and Approaches

Q78 – Post-employment non-compete (employee joins rival firm)

Approach: This is a textbook case of a post-employment restraint. Look for whether the restraint operates **after** the contract and whether the clause targets **competition**. **Legal lens:** Section 27 makes post-employment non-compete clauses void **irrespective** of seniority or voluntary agreement.

Q79 – In-term exclusivity in a franchise setting

Approach: Ask whether the restraint operates **during** the agreement and whether it supports the commercial arrangement.

Legal lens: Courts uphold such **in-term restraints** in commercial contracts (like *Gujarat Bottling*) where they enable cooperation.

Q80 – Post-employment non-solicitation clause (poaching employees)

Approach: Is this clause limited in scope (targeting **solicitation**, not employment)? Indian courts are more open to **narrow, targeted clauses**. **Legal lens:** Non-solicitation clauses may be enforceable if they do not impose a blanket ban.

Q81 – Non-compete clause tied to sale of goodwill

Approach: Determine whether this clause fits under the **statutory exception** to Section 27 (sale of goodwill). **Legal lens:** These clauses are valid if **reasonable in duration and scope**, and arise during a bona fide transfer.

Q82 – Broad post-employment restriction (fintech industry)

Approach: Check if the clause bars employment **after termination** and whether it spans the entire industry. **Legal lens:** Even sensitive sectors do not justify post-employment non-competes, which are **per se void**.

Q83 – Confidentiality clause in a commercial R&D project

Approach: Is the clause about restricting **trade**, or merely about safeguarding **confidentiality**?

Legal lens: Courts uphold confidentiality clauses—even after contract end—as they don't amount to restraint of trade.

Q84 – In-term distribution exclusivity clause

Approach: Focus on whether the restriction is **during** the contract and helps facilitate the business relationship. **Legal lens:** In-term exclusivity clauses are generally valid when they enable the collaboration (e.g., franchise or distribution).

3. Legal Principles from the Passage (Structured Summary)

Section 27 of the Indian Contract Act, 1872

- **Default Rule:** Every agreement in restraint of trade is **void**.
- **Narrow Construction:** The section is interpreted **strictly**—Indian law **does not accept** a "reasonableness" test in general.

Post-Employment Restraints in Employment Contracts

- **Invalid:** Non-compete clauses that apply **after termination** are typically **void**.
- **Judicial Support:**
 - *Niranjan Shankar Golikari*: upheld in-term restraint.
 - *Percept D Mark* and subsequent Delhi High Court rulings: struck down post-employment non-competes.
- **Rationale:** Such clauses impair the **right to livelihood** and the freedom to pursue one's profession (Line 7–8).

Valid In-Term Employment Clauses

- **Enforceable:** Non-compete and exclusivity clauses **during employment** are generally valid.
- **Examples:** Full-time employment covenants, confidentiality during service.

Commercial Agreements (Greater Tolerance)

- **Presumed Valid if:**
 - Between parties on **equal footing**,
 - Restriction is **in-term**,
 - Facilitates the **purpose of agreement**.
- **Case Law:** *Gujarat Bottling Co. Ltd. v. Coca-Cola* upheld in-term restraint in a franchise agreement (Line 10–11).

Exceptions to Section 27

- **Sale of Goodwill:**
 - Seller may agree to **reasonable** non-compete in time and area (Line 11–12).
 - Valid even if post-termination.
- **Confidentiality Clauses:**
 - Clauses preventing disclosure of **trade secrets, client lists, and technical know-how** are enforceable—even post-employment (Line 13).
- **Non-Solicitation:**
 - Clauses preventing **poaching of customers, employees or suppliers** may be valid if narrowly tailored (Line 13–14).

Subject Matter-Specific Observations

- **Confidentiality** – Upheld, especially for trade secrets.
- **Exclusivity** – Generally valid **during** contractual relationship (commercial context).
- **Non-solicitation** – Enforceable in **some cases**, especially when protecting client or employee connections.
- **Post-employment Non-compete** – Presumptively **void**, regardless of seniority, voluntariness, or industry.

SECTION D: - LOGICAL REASONING

Passage 1:

Q85. Correct answer : A — (Difficulty: Medium; Evidence: [1] [2] [4] [8] [10] [12])

These are **empirical planks**: the **policy fact** ([1]); **domestic output data** ([2]); **US export slump** framed via China's cuts ([4]); **India's import figure** ([8]); **USDA's reaction** ([10]); and the **95% re-export share** ([12]). They **set the stage** for, but do **not** themselves **constitute**, the author's **normative upshot** about enabling farmers or the call for US reciprocity. Option **B** folds in **normative/forward-looking** claims ([15]–[16]), which aren't premises; **C** wrongly asserts the measure is "**strictly domestic**", ignoring **optics/diplomacy** ([13]–[16]); **D** leaps to a prescriptive step (**reverse the waiver**), which the author never states, and miscasts mixed evidence about yields ([18]–[19]). In CR terms, **premises** are **supporting facts**, not **ought-claims** or **over-generalizations**. The items in **A** are the **data points** the argument **builds on**.

Q86. Correct answer : C — (Difficulty: Hard; Evidence: [11] [12] [17]–[22])

The text **links** the waiver to **exporter gains** (cheaper, cleaner inputs; **95% re-export**, [11]–[12]) and paints the **farmer** as a **loser** due to **technology denial** and **import inundation** ([17], [19], [21]), culminating in a prescriptive line about enabling farmers ([22]). Hence, it's reasonable to infer that **without tech/R&D**, higher imports may **worsen** farmers' relative standing while exporters benefit—**co-existing** effects on **different segments**. **A** over-promises **permanence** and **independence** from China, neither supported. **B** projects a **policy time-path** not in evidence; the waiver is explicitly **temporary** ([1]). **D** ignores the "**not just lower output**" line ([3]) and the extensive **optics/diplomacy** material ([13]–[16]). The best-supported **latent claim** is the **dual-track impact** captured in **C**.

Q87. Correct answer : D — (Difficulty: Medium; Evidence: [22] [21]) The author's **policy upshot** is explicit: "The Indian farmer can—and **should be enabled** to—compete, but not with **hands tied**." ([22]) He frames the **double-whammy** (tech denial + import inundation) ([21]) to motivate this. **A** (raise tariffs now) is **not** stated; the article **doesn't** demand

hiking tariffs. **B** invents a rationale about oil cleanliness/cheapness absent from the text; the “**penalty**” is called “unreasonable and irrational” ([16]) but not for that reason. **C** subordinates farm welfare to exports—again **not** the author’s stance. In CR, the **conclusion** is the **normative endpoint** that the premises point to; here it is **farmer enabling via technology**, not autarky or exporter primacy.

Q88. Correct answer : B — (Difficulty: Hard; Evidence: [13]–[16]) The reciprocity call assumes that US decision-makers will (i) **recognise** India’s zero-duty move as **goodwill** within the bilateral ledger ([13]–[15]) and (ii) have **discretion** to **lift** the 25% penalty in response ([16]). Without **perception** and **policy latitude**, the call to reciprocate would be **nugatory**. **A** mislocates authority in **exporters**, not **policymakers**. **C** ties oil sanctions to **cotton prices**, an irrelevant linkage. **D** is about **China** and **cotton**—off-point to **US oil policy**. In CR terms, this is a **necessary assumption**: if it fails, the reciprocity **conclusion** cannot reasonably follow from the **optics** premise.

Q89. Correct answer : A — (Difficulty: Medium–Hard; Evidence: [11] [12] [17]–[22]) The **tension**: policy → exporter gains ([11]–[12]); **farmer** loses due to absent tech and import pressure ([17]–[21]). **Resolution** in **A** disaggregates the economy: **different segments** experience **divergent effects**; **no contradiction** arises because both effects can be true **simultaneously**. **B** is wishful: the text never predicts farmers **will** benefit later. **C** falsely conditions farmer loss on China’s behaviour; the farmer’s disadvantage stems from **domestic tech denial + import inundation** irrespective of China ([19], [21]). **D** claims universal loss, contradicting the stated exporter **benefit** ([11]–[12]). CR “paradox” items often dissolve by **segmenting populations** or **time horizons**—exactly what **A** does.

Q90. Correct answer : C — (Difficulty: Hard; Evidence: [18]–[22]) The author argues for **enabling** farmers via **technology** ([22]) because after Bt’s gains ([18]) yields fell and pests surged ([19]), yielding record import reliance ([20]) amid an **import inundation** dynamic ([21]). **C** adds **high-quality causal evidence** (multi-state, multi-season improvements: yields ~600 kg/ha; pest losses –40%), **directly** supporting the claim that **technology access** can restore **competitiveness**—thereby **strengthening** the policy stance. **A** speaks to exports vs prices for one year—orthogonal to farmer tech. **B** is about marginal mill efficiency, not farmer competitiveness. **D** strengthens the case for industry, but **undercuts** the urgency of enabling farmers; it implies output will rise **even if** farm yields slide, which weakens the farmer-centric conclusion. In CR, the best **strengtheners** are the ones that **fills the causal gap** the author relies on—here, that **new tech** can **materially** change farm outcomes.

Passage-in-brief (4–5 lines) + how to read it: This passage presents a **policy move** (zero duty on cotton till Dec 31, 2025) and explains it through **multiple drivers**: domestic shortfall, trade optics with the US, and supply-chain realities, while warning of a **distributional cost** borne by farmers lacking new technology ([1]–[3], [10]–[16], [17]–[22]). Difficulty is **mixed**: lots of numbers, time markers, and parallel motives (economic + diplomatic). Read by (i) separating **data** from **normative upshots**, (ii) mapping **stakeholders** (exporters vs farmers), (iii) tracking **timelines** and **figures**, and (iv) flagging the author’s **calls** (US “reciprocate”; enable farmers).

How to approach each question (1–3 lines each)

Q85 – Premises identification - Scan for **neutral, checkable facts** (policy fact, figures, official reactions). The list that aggregates **numbers & observations** without making a value claim is right ([1], [2], [4], [8], [10], [12]).

Q86 – Inference - Synthesize two strands: **exporter gains** from cheaper, clean fibre ([11]–[12]) and **farmer losses** from tech denial + import pressure ([17]–[21]) → both can co-exist unless tech/R&D returns.

Q87 – Conclusion (author’s upshot) - Locate the author’s **ought**: the farmer “**should be enabled** ... not with hands tied” ([22]), built on the **double-whammy** framing ([21]).

Q88 – Assumption (reciprocity) - Bridge from **optics** to **policy change**: US policymakers must (a) **perceive** India’s move as goodwill and (b) **have discretion** to lift the 25% oil “penalty” ([13]–[16]).

Q89 – Paradox/Resolve - Resolve by **segmenting**: exporters benefit; farmers without tech are hurt. No contradiction—**different groups, different effects** ([11]–[12], [17]–[21]).

Q90 – Strengthen - Add **causal evidence** that **new tech** restores yields/resilience ([18]–[20], [22]). Field results on higher yield & pest control directly bolster the author’s remedy.

Extended CR brief (GMAT/LSAT/GRE/CLAT framing)

Premises (stated facts)

- **Policy:** Zero duty on cotton imports till **Dec 31, 2025** ([1]).
- **Domestic context:** Output 311.4 lb vs 336.5 lb prior, far below **398 lb (2013–14)**; **2.6%** sowing dip ([2]–[3]).
- **US context:** Exports fell **\$8.82b → \$4.96b** as China cut buys **\$2.79b → \$1.47b**; Jan–Jun 2025 China at **\$150.4m** ([4]–[5]).
- **India’s import shift:** Jan–Jun 2025 **\$181.5m** vs **\$86.9m** H1-2024; USDA welcomes; **~95%** re-exported ([8]–[12]).
- **Bilateral optics:** low moment in ties; talks should revive; “reciprocate” on **25% oil penalty** ([13]–[16]).
- **Farm side:** Bt era raised yields **302→566 kg/ha**; post-2013–14 yields **sub-450**, pests (pink bollworm, whitefly), boll rot; projected record imports **39 lb**; **double-whammy** (tech denial + import inundation) ([18]–[21]); **enable** farmers ([22]).

Core arguments

1. **Dual motive:** The waiver serves **domestic availability/competitiveness** and **geopolitical signalling** toward the US simultaneously ([1]–[3], [10]–[16]).
2. **Distributional warning:** Without **new technology & R&D**, farmers are structurally disadvantaged under rising import exposure—hence the call to **enable**, not shield indefinitely ([17]–[22]).

Inferences (supported but unstated)

- Exporter benefits can **co-exist** with farm distress (segment split).
- **Optics** can function as a lever in trade diplomacy only if the counterpart recognizes and can act on the signal.
- Sustained competitiveness on the farm side is **technology-dependent** in the current pest/price environment.

Conclusions (author’s upshots)

- **Short-run:** The waiver is pragmatic and diplomatically useful.
- **Medium-run:** Policy must **re-arm farmers technologically**; otherwise import pressure entrenches a **two-speed sector**.
- **Bilateral:** The US **should** reciprocate by removing the oil penalty.

Assumptions (necessary)

- US policymakers **perceive** and can **adjust** sanctions in response to goodwill ([13]–[16]).
- **Tech access** (breeding, traits, IPM) can **materially** lift yields/resilience (linking [18]–[20] to [22]).
- **95% re-export** implies exporter gains translate to macro benefits, not just firm-level margins.
- Increased imports **do** transmit price pressure to farm-gate outcomes when tech is static.

Paradoxes / tensions

- **Win–lose split:** exporters win while farmers lose → resolved by **different loci of impact**.
- **Temporary waiver vs long-term fix:** stop-gap access vs structural technology gap.
- **Optics vs substance:** diplomatic signalling valued, yet domestic tech policy is the binding constraint.

Passage 2:

Q91. Correct: C — (*Difficulty: Medium; Evidence: [4][5][9][10][11][15]*)

Why C is right: It compiles the passage’s **factual grounds**: bias entering hiring ([4]), adverse manager stats ([5]), experience requirements at “entry-level” ([9]), macro shocks (recession/COVID—[10][11]), and Gen Z’s social-native marketing to future consumers ([15]). These are **premises** that set up the author’s later **normative** claims (hire Gen Z; invest in skills).

- **Why A is wrong:** It mixes a value judgment with a **new prescription** (probation till 25) the passage never makes—this is a conclusion, not a premise.
 - **Why B is wrong:** It contradicts the text; stereotypes **do seep** into hiring ([4]) and are linked with firings ([5]). It asserts a conclusion dismissing the evidence.
 - **Why D is wrong:** It overreaches to a drastic policy (“replace older workers”), which the passage never advocates; it distorts the nuanced point about **complementarity** and future customers ([15][19]).
- In CR terms, **premises** are the **checkable facts** that ground an argument, not the leaps or prescriptions.

Q92. Correct: A — (*Difficulty: Hard; Evidence: [4][5][6][13][15][19]*)

Why A is right: The text says stereotypes are **seeping into hiring** ([4]) and gives harsh manager stats ([5]), which **worsen** an already tough market ([6]). It also argues firms **need** Gen Z for social-native reach to future consumers ([13][15]), and that skill-building is good for business ([19]). Thus, it's well-supported to infer that letting bias drive hiring both **hurts Gen Z's job access** and **deprives firms** of Gen Z's marketing advantages.

- **Why B is wrong:** Minimizes impact despite **explicit evidence** to the contrary ([4][5]).
- **Why C is wrong:** Flatly contradicts [10][11]; Gen Z was **not** insulated.
- **Why D is wrong:** Exaggerates a stereotype; the author never claims "nearly all" lack any social skill (indeed [16] says they can "shut it off"). Strong inferences combine **multiple premises** rather than cherry-picking one sentence.

Q93. Correct: D — (*Difficulty: Medium; Evidence: [13][17][19][15]*)

Why D is right: The text asserts survival stakes for businesses if they **don't hire Gen Z** ([13]), condemns age-based hiring as **unprofessional/unfair** ([17]), highlights Gen Z's **commercial** relevance via social media ([15]), and urges **confidence/skills building** as **good for business** ([19]). Together, they form the author's **upshot**: hire Gen Z **and** invest in them.

- **Why A is wrong:** A caricature; nowhere does the passage endorse replacing curricula with TikTok.
- **Why B is wrong:** Mocks a stereotype from [2]; the passage rebuts such superficial judgments.
- **Why C is wrong:** Over-corrects; the text critiques **excessive** experience demands ([9]) but doesn't say abolish **all** requirements. The **conclusion** is a **normative endpoint** borne by multiple strands: fairness, survival, and commercial logic.

Q94. Correct: A — (*Difficulty: Hard; Evidence: [13][14][15]*)

Why A is right: The survival claim ([13]) hinges on more than pipeline; it cites Gen Z's **social-native** edge ([14][15]) reaching future consumers. For the claim to bite, that edge must be **commercially meaningful** and **not fully replicable** by older cohorts at comparable cost/scale. Otherwise, "hire Gen Z or else" loses force.

- **Why B is wrong:** Even if many listings demand experience ([9]), the survival argument doesn't **depend** on that permanence.
- **Why C is wrong:** The passage never posits a fixed firing quota; that would undercut its call to **change** hiring norms ([17][19]).
- **Why D is wrong:** The author doesn't need immaturity to **vanish**; [16] explicitly says Gen Z can **turn it off**, and training can address gaps ([19]). In CR, a **necessary assumption** is one whose falsity would collapse the author's claim; A fits that role.

Q95. Correct: B — (*Difficulty: Medium; Evidence: [16][19] with tension from [5][13]*)

Why B is right: The tension pairs **perceived immaturity** ([5]) with **business necessity** ([13]). The passage itself says Gen Z **can shut it off** ([16]) and advocates **building career skills** ([19]). So the resolution is: **contextual behavior** plus **training** lets firms capture Gen Z's strengths while enforcing professionalism.

- **Why A is wrong:** Denies evidence; managers reported firings ([5]).
- **Why C is wrong:** Overstates; soft skills still matter (the author calls age-based assumptions **unprofessional** and urges **skills**—[17][19]).
- **Why D is wrong:** Non sequitur; elder criticism doesn't negate commercial value ([15][19]). Paradox items often dissolve by introducing a **distinction** (context) or a **mechanism** (training).

Q96. Correct: C — (*Difficulty: Medium–Hard; Evidence: aligns with [13][15][19]*)

Why C is right: It supplies **causal, quantitative** evidence that firms hiring Gen Z **and** upskilling them outperform peers with next-gen customers via social—precisely the channel the passage spotlights ([15]), strengthening the claim that hiring/skill-building is **good for business** ([19]) and even tied to survival stakes ([13]).

- **Why A is wrong:** Older customers' preferences don't address **future** consumers financing growth ([15]).
- **Why B is wrong:** Opinion without data doesn't weigh against the passage's logic/evidence.
- **Why D is wrong:** Vague behavior (mentoring enjoyment) sans hiring/ROI link doesn't support the business case. The best **strengtheners** directly connects the advocated action to **improved outcomes** on the metric the argument cares about.

Passage-in-brief (4–5 lines) + how to read it

This passage presents a **policy move** (zero duty on cotton till Dec 31, 2025) and explains it through **multiple drivers**: domestic shortfall, trade optics with the US, and supply-chain realities, while warning of a **distributional cost** borne by farmers lacking new technology ([1]–[3], [10]–[16], [17]–[22]). Difficulty is **mixed**: lots of numbers, time markers, and parallel motives (economic + diplomatic). Read by (i) separating **data** from **normative upshots**, (ii) mapping **stakeholders** (exporters vs farmers), (iii) tracking **timelines** and **figures**, and (iv) flagging the author's **calls** (US “reciprocate”; enable farmers).

How to approach each question (1–3 lines each)

Q85 – Premises identification - Scan for **neutral, checkable facts** (policy fact, figures, official reactions). The list that aggregates **numbers & observations** without making a value claim is right ([1], [2], [4], [8], [10], [12]).

Q86 – Inference - Synthesize two strands: **exporter gains** from cheaper, clean fibre ([11]–[12]) and **farmer losses** from tech denial + import pressure ([17]–[21]) → both can co-exist unless tech/R&D returns.

Q87 – Conclusion (author's upshot) - Locate the author's **ought**: the farmer “**should be enabled** ... not with hands tied” ([22]), built on the **double-whammy** framing ([21]).

Q88 – Assumption (reciprocity) - Bridge from **optics** to **policy change**: US policymakers must (a) **perceive** India's move as goodwill and (b) **have discretion** to lift the 25% oil “penalty” ([13]–[16]).

Q89 – Paradox/Resolve - Resolve by **segmenting**: exporters benefit; farmers without tech are hurt. No contradiction—**different groups, different effects** ([11]–[12], [17]–[21]).

Q90 – Strengthen - Add **causal evidence** that **new tech** restores yields/resilience ([18]–[20], [22]). Field results on higher yield & pest control directly bolster the author's remedy.

Extended CR brief (GMAT/LSAT/GRE/CLAT framing)

Premises (stated facts)

- **Policy**: Zero duty on cotton imports till **Dec 31, 2025** ([1]).
- **Domestic context**: Output 311.4 lb vs 336.5 lb prior, far below **398 lb (2013–14)**; **2.6%** sowing dip ([2]–[3]).
- **US context**: Exports fell **\$8.82b → \$4.96b** as China cut buys **\$2.79b → \$1.47b**; Jan–Jun 2025 China at **\$150.4m** ([4]–[5]).
- **India's import shift**: Jan–Jun 2025 **\$181.5m** vs **\$86.9m** H1-2024; USDA welcomes; **~95%** re-exported ([8]–[12]).
- **Bilateral optics**: low moment in ties; talks should revive; “reciprocate” on **25% oil penalty** ([13]–[16]).
- **Farm side**: Bt era raised yields **302→566 kg/ha**; post-2013–14 yields **sub-450**, pests (pink bollworm, whitefly), boll rot; projected record imports **39 lb**; **double-whammy** (tech denial + import inundation) ([18]–[21]); **enable** farmers ([22]).

Core arguments

1. **Dual motive**: The waiver serves **domestic availability/competitiveness** and **geopolitical signalling** toward the US simultaneously ([1]–[3], [10]–[16]).
2. **Distributional warning**: Without **new technology & R&D**, farmers are structurally disadvantaged under rising import exposure—hence the call to **enable**, not shield indefinitely ([17]–[22]).

Inferences (supported but unstated)

- Exporter benefits can **co-exist** with farm distress (segment split).
- **Optics** can function as a lever in trade diplomacy only if the counterpart recognizes and can act on the signal.
- Sustained competitiveness on the farm side is **technology-dependent** in the current pest/price environment.

Conclusions (author's upshots)

- **Short-run**: The waiver is pragmatic and diplomatically useful.
- **Medium-run**: Policy must **re-arm farmers technologically**; otherwise import pressure entrenches a **two-speed sector**.
- **Bilateral**: The US **should** reciprocate by removing the oil penalty.

Assumptions (necessary)

- US policymakers **perceive** and can **adjust** sanctions in response to goodwill ([13]–[16]).
- **Tech access** (breeding, traits, IPM) can **materially** lift yields/resilience (linking [18]–[20] to [22]).
- **95% re-export** implies exporter gains translate to macro benefits, not just firm-level margins.
- Increased imports **do** transmit price pressure to farm-gate outcomes when tech is static.

Paradoxes / tensions

- **Win–lose split**: exporters win while farmers lose → resolved by **different loci of impact**.
- **Temporary waiver vs long-term fix**: stop-gap access vs structural technology gap.

- **Optics vs substance:** diplomatic signalling valued, yet domestic tech policy is the binding constraint.

Passage 3:

Q97. Correct: C — (Difficulty: Medium; Evidence: [2], [3], [4], [5], [6]) - C aggregates the **checkable facts** the passage supplies as **premises**: the 1938 grant of self-government ([2]); the constitution's authors and enactment date ([3]); its **rights catalogue** and **decentralisation** ([4]); its **institutional tiers** ([5]); and Gandhi's **contemporaneous praise** ([6]). These are the data points from which any evaluative upshot follows. A is a new policy prescription the passage never makes, not a premise. B asserts a comparative claim ("only because others were reactionary") the passage does not state and treats a conclusion as a given. D is speculative and contrary to the text: brevity is presented alongside substantive guarantees ([4]–[5]), and Gandhi's praise is framed as earned ([6]). Recognising **premises** means isolating descriptive building blocks from normative leaps.

Q98. Correct: A — (Difficulty: Hard; Evidence: [4], [5], [6]) - A is the **best-supported** inference: the constitution's **decentralisation** and **village-tier design** ([4]–[5]) align with Gandhi's "village democracy" ideal, and his praise ([6]) signals that the change aimed at **real local authority**, not tokenism. B is contradicted: authorship is explicitly Gandhi/Pant/Frydman ([3]), not British. C reverses the text: freedom of the press is **guaranteed** ([4]). D is wrong: the system includes **taluka** panchayats ([5]) despite geographic fragmentation ([7]). Good inference answers fuse multiple lines—here, the rights + tiers + Gandhi's appraisal—to reach a warranted, though unstated, claim.

Q99. Correct: D — (Difficulty: Medium; Evidence: [1], [3], [4], [5], [6]) - D captures the passage's **upshot**: Aundh's reform is a **pioneering, progressive** experiment, **praised by Gandhi** ([1], [6]) and **institutionalised** via a concise constitution that guarantees rights and **decentralises** power into panchayats and an assembly ([3]–[5]). A overgeneralises from brevity; the text never claims "short is always superior." B misreads fragmentation ([7]); reform is presented as **meaningful**, not ceremonial. C misattributes causality to "mysticism"; the emphasis falls on **institutional design** and rights ([4]–[5]). In CR terms, the **conclusion** synthesises praise + design features into an evaluative thesis about the case's significance.

Q100. Correct: A — (Difficulty: Hard; Evidence: [1], [2], [6]) - A states the **necessary assumption** behind Gandhi's claim that the "declaration of full responsibility" was a **natural result** of prior progressive acts ([6]): that the transfer was **real** (not coerced/nominal) and **voluntary** ("unasked" in [1]) and that the ruler's past conduct legitimately **led** to it. If the grant had been merely symbolic or forced by British pressure, Gandhi's "natural result" framing would collapse. B treats Gandhi's reputation as a substitute for institutions—contrary to the design detail ([4]–[5]). C is false; the text treats decentralisation as workable despite fragmentation ([7]). D is a non-sequitur; page length doesn't ground legitimacy. A **must** hold for Gandhi's causal narrative to remain persuasive.

Q101. Correct: B — (Difficulty: Medium; Evidence: [3], [5], [7], [9]) - Paradox: **Small, fragmented** polity under British control ([7]) versus **advanced decentralisation** and Gandhi's praise ([5]–[6]). B resolves it by pointing to **leadership and design capacity**: an **educated** ruler influenced by reformist scholarship ([9]), working **with Gandhi, Pant, Frydman** to craft and enact village-centred institutions ([3], [5]). Thus, **agency and expertise** offset structural constraints. A is contradicted (institutions are specified and enacted). C falsely universalises—Aundh is presented as distinctive, not generic. D assumes scandal precludes reform; the text shows the opposite—accession after turmoil leads to enacted reform ([8], [3]). Paradox items often dissolve once you surface the **mechanism** that bridges the gap—here, **coalitional design and leadership**.

Q102. Correct: C — (Difficulty: Medium; Evidence: [4], [5]) - C would **directly corroborate** that the decentralised design produced **operational** results: regular panchayat sittings, education gains, enforcement of non-discrimination, working taluka escalation—precisely the outcomes implied by the rights + tiered architecture ([4], [5]). That transforms the narrative from declaratory to **demonstrably effective**, thereby strengthening the passage's implicit claim of substantive

progress. A is irrelevant to governance performance. B is unrelated anecdote. D shows rhetorical diffusion elsewhere without institutional follow-through—no support for Aundh’s effectiveness. Strong **strengtheners** add **outcome evidence** tightly linked to the proposed **mechanism** (here, local institutions realising rights and services).

Passage-in-brief (4–5 lines) + how to read it

The passage recounts the **Aundh experiment** (1938–39): Raja Balasaheb Pant Pratinidhi granted **full self-government**, followed by a concise constitution drafted with **Gandhi, Appasaheb Pant, and Maurice Frydman**. Despite being only ~four pages, it guaranteed **civil liberties, free primary education, non-discrimination**, and—crucially—**decentralised village democracy** (panchayats → taluka → assembly). Gandhi praised Aundh’s reform as the **natural culmination** of a progressive ruler’s prior acts. Read by separating (i) **facts/timeline** from (ii) **design features** and (iii) **evaluation** (Gandhi’s praise), then mapping how **leadership + design** overcame **state size/fragmentation**.

How to approach each question (1–3 lines each)

Q97 (Premises identification) - Scan for **neutral, checkable facts**: the 1938 grant, the 1939 enactment, named drafters, rights list, and the tiered local bodies—then Gandhi’s contemporary praise. Avoid options that **assert new judgments** or **speculate** about what brevity implies. (Use lines [2], [3], [4], [5], [6].)

Q98 (Inference) - Fuse **institutional design** (panchayats, talukas) with Gandhi’s **village democracy** ideal and his **endorsement** to infer that decentralisation aimed at **real local authority**, not token bodies. Reject claims contradicting explicit guarantees/authorship. (Lines [4], [5], [6].)

Q99 (Conclusion / author’s upshot) - Synthesize the **rights + decentralisation + Gandhi’s praise** to arrive at the evaluative thesis: Aundh was a **genuinely progressive, pioneering** self-government model. Discard overgeneralizations about “short documents always better.” (Lines [1], [3]–[6].)

Q100 (Assumption — necessary) - Bridge Gandhi’s claim (“natural result”) by assuming the transfer was **voluntary and substantive**, rooted in the ruler’s **progressive track record**—else the causal narrative collapses. (Lines [1], [2], [6].)

Q101 (Paradox/Resolve) - Resolve “small/fragmented yet advanced” by pointing to **leadership + coalition design** (educated ruler + Gandhi/Pant/Frydman) that **implemented** village-centred institutions despite constraints. (Lines [3], [5], [7], [9].)

Q102 (Strengthen) - Prefer evidence that the **institutions worked** (regular panchayat sittings, school enrolment up, non-discrimination enforced, clear escalation). That converts declarations into **documented outcomes**. (Lines [4], [5].)

Premises:

- **Policy acts:** Nov 1938 the Raja grants **full self-government**; **constitution enacted** 14 Jan 1939. ([2], [3])
- **Authorship:** Gandhi, Appasaheb Pant, Maurice Frydman. ([3])
- **Content:** Rights guarantees (speech/press/assembly/worship), **non-discrimination, free primary education; decentralised** governance. ([4])
- **Institutions:** 5-member village panchayats → taluka panchayats → assembly (presidents + elected reps + 5 nominees). ([5])
- **Evaluation:** Gandhi’s **praise**; reform as “natural result” of the ruler’s prior progressive acts. ([1], [6])
- **Context constraints:** British suzerainty; **fragmented** territory; ruler’s **education** and reformist influence. ([7], [9])

Core arguments:

1. **Design argument:** A concise but **substantive** constitution operationalised **village democracy** through a **tiered local architecture** and rights provisions → progressive in content.
2. **Causal-evaluation argument:** Given the ruler’s progressive record, the **transfer of responsibility** was a **natural culmination**, not a token gesture → Gandhi’s praise is warranted.

Inferences:

- Decentralisation sought **effective local authority** aligned with Gandhi’s village ideal; not a mere symbolic body in the capital. (From [4], [5], [6])
- **Leadership capacity** (educated ruler + reformist collaborators) can **offset structural constraints** (size/fragmentation). (From [3], [7], [9])

Conclusions:

- Aundh was a **pioneering** princely-state experiment in **self-government** and **village democracy**, both **rights-forward** and **institutionally grounded**, meriting Gandhi's praise. (Synthesising [1], [3]–[6])

Assumptions:

- The transfer of power was **voluntary, substantive, and implemented**, not coerced/nominal. (Needed for Gandhi's "natural result".)
- The rights + tiered structure were **intended to operate in practice**, not merely declarative.
- Governance can function **despite** territorial fragmentation when local institutions are empowered.

Paradoxes / tensions:

- **Small, fragmented state** vs **ambitious decentralisation** → resolved by **leadership + coalition design** and Gandhian influence enabling enactment.
- **Brevity** of constitution vs **depth** of reform → brevity here **coexists** with specificity (rights lists, institutional tiers).
- **Princely rule** vs **democratic localism** → a ruler's **voluntary devolution** can seed democratic practice.

Passage 4:

Q103. Correct: B — (Difficulty: Medium) Why B: It strings together the **empirical premises** used to motivate the paradigm shift: the base rate of distress/disorder after exposure ([1]); the claim of **seven trajectories** ([4]); the observation that **resilience is most common** ([5]); and the methodological pivot from **single-risk** to **dynamic processes** with **regulatory flexibility** as a candidate mechanism ([6]–[7]). These are **grounds**, not end-state policy slogans.

- Why A is wrong: It alleges universal failure of binary models and prescribes immediate abandonment—this is **not** in the text, which acknowledges achievements ([3]). It's a conclusion, not a premise list.
- Why C is wrong: It directly contradicts key premises: resilience as **rare** and lifelong chronicity as default are **opposite** of [5] and [4].
- Why D is wrong: It asserts that binary models must be retained "unchanged" because disasters are large—again a **conclusion** that ignores the premises about **dynamic** responses ([4]–[7]).

Line refs anchoring the correct set: [1], [4], [5], [6], [7].

Q104. Correct: C — (Difficulty: Hard) Why C: The passage argues responses are **dynamic** ([4]) and that the field should move beyond a **case/no-case binary** ([2]–[3], [8]–[9]). With **seven trajectories** ([4]) and **resilience most common** ([5]), many genuine patterns are **missed or misclassified** by a binary lens. Thus, C is the best supported inference, though unstated verbatim.

- Why A is wrong: It treats past utility as sufficiency for **all** future aims, ignoring the text's claim that the binary lens **limits knowledge** about varied responses ([3]).
- Why B is wrong: The text gives no age carve-out; regulatory flexibility is proposed **generally** as crucial ([7]).
- Why D is wrong: It invents a causal explanation—"modern disasters less severe"—unsupported by any line; severity is never cited. Line refs: [4], [5], [8], [9].

Q105. Correct: D — (Difficulty: Medium) Why D: The passage's **upshot** is a **disciplinary pivot**: leave a binary, risk-based lens and adopt a **resilience-based** program recognizing **multiple, changing responses over time**, with implications for **research aims** and **objectives** (diversity, coping) ([8]–[11]). D accurately integrates these commitments.

- Why A is wrong: It advocates outlawing disorder therapies—contrary to the text's respect for earlier achievements ([3]).
- Why B is wrong: The passage does **not** say "ignore pathology"; it argues to **broaden** objectives, not erase them ([11]).
- Why C is wrong: A glossary add-on leaves the binary frame intact; the text calls for a **shift**, not a cosmetic supplement ([8]–[9]). Line refs: [8], [9], [11].

Q106. Correct: A — (Difficulty: Hard) Why A: For the recommendation to **shift interventions to dynamic processes** to be rational, those processes must be **trainable/teachable, measurable, situationally sensitive**, and **causally** tied to resilient outcomes across varied trajectories—exactly what A asserts. Without this, the prescription lacks footing.

- Why B is wrong: It overstates the claim by implying disorder-specific treatments become obsolete; the passage never says that ([3], [10]).
- Why C is wrong: If regulatory flexibility were **genetically fixed**, focusing on it would be futile; this undercuts the intervention proposal ([7]).
- Why D is wrong: The text never posits a one-to-one mapping between “seven processes” and “seven trajectories”; that’s a fabricated constraint. Line refs grounding the needed bridge: [6] (shift to dynamic processes), [7] (regulatory flexibility crucial).

Q107. Correct: B — (Difficulty: Medium–Hard) Why B: The apparent paradox—binary models yielded **real gains** ([3]) yet are to be **moved beyond** ([8])—resolves once we accept that a framework can be **historically productive yet currently constraining**. Keeping effective tools for disorders while **adding a resilience-based, dynamic** layer captures the **time-varying** patterns the binary misses ([4], [9]) without erasing prior advances.

- Why A is wrong: It denies the achievements the text explicitly credits ([3]).
- Why C is wrong: The passage nowhere denies disorders; it **broadens** scope to resilience and coping ([9], [11]).
- Why D is wrong: It recruits ethics rhetoric to abandon pathology; the text argues for **revising objectives**, not moralizing against pathology ([11]). Line refs: [3], [8], [9].

Q108. Correct: C — (Difficulty: Medium) Why C: This multi-wave RCT demonstrates exactly what the passage posits: training in **regulatory flexibility** leads to **more resilient trajectories, faster remission**, and **better functioning** over time, with **mediation** through flexible regulation—empirical confirmation of the **dynamic-process** mechanism ([6], [7]), the **time-varying** nature of responses ([4], [9]), and superiority to **single-risk** education.

- Why A is wrong: Preference for a term is cosmetic; it doesn’t validate mechanisms or outcomes.
- Why B is wrong: Null results would **weaken** the case for the dynamic approach.
- Why D is wrong: A single-risk avoidance benefit in a subset for one disorder does not speak to the **general, multi-trajectory, dynamic** claims the passage advances. Line refs: [6], [7], supported by [4], [9].

Passage-in-brief (4–5 lines) + how to read it - The passage argues psychology should move **beyond a binary, risk-based lens** (case vs no case; stable symptoms) toward a **resilience-based, dynamic** view of post-trauma responses. It notes **seven trajectories**, with **resilience the most common**, and urges interventions to target **regulatory flexibility** (adapting coping to situational demands). Difficulty is **mixed**: clear claims but conceptually tricky (paradigm shift, mechanisms, longitudinal thinking). While reading, keep separate (i) **facts/base rates**, (ii) **definitions** (resilience, regulatory flexibility), (iii) **mechanism** (dynamic processes), and (iv) **disciplinary implications** (what research and treatment should prioritize).

How to approach each question (1–3 lines each)

Q103 (Premises identification) - Hunt the **neutral, checkable grounds**: base rates (one-third distressed), **seven trajectories, resilience common**, and the **intervention pivot to regulatory flexibility**. Reject options that inject prescriptions or contradict these givens.

Q104 (Inference) - Synthesize several statements: if responses are **dynamic** and span **seven patterns**, a **binary** frame will **miss/misclassify** many real courses. Prefer an inference that stitches those strands; avoid claims the text never hints at (e.g., age limits, disaster severity).

Q105 (Conclusion / author’s upshot) - Locate the **disciplinary endpoint: pivot** from binary/risk to **resilience/dynamics**, expanding objectives to **diversity & coping**. Eliminate absolutist or strawman options (ban therapies, ignore pathology, add a glossary).

Q106 (Assumption — necessary) - Bridge from recommendation to feasibility: for focusing on **dynamic processes** to make sense, they must be **teachable/measurable** and **causally** related to resilience across trajectories. Any answer denying trainability or causality undercuts the move.

Q107 (Paradox/Resolve) - Resolve “binary lens produced gains” and “move beyond it” by a **both/and**: keep useful disorder tools, **add** a resilience-based dynamic framework to capture time-varying responses the binary lens misses.

Q108 (Strengthen) - Choose evidence that **directly tests the mechanism** over time: a **multi-wave RCT** where **regulatory-flexibility training** lifts resilient trajectories and functioning, ideally with **mediation** by flexibility—strongly buttressing the passage’s proposal.

Extended CR Brief (GMAT/LSAT/GRE/CLAT framing)

Premises (explicit facts/claims)

- Roughly **one-third** of people exposed to stressful/traumatic events show **distress/disorders**.
- The **traditional binary** model: disorder vs no disorder; symptoms relatively **stable**.
- Binary view has **achievements** (vulnerability profiles, modifiable risks, therapies) yet **limits** knowledge of the **array** of responses.
- There are **seven** post-trauma **trajectories**; responses are **dynamic** and multiply determined.
- A **stable healthy** trajectory (**resilience**) is the **most common** outcome.
- Interventions should move from **single-risk** strategies to **dynamic processes**; **regulatory flexibility** is proposed as **crucial**.
- Psychology is **shifting** objectives from pathology/cure toward **resilience, diversity, and coping**.

Inferences (supported but unstated)

- A binary case/no-case lens will **miss or flatten** time-varying courses (delayed onset/recovery, waxing–waning patterns).
- Effective research/treatment will require **longitudinal** designs and **process** measures (context-sensitive coping choices).
- If resilience is common and malleable, **training flexibility** can reduce chronic impairment **without** abandoning disorder-specific care.
- Studies on single transient outcomes risk **limited relevance** unless embedded in a **trajectory** framework.

Conclusions (author’s upshots)

- **Paradigm shift**: from binary, risk-centric psychopathology to a **resilience-based, dynamic** program.
- **Practical pivot**: prioritize **regulatory flexibility** and other dynamic adaptations in interventions.
- **Scope broadening**: include **diversity in responses** and **coping** alongside diagnosis and cure.

Core arguments (structure)

1. **Descriptive**: Empirical diversity (seven trajectories; resilience common) contradicts binary stability assumptions.
2. **Explanatory**: **Dynamic regulation** better accounts for changing responses than static risk lists.
3. **Normative**: Therefore, **interventions** and **research aims** should re-orient toward **resilience processes**.

Assumptions (necessary links)

- **Regulatory flexibility** is **trainable, measurable, and predictive/causal** for resilient outcomes across contexts.
- Trajectories can be **reliably identified** (valid methods, adequate follow-up).
- Shifting some attention/resources to resilience **won’t preclude** continued care for entrenched pathology.
- Population findings on resilience generalize across **ages, cultures, and types of trauma** sufficiently to guide policy.

Paradoxes / tensions (and resolutions)

- **Past success** of binary lens vs need to **move beyond** it → Keep effective disorder tools **and add** a dynamic resilience layer (**complementarity**).
- **High prevalence** of resilience despite mass trauma → Dynamic adaptation (flexibility) enables healthy functioning; not all exposures entail disorder.

- **Risk-based precision vs process focus** → Integrate: use risk profiling **within** a trajectory/process framework to tailor timing and content of intervention.

SECTION E: - QUANTITATIVE TECHNIQUES

Q109. Answer: (A) Difficulty: Hard

Explanation: From [L2], 15% of the 10,000 workforce were in Retail, i.e., 1,500 individuals. From [L3], 50% of Retail workers were women, i.e., 750. Thus, (A) is correct. Option (B) is wrong because Retail is 15%, not 20%, of the workforce. Option (C) is a miscalculation since it incorrectly assumes half the female workforce belongs to Retail, which is not given. Option (D) wrongly assumes 20% of the *entire workforce* are women in Retail, ignoring the sector-specific 50%. Correct option is (A).

Q110. Answer: (A) Difficulty: Hard

Explanation: From [L2], Manufacturing = 25% of 10,000 = 2,500. From [L3], women = 20% of 2,500 = 500. IT = 10% of 10,000 = 1,000. Men = 65% of 1,000 = 650. Ratio = 500:650 = 10:13. Option (A) reflects this exactly. Option (B) incorrectly treats percentages as fractions of total women rather than sector-specific. Option (C) wrongly assumes 30% instead of 20% in Manufacturing and inflates IT men. Option (D) is arbitrary with no basis. Hence, (A) is correct.

Q111. Answer: (B) Difficulty: Hard

Explanation: From [L2], Services = 40% of 10,000 = 4,000, Manufacturing = 25% of 10,000 = 2,500. From [L4], income = $4,000 \times 30,000 = 120,000,000$; Manufacturing = $2,500 \times 25,000 = 62,500,000$. Ratio = $120,000,000:62,500,000 = 48:25$. So (B) is correct. Option (A) restates a fact qualitatively but does not simplify to ratio form. Option (C) is false since weighted averages aren't used in direct sector ratios. Option (D) incorrectly applies the Services:IT ratio to Services:Manufacturing. Correct option is (B).

Q112. Answer: (A) Difficulty: Hard

Explanation: From [L2] & [L3],

- Services: $4,000 \times 30\% = 1,200$.
- Manufacturing: $2,500 \times 20\% = 500$.
- Retail: $1,500 \times 50\% = 750$.
- IT: $1,000 \times 35\% = 350$.
- Agriculture: $1,000 \times 45\% = 450$. Total = 3,250 women. Hence, (A) is correct. Option (B) wrongly assumes 40% overall. Option (C) miscalculates by reducing Agriculture and Retail. Option (D) inflates values without reference. Correct is (A).

Q113. Answer: (A) Difficulty: Hard

Explanation: From [L8], Services:IT = 12:1. Combined = 13 parts = ₹130,000,000. One part = 10,000,000. Services = 12 parts = 120,000,000. Hence, (A) is correct. Option (B) assumes arbitrary 5%. Option (C) misuses the ratio as 10:1 not 12:1. Option (D) uses weighted averages, not actual ratio. Correct is (A).

Q114. Answer: (D) Difficulty: Hard

Explanation: From [L5–L6], median = 27,000, mode = 20,000. A lower mode compared to median indicates left-skewed clustering. Hence (D) is correct. Option (B) is false since values differ. Option (C) wrongly suggests mean determines median, which is incorrect in skewed data. Option (A) misinterprets standard deviation as eliminating skew. Correct is (D).

Passage Summary & Approach

This passage is a statistical survey of 10,000 workers in Vidyapur, spread across five sectors with data on gender distribution, average monthly incomes, and overall statistical measures (mean, median, mode, standard deviation). It

also provides a key income ratio between Services and IT. The passage is of **hard difficulty**, since it requires combining percentages, ratios, and averages with multiple data layers. The theme is **labour economics with quantitative focus**, and the main idea is to interpret data carefully, compute precise numbers, and apply logical reasoning with statistical concepts. While reading, note the **distribution percentages** first, then the **gender splits**, and finally the **income averages and ratio statements**, as they form the backbone of all questions.

Question-wise Approach

- **Q109 (Women in Retail):** Focus on sector size (15% of 10,000) and apply the female percentage (50%). Straight multiplication gives the answer.
- **Q110 (Ratio Women in Manufacturing to Men in IT):** Break the ratio into two parts — first calculate women in Manufacturing, then men in IT. Reduce the ratio carefully.
- **Q111 (Services vs Manufacturing income):** Multiply number of employees in each sector with average income to get total contribution, then simplify into ratio.
- **Q112 (Total women):** Add sector-wise female employees step by step. This is a cumulative calculation problem.
- **Q113 (Services contribution from Services+IT):** Use the given 12:1 ratio, split the combined total into 13 parts, and assign 12 parts to Services.
- **Q114 (Median vs Mode explanation):** No calculation required — test understanding of statistics. Recognise skewness when median > mode.

Got it 👍 — let me rewrite the **answers to Q115–Q120** in a **clean, compact format** (like a handout/answer key), so you can copy it easily.

Passage 2 – Answer Key

Q115. Correct answer – D [Difficulty: Hard]

- Cylinders: $4 \times \pi \times 32 \times 10 = 1130.4 \text{ m}^3$
- Cones: $2 \times 13\pi \times 42 \times 6 = 200.96 \text{ m}^3$
- Cubes: $3 \times 5^3 = 375 \text{ m}^3$
- Total capacity = $1706.36 \text{ m}^3 \rightarrow 80\% \text{ filled} = 1365.1 \text{ m}^3$
- Correct: $\approx 1365.1 \text{ m}^3$

Q116. Correct answer : (B) ₹8,20,000 [Difficulty: Hard]

Cylinders: $= 1130.4 \times 450 = 5,08,680$

Cones: $= 200.96 \times 600 = 1,20,576$

Cubes: $375 \times 500 = 1,87,500$

Total $\approx ₹8,16,756 \rightarrow \text{rounds to } ₹8,20,000$

Q117. Correct answer : (C) 71:100 [Difficulty: Medium]

- Both cones = 200.96 m^3 , one cylinder = 282.6 m^3
- Ratio = $200.96 : 282.6 \approx 0.71 \approx 71:100$

Q118. Correct answer : (B) 80.4 m³ [Difficulty: Easy]

- One small cylinder = $\pi \times 22 \times 4 = 50.24 \text{ m}^3$
- Two cylinders = 100.48 m^3 capacity $\rightarrow 80\% \text{ filled} = 80.4 \text{ m}^3$

Q119. Correct answer : (C) 1.5% [Difficulty: Hard]

- Original filled = 1365.1 m^3
- Replaced cube's filled = 100 m^3 ; new cylinders filled = 80.4 m^3
- Net reduction = 19.6 m^3
- % reduction = $19.6 \div 1365.1 \times 100 \approx 1.44\% \approx 1.5\%$

Q120. Correct answer : (B) ₹45,216 [Difficulty: Hard]

- Two small cylinders capacity = 100.48 m^3
- Cost = $100.48 \times 450 \approx ₹45,216$

Passage Summary & Approach

This passage presents a logistics firm's storage tanks of three types (cylinders, cones, and cubes), with their dimensions, fill percentage, and construction costs. It also introduces a replacement scenario involving one cube being swapped for two smaller cylinders. The theme is **mensuration and applied arithmetic**, requiring use of formulas for volume, multiplication by costs, and ratio/percentage reasoning. The difficulty level is **hard**, because the test-taker must keep track of capacity vs filled volume, apply the 80% fill carefully, and check when the question uses *construction cost (capacity)* versus *liquid content (filled)*. The correct approach is to first calculate all base volumes clearly, then apply the 80% fill or cost-per-cubic-meter values as required, and only then move to ratio or percentage reductions.

Question-wise Approach

- **Q115 (Total filled volume):** Compute volumes of each shape, sum them, then apply 80%. Avoid the trap of adding full volumes without applying the 80% fill.
- **Q116 (Construction cost):** Use **capacity volumes only** (not filled). Multiply each shape's capacity by its rate, then add. This is a classic test of attention to wording.
- **Q117 (Ratio cones : one cylinder):** Calculate total cone capacity (both tanks), divide by single cylinder capacity, and simplify. Do not use filled volume here since the question explicitly compares **volumes of tanks**, not liquids.
- **Q118 (Volume of new small cylinders):** Compute capacity of one small cylinder using $\pi r^2 h$, double it, then take 80%. Many will mistakenly use capacity instead of filled volume — watch out for that.
- **Q119 (Percentage reduction):** Compare original filled total with new filled total after replacement. Subtract, then divide by the original, multiply by 100. Be careful: the reduction is small ($\sim 1\text{--}2\%$), not huge.
- **Q120 (Replacement cost):** Multiply new cylinders' **capacity** by cost rate. Some may mistakenly use filled volume here, but construction cost is always based on capacity. The "net" here means the new cost for the two cylinders, which is lower than the old cube cost.