

ANSWERS KEY WITH EXPLANATIONS

SECTION-A: ENGLISH LANGUAGE

Passage 1:

1. Correct Answer: C (The impact of GST on Indian agriculture and food industry)

- **Explanation:** The passage primarily addresses the impact of GST on the agricultural and food sectors, with a focus on the rationalisation of tax rates for food products and agricultural tools. The passage also touches on political implications but that is secondary to the GST discussion (Line 1-2).
- **Why other options are incorrect:**
 - A: While political implications are mentioned, they are not the focus.
 - B: Food taxes are discussed but are not the main focus.
 - D: The passage discusses both the food industry and GST reforms, not just post-GST challenges.

2. Correct Answer: C (A boost)

- **Explanation:** The word 'fillip' in the passage refers to something that provides a boost or encouragement to a process, in this case, the GST rationalisation exercise (Line 8).
- **Why other options are incorrect:**
 - A: A sudden force does not align with the context of gradual reform discussed.
 - B: A small piece is unrelated to the meaning of fillip.
 - D: A formal statement is a weak match and doesn't fit the context of improvement.

3. Correct Answer: C (Exemption from GST on ice cream)

- **Explanation:** The passage mentions a reduction in taxes, such as on dairy products, tractors, and Indian breads, but it does not state any exemption from GST on ice cream (Line 17).
- **Why other options are incorrect:**
 - A: Uniform taxation on processed dairy products is explicitly mentioned.
 - B: The reduction of GST on tractors and irrigation systems is clearly outlined.
 - D: The tax reduction on chapati and roti is discussed in the passage.

4. Correct Answer: C (Ice cream contains 21 per cent milk solids, which is a dairy product)

- **Explanation:** The passage explains that the 18 per cent tax on ice cream was due to a misunderstanding of its composition and that it is a dairy product, with 21 per cent milk solids (Line 14).
- **Why other options are incorrect:**
 - A: The passage does not suggest that ice cream is a luxury item.
 - B: Ice cream is not considered a high-end product in the passage.
 - D: Ice cream is classified as a food product, not a non-food item.

5. Correct Answer: C (A careless and indifferent attitude towards addressing agricultural reforms)

- **Explanation:** The phrase 'cavalier, do-nothing approach' refers to an attitude of carelessness and neglect, suggesting that agricultural reforms should not be approached in this way (Line 30).
- **Why other options are incorrect:**
 - A: Ignoring agricultural issues doesn't capture the full meaning of the phrase.
 - B: This is the opposite of what the phrase intends.

- **D:** A swift reform process is not implied by the phrase.

6. Correct Answer: B (Purify)

- **Explanation:** 'Adulterate' means to corrupt or make something impure by adding inferior substances, so 'purify' is the antonym (Line 19).
- **Why other options are incorrect:**
 - **A:** Contaminate is similar in meaning to adulterate.
 - **C:** Fabricate does not serve as the opposite of adulterate.
 - **D:** Ferment is unrelated to the meaning of adulterate.

Difficulty Level:

1. Medium
2. Medium
3. Hard
4. Medium
5. Easy
6. Medium

Brief Passage Explanation:

The passage discusses the impact of GST on Indian agriculture and the food industry, particularly the simplification of taxes on agricultural products and processed food items. It highlights how the rationalisation of GST rates has made the tax structure simpler, with most agricultural and food items now taxed at either zero or 5%. The passage also criticizes past agricultural policies, urging for the continuation of reforms to eliminate barriers in the agricultural sector, such as restrictions on the marketing and movement of farm produce. While addressing GST reform, the author calls for further agricultural reforms to ensure the sector thrives.

Approach to Reading the Passage:

- **Theme and Comprehension:** The passage deals with the topic of GST reforms and their impact on agriculture and the food industry. The reader should focus on understanding the change in tax structure, the specific food products impacted, and the political and economic implications of these reforms.
- **Difficulty:** The difficulty lies in distinguishing between the specifics of the GST reform and its broader political and economic impact on agriculture.
- **Main Idea:** The central idea is the positive impact of GST rationalisation, but the author also stresses that this is just one step in a larger agricultural reform agenda.

Question-wise Approach and Explanation:

1. What does the passage primarily discuss?

- **Approach:** Focus on understanding the central subject of the passage. It primarily discusses the implications of GST reform on agricultural products, food items, and the broader economy. Eliminate answers that focus on secondary issues like politics or narrow topics like consumer behavior.
- **Reference:** The first lines of the passage introduce GST and its effects on agricultural products.

2. Which of the following words most closely means 'fillip' as used in the passage?

- **Approach:** This is a vocabulary-based question. Look at the context in which 'fillip' is used—describing a positive boost to GST reforms. Consider synonyms that imply an increase or boost.

- **Reference:** Line 8 describes GST rationalisation as receiving a "fillip."

3. Which of the following reforms is NOT mentioned in the passage as part of GST simplification?

- **Approach:** The key to answering this is to carefully note the examples of GST reforms discussed in the passage. Look for specific items or sectors mentioned as benefiting from simplification and identify the one that doesn't match.
- **Reference:** Line 17-19 detail specific food items and agricultural equipment that were impacted by the reform.

4. According to the passage, why was the 18 per cent GST on ice cream a mistake?

- **Approach:** This question tests your understanding of the details of GST reforms. The passage explains that the tax was based on a misconception about the nature of ice cream. Identify the core reason for the mistake, which is the dairy composition of ice cream.
- **Reference:** Line 14 discusses the tax rate on ice cream, clarifying that it is a dairy product.

5. What does the author mean by "a cavalier, do-nothing approach" in the last paragraph?

- **Approach:** This is a question on the tone and implication of the author's language. Focus on interpreting what "cavalier" means in the context of the government's handling of agricultural reforms.
- **Reference:** Line 30 mentions the "cavalier, do-nothing approach," emphasizing the indifference of the government towards further reforms.

6. Which of the following is an antonym of 'adulterate' as used in the passage?

- **Approach:** A vocabulary question that tests understanding of "adulterate" in context. Recognize that adulterate means to make something impure or to mix it with inferior substances. Find the option that conveys the opposite meaning — purify.
- **Reference:** Line 19 discusses the concept of adulterating desi ghee.

Elaboration: Premises, Inferences, Conclusions, Arguments, Assumptions, and Paradoxes:

- **Premises:**
 - The passage premises on the GST simplification exercise undertaken by the GST Council, focusing on reducing taxes and creating uniformity.
 - The notion that GST has improved the tax burden on various agricultural and food items by standardising duties, particularly dairy products, bakery goods, and farm equipment.
- **Inferences:**
 - There is an implicit inference that the previous taxation system was flawed, particularly in its application to agricultural products and processed food items, which were taxed at rates that did not reflect their basic agricultural origins.
 - Another inference is that while GST rationalisation is a positive step, it is not enough on its own to revive the Indian agricultural sector; comprehensive reform is needed.
- **Conclusions:**
 - The conclusion drawn by the author is that GST reform is a necessary but insufficient first step in agricultural reform, which must include eliminating barriers to marketing, storage, and distribution of agricultural produce.
 - The government's previous failure to implement agricultural reforms is critiqued, urging for a more proactive and meaningful approach.
- **Arguments:**
 - The author argues that GST simplification, by reducing rates and eliminating multiple duties, is beneficial for the agriculture and food industry.
 - Another argument is that the government's earlier attempt at farm laws was undermined by political pressures, which resulted in contradictory policies like export bans.
- **Assumptions:**

- The passage assumes that rationalising GST is an important step towards improving the agricultural sector but requires further changes in infrastructure and policy.
- The author assumes that the lack of value addition and organised processing is a key issue hindering the growth of the agricultural sector.
- **Paradoxes:**
 - The paradox is that while the GST rationalisation seems like a positive reform, its impact will be limited if not accompanied by broader, structural agricultural reforms.
 - There is also a tension between the rationalisation of GST for processed foods and the government's political response to agricultural reforms, such as imposing export bans.

Passage 2:

Q7) Correct option: C — **Difficulty: Medium** — **Lines: 1–6, 11–12, 16–17**

The passage opens by calling the denial of bail a “grim affirmation” of how **special security laws plus a deferential judiciary** can convert **pre-trial detention into extended punishment** (line 1), explains how **Section 43D(5) + Watali** raise a near-insurmountable bail barrier (lines 3–5), and later criticizes treating protest planning/speech as **prima facie terrorism** (lines 11–12). It culminates in the warning that such practices **collapse accusation and guilt and hollow out Articles 19 and 21** (lines 16–17).

- **Why C is correct:** It integrates the statute-plus-judiciary mechanism, the protest–terror conflation, and the constitutional stakes, while urging the need for courts to counteract.
- **A is incorrect:** The author does not call this an “isolated misstep” or propose mere tweaks; the critique is structural and recurring (lines 1–6).
- **B is incorrect:** The passage never asserts UAPA was “never intended” for protest-adjacent matters; it argues the **application here** blurs lines (lines 9–12).
- **D is incorrect:** No categorical repeal is advocated; instead, the text stresses **judicial authority to grant relief** (lines 7–8).

Q8) Correct option: A — **Difficulty: Easy** — **Line: 1**

“Deferential judiciary” (line 1) is used pejoratively alongside “special security laws” to describe a judiciary **overly respectful/submissive** to the state’s narrative at the bail stage.

- **Why A is correct:** It directly captures **undue respect/submission** in context.
- **B is incorrect:** “Formally independent but occasionally cooperative” understates the critique; the tone implies **over-deference**, not neutral cooperation.
- **C is incorrect:** The judiciary is not depicted as **adversarial**; the problem is the opposite.
- **D is incorrect:** “Procedurally overburdened” is not the semantic core; the author’s charge concerns **deference**, not mere inefficiency.

Q9) Correct option: D — **Difficulty: Medium** — **Lines: 6–8**

Lines 6–8 say UAPA provisions **extend investigations to 180 days** and **prohibit anticipatory bail**, making the **process the penalty** (line 6), yet they also stress that **courts possess authority** to counter procedural constraints and that **long incarceration without trial** can justify relief (lines 7–8).

- **Why D is correct:** It preserves both halves: **punitive effect of process** and **residual judicial power** to mitigate.
- **A is incorrect:** Overstates; courts **can** provide relief (lines 7–8), and the law does not literally forbid all examination ever—Watali limits depth at **bail** stage (lines 3–4).
- **B is incorrect:** Misstates the law as “lenient” and flips the rationale for denial.
- **C is incorrect:** Claims courts are powerless, contradicting **lines 7–8** about judicial authority and relief for long incarceration.

Q10) Correct option: C — **Difficulty: Hard** — **Lines: 11–12, 9–10**

The passage contrasts a **2021 Bench** that warned the state had **blurred protest vs terrorism** (lines 9–10) with the **current Bench** that “appears to have ignored this crucial distinction” (line 11) and treated **protest-related speech and organisational planning** as enough for a **prima facie** terrorism case (line 12).

- **Why C is correct:** It precisely states that the current Bench **erases** the earlier distinction by deeming protest-adjacent acts sufficient.
- **A is incorrect:** No balancing of Articles 19/21 is credited to the current Bench; rather, the author faults it for **ignoring** the distinction (line 11).
- **B is incorrect:** The current Bench **did not** accept broad immunity for protest speech; it did the **opposite** (line 12).
- **D is incorrect:** The current Bench is faulted for **following** a deferential path and **not** urging a searching review contra Watali.

Q11) Correct option: A — *Difficulty: Easy* — *Line: 6*

Line 6 explicitly identifies “**extend the investigation period to 180 days and prohibit anticipatory bail**” as part of a framework where **the process becomes the penalty**.

- **Why A is correct:** It quotes the two specific features the author flags.
- **B is incorrect:** The passage mentions neither “30 days” nor “automatic default bail.”
- **C is incorrect:** There is no requirement to call all witnesses or allow cross-examination at the bail stage; in fact, **Watali** limits detailed evaluation (lines 3–4).
- **D is incorrect:** The text does not discuss absence of a charge sheet or statutory compensation.

Q12) Correct option: B — *Difficulty: Medium* — *Lines: 3–5*

Lines 3–5 explain that **Section 43D(5)** plus **Watali** create a **prima facie** threshold that effectively **bars bail** if accusations appear true, while also **forbidding detailed examination** at bail—thus courts tend to accept the **prosecution’s narrative**, especially where **voluminous material** is attached (lines 4–5).

- **Why B is correct:** The admissions board analogy mirrors the structure: at a preliminary stage, **no close review** is allowed; a **bulky dossier** triggers a **presumption** against the applicant—akin to the prosecution’s narrative prevailing **prima facie**.
- **A is incorrect:** It posits a tribunal that **does** weigh evidence at the interim stage—the opposite of **Watali’s** constraint.
- **C is incorrect:** This demands **strict proof** up front; the passage describes the state succeeding with **prima facie + limited scrutiny**.
- **D is incorrect:** It requires a **mini-trial** at the interim stage, again contradicting **lines 3–4**.

Quick brief of the passage (4–5 lines)

The passage criticizes the Delhi High Court’s refusal to grant bail to Umar Khalid under the UAPA, arguing that **stringent bail thresholds (Section 43D(5) + Watali)** plus **judicial deference** convert pre-trial detention into **punishment**. It contrasts an earlier 2021 Bench—which cautioned against **blurring protest and terrorism**—with the current Bench, which, the author says, effectively does blur that line. Statutory features like **180-day investigations** and **bar on anticipatory bail** make delay “natural,” thereby hollowing **Articles 19 and 21**. The piece’s main thrust: courts **can and should** counter these procedural penalties by treating **long incarceration** as a ground for relief. Tone: sober, rights-protective, and institutionally critical.

Reading approach (how to tackle this passage)

1. **Map the legal scaffolding:** Identify **Section 43D(5)**, **Watali (2019)**, 180-day investigation, and **no anticipatory bail**—all are “mechanics” that shape the author’s reasoning.
2. **Track the two Benches:** Earlier Bench (pro-protest distinction) vs current Bench (prima facie terrorism); locate the **contrast** and its evaluative thrust.
3. **Separate descriptive law from normative claim:** Descriptive—what UAPA/Watali do at bail; Normative—why that’s problematic for liberty under **Arts. 19 & 21**.
4. **Note argumentative pivots:** “process becomes the penalty,” “deferential judiciary,” “courts possess the authority”—these reveal the author’s **stance** and **recommendation**.
5. **Anticipate question types:** Main idea, vocab-in-context (“deferential”), grammar/stance fidelity, inference about the current Bench, detail retrieval (180 days + anticipatory bail), analogy for **prima facie** screening.

Per-question strategy

Q7 (Main idea)

What it tests: Synthesis of *mechanism* (UAPA + Watali + deference) and *effect* (detention = punishment) + *remedy* (judicial counter).

Approach: Pick the option that **combines** these threads and mentions **blurring protest–terror + constitutional hollowing**; reject repeal absolutism or “isolated misstep” framings.

Q8 (Vocabulary: “deferential”)

What it tests: Contextual meaning in a critical tone.

Approach: Because it is paired with “grim affirmation,” choose **unduly respectful/submissive** to state power—not neutral cooperation, not adversarial, not mere inefficiency.

Q9 (Grammar/Concision with stance fidelity)

What it tests: Accurate compression without distorting the author’s **twofold** point.

Approach: Preserve **both** the punitive design (extended timelines + bail limits) **and** the author’s claim that **courts still have authority** to mitigate long incarceration.

Q10 (Author’s stance / inference on current Bench)

What it tests: Reading the **contrast** with the 2021 Bench.

Approach: Select the option that says the current Bench **treats protest speech/planning as prima facie terrorism**, thereby **erasing** the earlier Bench’s protest–terror distinction.

Q11 (Specific detail)

What it tests: Direct retrieval of the **two concrete provisions** that make process punitive.

Approach: Look for “**180 days**” and “**no anticipatory bail**.” Avoid distractors referencing default bail, witness calling, or compensation (not in the passage).

Q12 (Analogy / similar logic)

What it tests: Mapping **prima facie bar + no detailed review at bail** to an analogous screening context.

Approach: Pick the scenario where a decision-maker **cannot closely review** and must **presume truth** from a **voluminous dossier** at the preliminary stage.

Elaborate brief for test logic

Premises (explicit)

- **P1:** Section 43D(5) UAPA + **Watali (2019)** create a **prima facie** bail bar where courts cannot deeply examine evidence at the bail stage.
- **P2:** UAPA permits **investigation up to 180 days** and **bans anticipatory bail**.
- **P3:** The **current Bench** denied bail and treated protest-linked speech/planning (e.g., road blockades) as enough for a **prima facie** terrorism case.
- **P4:** An **earlier Bench (2021)** warned the state had blurred **protest vs terrorist activity**, affirming that peaceful mobilisation cannot be casually labeled terrorism.
- **P5:** **Long incarceration without trial** has been recognised judicially as a ground for relief; courts **possess authority** to counter procedural harshness.
- **P6:** Prolonged delay + presumption at bail risks **collapsing accusation and guilt**, hollowing **Articles 19 & 21**.

Inferences (supported but not verbatim)

- **I1:** Bail jurisprudence under UAPA + Watali **structurally favors** the prosecution’s narrative at the interim stage.
- **I2:** Where charge-sheets are **voluminous**, the **prima facie** threshold becomes a near-automatic detention trigger.
- **I3:** Judicial **deference** (rather than active scrutiny) magnifies the statute’s asymmetry, turning **process into penalty**.
- **I4:** The current Bench’s approach **narrows** constitutional space for dissent relative to the **2021 Bench** standard.

Conclusions (author’s ultimate claims)

- **C1:** The **interaction** of UAPA’s bail design and **deferential judicial practice** converts pre-trial detention into **extended punishment**.
- **C2:** This **blurs** the protest–terror line and **erodes** fundamental rights (Arts. 19 & 21).
- **C3:** **Courts should intervene**—especially where incarceration is long—to restore constitutional balance.

Argument structure (flow)

1. **Diagnosis:** Legal design (43D(5) + Watali + timelines + no anticipatory bail) bail becomes **near-insurmountable**.

2. **Illustration:** Current Bench vs **2021 Bench** from **protecting protest** to **prima facie terrorism** via protest-adjacent acts.
3. **Rights impact:** Delay + presumptions **accusation** ≈ **guilt**; liberty/free expression **hollowed**.
4. **Remedy:** **Judicial authority** exists; long incarceration should trigger **relief** even in serious cases.

Assumptions (unstated but necessary)

- **A1:** The **bail stage** should allow enough scrutiny to prevent **unwarranted detention** in politically sensitive cases.
- **A2:** Classifying protest-related speech/planning as **terrorism** absent detailed scrutiny risks **overbreadth** and **chilling effect**.
- **A3:** Judicial **non-deference** (active rights-protective review) is both legitimate and necessary **within** the statutory framework.
- **A4:** **Delay** is not a neutral fact but a **constitutional harm** when coupled with restricted bail review.

Paradoxes / tensions (good to spot in exams)

- **Paradox 1 – Security vs Liberty:** A law meant for **security** protection (UAPA) can **undercut** security's foundation—**public trust and rights**—when used to penalize protest at the bail stage.
- **Paradox 2 – Process as Penalty:** Procedures (long investigations, limited review) meant to ensure **thoroughness** end up **punishing** before guilt is proven.
- **Paradox 3 – Judicial Role:** Courts possess **authority** to guard against excess, yet **deference** makes them **instruments** of the process they should temper.

Passage 3:

Q13) Correct option: B — Difficulty: Medium — Lines: 2–4, 3, 5–6

The passage sharply differentiates the humorous story (American) from the comic (English) and witty (French): the humorous depends on **manner** of telling (line 2), can be long and wandering (line 3), is a **work of art** (line 4), and is delivered **gravely** (line 5), sometimes with an understated “nub” (line 6).

- **Why B is correct:** It accurately synthesizes **method (manner/deadpan/art)** vs **matter (brief/point)** and the national labels (line 2).
- **Why A is incorrect:** The author stresses **differences**, not identity (lines 2–4).
- **Why C is incorrect:** The author never ranks comic/witty as **superior**; he calls humorous a “high and delicate art” (line 4).
- **Why D is incorrect:** The author says **humorous** requires an **artist** (line 4); “anybody can do it” is said of comic/witty (line 4).

Q14) Correct option: D — Difficulty: Easy — Line: 5

“Gravely” is used to describe the **deadpan** style: the teller hides any sign that he finds it funny (line 5).

- **Why D is correct:** “Seriously and deadpan” matches the explicit idea—concealing humor (line 5).
- **Why A is incorrect:** “Severely” concerns harm; not intended here.
- **Why B is incorrect:** No ritual/pomp appears.
- **Why C is incorrect:** The tone isn’t despair; it’s **straight-faced** delivery.

Q15) Correct option: C — Difficulty: Medium — Line: 6; plus examples line 7

The teller “drops” the nub **casually** and **indifferently**, pretending **not to know** it is a nub (line 6). Artemus Ward, etc., used this so the audience **catches the joke belatedly** (line 7).

- **Why C is correct:** It captures the **low-key concealment** and **delayed audience recognition** (lines 6–7).
- **Why A is incorrect:** The teller does the **opposite**—no loud announcement (line 6).
- **Why B is incorrect:** There is no mid-story analytic explanation; that would spoil the device (line 6).
- **Why D is incorrect:** The humorous story **often** does have a nub; the trick lies in **how** it is dropped (lines 3 & 6).

Q16) Correct option: A — Difficulty: Easy — Line: 3

Line 3: humorous stories may be **long/wandering** and **arrive nowhere in particular**, whereas comic/witty stories are **brief and end with a point**.

- **Why A is correct:** It faithfully compresses the exact contrast.
- **Why B is incorrect:** Overstates to value judgment (“fail” vs “succeed”) that the author does not make.
- **Why C is incorrect:** Reverses traits—comic/witty are **brief**, not lengthy; humorous may **wander** (line 3).
- **Why D is incorrect:** Also reverses the traits.

Q17) Correct option: D — Difficulty: Hard — Lines: 3 & 5–6

Humorous: **long, bubbling, subtle**, often **deadpan** with a quietly dropped nub (lines 3, 5–6). Comic/witty: **brief, pointed, burst** (line 3).

- **Why D is correct:** A **jazz improvisation** (long, flowing, understated tag) mirrors humorous; a **pop single** (tight, brief, catchy hook) mirrors comic/witty.
- **Why A is incorrect:** The traits are mismatched and muddled (short yet discursive; long yet meandering).
- **Why B is incorrect:** The stew never finishing doesn’t capture **artful bubbling + nub**; the “explosive flavors” analogy is misaligned with the author’s pairing.
- **Why C is incorrect:** It contrasts signaling a punchline vs monotone reading, but doesn’t capture **length + structure + understated nub** vs **tight point**.

Q18) Correct option: C — Difficulty: Medium — Line: 4 (and 2)

He calls humorous storytelling a “**high and delicate art**” and claims its **creation** and **home** are America (line 4), after labeling types by nation (line 2). The tone suggests **rhetorical flourish** elevating an **oral, deadpan art** rather than a strict historical taxonomy.

- **Why C is correct:** It reads the line as **sweeping, evaluative rhetoric** to emphasize method and esteem, not a narrowly empirical thesis.
- **Why A is incorrect:** The claim is not framed as scientifically verified national ownership.
- **Why B is incorrect:** He **praises**, not denigrates, humorous stories (line 4).
- **Why D is incorrect:** He does not declare comic/witty irrelevant; he contrasts **art** vs **anybody can do it** (line 4), not total rejection.

Quick brief of the passage

The author (in Twain-like voice) contrasts three story types: **humorous** (American), **comic** (English), and **witty** (French). Humorous stories rely on the **manner** of telling—long, meandering, and delivered **gravely**—often hiding the punchline (“nub”) so listeners discover it late. Comic/witty stories rely on **matter**—they are **brief** and end with a sharp point; they “burst” instead of “bubble.” The author calls humorous storytelling a **high and delicate art** of oral performance, citing performers who drop the nub **casually** to misdirect audiences.

Reading approach (how to tackle this passage)

1. **Map definitions & contrasts first:** Humorous = **manner/long/deadpan**, Comic & Witty = **matter/brief/point**.
2. **Track tone & stance:** The author **praises** humorous storytelling as an art, gently satirizing comic tellers who telegraph punchlines.
3. **Spot technique terms:** “Gravely,” “nub,” “bubbles vs bursts,” “casually/indifferently” dropped ending.
4. **Expect question types:** Main idea/synthesis, vocab-in-context (“gravely”), inference about the nub trick, analogy (jazz vs pop), grammar/condensation of the contrast, author’s stance on “American” claim.
5. **Answer method:** Prefer options that **preserve contrasts and tone**; avoid reversals or value judgments not in the text.

Per-question strategy

Q13 (Main Idea)

What it tests: Global synthesis of definitions, national labels, and delivery differences.

Approach: Choose the option that highlights **humorous = manner (deadpan, long, art)** versus **comic/witty = matter (brief, pointed)**, **without** ranking them as better/worse.

Q14 (Vocab in context: “gravely”)

What it tests: Contextual meaning through surrounding cues.

Approach: Because the teller hides any sign of amusement, pick **serious/deadpan**—not “severe,” “pompous,” or “despairing.”

Q15 (Inference/technique: the “nub” trick)

What it tests: Understanding misdirection and delayed recognition.

Approach: Select **low-key delivery** of the punchline so the audience catches it late; reject options with loud announcements or no punchline at all.

Q16 (Grammar/Concision: contrast sentence)

What it tests: Faithful compression of the **long vs brief** and **no-point vs point** distinction.

Approach: Pick the sentence that keeps **humorous = may wander** and **comic/witty = brief + sharp point**—no reversals, no exaggerated value claims.

Q17 (Analogy / similar logic)

What it tests: Mapping structure and effect to a parallel domain.

Approach: Match **humorous** to **long, subtle, understated tag** and **comic/witty** to **tight, brief, hook** (e.g., jazz improv vs pop single).

Q18 (Author's stance / implication about "created in America")

What it tests: Reading rhetoric vs literal historiography.

Approach: Treat it as **rhetorical elevation** underscoring the oral/deadpan art—not a hard empirical ownership claim or a put-down of other forms.

Elaborate test-logic brief

Premises (explicit)

- **P1:** There are several kinds of stories; the **humorous** kind is the most difficult.
- **P2:** Humorous (American) depends on **manner**; comic (English) and witty (French) depend on **matter**.
- **P3:** Humorous stories may be **long, rambling**, even ending "nowhere in particular"; comic/witty must be **brief and end with a point**.
- **P4:** Humorous is a "**high and delicate art**" of **oral** telling; comic/witty require **no art** by comparison.
- **P5:** Humorous stories are told **gravely**; comic tellers **telegraph** their fun and often **restate** the nub seeking applause.
- **P6:** The humorous teller may **drop the nub casually**, masking it so the audience **gets it late**; noted performers use this trick.

Inferences (supported but not verbatim)

- **I1:** Audience satisfaction in humorous stories often comes from **delayed realization**, not the mere presence of a punchline.
- **I2:** Over-signaling humor (comic style) can **reduce sophistication** of effect, as contrasted with the **artful misdirection** of humorous storytelling.
- **I3:** The author's national assignments function as a **rhetorical taxonomy** rather than a research-heavy historical claim.

Conclusions (author's ultimate claims)

- **C1:** The **humorous story** is an **art of delivery**; its difficulty lies in **deadpan, timing, and subtlety**.
- **C2:** **Comic/witty stories**, while effective, operate chiefly through **compact content and a pointed ending**.
- **C3:** Mastery in humor involves **concealment and control**—letting the audience discover the nub rather than being told when to laugh.

Arguments (structure/warrants)

- **A1 (Contrast warrant):** If **effect** depends on either **manner** or **matter**, then differences in **length, tone, and punchline handling** will predictably distinguish story types.
- **A2 (Delivery warrant):** If humor relies on **how** it is told, then **deadpan** and **casual nub-dropping** are legitimate techniques that heighten audience engagement via **inference** rather than **instruction**.
- **A3 (Evaluation warrant):** Calling humorous storytelling a "**high and delicate art**" is an evaluative judgment supporting the author's preferred method.

Assumptions (unstated but necessary)

- **As1:** Audiences can appreciate **subtle, delayed** humor without explicit cues.
- **As2:** "Artfulness" is linked to **performance choices** (tone, pacing, misdirection) more than to **plot content**.
- **As3:** National labels are **heuristic**; readers will not demand rigorous historical proof to understand the point about styles.

Paradoxes / tensions

- **Paradox 1 – Hidden humor:** The **funnier** the tale, the **straighter** the face; the teller must suppress visible amusement to maximize audience laughter.
- **Paradox 2 – Wandering path, precise effect:** A humorous story may **meander and end “nowhere,”** yet achieve a **sharper experiential payoff** through delayed recognition than a tightly pointed joke.
- **Paradox 3 – Ease vs art:** The **short, pointed** comic/witty form “anyone can do,” whereas the **long, understated** humorous form demands **greater craft**, even though the latter **pretends** to be casual.

Passage 4:

Q19) Correct option: A — **Difficulty: Medium — Lines: 3–6, 7–13, 16–19**

The author repeatedly argues **against** treating March For Australia as an **aberration** (line 3), insisting it is **not exceptional** and **did not occur in a vacuum** (line 6). He situates it within a **longer and broader history** (line 13), notes **recurring similarities** with past domestic/international events (lines 7–8), and warns that “fringe only” framings let **mainstream** Australia off lightly (lines 16–17). He also critiques overreliance on “contagion thesis” framings (line 19).

- **Why A is correct:** It integrates **non-aberration, historicity, and mainstream complicity**, which are the backbone of the passage (lines 3, 6, 13, 16–19).
- **Why B is incorrect:** The author resists the claim of a wholly **new** era; he stresses continuity, not novelty (lines 3–6, 13).
- **Why C is incorrect:** He provides **precedents** and networks, contradicting “no local precedent” (lines 7–11).
- **Why D is incorrect:** He does not blame **foreign influence** primarily; he underscores **local recurrence** and mainstream conditions (lines 6, 13, 16–17).

Q20) Correct option: A — **Difficulty: Easy — Line: 3**

“**Aberration**” here warns against calling the rallies a **deviation** from the norm—as if new, isolated, or anomalous. The author’s point is that they are **not** an anomaly (lines 3, 6).

- **Why A is correct:** “Departure from the expected norm; outlier” matches the caution in line 3.
- **Why B is incorrect:** Nothing suggests the event was a **hoax**.
- **Why C is incorrect:** The author never calls the rallies an **inevitable culmination**; he emphasizes continuity and conditions, not determinism.
- **Why D is incorrect:** He takes the matter seriously; not a **minor inconvenience** (lines 1–2, 15).

Q21) Correct option: D — **Difficulty: Medium–Hard — Lines: 16–19**

The author notes a **problem** with language that pushes events to the **margins** (lines 16–17) and observes that research sometimes uses a “**contagion thesis**” (line 19)—fringes “contaminate” the centre. He implies this can obscure **internal, mainstream** conditions already present.

- **Why D is correct:** It captures the author’s **caution**: outside-in models underplay **inside-out, longstanding** factors (lines 16–19).
- **Why A is incorrect:** He does **not** endorse it as **sole** correct; he warns about its implications.
- **Why B is incorrect:** He does **not** deny far-right influence; he questions **how** we frame it.
- **Why C is incorrect:** He never ties the thesis to a **brand-new, post-pandemic** period; he stresses **longer history** (line 13).

Q22) Correct option: C — **Difficulty: Medium — Lines: 7–11**

Lines 7–8 list **comparable events and groups** at home and abroad; lines 9–10 show **rebranding** and **leader recycling** (Thomas Sewell’s affiliations); line 11 concludes this **was not spontaneous**.

- **Why C is correct:** It preserves all three elements—**recurrence, recycling, and non-spontaneity**—in one concise sentence.
- **Why A is incorrect:** It says “unique”/“never resurfaced,” contradicting **pop up later under another name** (line 9).
- **Why B is incorrect:** It denies comparability, contradicting “**Consider the similarity ... here and abroad**” (line 7).
- **Why D is incorrect:** Disbanding ≠ fading; the text says groups **reappear** (line 9).

Q23) Correct option: B — Difficulty: Medium — Lines: 14–17

The author writes that heavy use of labels like “far right,” “extreme,” “neo-Nazis” (line 14) can **portray** events as if they **subsist only in the margins** (line 16), which **lets “mainstream” Australia off too lightly** (line 17).

- **Why B is correct:** It directly matches the **unintended consequence** described (lines 16–17).
- **Why A is incorrect:** No claim that extremists **abandon** the public sphere.
- **Why C is incorrect:** The author warns against **assuming** full centre capture; he stresses **continuity and mainstream conditions**, not completed takeover.
- **Why D is incorrect:** The passage does not discuss **law enforcement policy** outcomes.

Q24) Correct option: B — Difficulty: Hard — Lines: 6–11, 13

The passage argues the rallies are **not exceptional** (line 6), sit within a **longer history** (line 13), and that groups **disband** and re-emerge **under new names** (line 9). This is like fashion **cycles**—patterns recur with **relabeling**, reflecting **enduring tastes/conditions** rather than one-off external shocks.

- **Why B is correct:** It mirrors **recurrence + rebranding + embedded preferences/conditions** (lines 6, 9, 13).
- **Why A is incorrect:** A singular comet **contradicts** recurrence.
- **Why C is incorrect:** A non-replicable lab error implies **exceptionality**, not cyclicity.
- **Why D is incorrect:** A pure lottery is **random**, not patterned or conditioned by history.

Quick brief of the passage

The author argues that “March For Australia” should **not** be treated as an aberration or turning point but as part of a **recurring** pattern of racism and far-right mobilisation in Australia with clear **domestic precedents** and parallels abroad. Treating such events as purely **fringe** (via labels like “far right,” “extreme,” “neo-Nazi”) hides the role of **mainstream** social and political conditions. Groups routinely **disband and rebrand**, resurfacing under new names, so the rally did **not** emerge spontaneously. The commonly cited “**contagion thesis**” (fringe infects the centre) can mislead if it ignores long-standing, internal drivers. The piece’s main idea: to understand and address such events, look **beyond margins** to the **broader historical and mainstream context** that enables them.

Reading approach (how to tackle this passage)

1. **Map the author’s thesis vs. popular narrative:** The text resists “turning point/aberration” framing; underline lines that say “not exceptional,” “not in a vacuum,” “longer and broader history.”
2. **Track evidence structure:** Lists of comparable **events** (Cronulla, Charlottesville, Capitol, London) and **groups** (ADL, Reclaim Australia, Proud Boys) show **recurrence** and **rebranding**.
3. **Note the critique of language/research:** Heavy “extreme” labels + “contagion thesis” risk **marginalising** the phenomenon and absolving the **mainstream**.
4. **Expect question types:** Main idea; vocab (“aberration”); inference about contagion thesis; condensation of lines on recurrence/rebranding; unintended consequence of labeling; analogy capturing **cyclical reappearance**.

Per-question strategy (linked to Q19–Q24)**Q19 (Main idea)**

What it tests: Synthesis of the entire argument.

Approach: Choose the option that **rejects aberration/turning-point framing**, stresses **recurrence** and **mainstream** enabling conditions, and warns against focusing only on the fringe.

Q20 (Vocabulary: “aberration”)

What it tests: Contextual meaning.

Approach: In a paragraph cautioning against calling the rally “new/unusual,” pick “**departure from the norm; outlier**,” not “hoax,” “inevitable,” or “minor.”

Q21 (Author’s stance on “contagion thesis”)

What it tests: Nuanced inference about the thesis.

Approach: The author **doesn’t endorse** contagion as the sole model; select the option saying outside-in frames **understate** the **internal/mainstream** drivers.

Q22 (Grammar/Concision / synthesis of lines 7–11)

What it tests: Compress evidence without losing logic.

Approach: Keep **comparative events**, **group recycling/rebranding**, and the conclusion that the rally **wasn't spontaneous**.

Q23 (Unintended consequence of “extreme” labels)

What it tests: Detail/implication.

Approach: Pick the effect that such labeling pushes the phenomenon to the **margins** and lets the **mainstream** off too lightly—**not** police policy or completed “centre capture.”

Q24 (Analogy / similar logic)

What it tests: Structure mapping.

Approach: Choose the analogy of **cyclic reappearance under new labels** (e.g., fashion trends), not one-offs (comet/lab error) or randomness (lottery).

Elaborate brief for test logic

Premises (explicit statements)

- **P1:** Many observers call the rallies a **turning point**, suggesting a new era of far-right normalisation/violence.
- **P2:** Despite overt racism and a neo-Nazi attack, the author warns **against** treating the rallies as an **aberration** or **exception**.
- **P3:** There are **domestic and international precedents** (Cronulla; EDL; Charlottesville; Capitol; London).
- **P4:** Far-right groups **disband and reappear** under new names; leaders cycle through multiple organisations.
- **P5:** Over-reliance on “far right/extreme” language and the **contagion thesis** risks portraying the phenomenon as purely **fringe**, absolving the **mainstream**.
- **P6:** There is a **longer and broader history** explaining these rallies that cannot be reduced to isolated “extreme” actors/events.

Inferences (logically supported, not verbatim)

- **I1:** The enabling conditions for far-right mobilisation are **embedded** in broader Australian society, not just on its edges.
- **I2:** Media/political narratives that emphasise **novelty** and **fringe contamination** may **obscure continuity** and **structural causes**.
- **I3:** Policy or social responses focused only on “extremists” will likely be **insufficient** if mainstream drivers persist.
- **I4:** The pattern of **rebranding** implies strategic adaptation, not decline.

Conclusions (author's ultimate claims)

- **C1:** “March For Australia” is **not** a one-off aberration; it fits a **recurring** pattern with **domestic roots**.
- **C2:** Analytical frames and labels that push it to the **margins** are **misleading** and **normatively convenient** for the mainstream.
- **C3:** Understanding/mitigation requires **examining mainstream conditions** and the **long historical arc**, not solely focusing on fringe “contagion.”

Argument structure (warrants)

- **W1 (Continuity warrant):** If similar events/groups recur domestically and internationally, then the latest rally likely reflects **ongoing dynamics**, not a sudden rupture.
- **W2 (Attribution warrant):** If labels and research frames move the phenomenon to the margins, they **misattribute** causality and **under-diagnose** mainstream factors.
- **W3 (Agency warrant):** If groups rebrand and leaders cycle through organisations, then mobilisation is **opportunistic and persistent**, not spontaneous.

Assumptions (unstated but necessary)

- **A1:** The “mainstream/fringe” boundary is often **porous**; attitudes and networks diffuse across it.
- **A2:** Public narratives can **shape** understanding and policy; misframing has **real consequences**.
- **A3:** Historical patterns are **probative** for causal inference about present events.

Paradoxes / tensions to notice

- **Paradox 1 — Visibility vs. Causality:** The most visible “extreme” actors are **not** the sole cause; **less visible mainstream** factors may be **more** causally important.
- **Paradox 2 — Newness vs. Recurrence:** What looks like a **turning point** can actually be the **latest iteration** of a long pattern.

- **Paradox 3 — Margins vs. Centre:** The more we insist this is only **fringe**, the more we risk **entrenching** it by refusing to confront **centre-located** drivers.

SECTION B: - CURRENT AFFAIRS (INCLUDING GENERAL KNOWLEDGE)

Q25. Correct option: A (Easy). The reform packages the GST rate structure into two broad slabs—5% as a merit rate and 18% as the standard rate—while removing the 12% and 28% slabs, with commencement on **22 September 2025**. This aligns with the broader goal of simplifying compliance and reducing classification disputes while maintaining revenue neutrality through a narrower spread of rates. Option B is incorrect because it retains three slabs and delays the start to 1 January 2026, which diverges from the specified two-rate model and date. Option C suggests a single 12% rate and a phased rollout in April 2026; this contradicts the dual-rate approach and the notified timeline. Option D shifts to 8% and 16% and claims immediate effect, both inconsistent with the described structure and the provided effective date. The correct choice reflects both the numerical slabs and the exact go-live date for the rationalization.

Q26. Correct option: C (Medium). The One Hundred and First Amendment Act, 2016 embedded GST into the Constitution by introducing key provisions governing concurrent taxing powers, inter-State supply, and the Council's framework. Option A (97th) relates primarily to cooperative societies and is unrelated to GST. Option B (103rd) concerns reservation for EWS in education and public employment, not taxation reform. Option D (122nd) was the Constitutional Amendment Bill number during the legislative process, but the enacted Amendment is the **101st**, not the 122nd—conflating the Bill number with the final Amendment Act number is a common trap. The 101st Amendment laid the groundwork for Articles 246A, 269A, and 279A, thereby enabling the unified indirect tax regime. Hence, only option C captures the correct and final constitutional instrument.

Q27. Correct option: D (Medium). The basket that matches the essentials relief is: milk, paneer, chapati, paratha at **zero GST**, and a **5%** rate on toiletries, medicines, bicycles, and basic farm tools. This is crafted to lower household expenditure on frequently consumed items while modestly taxing low-value necessity goods to preserve revenue. Option A mixes staples with “premium soaps at 12%,” which does not align with the reduced 5% bracket for toiletries. Option B folds in dairy products that are not the specified focus and misstates detergents at 12% rather than the revised 5% class for toiletries. Option C lists rice, sugar, tea—none of which are the specifically identified four essentials that were zero-rated here—and wrongly assigns OTC drugs to 12%. Option D precisely matches the relief configuration, ensuring the zero-rate and 5% tiers are accurately mapped to the right categories.

Q28. Correct option: B (Easy). The Union Finance Minister chairs the GST Council, ensuring central fiscal stewardship while State Finance Ministers represent sub-national interests. This structure balances centre–state coordination for rate-setting and policy guidance. Option A (Prime Minister) is incorrect; the PM does not chair deliberative tax federalism bodies of this nature. Option C (Revenue Secretary) is an ex-officio official who supports the Council but does not chair it. Option D (Cabinet Secretary) coordinates across ministries administratively and has no chairing role in the Council's constitutional design. The chairmanship by the Union Finance Minister provides continuity with Union fiscal policy and aligns the Council's agenda with budgetary priorities while retaining federal consultation.

Q29. Correct option: D (Hard). Sin goods—tobacco, luxury vehicles, and aerated drinks—are shifted to a **40%** tax. This steep rate reflects both revenue considerations and the corrective-tax rationale for goods with negative externalities or conspicuous consumption profiles. Option A (28% + optional 10% cess) under-states the consolidated stance; the architecture aims for a clear, higher incidence rather than a patchwork of base rate plus variable cesses. Option B (35% without cess) also understates the final burden and removes the policy flexibility embedded in a clear high headline rate. Option C (28% plus specific duty) describes a hybrid model not chosen in the approved overhaul. The 40% figure signals an intentional wedge between merit/standard goods and sin/luxury categories to discourage consumption and to compensate for rate compressions elsewhere.

Q30. Correct option: A (Medium). Operationalizing the **GSTAT** streamlines appellate remedy and eases High Court burdens by furnishing a specialized, structured forum for GST disputes. This is crucial for certainty, compliance culture,

and timely jurisprudence on classification, valuation, input tax credit, and procedural issues. Option B (NAA 2.0 with criminal powers) is inaccurate; the anti-profiteering framework has been undergoing sunset/reconfiguration rather than criminalization. Option C (district-level State AAR benches) exaggerates decentralization; Advance Ruling systems exist at State/National levels but not as a district-everywhere mandate. Option D (GST Ombudsman with binding powers) does not reflect the adjudicatory tier adopted; ombuds models are typically recommendatory and are not substitutes for a statutory appellate tribunal. The GSTAT decision directly targets pendency and interpretive consistency.

Q31. Correct option: C (Easy). The tournament opens on the last Monday of August, anchoring a two-week window that overlaps the Labor Day weekend in the United States. This timing is a long-standing feature that helps broadcasters and organizers plan marquee sessions across the middle weekend. Option A is incorrect because the first Monday of August would shift the event four weeks earlier than the established window. Option B misplaces the start into September and would miss the traditional pre-Labor Day kickoff. Option D cites a Friday start, which conflicts with the established Monday commencement pattern used to structure first-round matches. The Monday start also supports staggered scheduling across multiple courts and a predictable rhythm for player rest days and night sessions.

Q32. Correct option: D (Medium). The United States Tennis Association (USTA) runs the event, reflecting its status as the national federation for tennis in the U.S. This governance includes venue operations at the USTA Billie Jean King National Tennis Center, commercial rights, and competitive regulations. Option A (ATP) administers the men's professional tour but does not own or organize Grand Slams. Option B (ITF) is the world governing body and custodian of the Grand Slam rulebook, yet operational control of each Slam rests with local organizers. Option C (Wimbledon Committee) pertains only to The Championships, Wimbledon, under the All England Lawn Tennis Club. The USTA's role aligns with national association stewardship typical across the four majors.

Q33. Correct option: B (Medium). The Open Era began in 1968, when professional players were permitted to compete alongside amateurs at major tournaments, modernizing the sport's competitive ecosystem. Option A (1967) precedes the policy change and thus cannot be correct. Option C (1970) is after the watershed and inaccurately delays the shift by two years. Option D (1950) predates the professional-amateur integration by nearly two decades and is historically untenable. The 1968 transition catalyzed deeper draws, higher standards, and broader commercial appeal, setting the stage for the contemporary Grand Slam circuit with integrated ranking points and larger prize purses.

Q34. Correct option: A (Easy). The US Open stands out for having avoided wartime cancellations and for proceeding in 2020 despite pandemic disruptions. That continuity distinguishes it from its peers in moments of global crisis. Option B is wrong because Wimbledon was canceled during both World Wars and did not take place in 2020. Option C faced interruptions historically and 2020 presented severe logistical barriers that affected schedules and travel. Option D likewise has a history of disruptions and required adjustments in extraordinary circumstances. The uninterrupted run underscores institutional resilience, flexible scheduling, and the ability to operate under strict public-health protocols when needed.

Q35. Correct option: C (Hard). The stated men's singles outcome is Carlos Alcaraz defeating Jannik Sinner, credited as his second US Open and sixth major overall. Option A inverts the winner–runner-up relationship and thus cannot stand. Option B introduces different players not tied to the specific result being tested here; while both are elite competitors, their pairing doesn't match the described final. Option D also presents a high-profile duo from recent seasons but misaligns with the specified championship outcome. This item tests accurate recall of a specific championship pairing and title count, distinguishing it from generic knowledge of tour leaders or typical Slam contenders.

Q36. Correct option: B (Medium). Don Budge completed the first calendar-year Grand Slam in 1938, sweeping all four majors in a single season—an epochal benchmark for tennis. Option A (Rod Laver) did achieve the feat later (two times, in different contexts), but not the first. Option C (Fred Perry) was a dominant pre-Open Era champion yet did not complete a calendar-year sweep. Option D (Roy Emerson) amassed numerous majors without sealing a single-season

four-trophy run. Recognizing Budge's precedence situates later accomplishments in historical sequence and clarifies the lineage of the sport's most coveted single-season milestone.

Q37. Correct option: B (Medium). All Members of Parliament from both Lok Sabha and Rajya Sabha, **including nominated members**, constitute the Electoral College for the Vice-Presidential election, while State Legislative Assembly members do **not** participate. This framework centralizes the mandate in Parliament because the Vice President presides over the Council of States and is part of the Union legislature's functioning. Option A is incorrect: it wrongly excludes nominated members despite their voting entitlement here. Option C is incorrect because MLAs and UT legislators are not part of this Electoral College; their participation pertains to the **Presidential** election, not the Vice-Presidential one. Option D is too narrow, limiting the body only to Rajya Sabha members, whereas Lok Sabha members (elected) and nominated MPs of both Houses also vote. This arrangement preserves parliamentary representativeness without federal legislative dilution through State Assemblies.

Q38. Correct option: D (Easy). A valid nomination requires **20 proposers and 20 seconders**, all of whom must be MPs. This threshold ensures that only candidates with a basic cross-party parliamentary footprint enter the ballot, curbing frivolous candidacies and upholding institutional seriousness. Option A (10/10) lowers the bar excessively, risking an overcrowded field. Option B (15/15) still falls short of the statutory requirement and could enable marginal nominations. Option C (25/25) overstates the bar and would unjustifiably restrict candidacies beyond the prescribed minimum. The stipulated numbers align with the objective of balancing accessibility with legitimacy.

Q39. Correct option: C (Medium). The Vice-Presidential election employs **Proportional Representation by means of the Single Transferable Vote (STV)** with **preferential ballots** and a **secret vote**. Each MP has one ballot on which candidates are ranked; counting proceeds via first preferences and, if necessary, transfers from eliminated candidates until a candidate secures the required majority of valid votes. Option A (first-past-the-post) ignores preferential ranking and transfers, leading to potential minority winners. Option B (approval voting) allows multiple approvals and lacks transfer mechanics tied to majority thresholds. Option D (Borda count) aggregates ranked points rather than using quota-based transfers; it is not the prescribed legal method here. The STV design enhances consensus selection and reflects the multi-party composition of Parliament;

Q40. Correct option: A (Easy). The **Vice President of India** is the ex-officio Chairperson of the Rajya Sabha, presiding over its proceedings, ensuring procedural order, and exercising casting-vote powers in certain ties. Option B is incorrect because the Speaker presides over the Lok Sabha, not the Council of States. Option C (Prime Minister) leads the executive and the Lok Sabha majority but does not chair the Upper House. Option D (Chief Justice) heads the judiciary and has no presiding role in parliamentary chambers. The separation of roles maintains legislative procedure independent of executive and judicial offices, with the Vice President uniquely positioned to steward the Upper House's agenda.

Q41. Correct option: C (Hard). Polling is **usually conducted in Parliament House** using a **secret ballot**, and the Returning Officer is **often the Secretary-General of the Rajya Sabha**, reflecting the office's institutional nexus to the Upper House which the Vice President chairs. Option A is incorrect: Rashtrapati Bhavan is not the standard polling venue, and the President does not appoint the RO for this election. Option B is incorrect: the Supreme Court has no role as polling station; the CJI does not nominate the RO. Option D is incorrect: the PMO and Cabinet Secretariat are executive offices without statutory authority to conduct this parliamentary election. The arrangement ensures administrative neutrality and logistical convenience for MPs.

Q42. Correct option: B (Medium). Removal requires a **resolution in the Rajya Sabha**, passed by a **majority of its members at that time, agreed to by the Lok Sabha**, with a **minimum 14-day notice** before moving the resolution. Option A mischaracterizes the process as a Lok Sabha-led impeachment with a special majority; impeachment terminology is reserved for the President and judges under distinct procedures. Option C proposes a joint sitting and simple majority without notice, which lacks constitutional basis and procedural safeguards. Option D incorrectly assigns adjudicatory removal to the Supreme Court based on an EC reference; courts may adjudicate disputes but do

not initiate or effect removal in this manner. The specified path preserves bicameral accountability while respecting the Rajya Sabha's primacy in relation to its presiding officer. Verbatim numeric thresholds and phrasing from the text are

Q43. Correct option: B (Medium). The summit outcomes recorded the acceptance of as a partner country, taking the overall tally to **27]** comprising **10 members + 17 partners**. This aligns with the broader SCO trajectory of calibrated expansion via full members, observers, and partners to enhance regional reach without diluting institutional coherence. Option A is incorrect because it elevates **Bhutan**, which is not reflected in the decisions or SCO's usual engagement pathways. Option C misstates the entities—**Mongolia** has long-standing observer status but no new paired admission with **Nepal** was concluded in this context. Option D wrongly upgrades **Turkey** to full membership; Turkey remains a dialogue partner and was not converted at this summit. The precise partner addition and arithmetic are captured in the correctly framed option, whereas the distractors either name the wrong countries or the wrong status transitions.

Q44. Correct option: D (Easy). The **SCO Secretariat** is housed in **Beijing**, consistent with the organization's Eurasian footprint and administrative arrangements set out post-charter. Option A (Moscow) is a common misdirection due to Russia's central role but it is not the Secretariat's base. Option B (Tashkent) hosts **RATS**—the Regional Anti-Terrorist Structure—rather than the Secretariat, so conflating the two leads to error. Option C (Astana/Nur-Sultan) is the capital of Kazakhstan and plays host to numerous regional fora but not the SCO Secretariat. Locating the Secretariat in Beijing helps with institutional continuity, liaison with member missions, and coordination across SCO working bodies and expert groups, while RATS in Tashkent concentrates on counter-terror mechanisms separately.

Q45. Correct option: C (Medium). The proposal branded the seeks to promote sovereign equality, multilateralism, and a just global order—a formulation that mirrors India's theme highlighted in recent summitry. Option A (EPC), Option B (MGC), and Option D (SDP) are plausible-sounding but fabricated constructs that do not correspond to the adopted or proposed label in the outcomes. The initiative's positioning intersects with Global South priorities—reforming institutions, resisting coercive unilateral measures, and strengthening rule-based frameworks rooted in the UN and WTO system. The distractors test whether candidates can separate authentic nomenclature from policy-scented neologisms designed to confuse.

Q46. Correct option: A (Easy). The **Heads of State Council** is the SCO's supreme body for strategic direction, external engagement decisions, and top-level approvals. Option B (Council of National Coordinators) handles coordination and follow-up but not supreme decision-making. Option C (Council of Ministers of Foreign Affairs) manages day-to-day political coordination and prepares issues for leaders but is not the apex authority. Option D (Heads of Government Council) oversees budgets and economic cooperation yet sits below the Heads of State in hierarchy. Understanding this ladder is essential: leaders decide the organization's trajectory; foreign ministers refine the political agenda; heads of government drive economic implementation; coordinators ensure bureaucratic execution.

Q47. Correct option: C (Hard). The outcomes intertwined security and normative stances: a **condemnation of terrorism** (including **the Pahalgam attack]**), calls to halt **cross-border terrorist movement**, and a **rejection of unilateral coercive measures** that contradict **UN/WTO** principles. Option A is the inverse of reality, wrongly asserting endorsement of unilateral sanctions and silence on terrorism. Option B artificially inserts **NATO observers** and claims a trade-only focus, neither of which matches the breadth of security, governance, and humanitarian references. Option D reduces the summit to culture and mistakenly proposes dissolving **RATS**, contrary to the emphasis on counter-terror cooperation through RATS and related mechanisms. The correct statement also coheres with parallel references to regional crises and inclusive governance goals, situating security within a rules-based economic order.

Q48. Correct option: B (Medium). The UK is identified as the **first European** economy to accede to CPTPP, with parties and the UK signing an **accession protocol in 2023]**, paving the path to formal entry. This fits the bloc's Indo-Pacific tilt while broadening its geographic reach into Europe through accession rather than founding membership. Option A is incorrect because CPTPP's founding instrument dates to **2018]**, and the UK was not an original signatory. Option C is

wrong: CPTPP accessions are negotiated inter-governmentally; there is no “referendum of all CPTPP citizens” mechanism. Option D misstates the status—accession confers member market-access commitments, not mere observer standing. Strategically, UK entry underscores supply-chain diversification, services openness, and standards alignment across advanced and emerging Indo-Pacific partners.

Q49. Correct option: D (Easy). CPTPP was signed by **11 countries** on **8 March 2018** in **Santiago, Chile**, crystallizing the successor framework after the earlier TPP configuration. Option A (2015, Kuala Lumpur) conflates ministerial meetings with the legal signing. Option B (2017, Tokyo) misdates the deal and misplaces the venue. Option C (2019, Ottawa) post-dates entry into force stages for several members and is not the signature locale. Understanding the correct date and venue is basic static GK that routinely appears in prelim-style exams, and helps distinguish CPTPP’s formation from subsequent accessions and domestic ratification timelines that vary by country.

Q50. Correct option: C (Medium). CPTPP’s footprint covers **~15% of global GDP** and **500+ million people**, marking it as one of the most consequential plurilateral trade blocs by economic weight and population. Option A grossly understates both GDP share and population, making it implausible for an 11-economy Indo-Pacific pact. Option B still understates the scale, inconsistent with the combined weight of Japan, Canada, Mexico, Australia, Vietnam, Malaysia, Singapore, Chile, Peru, New Zealand, and Brunei. Option D exaggerates the bloc’s share, approaching quarter of global GDP and 1+ billion people, which would require several additional large economies. The correct choice reinforces why accession debates matter: even modest tariff cuts can produce large trade-creation effects at this scale.

Q51. Correct option: C (Hard). The policy case outlines **reduced tariffs** and **expanded market access** as levers to unlock exports, particularly for **MSMEs** that contribute **~40%** of India’s exports, alongside supply-chain diversification via the **“China plus one”** strategy. Option A reverses the logic by advocating tariff hikes and constraining exports, clashing with integration aims. Option B artificially narrows to services and denies tariff relevance, ignoring merchandise export opportunities and rules-of-origin benefits. Option D proposes abandoning FTAs in favor of bilaterals and dialing down Asia-Pacific engagement, contradicting the objective of joining mega-regional pacts that deliver cumulative rules, scale economies, and deeper production-network participation. The chosen mix reflects both sectoral opportunity and strategic hedging within Indo-Pacific trade ecosystems.

Q52. Correct option: B (Easy). The **United States** was **not** among the original **11** signatories in 2018; the founding set comprised Australia, Brunei, Canada, Chile, Japan, Malaysia, Mexico, New Zealand, Peru, Singapore, and Vietnam. Option A (Japan), Option C (Canada), and Option D (Singapore) are all founding members and thus cannot be the correct answer. Distinguishing between **founders** and **acceding members** is classic static GK: founders establish the initial tariff schedules and rules architecture, whereas acceders negotiate entry terms to align with the existing acquis. The UK’s pathway came later via an accession protocol, reflecting the pact’s open-architecture design for new entrants meeting standards and commitments.

SECTION C: - LEGAL REASONING

Q53 Correct Answer: C | Line Reference: Line 11 | Difficulty: Medium

Explanation:

Line 11 states that *“in case the JJB does not have at least one member who is a practising professional with a degree in child psychology or child psychiatry, the Board shall take the assistance of psychologists...”*. This makes it clear that experts assist in conducting the assessment **only if the JJB lacks internal psychological expertise**. Their role is **supportive, not determinative**.

- **Option A** is incorrect as expert involvement is not conditional on trauma.
- **Option B** is incorrect because no provision exists for issuing independent certificates that bind the Board.
- **Option D** misplaces expert involvement to post-transfer stages, which is not supported by the statute.

Q54 Correct Answer: C | Line References: Lines 6, 11, 13 | Difficulty: High

Explanation:

Under **Section 15 (Line 6)**, the JJB must assess the child's mental/physical capacity and awareness of consequences. Veer is above 16, understood the offence, and showed intent and planning. Expert assistance was obtained as the Board lacked a psychologist (**Line 11**), and an SIR was considered (**Line 13**). Since all procedural and substantive thresholds are met, the JJB is justified in **transferring the case under Section 18(3)**.

- **Option A** is incorrect — non-violence does not bar adult trial if the offence is heinous and awareness exists.
- **Option B** is wrong — external experts are allowed by law (Line 11).
- **Option D** has no statutory basis; the District Magistrate has no role in such transfers.

Q55 Correct Answer: B | Line References: Lines 6, 13 | Difficulty: Very High**Explanation:**

Line 6 lays out that the key threshold is whether the child had the **mental and physical capacity** to commit the offence and **understood the consequences**. Here, Arya is 17, showed strategic thinking, and committed a **heinous sexual offence under POCSO**, which qualifies under the statute. The presence of a psychology expert and an SBR showing premeditation satisfy the requirement under Line 13.

- **Option A** fails because social media influence does not override clear evidence of understanding.
- **Option C** adds requirements not mentioned in law — media psychologists are not a necessity.
- **Option D** is absurd — existing psychologist has statutory legitimacy (Line 11).

Q56 Correct Answer: B | Line References: Lines 11, 12 | Difficulty: High**Explanation:**

Line 12 makes **legal aid counsel mandatory** during assessment. Line 11 requires expert involvement if no psychology-qualified member exists. Here, absence of legal aid **invalidates the assessment** even though other requirements were partially met. This is a **procedural safeguard failure**, which vitiates the Board's transfer decision.

- **Option A** wrongly ignores the legal aid lapse.
- **Option C** invents a validation mechanism not present in the JJ Act.
- **Option D** doesn't cure the core procedural breach.

Q57 Correct Answer: A | Line References: Line 6, 13 | Difficulty: Medium-High**Explanation:**

The assessment must determine capacity to understand the act and consequences (Line 6). Anaya's psychologist report notes anxiety and peer pressure. The SIR indicates **lack of full awareness**, and her role was limited. **Transfer is not automatic**, especially in borderline cases. JJB may **retain jurisdiction** when capacity is not established beyond doubt.

- **Option B** ignores mental state — transfer is discretionary, not mandatory.
- **Option C** overstates the NCPDR's role — they monitor, not adjudicate (Line 14).
- **Option D** is legally unsustainable — role and mental health don't nullify prosecution.

Q58 Correct Answer: C | Line References: Lines 6, 13 | Difficulty: High**Explanation:**

Even though Nikhil has PTSD, both psychologists agree he had capacity and showed leadership. Line 6 requires assessment of **actual capacity and understanding**, not just medical diagnosis. The SIR confirms planning, which supports adult trial. Line 13 mandates that **both reports** (psychologist + SIR) be considered — the JJB is justified in transferring the case.

- **Option A** violates the requirement to consider both expert opinion and SIR.
- **Option B** misinterprets PTSD as automatically negating understanding.
- **Option D** wrongly suspends legal process — psychiatric referral is a sentencing matter, not procedural.

1. Passage Summary and Approach to Reading

The passage focuses on the legal mechanism under the Juvenile Justice (Care and Protection of Children) Act, 2015 for determining whether children aged between 16 and 18, accused of heinous offences, should be tried as adults. It describes the statutory basis for this process in Section 15, which mandates a preliminary assessment of the child's

mental and physical capacity, ability to understand the consequences, and the circumstances of the offence. If the assessment supports adult trial, the case may be transferred to the Children's Court under Section 18(3). The passage also details the procedural safeguards, such as mandatory legal aid and expert psychological assistance, and highlights the role of supporting documents like the Social Investigation Report and the Social Background Report. Finally, it points to issues in ground-level implementation and the oversight role of the NCPCR under Section 109.

While reading the passage, test takers should identify the sequential flow of the law: (i) categorization of offences, (ii) age threshold for preliminary assessment, (iii) substantive criteria for assessment (capacity, understanding, circumstances), and (iv) procedural safeguards. A layered understanding of who plays what role—the JJB, psychologists, legal counsel, social workers, and the Children's Court—is essential to handle the complexity of factual scenarios in the questions. The passage tests a mix of doctrinal comprehension, procedural awareness, and the ability to apply multi-factorial reasoning in context-sensitive cases.

2. Per-Question Strategy and Analytical Approach

Question 53 – Passage-Based - Tests recognition of the conditions under which expert assistance is required during the preliminary assessment. The key is to recall that such assistance is mandatory when the JJB lacks a psychology-qualified member (Line 11). The test taker should rule out any option suggesting experts are determinative or only involved post-transfer.

Question 54 – Factual Matrix - Assesses whether all statutory conditions for transferring a child to the Children's Court were fulfilled. The test taker should evaluate (i) the child's age, (ii) whether mental and physical capacity were assessed, (iii) whether procedural safeguards were met (expert consultation and legal aid), and (iv) whether the SIR supported the child's understanding (Lines 6, 11, 13).

Question 55 – Factual Matrix - Tests how the JJB should approach a child who committed a digitally sophisticated offence with clear evidence of planning and comprehension. The test taker must distinguish social influence from legal capacity, and apply the principle that understanding consequences and premeditation justify transfer to adult trial (Lines 6, 13).

Question 56 – Factual Matrix - Focuses on procedural defects during the assessment—specifically, the absence of legal aid. The correct approach is to identify whether mandatory safeguards under the JJ Act (Lines 11, 12) were breached and whether such breach renders the assessment invalid despite expert involvement and SIR submission.

Question 57 – Factual Matrix - Explores whether peer pressure and partial awareness negate the possibility of transfer. The test taker must balance psychological findings with the SIR and remember that where mental capacity is not conclusively established, the JJB has discretion to retain the case (Lines 6, 13).

Question 58 – Factual Matrix - Involves conflicting evidence: psychological trauma (PTSD) versus planning and leadership. The test taker must recognize that PTSD does not automatically negate capacity if other indicators point to full awareness and leadership, and that the law mandates consideration of both expert reports and SIR (Lines 6, 13).

3. Legal Principles from the Passage

1. Under Section 15 of the Juvenile Justice Act, 2015, if a child aged 16 or above is alleged to have committed a heinous offence, the Juvenile Justice Board must conduct a preliminary assessment.
2. The preliminary assessment under Section 15 must evaluate the child's:
 - Mental capacity to commit the offence
 - Physical capacity to commit the offence
 - Ability to understand the consequences of the offence
 - Circumstances under which the offence was allegedly committed
3. Following the assessment, if the Board concludes that the child should be tried as an adult, it may transfer the case to the Children's Court under Section 18(3) of the JJ Act.
4. The Board must provide a copy of its order to the child, the child's family, and legal counsel.
5. If the Board lacks at least one member who is a professional with a degree in child psychology or child psychiatry, it is mandatory to seek assistance from external psychologists or experts with experience in working with children (Line 11).
6. The child must be provided legal aid counsel through the District Legal Services Authority, who must be present during the preliminary assessment (Line 12).
7. The preliminary assessment must include consideration of either:

- A Social Investigation Report (SIR) prepared by a probation officer, child welfare officer, or social worker; or
 - A Social Background Report (SBR) prepared after interaction with the child or the child's family (Line 13).
8. Experts who assist the JJB are required to undergo training concerning Section 15 of the Act.
 9. The National Commission for Protection of Child Rights (NCPCR) has a statutory duty under Section 109 to monitor the proper implementation of the Juvenile Justice Act, including procedures related to trial of juveniles as adults (Line 14).
 10. Many Boards and Children's Courts have failed to properly implement the procedural safeguards and principles embedded in the Act, leading to inconsistent application.

Passage 2:**Q59. Correct Answer: C [Difficulty: Medium-High]****Explanation:**

The passage affirms a shift in Indian jurisprudence toward an ecocentric approach (para 2), where rivers and natural entities are subjects with rights to exist, survive, and regenerate. The Supreme Court's recent dicta in *State of Telangana v. Mohd. Abdul Qasim* explicitly assert that man must act as a trustee of the earth and respect nature's rights. The facts reflect a clear violation of these rights through riverbed destruction, and continued construction would further contravene the ecocentric doctrine.

- A and B wrongly prioritize economic benefits over legal rights of nature.
- D suggests mitigation but fails to recognize the core violation of fundamental ecological rights.

Q60. Correct Answer: C [Difficulty: Medium-High]**Explanation:**

The Supreme Court's position, as cited in the passage, supports a fundamental shift from anthropocentrism to ecocentrism. The Court speaks of nature having fundamental rights—such as the right to survive and regenerate (para 3). This is an explicit recognition of nature as a legal subject, not merely an object of human use or protection.

- A and B are inconsistent with the language used in the judgment.
- D limits enforcement to human interests, which the Court clearly rejects.

Q61. Correct Answer: B [Difficulty: Medium]**Explanation:**

The passage emphasizes that rivers, mountains, and ecosystems have independent rights to survive and function naturally. Allowing human settlements to remain on flood-prone areas after clear warnings would continue the cycle of ecological disruption and human vulnerability. The Court's ecocentric approach demands realignment of human settlement with nature's integrity.

- A incorrectly prioritizes anthropocentric rights.
- C's attempt at balance dilutes the urgency indicated by the Court.
- D wrongly dismisses the claim without considering constitutional rights.

Q62. Correct Answer: B [Difficulty: Easy]**Explanation:**

The passage attributes disasters like the 2023 floods in Himachal Pradesh to rampant, norm-violating construction (para 4). These included violations of zoning norms, construction on floodplains, in seismic zones, and on unstable slopes. The passage squarely blames poor planning and disregard for ecological integrity.

- A and C are side-effects but not the central cause.
- D is only partially true and does not capture the full scope of the structural violations highlighted.

Q63. Correct Answer: B [Difficulty: Medium-High]**Explanation:**

The company constructed roads without environmental clearance, violating procedural and substantive safeguards.

The Supreme Court's ecocentric reasoning demands that any act causing ecological degradation without due diligence or clearance be penalized, regardless of subsequent natural events like monsoon rains.

- A denies causality that the Sikkim and Himachal disasters have already proven.
- C underestimates the violation and fails to respond with accountability.
- D misplaces liability when the primary violation lies with the private entity.

Q64. Correct Answer: D [Difficulty: High]

Explanation:

The mining activity, despite minor mitigation efforts, has led to irreversible ecological damage, including destruction of endangered species' habitats and erosion. Under an ecocentric regime, nature's intrinsic value and the long-term ecological impact take precedence over short-term economic gains. As the Court notes, "Man is bound by nature's law." Partial mitigation cannot justify ongoing harm.

- A and B reflect anthropocentric prioritization.
- C is inadequate as the damage is already significant and cannot be undone through delayed improvement.

1. Passage Summary and Approach

The passage explores the ongoing conflict between development and environmental preservation in the Indian Himalayan Region (IHR). It underscores how the Supreme Court of India, through recent rulings like *State of Telangana v. Mohd. Abdul Qasim*, has adopted an **ecocentric approach**, recognizing that nature—rivers, mountains, forests—has **fundamental rights** to exist, regenerate, and sustain its cycles. The passage critiques the prevailing **anthropocentric development model**, marked by unchecked infrastructure expansion, hydroelectric projects, and deforestation in ecologically fragile zones, which has led to repeated disasters like the 2023 floods in Himachal Pradesh.

Approach to Reading the Passage: The test taker should focus on:

- The **jurisprudential shift** from anthropocentrism to ecocentrism
- The **nature of rights accorded to ecosystems** and non-human entities
- The **examples of environmental degradation** caused by norm-violating development
- The **role of the Supreme Court** in recognizing nature as a rights-bearing subject
- How these legal principles apply to **real-life disputes** involving development projects

This is a high-complexity passage testing advanced comprehension of environmental rights, constitutional principles, and legal reasoning in emerging areas of jurisprudence.

2. Per-Question Analysis and Approach

Question 59: Rights of Rivers vs Development (Hydropower Project)

This question tests whether the test taker understands the shift from utilitarian reasoning (benefit of energy needs) to **ecocentric rights** of rivers. Despite claims of minimal harm, the company has violated the **intrinsic rights** of the river. The correct approach is to prioritize the **fundamental right of nature** to exist and regenerate (see para 3 of passage).

Correct approach: Reject anthropocentric justifications if they infringe nature's legal personhood and rights.

Question 60: Supreme Court's Position on Nature and Development

This passage-based question requires recognition of the Supreme Court's **doctrinal framing**. The Court asserts that rivers, trees, and ecosystems are **subjects with rights**, not objects for exploitation. The test taker must identify that the Court **does not follow an anthropocentric model**, but embraces ecocentrism.

Correct approach: Identify the Supreme Court's language treating nature as a **rights-holder** (see quote in para 2).

Question 61: Conflict Between Human Habitation and River Ecology

This factual scenario poses a classic **development-vs-displacement** dilemma. The key is to apply ecocentric principles and consider whether human settlement can override **nature's right to flow and survive**. The Court would likely prioritize preventing further ecological harm and align development with sustainability.

Correct approach: Recognize that the **river's ecological function and integrity** override continued human encroachment.

Question 62: Root Causes of Environmental Disasters

This tests factual recall and comprehension. The passage clearly links the **Teesta dam breach and Himachal floods to illegal construction on floodplains and seismic zones** (see para 4). It is a direct indictment of **regulatory failure and unscientific planning**.

Correct approach: Focus on the link between **human intervention** and **natural disasters**, not natural causes alone.

Question 63: Road Construction and Landslides

The key issue is liability for **environmental degradation caused by unregulated infrastructure**. The passage criticizes projects like four-laning roads without ecological safeguards. The company acted without environmental impact assessment and caused harm.

Correct approach: Apply the principle that **lack of precautionary safeguards**, even without intent, attracts liability in ecocentric regimes.

Question 64: Mining and Rights of Biodiversity

Here, the test taker must distinguish **mitigation efforts** from actual **ecological impact**. Despite the company's sustainable claims, the passage (and the Court's approach) indicates that **irreversible harm** to nature—even with partial safeguards—violates nature's rights.

Correct approach: Acknowledge that **partial compliance** cannot excuse violation of **nature's core right to survive and persist**.

3. Legal Principles Derived from the Passage

1. **Nature as a Rights-Bearing Subject:** The Supreme Court recognizes that nature has **fundamental rights**, such as the right to exist, persist, regenerate, and be restored—similar to legal personhood.
2. **Ecocentric Jurisprudence:** The Court is shifting from an anthropocentric (human-centered) to an ecocentric model where the **interests of nature are independently protected**, not merely for human benefit.
3. **Trusteeship Model of Environmental Responsibility:** Humans, as an enlightened species, are to act as **trustees of the earth**, holding nature in trust for future generations.
4. **Incompatibility of Destructive Development:** The current development model, marked by hydroelectric projects, road widening, and construction on floodplains, is **inconsistent with ecological sustainability** and violates nature's rights.
5. **Judicially Recognized Rights of Rivers, Mountains, Air, and Forests:** In *State of Telangana v. Mohd. Abdul Qasim*, the Court held that entities like rivers, lakes, beaches, ridges, trees, and mountains have **inherent value and rights**, and human beings are **bound by nature's law**.
6. **Environmental Destruction as Constitutional Wrong:** Ignoring the science of ecology and pushing unsustainable development is a violation not only of environmental law but also of **constitutional values of justice and inter-generational equity**.
7. **Regulatory Violations as Cause of Disasters:** Disasters in the IHR are **not natural**, but result from **human activities**—including construction in seismic zones, on riverbeds, and deforestation—often in **violation of laws, norms, and even court orders**.
8. **Precautionary Principle and Prior Assessments:** Environmental impact assessments and precautionary measures are **non-negotiable duties**, not post-facto formalities. Failure to conduct them undermines ecological integrity.
9. **State's Accountability in Upholding Nature's Rights:** The judiciary emphasizes that **public interest, economic development, or local employment** cannot override the **non-derogable rights of nature** when ecological damage is irreversible.
10. **Constitutional Right to Sustainable Development:** The passage hints at the Court's emerging position that **sustainable development is itself a fundamental right**, enforceable in cases of developmental overreach.

Passage 3:

Q65. Difficulty: High

Correct Answer: C

Explanation:

This is a classic instance of **claim preclusion** (Line 16–18), where the same cause of action—breach of contract—has already been fully adjudicated. The remedy sought (damages vs specific performance) is irrelevant once the **underlying claim** has been decided. The cause of action remains the same because it arises from the same facts and contract.

- Option A is incorrect because res judicata bars **subsequent** suits even if alternate remedies were not claimed in the first suit.
- Option B ignores the bar against *splitting claims*.
- Option D would only matter if the breach occurred after the original judgment, which is not stated.

Q66. Difficulty: Medium-High

Correct Answer: A

Explanation:

This case invokes **issue preclusion** (Line 20–24). The ownership of the land was **substantially and conclusively determined** in the earlier case and formed the **foundation of the prior judgment**. Even if the present suit is for trespass (a different cause of action), the issue of ownership is **collaterally estopped**.

- Option B misunderstands the scope of issue preclusion—it can apply across causes of action.
- Option C is incorrect; final decisions on essential issues are not reopened for "new evidence" unless under appeal/review.
- Option D wrongly implies that relief type determines preclusion of issues, which is doctrinally incorrect.

Q67. Difficulty: Very High

Correct Answer: B

Explanation:

Per Section 11 CPC and principles of **constructive res judicata** (Line 13–14), jurisdictional objections must be raised at the earliest. If not, and the court proceeds to decide the matter, its ruling—even if potentially erroneous—is binding. The second suit is barred because E cannot now claim a defect he failed to raise earlier.

- A is true only if the defect was raised and decided—silent acquiescence precludes a fresh suit.
- C is incorrect as "awareness" is not the test; opportunity to raise is.
- D wrongly assumes jurisdiction must be discussed explicitly to attain finality.

Q68. Difficulty: High

Correct Answer: D

Explanation:

Section 11 CPC bars suits that could have been raised in the previous proceeding with reasonable diligence (Line 29–31). If G could have raised these interpretations earlier, the second suit is barred. However, if this were about a **new republication**, it could potentially escape the bar, but that's not the case here.

- A is overly broad; courts will examine whether the claim arises from the **same actionable facts**.
- B wrongly treats subjective interpretation as a legal ground.
- C introduces facts not stated in the problem.

Q69. Difficulty: High

Correct Answer: A

Explanation: Once a court decides that a plaintiff lacks **locus standi** (Line 33–36), it settles the **threshold maintainability** of that party in relation to the subject matter. Unless the new facts were **legally significant and unavailable earlier**, the principle of res judicata bars repetitive litigation to bypass the earlier finding.

- B ignores that legal status and title are **not separate** once adjudicated.
- C is unnecessary; even if deed is newly introduced, it must be part of the earlier claim.
- D introduces a hypothetical legal theory not supported by facts.

Q70. Difficulty: Medium

Correct Answer: B

Explanation: The maxim (Line 6) means **"a thing adjudicated is accepted as true."** It reflects the doctrine's underlying goal: **finality of litigation** and judicial certainty. Courts presume correctness and conclusiveness of previous decisions unless overturned by appeal or review.

- A and C are incorrect as they undermine the finality principle.

- D is partially correct but not an interpretation of the maxim itself.

1. Passage Summary and Reading Strategy

This passage introduces the **doctrine of res judicata** under **Section 11 of the Civil Procedure Code (CPC)**, 1908. It explains how once a competent court has adjudicated a matter, the same issue cannot be re-litigated. The doctrine serves two purposes: preventing **repetitive litigation** and upholding **judicial finality and efficiency**. It rests on three legal maxims, especially the idea that a judicial decision must be treated as **final and binding** (*res judicata pro veritate occipitur*). The passage further distinguishes between **claim preclusion** (entire causes of action) and **issue preclusion** (specific issues within broader disputes), and discusses how **maintainability**—whether a court can hear a case—interacts with *res judicata*.

How to Approach the Passage:

- Focus on identifying the **conditions** for applying *res judicata*: identity of parties, finality, competence of court, identity of issues or causes of action
- Understand the **distinction** between different types of *res judicata* and how they relate to maintainability
- Track the **statutory basis** (Section 11 CPC), relevant **maxims**, and **judicial policy rationale**
- When reading factual matrices, ask whether the new suit arises from the **same issue**, involves **new facts**, or is simply a **reformulation of a barred claim**

2. Question-by-Question Approach and Analysis

Q65 – Claim Preclusion: Change of Remedy for Same Cause - This tests whether *res judicata* bars **different reliefs** sought for the **same cause of action**. The court already decided that no breach occurred; hence, the new suit for specific performance arises from **identical facts**. **Approach:** Ask: Is the cause of action the same? If yes, the **remedy doesn't matter**. The court has already ruled that breach did not occur.

Q66 – Issue Preclusion: Ownership Already Decided - This tests whether a **specific issue** (ownership) that was **essential to a prior decision** can be re-litigated. Even though the second suit is for trespass (a new legal wrong), the ownership question is already settled. **Approach:** Focus on whether the **issue was necessary to the prior decision**, not whether the relief or cause of action is new.

Q67 – Jurisdiction and Constructive Res Judicata - Here, the test is whether *res judicata* applies when the new suit claims that the original court lacked jurisdiction. If this was not raised earlier, the principle of **constructive res judicata** applies. **Approach:** Determine if the party had the opportunity to raise the issue before. If yes, **jurisdictional objections are precluded** once a decision is rendered.

Q68 – New Facts Post-Judgment - This tests the application of *res judicata* when **new interpretations** or **consequences** of previously adjudicated facts arise. Courts look at whether the new claim is **materially distinct** or could have been raised earlier. **Approach:** Ask whether the new facts are truly new or simply **refinements of the old claim**. If they could have been raised earlier, **res judicata applies**.

Q69 – Locus Standi and Reframing the Suit - The test here is whether a dismissal on grounds of **lack of legal standing** bars future suits reframing the same issue (e.g., seeking partition again by now claiming coparcenary status). **Approach:** Once a party's **legal entitlement to sue** is decided, the issue cannot be reopened by **repackaging the cause of action**.

Q70 – Maxim-Based Interpretation - This tests the test taker's understanding of the maxim "**res judicata pro veritate occipitur**"—that judicial decisions are presumed to be correct and binding. **Approach:** Choose the option that emphasizes **finality, binding character**, and the presumption of correctness in prior decisions.

3. Legal Principles from the Passage (as Pointers)

1. **Section 11 of the CPC** codifies the doctrine of *res judicata*: no court shall try any suit or issue that has already been finally decided between the same parties under the same title by a competent court.
2. **Res judicata** literally means "a matter already adjudged," and it aims to **prevent repetitive litigation** and promote **judicial efficiency**.
3. The doctrine is founded on three Latin maxims:
 - *Nemo debet bis vexari pro una et eadem causa* (No one should be vexed twice for the same cause)
 - *Interest reipublicae ut sit finis litium* (It is in the interest of the State that there be an end to litigation)
 - *Res judicata pro veritate occipitur* (A decision once rendered is accepted as the truth)
4. **Claim Preclusion (Cause of Action Estoppel)**: Bars re-litigation of the **entire cause of action**, even if new reliefs or arguments are raised (Line 15–18).

5. **Issue Preclusion (Collateral Estoppel):** Prevents re-litigation of **specific legal issues** that were:
 - Raised in an earlier suit
 - Decided finally
 - Essential to the decision
 - Between the same parties (Line 20–24)
6. **Maintainability** relates to the court's competence to entertain a suit. It includes:
 - **Jurisdiction:** subject matter and personal jurisdiction
 - **Locus Standi:** the plaintiff must have a personal stake in the case
 - **Limitation:** the suit must be filed within prescribed time limits (Lines 26–28)
7. **Constructive Res Judicata:** If a party **could and should have raised** a matter in a previous suit but did not, they are precluded from raising it later (Line 13–14).
8. **Res judicata and maintainability intersect:** If a prior suit was maintainable and decided on merits, re-litigation on the same claim or issue is not maintainable in law (Lines 32–36).
9. A **challenge to jurisdiction** cannot be used as a ground for a fresh suit if the party failed to raise it when the earlier suit was heard and disposed of.
10. **Legal standing once denied** cannot be reasserted merely by reframing or modifying the claim.
11. The **presumption of correctness** under *res judicata pro veritate occipitur* enforces the idea that courts should not endlessly reopen matters already adjudicated (Line 6).

Passage 4:

Q71. Correct Answer: (B) [Difficulty – Medium]

Explanation:

Isha failed to disclose a material connection (payment of ₹4 lakh), violating the **Mandatory Disclosure requirement** (Line 28–30), and she made an **exaggerated health claim** without using the product or verifying scientific accuracy, violating the **Due Diligence and Truthful Endorsement clauses** (Line 33–37).

- (A) is incorrect: liability does not depend solely on the brand's disclosure; influencers must verify claims.
- (C) is incorrect: while manufacturers are liable, influencers also share liability under Section 21 CPA (Line 12–15).
- (D) is incorrect: following a script does not exempt influencers from their obligation to ensure accuracy.

Q72. Correct Answer: (C) [Difficulty – Medium-High]

Explanation:

Even **non-monetary compensation like gifts** must be disclosed (Line 28–30), and Nikhil's **fabricated video and exaggerated claim** breach the *truthful endorsement* requirement (Line 33–35).

- (A) is incorrect: free products also constitute a "material connection" under the guidelines.
- (B) is incorrect: influencer liability is independent of brand direction.
- (D) is incorrect: misleading visuals count as deceptive advertisements under the guidelines.

Q73. Correct Answer: (B) [Difficulty – Medium]

Explanation:

Ritika's liability arises from **two breaches**: failure to disclose her **material connection** (Line 28–30) and lack of **due diligence** before endorsing a potentially unsafe product (Line 36–38).

- (A) is incorrect: influencers must verify claims before endorsement.
- (C) is incorrect: she is not liable solely due to a future government warning, but for lack of verification at time of posting.
- (D) is incorrect: even if misled, influencers remain responsible under the 2022 Guidelines.

Q74. Correct Answer: (B) [Difficulty – Easy]

Explanation:

Even if phrased as a **subjective experience**, Dev's statement implies **scientific backing** of performance (Line 33–36). Additionally, **inadequate disclosure** (hashtag not "prominent and hard to miss" as per Line 29–30) weakens his defense.

- (A) is incorrect: influencers are not exempt for using personal anecdotes if they relate to false or unsafe product claims.
- (C) is incorrect: influencer and brand both share liability under Section 21 CPA (Line 12–15).
- (D) is incorrect: even if hashtag was present, lack of verification is an independent breach.

Q75. Correct Answer: (D) [Difficulty – Medium]**Explanation:**

Aman made **repeated exaggerated claims** (Line 33–35) without independent verification, violating the **due diligence standard** (Line 36–38). Section 21 CPA holds him accountable for **endorsement of misleading claims**, even if based on press materials.

- (A) is incorrect: lack of expertise does not excuse the legal requirement of due diligence.
- (C) is incorrect: the brand's failure to disclaim does not waive the influencer's duty.
- (B) is incorrect: mixed personal and factual claims do not negate misleading content.

Q76. Correct Answer: (B) [Difficulty – Easy]**Explanation:**

Naina's disclosure was not "clear, prominent, and hard to miss" as per Line 29–30, and her **absolute safety claim** amounts to an **unverified endorsement** (Line 33–35). The guidelines require disclosures to be visible on the main post, not ephemeral content.

- (A) is incorrect: compensation includes non-monetary gifts.
- (C) is incorrect: stories are not permanent and insufficient for disclosure compliance.
- (D) is incorrect: knowledge of side effects is not required to trigger liability.

Q77. Correct Answer: (A)**Explanation:**

Line 25–27 clearly state that the 2022 Guidelines aim to ensure consumers can distinguish genuine content from paid promotions. They promote **ethical influencer conduct**, including **mandatory disclosures** and **truthful endorsements** (Lines 28–37).

- (B) is incorrect: penalties apply to both brands and influencers, but the core goal is not punishment.
- (C) is incorrect: the guidelines enhance accountability, not shield influencers.
- (D) is incorrect: scientific testing is product-specific and not always mandatory for all endorsements.

1. Passage Summary and Reading Approach (4–5 lines)

The passage centers on the regulatory framework governing **social media influencers** in India, particularly under the **Consumer Protection Act, 2019** and the **2022 Guidelines for Prevention of Misleading Advertisements and Endorsements for Celebrities and Influencers**. It outlines how influencers are treated as endorsers and are required to adhere to standards of **transparency**, **truthfulness**, and **due diligence**, especially when there exists a **material connection** (monetary or otherwise) with brands. The core of the passage is to understand when influencer actions cross the line into **misleading advertisement** and how Indian law assigns liability. While reading, the test-taker should identify the legal triggers of liability—such as non-disclosure, exaggeration, unverified claims, and role of consent—and distinguish between permissible personal opinions and prohibited commercial endorsements.

2. Per-Question Breakdown: Approach and Strategy**Q71 Approach (False health claims + no disclosure)**

Read for **undisclosed paid promotion** and **false claims** of clinical testing and personal use. The influencer neither disclosed sponsorship nor verified the product claims—both elements are clear red flags under the guidelines.

Key Concepts to Identify: Material connection + due diligence + health claim falsity.

Q72 Approach (Free product + manipulated visuals)

This tests **non-monetary disclosure** (gifting) and the **misleading use of visuals** to exaggerate product efficacy. Look for the influencer's role in fabricating scenarios, even in the absence of cash payment.

Key Concepts to Identify: Gift ≠ no liability; staging ≠ honesty.

Q73 Approach (Unapproved product + lack of knowledge)

This question explores whether an influencer can be excused for **ignorance of regulatory approvals**. Focus on the principle that influencers are expected to exercise **reasonable due diligence** even if they aren't technical experts.

Key Concepts to Identify: Duty to verify > ignorance defense.

Q74 Approach (Subjective experience + improper tagging)

Looks at the distinction between **subjective statements** and **objective claims** with regulatory significance. Even feelings or personal anecdotes, when used commercially, can mislead if tied to exaggerated performance.

Key Concepts to Identify: Opinion ≠ liability shield if it implies medical/technical impact.

Q75 Approach (Repeated exaggerated claims + reliance on brand material)

This question examines **repeated misleading claims**, especially technical ones, and tests whether citing brand press releases excuses liability. The test-taker should identify the failure to independently **verify factual claims** as the core violation.

Key Concepts to Identify: Repetition + technical inaccuracy + lack of verification = liability.

Q76 Approach (Ephemeral disclosures + safety exaggeration)

This tests understanding of what counts as a **clear, prominent disclosure**. A story that expires is not sufficient. A claim of "safest" product also raises red flags when not backed by evidence.

Key Concepts to Identify: Permanency of disclosure + safety exaggeration = potential violation.

Q77 Approach (Doctrinal purpose of the Guidelines)

Tests the **policy rationale** of the Guidelines. The correct answer connects to **consumer clarity, ethical advertising**, and the regulator's intent to create boundaries in influencer conduct.

Key Concepts to Identify: Prevention of deception, not punishment for its own sake.

3. List of Legal Principles from the Passage

1. **Influencers are treated as "endorsers"** under the Consumer Protection Act, 2019, and are liable under Section 21 if they promote misleading advertisements.
2. **Material Connection Rule:** Any connection that may affect the credibility of an endorsement (payment, gifts, sponsorship) must be **clearly and prominently disclosed**.
3. **Truthful Representation:** Influencers must not make false, unverified, or exaggerated claims about products or services.
4. **Due Diligence Requirement:** Influencers are required to **personally verify the claims** made in the advertisement before endorsing the product.
5. **Liability is independent of intent or knowledge**—ignorance of product flaws or falsehoods is not a valid defense if reasonable verification was not conducted.
6. **Misleading visual representations** are as culpable as misleading words.
7. **Prominence and Permanency of Disclosure:** Hashtags like #ad, #sponsored, or #paidpartnership must be visible, unambiguous, and not hidden in stories or collapsed captions.
8. **Even subjective or personal testimonials** may be misleading if they imply objective facts that cannot be substantiated.
9. **Influencers can be fined up to ₹50 lakh and face temporary bans** on endorsements if they fail to comply with the guidelines.
10. **The Guidelines aim to ensure consumer protection by preventing deceptive endorsements**, ensuring influencer accountability, and distinguishing between organic and paid content.

Q78. Answer: B [Difficulty: Hard]

Explanation:

- Option B is correct. Descriptive use to show compatibility is allowed under trademark law if there is no consumer confusion, especially when accompanied by a **clear disclaimer** (Line 12). The fact that TechDock is using the mark solely to indicate compatibility, not origin, makes the use non-infringing.

- Option A is incorrect because no confusion arises when proper disclaimers are used, and mere use of the mark doesn't prove infringement (Line 12).
- Option C is incorrect because **not all third-party use of a registered mark is infringement**—context and disclaimers matter (Line 12).
- Option D is incorrect because **industry segmentation is not conclusive** if association and confusion still arise; here, the absence of confusion is what matters (Line 12).

Q79. Answer: B [Difficulty: Medium-Hard]

Explanation:

- Option B is correct. Under the **"Classic Trinity" test** (Line 17), GreenSpark must prove **(1) goodwill, (2) misrepresentation, and (3) damage**. The absence of misrepresentation or likelihood of confusion would defeat the claim even if there's goodwill.
- Option A is incorrect because **market priority alone does not suffice**; misrepresentation must still be shown (Line 18).
- Option C is incorrect because the claim cannot succeed **automatically**—each element must be proved (Line 17).
- Option D is incorrect; the nature of the product is irrelevant. Passing off applies across all industries if the legal test is met (Line 17).

Q80. Answer: C [Difficulty: Hard]

Explanation:

- Option C is correct. **Phonetic similarity + consumer confusion** is sufficient for trademark infringement, even if the goods/services differ slightly, particularly in digital spaces where overlaps are common (Line 8).
- Option A is incorrect because **similarity in mark + confusion** is what matters, not just identical use (Line 6).
- Option B is incorrect since **different industries don't rule out confusion**, especially where brand names are phonetically alike (Line 8).
- Option D is incorrect; intent is **not required** for statutory infringement (Line 6).

Q81. Answer: C [Difficulty: Medium]

Explanation:

- Option C is correct. The **use of a registered mark or similar mark on merchandise sold commercially** qualifies as use "in the course of trade" (Line 14), and the stylization adds to potential confusion.
- Option A is incorrect because blogs that **sell merchandise** do engage in trade (Line 14).
- Option B is incorrect because **infringement can occur across product categories** if consumer confusion or association arises (Line 8).
- Option D is incorrect because **financial loss is not required**—commercial misuse and confusion suffice (Line 14).

Q82. Answer: B [Difficulty: Medium-Hard]

Explanation:

- Option B is correct. Passing off protects **prior unregistered users** who have **established goodwill** (Line 17). Registration does not override earlier goodwill in passing off actions.
- Option A is incorrect because **registration does not bar passing off** by a prior user (Line 17).
- Option C is incorrect because **passing off applies to unregistered trademarks** (Line 17).
- Option D is incorrect as **intent or knowledge is not required** in passing off; what matters is misrepresentation and damage (Line 18).

Q83. Answer: B [Difficulty: Medium-Hard]

Explanation:

- Option B is correct. **Suggesting association with a registered trademark** without authorization can create confusion and violate trademark rights (Line 10). Misrepresentation here also meets the passing off test (Line 18).
- Option A is incorrect because **commercial advertising with misleading associations** can still amount to infringement (Line 10).
- Option C is incorrect because passing off is based on **goodwill and misrepresentation**, not just product sales (Line 17).
- Option D is incorrect since **conceptual similarity and misleading language** can amount to deceptive use (Line 6).

Q84. Answer: C [Difficulty: Medium]

Explanation:

- Option C is correct. Trademark infringement applies only to **registered marks** and presumes confusion when similarity exists (Line 6), while **passing off** is a **common law remedy** requiring all three components—goodwill, misrepresentation, and damage (Line 17).
- Option A is incorrect because it **confuses the tests**—goodwill is a requirement for passing off, not for infringement (Line 17).
- Option B is incorrect because passing off also applies to **deceptively similar** marks (Line 18).
- Option D is incorrect because **passing off can be pursued without registration** (Line 17).

1. Passage Summary and Reading Approach (Q78–Q84)

This passage draws a clear doctrinal distinction between **statutory trademark infringement** under the Trade Marks Act, 1999 and the **common law action of passing off**. The former protects registered trademarks and presumes confusion when similar marks are used in the course of trade, while the latter applies even to unregistered marks but requires proof of three elements: **goodwill, misrepresentation, and damage**. The passage also explores edge cases like descriptive use, phonetic similarity, commercial misappropriation, and inter-industry confusion.

Approach to Reading: While reading, test-takers should:

- Distinguish between *infringement* and *passing off*, focusing on the **elements required for each**.
- Pay attention to **when registration matters**, and when prior use or reputation can suffice.
- Understand that **consumer confusion**, not just identical use, is the central test in both doctrines.
- Note the specific **situations where disclaimers, product category, or stylisation** affect liability.

2. Question-Wise Approach and Strategy

Q78 – Compatibility + Descriptive Use + Disclaimer (Difficulty: Hard)

Approach: Focus on Line 12 of the passage, which clarifies that **descriptive use accompanied by a disclaimer** is not infringement. The fact pattern involves non-use of logo, compatibility language, and a disclaimer—all pointing to fair use.

Q79 – Unregistered Mark + No Misrepresentation (Difficulty: Medium-Hard)

Approach: Apply the **“Classic Trinity” test** mentioned in Line 17. Since no misrepresentation or likelihood of confusion exists, the claim fails even if goodwill is present.

Q80 – Phonetic Similarity + Cross-Industry Use (Difficulty: Hard)

Approach: Refer to Lines 6–8. Even in different domains, **confusion from phonetic similarity** can amount to infringement. Don't rely solely on product category—focus on consumer perception.

Q81 – Merchandising by Blogs (Difficulty: Medium)

Approach: Use Line 14. Even if the entity is a blog, the **sale of goods using similar branding constitutes commercial use** and can infringe. Focus on “use in the course of trade.”

Q82 – Prior User + Passing Off vs. Registered Mark (Difficulty: Medium-Hard)

Approach: Refer to Line 17. Even without registration, a **prior user with goodwill** can succeed in passing off. Registration does not defeat common law rights.

Q83 – Suggestive Ads + Misleading Use (Difficulty: Hard)

Approach: Refer to Line 10 and Line 18. Even if the actual product is not sold, **suggesting association or endorsement** may create confusion and meet passing off/infringement thresholds.

Q84 – Comparative Test of Remedies (Difficulty: Medium)

Approach: This is doctrinal comparison. Lines 6 and 17 are critical—know that **infringement assumes confusion for registered marks**, while **passing off demands proof of goodwill, misrepresentation, and damage**.

3. Legal Principles Mentioned in the Passage (List Form)

- **Trademark infringement** under the Trade Marks Act, 1999:
 - Applies **only to registered trademarks**.
 - Involves use of **identical or deceptively similar marks**.
 - **Consumer confusion** or association is sufficient—**no need to prove intent**.
 - Requires **use in the course of trade** for commercial gain.
 - **Phonetic, visual, or conceptual similarity** may suffice for confusion.
- **Passing off** under common law:
 - Available for **unregistered marks** based on **prior use** and reputation.
 - Follows the “**Classic Trinity**” test:
 - (i) Goodwill or reputation
 - (ii) Misrepresentation leading to confusion
 - (iii) Damage to goodwill or business
 - Requires **proof of confusion**, not presumed like in infringement.
 - **Intentional misrepresentation is not necessary**, only its **effect** matters.
 - Applies across all industries and to various types of branding (names, logos, slogans).
- **Defences and Exceptions:**
 - **Descriptive or nominative use**, particularly to show compatibility, may be allowed **if there is no confusion and disclaimers are clear**.
 - Different industries **do not automatically rule out** confusion or liability.
 - **Use by bloggers, educators, or non-traditional sellers** can constitute infringement **if it is in the course of trade** or if merchandise is sold.
 - Prior unregistered users **can sue for passing off even against later registered users**.

SECTION D: - CRITICAL REASONING**Passage 1:**

Q85) Correct option: A — Difficulty: Medium — Lines: 12–16, 17–18, 19–21

The author concedes that India has **favoured multipolarity for flexibility and choice** (line 12) but stresses the need to **balance this with uncertainty** (line 13). He **does not advocate staying bipolar** (line 14) and states that the world **will be increasingly multipolar** (line 15). Hence, “**we should prepare ourselves for what it means**” (line 16). He then illustrates uncertainty via **US reliability potentially diminishing** (lines 19–21).

- Why A is right: It fuses the inevitability of multipolarity (line 15), the prudential recommendation to **prepare** (line 16), and the new uncertainty about US support (lines 19–21).
- Why B is wrong: The author explicitly **rejects** advocating for a bipolar status quo (line 14).
- Why C is wrong: He says the world is **not** currently multipolar (line 3); he projects a future transition (line 15).
- Why D is wrong: He does not claim **permanent** US hostility; the claim is about **uncertainty** and revisability of assumptions (lines 19–21), not permanence.

Q86) Correct option: A — Difficulty: Easy — Lines: 6–8, 9

The passage notes a **longstanding scholarly debate** and that “**the balance of scholarly opinion**” favours **bipolar stability** (lines 6–7), with **more predictable interactions** (line 8). It then contrasts **multipolarity** as **less stable** (line 9). This premise undergirds the caution that a shift toward multipolarity entails **greater uncertainty**, justifying **preparation** (line 16).

- Why A is right: It is directly stated: bipolarity stability/predictability (lines 6–8).
- Why B is wrong: The text says India **has favoured** multipolarity (line 12), not the opposite.

- Why C is wrong: Nowhere does the passage assert that multipolarity guarantees **friendliness** to India.
- Why D is wrong: The author uses Trump to **illustrate** uncertainty (line 17), not to claim he is the **sole determinant**.

Q87) Correct option: D — Difficulty: Medium–Hard — Lines: 19–21

The author writes that **until recently** India could count on US goodwill and cost-bearing (line 19) and immediately questions whether this can be relied upon **even post-Trump** (lines 20–21). This supports the inference that a **return to automatic US largesse cannot be assumed** and that expectations require **reassessment**.

- Why D is right: It carefully matches the rhetorical questions that **cast doubt** on past assumptions (lines 20–21).
- Why A is wrong: It asserts the opposite of the author’s caution; he **doubts** indefinite US cost-bearing (lines 20–21).
- Why B is wrong: The author does not say India’s advocacy was a **mistake** or demand immediate abandonment; he urges **preparation** (line 16).
- Why C is wrong: No claim that China will **certainly** replace the US; that would exceed the text’s guarded assertions.

Q88) Correct option: C — Difficulty: Hard — Lines: 15–16 (with 12–13 as context)

The **recommendation** to prepare (line 16) presupposes that **preparation can mitigate risk**—i.e., that policy choices are not futile in the face of systemic uncertainty. Without that assumption, “prepare” would be pointless. The text’s recognition of **uncertainties** (line 13) and inevitability of **increasing multipolarity** (line 15) make the **utility of preparation** the key implicit bridge.

- Why C is right: It is the **necessary** assumption linking diagnosis (uncertainty) to prescription (prepare).
- Why A is wrong: The author says increased multipolarity is **fairly sure** (line 15); it cannot be delayed indefinitely.
- Why B is wrong: If choices were irrelevant, **preparing** would be meaningless, contradicting the recommendation (line 16).
- Why D is wrong: He never says bipolarity is **normatively undesirable**; he merely says he’s **not advocating** it (line 14).

Q89) Correct option: B — Difficulty: Medium — Lines: 18–21 (supporting the thrust)

If **recent US policy memoranda** emphasise stricter **burden-sharing** and **transactional** ties with partners (including India), that directly **corroborates the author’s warning** that prior assumptions about US willingness to bear disproportionate costs (line 19) are **no longer safe** (lines 20–21). This **strengthens** the case for **preparation** amid uncertainty (line 16).

- Why B is right: It provides concrete contemporary evidence consistent with **reduced automatic US largesse**, reinforcing the author’s claim.
- Why A is wrong: Praiseful reports do not address **material reliability or costs**.
- Why C is wrong: Cultural exchanges are orthogonal to **strategic burden-sharing**.
- Why D is wrong: Popularity of culture says nothing about **state behaviour** or **alliance costs**.

Q90) Correct option: B — Difficulty: Medium–Hard — Lines: 6–11 (undermining the rationale)

The author’s uncertainty claim rests on the idea that **multipolarity is less stable** due to **tracking difficulties** and **dizzying permutations** (lines 9–11). If, however, a **binding, enforceable** multilateral regime **standardised alliance behaviours** to the point that interaction patterns in multipolarity became **as predictable as in bipolarity**, the core instability premise would be **neutralised**, weakening the argument for special uncertainty.

- Why B is right: It **directly attacks** the mechanism (unpredictability from permutations), thereby **weakening** the conclusion about distinctive uncertainty.
- Why A is wrong: More diplomats help India cope but do not change the **systemic volatility** claim.
- Why C is wrong: EU leadership churn is a side note; it doesn’t systemically regularise **great-power** behaviour.
- Why D is wrong: Bilateral MoUs may help India, but they don’t negate the **system-level** unpredictability in a multipolar order.

Quick brief of the passage (4–5 lines): The author cautions that although India has long **favoured multipolarity** for flexibility, the world is **not yet** multipolar (the US and China remain **pre-eminent**) and any emerging multipolarity will

likely be **less predictable** and **more uncertain**. Drawing on IR scholarship, he notes **bipolarity** tends to be **more stable/predictable**, whereas **multipolarity** (3–5 co-equal poles) complicates alliance math. Trump-era shocks simply **expose** this uncertainty; they don't solely create it. Hence, India should **prepare** for a future that is likely **increasingly multipolar**, without **romanticising** it.

Reading approach (how to tackle this passage)

1. **Outline the structure:** Present state (not multipolar) theory (bipolar more stable) contrast (multipolar less stable) India's prior optimism vs. costs prescription (**prepare**).
2. **Track cues:** "pre-eminent," "glimpse," "unsettling," "we should prepare" signal stance; rhetorical questions (lines 20–21) show uncertainty about US reliability.
3. **Separate is/ought:** Descriptive claims (stability literature; permutations) vs. normative recommendation (prepare).
4. **Mark evidence vs illustration:** Scholarship is the **premise**; Trump is an **illustration**.
5. **Expect questions:** conclusion, premise, inference, assumption, strengthen, weaken—each exactly once.

1–3 line guidance per question (Q85–Q90)

Q85 (Main conclusion): Combine inevitability (**increasingly multipolar**, line 15) + risk (**uncertainty**, lines 13, 18) + action (**prepare**, line 16) + US-reliability doubts (lines 19–21). Avoid options that say "remain bipolar" or "already multipolar."

Q86 (Premise identification): Lift a **stated** support: "balance of scholarly opinion: **bipolar more stable/predictable**" (lines 6–8). Reject claims about India preferring bipolarity or Trump being sole driver.

Q87 (Inference): The rhetorical questions (lines 20–21) imply **do not assume automatic US largesse even post-Trump**. Eliminate certainties (e.g., China will replace US) or a guaranteed US return.

Q88 (Assumption—necessary): The recommendation to **prepare** (line 16) presumes **preparation can mitigate risks** of multipolar uncertainty; otherwise the prescription is pointless.

Q89 (Strengthen): Choose evidence that **reduces expected US largesse / increases transactionalism**, aligning with lines 19–21 validates need to **prepare**.

Q90 (Weaken): Attack the **mechanism** of unpredictability (lines 9–11). If **binding rules** make multipolar interactions **as predictable** as bipolar, the author's uncertainty claim weakens.

Elaborate brief (GMAT/LSAT/GRE/CLAT logic)

Premises (explicit, citable)

- **P1:** The world is **not** currently multipolar; **US and China are pre-eminent** (line 3).
- **P2:** **Bipolarity** is generally **more stable/predictable** (lines 6–8).
- **P3:** **Multipolarity** (≥ 3 co-equals) is **less stable**, hard to track; **permutations** are "dizzying" (lines 9–11).
- **P4:** India **favoured** multipolarity for **fluidity and choice** but must **balance** that against uncertainty (lines 12–13).
- **P5:** The world will be **increasingly multipolar** (line 15); **we should prepare** (line 16).
- **P6:** Trump-era policies **illustrate** uncertainty; India is a **secondary** power in such a world (lines 17–18).
- **P7:** India could earlier **count on** US goodwill and disproportionate cost-sharing; now that is **questioned** (lines 19–21).

Inferences (logically supported)

- **I1:** India must **reassess expectations** of US automatic support even **post-Trump** (lines 20–21).
- **I2:** The **benefits** (choice/flexibility) do **not** cancel the **costs** (uncertainty/complexity).
- **I3:** Policy **preparation** is rational because the shift is **probable** (line 15) and risk exposure is **increasing**.

Main conclusion

- **C:** Multipolarity is **coming**; it **increases uncertainty**, particularly about partners like the US; therefore, India should **prepare** rather than **romanticise** (lines 15–16, 19–21).

Arguments & structure (warrants)

- **W1 (Theoretical warrant):** If **system structure** affects stability, and multipolarity entails more actors **more permutations less predictability** (lines 9–11).
- **W2 (Prudential warrant):** If uncertainty rises and cannot be wished away, **preparation** is the rational response (line 16).

- **W3 (Illustrative warrant):** Observed US behaviour (lines 19–21) **exemplifies** the kind of volatility that makes prior assumptions unsafe.

Assumptions (unstated but necessary)

- **A1: Preparation** (policy planning, diversification, capability-building) can **mitigate** uncertainty (needed for line 16).
- **A2:** Past patterns of US support are **not** guaranteed to persist (implicit in lines 20–21).
- **A3:** Systemic characteristics (number of poles) materially affect **predictability** of interactions.

Paradoxes / tensions

- **Paradox 1 — Choice vs. Certainty:** Multipolarity yields **more choices** for India (line 12) yet **less certainty** (lines 13, 18).
- **Paradox 2 — Desired outcome vs. Lived risk:** India **desired** multipolarity, but its **practical** face is **unsettling** (line 4; lines 17–18).
- **Paradox 3 — Familiar partner, unfamiliar terms:** A friendly US can still become **less predictable** in cost-sharing, challenging **comfortable** expectations (lines 19–21).

Passage 2:

Q91) Correct option: B — Difficulty: Medium — Line(s): 7–13, 14–16

Why B is correct: The passage endorses expanding monitoring “beyond the remit of State Pollution Control Boards” (line 1) by accrediting private agencies (line 7) to evaluate compliance, including complex carbon-accounting and Green Credit linkages (lines 11–13). Simultaneously, it warns that **preparing for the future should not compromise core responsibilities** (line 14) and stresses that **flagrant travesties** often occur at district/block/panchayat levels (line 15), concluding that **the new regime must seek to empower them too** (line 16). Hence, capacity expansion + grassroots empowerment is the composite conclusion.

- Why A is incorrect: The author never claims private auditors “replace” Boards or that policing is obsolete; rather, they **augment** constrained regulators (lines 4–6, 7).
- Why C is incorrect: Green Credits are an added dimension (lines 10–11); industrial compliance remains central (lines 1–3).
- Why D is incorrect: The text expressly says deficits exist and local empowerment is still required (lines 4–6, 15–16), not that grassroots institutions will be redundant.

Q92) Correct option: C — Difficulty: Easy — Line(s): 4–5

- Why C is correct: The passage explicitly states authorities face **significant constraints in manpower, resources, capacity and infrastructure** (line 4), and that “these limitations have hampered their ability to comprehensively monitor and enforce” compliance (line 5). This is a textbook **stated premise** for reform.
- Why A is incorrect: The passage does not allege corruption; it cites **capacity constraints**, not malfeasance (lines 4–5).
- Why B is incorrect: It never claims companies already meet global standards; instead, it predicts **nearly every company will have to account** for emissions (line 12) and calls that **complex** (line 13).
- Why D is incorrect: Green Credit Rules **add** a dimension (lines 10–11); they don’t eliminate traditional compliance checks.

Q93) Correct option: A — Difficulty: Medium — Line(s): 12–13, 7–11

- Why A is correct: The text says “**nearly every company**” must account for **direct and indirect carbon emissions** (line 12) and that this will entail **complex accounting practices beyond what PCB officials can handle** (line 13). It also introduces **accredited private auditors** (line 7) with expanded audit uses including **Green Credit compliance** (lines 10–11). It is therefore reasonable to infer private auditors will see a **growing role** in measurement/verification.
- Why B is incorrect: The passage never says industrial compliance checks become unnecessary; it maintains their centrality (lines 1–3, 11).
- Why C is incorrect: Nowhere does it say Boards will “cease to exist”; the aim is to **bridge deficits** (line 6), not abolish institutions.

- Why D is incorrect: The passage explicitly rejects the idea that this is mere bookkeeping; it invokes **complex, technical accounting** (line 13) and broader regulation (lines 9–11).

Q94) Correct option: D — Difficulty: Hard — Line(s): 15–16

- Why D is correct: The closing recommendation is that **the new regime must seek to empower [local levels] too** (line 16), because the **most flagrant environmental travesties abound** at those tiers and **escape notice due to lack of trained staff** (line 15). The **necessary assumption** is that, absent such empowerment, violations would still be missed—meaning that private auditors and higher-tier capacity upgrades alone won't suffice.
- Why A is incorrect: The centre's ability to issue directions is not at issue; the claim is about **capacity and visibility** at the grassroots (line 15).
- Why B is incorrect: Green Credits are **one** dimension (line 11); the recommendation is broader and about **enforcement gaps** (line 15).
- Why C is incorrect: The issue is not the **location** of licensing but whether local gaps persist without empowerment (line 15–16).

Q95) Correct option: B — Difficulty: Medium — Line(s): 15–16

- Why B is correct: A finding that **over 60% of serious violations occur at district/block level and remain uninspected due to staffing shortages** directly corroborates the text's claim that local tiers are where **travesties abound** and **escape notice** (line 15), thereby **strengthening** the call to empower them (line 16). It tightens the causal link between local deficits and undeterred violations.
- Why A is incorrect: Training **central** regulators in carbon markets doesn't address **grassroots enforcement gaps** (line 15).
- Why C is incorrect: Voluntary templates may help reporting, but do not solve **under-inspection** at local levels.
- Why D is incorrect: Satellite imagery to CPCB could help, but without trained **local** staff to act, the visibility enforcement chain remains weak (lines 15–16).

Q96) Correct option: C — Difficulty: Medium–Hard — Line(s): 7–11, 6

- Why C is correct: The scheme assumes accredited private auditors will **bridge manpower and infrastructure deficits** (line 6) and be authorised to evaluate compliance (lines 7–8). However, if evidence shows **company-paid auditors underreport violations due to conflicts of interest** unless strong **independent oversight and random re-inspections** exist—and such safeguards are **not specified**—then the reliability of this bridging mechanism is **seriously undermined**. It weakens confidence that accreditation alone ensures effective compliance.
- Why A is incorrect: Tough exams/licensing could raise competence but do not solve **independence** problems or guarantee unbiased reporting.
- Why B is incorrect: A public registry aids transparency but does not cure **incentive misalignment** during audits.
- Why D is incorrect: More field kits for Regional Offices may help inspections but do not challenge the **core claim** about private auditors' reliability.

Quick brief of the passage (4–5 lines) - The passage explains the **Environment Audit Rules, 2025**, which let accredited **private environmental auditors** supplement overstretched regulators (CPCB, Regional Offices, SPCBs/PCCs). Because **manpower/capacity deficits** hobble comprehensive monitoring, the new rules aim to **bridge gaps** and handle complex new tasks (e.g., **carbon accounting**, **Green Credit** compliance). Yet the author warns: **future-proofing** must not erode **core enforcement**, especially at the **district/block/panchayat** levels where violations often slip through. The **main idea** blends **capacity expansion** with a call to **empower grassroots enforcement**.

Reading approach (how to tackle this passage)

1. **Map the structure:** Problem (lines 4–6) Solution (private accreditation, lines 7–11) New tasks (lines 10–13) Caution & normative recommendation (lines 14–16).
2. **Mark key contrasts:** Central/board capacity vs. private augmentation; futuristic carbon accounting vs. present-day core policing.

3. **Separate facts & judgment:** Facts—constraints, scope of rules, carbon accounting complexity; Judgment—don't neglect local enforcement.
4. **Look for exam levers:** Clear **premise** (capacity deficit), **conclusion** (expand + empower grassroots), and places to **strengthen/weaken** (conflicts of interest, data on local violations).
5. **Watch for assumptions:** Adding private auditors **alone** won't catch hyper-local violations unless **local staff** are empowered.

Per-question strategy (linked to Q91–Q96)

Q91 (Main conclusion)

Pick the choice that **integrates** both halves: (i) **accredit private auditors** to expand capacity and meet complex climate-accounting needs (lines 7–13), and (ii) **empower local tiers** so core enforcement isn't sacrificed (lines 14–16). Avoid "replacement" or "problem solved" extremes.

Q92 (Premise identification)

Lift the **stated** reason for reform: regulators face **manpower/resources/capacity/infrastructure constraints** that hamper monitoring (lines 4–5). Reject options about corruption or claims that Green Credits replace compliance.

Q93 (Inference)

Link "**nearly every company** must do carbon accounting" (line 12) + it's **beyond PCB officials' capacity** (line 13) **private auditors' role will grow**. Avoid choices that abolish boards or trivialize technical expertise.

Q94 (Assumption—necessary)

The call to **empower local levels** (line 16) presumes that **without** such empowerment, **serious local violations** will still **escape notice** (line 15); i.e., private auditors alone won't fix the gap.

Q95 (Strengthen)

Evidence showing **most serious violations sit at district/block** and go **uninspected due to staffing shortages** directly **bolsters** the grassroots-empowerment recommendation (lines 15–16). Prefer specific, outcome-linked data to generic training/donations.

Q96 (Weaken)

Target the **mechanism** that private accreditation will reliably bridge deficits: show **conflict-of-interest** risks for **company-paid auditors without** strong oversight/re-inspections. That undermines the scheme's reliability unless safeguards (not stated) are added.

Elaborate logic brief

Premises (explicit)

- **P1:** Monitoring/compliance currently rely on CPCB, Regional Offices, SPCBs/PCCs (lines 2–3).
- **P2:** These bodies face **significant manpower/resources/capacity/infrastructure constraints** that hamper comprehensive enforcement (lines 4–5).
- **P3:** The scheme aims to **bridge deficits** and strengthen implementation (line 6) by accrediting **private auditors** (lines 7–8).
- **P4:** Environmental regulation now includes **new dimensions** (climate, Green Credits), and **nearly every company** must do **direct/indirect emissions accounting** (lines 9–13).
- **P5:** **Carbon accounting is complex** and beyond current PCB capacity (line 13).
- **P6:** **Preparing for the future** must not **compromise core responsibilities**; **flagrant travesties** abound at **district/block/panchayat** levels due to lack of trained staff (lines 14–15).
- **P7:** Therefore, **the new regime must empower local tiers** as well (line 16).

Inferences (reasonable, not verbatim)

- **I1:** Accredited auditors will likely handle swathes of **measurement/verification** for climate and compliance tasks (lines 7–13).
- **I2:** **Augmentation ≠ replacement**; boards remain necessary but supported.
- **I3:** Without **grassroots capacity**, many violations will **continue to go undetected**, blunting the reform's effect (lines 15–16).

Main conclusion

- **C:** Expand capacity via **accredited private auditors** for complex, emerging requirements **and** simultaneously **empower grassroots enforcement** so core environmental policing is not weakened (lines 14–16).

Argument & warrants

- **W1 (Capacity warrant):** If existing regulators are **capacity-constrained** (P2), then accrediting **additional competent auditors** can **raise throughput** (P3).
- **W2 (Complexity warrant):** If climate-era compliance is **technically complex** (P4–P5), then **specialised auditors** can meet that need.
- **W3 (Coverage warrant):** If the **worst violations** occur at the **local** level (P6), then reforms **must** include **local empowerment** (P7) to ensure coverage and deterrence.

Assumptions (unstated but necessary)

- **A1:** Private auditors can provide **competent, timely, and independent** assessments at scale (else P3 collapses).
- **A2: Local staff empowerment** (training, headcount, authority) will **raise detection and enforcement** where violations concentrate (supports P7).
- **A3:** Central & private capacity alone **cannot** substitute for **on-the-ground** visibility in remote districts (bridges P6P7).
- **A4:** Incentive structures and oversight will be adequate to prevent **auditor capture** or **under-reporting** (implicit risk the weaken question probes).

Paradoxes / tensions

- **Paradox 1 — Future vs. Present:** Building **sophisticated climate accounting** capacity risks **diverting** attention/resources from **basic, local enforcement**—the author flags this and proposes dual focus (lines 14–16).
- **Paradox 2 — More actors, better outcomes?** Adding private auditors could **increase capacity** yet also **introduce conflict-of-interest risk**, unless oversight matches scale.
- **Paradox 3 — Central expertise vs. local reality:** High-end analytics (credits, carbon ledgers) are valuable, but **unseen local infractions** can still drive real-world harm.

Passage 3:

Q97) Correct option: C — Difficulty: Medium — Lines: 1–2, 3–6, 7–13

Why C is correct: The passage foregrounds an intentional national strategy: building “physical and regulatory infrastructure” to attract top AV companies (line 1) and targeting thousands of AVs within five years, aiming for “at least one in every four trips” in top cities (line 2). It juxtaposes this with human impact: “a potential nightmare for the 30,000 cab drivers” (line 3) and migrant-workforce disruption (lines 5–6). The text also lists institutional props—proactive policy, smart infrastructure, PPPs (line 7)—and economic/efficiency promises (lines 8–10). This combined thrust matches option C’s balanced, two-sided conclusion.

- **Why A is incorrect:** The piece never dismisses the strategy as PR; it cites significant pilots, targets, and institutional clusters (lines 8–10).
- **Why B is incorrect:** The author never claims *certainty* of eliminating all taxi jobs in five years; benefits are projected, not asserted as moral justification (lines 8–10).
- **Why D is incorrect:** Partnerships with Chinese firms are noted (lines 12–13), but the text does not say the UAE will “abandon” all Western partners; it stresses an open “pilot site” approach (line 11).

Q98) Correct option: A — Difficulty: Easy — Line: 7

Why A is correct: The Arthur D. Little citation explicitly calls the UAE among the most AV-ready markets due to “proactive policy, smart infrastructure, and public-private partnerships” (line 7). That is a *stated premise* justifying the national strategy.

- **Why B is incorrect:** The passage mentions neither Tesla crash data nor “safest stack” claims.
- **Why C is incorrect:** It never says roads are emptier or regulation unnecessary; if anything, it emphasises regulation/investment support (line 7).
- **Why D is incorrect:** No fare comparison is given; pricing is absent from the text.

Q99) Correct option: B — Difficulty: Medium — Lines: 12–13

Why B is correct: The text says “Chinese AV firms like WeRide have raced ahead of their American counterparts like Tesla and Waymo” (line 12) and then highlights TXAI, operated by Emirati firm Space42 “in partnership with WeRide,”

using GAC vehicles (line 13). It is therefore reasonable to infer that early operational deployments have been Chinese-linked.

- **Why A is incorrect:** There is no statement about a *ban* on U.S. firms; the comparison is about pacing/footprint (line 12).
- **Why C is incorrect:** The 2021 TXAI launch does not imply the 25% trips target has been met; those targets are for 2030/2040 (lines 8–10).
- **Why D is incorrect:** The passage does not claim AVs “never” crash; it gives percentage projections (line 8) without absolutist claims.

Q100) Correct option: D — Difficulty: Hard — Lines: 2–4, 5–6

Why D is correct: The worry that AV growth is a “potential nightmare” for “30,000 cab drivers” (line 3) presupposes that rising AV penetration will *displace* demand for human taxi work rather than be fully offset by new demand or complementary roles. Without the assumption that AVs will materially reduce (or fail to grow) opportunities for human drivers, the “nightmare” concern lacks force.

- **Why A is incorrect:** Relative cost is not asserted; the argument does not depend on AVs being *more expensive*.
- **Why B is incorrect:** Seamless transition to engineering jobs is nowhere suggested; indeed, the text stresses migrant, low-income workers (lines 5–6).
- **Why C is incorrect:** Job creation in AV industry (lines 9–10) is not said to “automatically” accrue to current drivers; assuming that would contradict the expressed worry.

Q101) Correct option: A — Difficulty: Medium — Lines: 2–6

Why A is correct: A regulator’s *formal phase-down* of human-driven taxi licences as AV share approaches 25%, coupled with “no mandatory retraining,” directly heightens the plausibility of *displacement*, aligning with the “nightmare” for drivers (line 3) and the expert’s claim that “large-scale displacement is inevitable” (lines 5–6). This policy evidence **strengthens** the displacement argument.

- **Why B is incorrect:** Public-education MOUs do not change employment dynamics.
- **Why C is incorrect:** Research grants for sensors may aid technology, but they do not directly link to near-term driver displacement.
- **Why D is incorrect:** Positive rider sentiment with residual preference for human drivers at night is mixed and does not show *policy-driven* displacement pressure.

Q102) Correct option: C — Difficulty: Medium — Lines: 3, 5–6, 8–10

Why C is correct: A binding rule requiring a *human safety operator physically present* in each commercial AV through 2035, prioritising hiring from licensed taxi drivers, directly **weakens** “inevitable displacement.” It converts many putatively “driverless” jobs into **re-badged** human operator roles for years, undermining the claim of near-term inevitability.

- **Why A is incorrect:** Weather-related suspensions limit service hours but do not necessarily preserve driver jobs at scale.
- **Why B is incorrect:** Fare floors can slow substitution but don’t guarantee continued employment; operators could still be displaced by mandated shifts or fleet decisions.
- **Why D is incorrect:** Off-peak, geo-fenced expansions say little about staffing outcomes; limited deployments can still displace some or none—impact is ambiguous.

Quick brief of the passage (4–5 lines)

The passage outlines the UAE’s **deliberate push** to become a global **autonomous-vehicle (AV) test bed**, pairing **regulatory and infrastructure** support with **aggressive deployment targets** (25% of trips in major cities in the coming years/decade). It flags the **economic and efficiency upside** (fewer accidents, lower emissions, time and cost savings, industry/jobs growth) while warning of **workforce disruption**, especially for **~30,000 largely migrant taxi drivers**. Early operational progress (e.g., **TXAI with WeRide/GAC**) shows **Chinese-linked deployments** leading U.S. rivals. The core tension is between **tech-led gains** and **labour displacement risks**.

Reading approach (how to tackle this passage)

1. **Map the structure:** Strategy & targets evidence/metrics projected benefits human impact (drivers) ecosystem players (Chinese/U.S.).
2. **Separate fact vs. projection:** Distinguish **stated data** (trip counts, km driven, cluster plans) from **forecasts** (25% autonomous, savings, jobs).
3. **Track stakeholders & incentives:** Government/regulators, AV firms (Chinese/U.S.), taxi workforce, public.
4. **Expect critical-reasoning angles:** conclusion vs premises, inference from stated facts, hidden **assumptions** (how AV share affects jobs), **strengthen/weaken** levers (policy rules, fare floors, safety-operator mandates).
5. **Watch wording traps:** “Inevitable,” “ban,” “certain”—prefer qualified, text-grounded options.

Per-question strategy (Q97–Q102)

Q97 (Main conclusion): Synthesize both sides—**intentional test-bed strategy + big benefits and the risk of driver displacement**. Avoid extremes (PR stunt, total taxi extinction, or blanket Western exclusion).

Q98 (Premise): Lift a **stated** justification: the **Arthur D. Little** report on UAE’s AV-readiness (policy, infrastructure, PPPs). Reject unmentioned claims (fares, emptier roads, Tesla safety).

Q99 (Inference): From TXAI’s **WeRide/Space42/GAC** partnership and “Chinese firms raced ahead,” infer **Chinese-linked deployments leading early operations**; avoid claims of U.S. bans or targets already met.

Q100 (Assumption—necessary): The “nightmare” for drivers presumes **AV penetration reduces demand for human taxi work** (or dampens growth), threatening livelihoods. If demand weren’t affected, the worry collapses.

Q101 (Strengthen): Strongest is **policy evidence** directly curtailing human taxi licences as AV share rises **without** retraining—this operationalizes displacement.

Q102 (Weaken): A regulation requiring a **human safety operator in each AV (sourced from taxi drivers) through 2035** converts “driverless” into **driver-rebadged**, undercutting “inevitable displacement.”

Elaborate brief

Premises (explicit, text-based)

- **P1:** The UAE is **building physical & regulatory infrastructure** to attract AV leaders and targets **thousands of AVs and ≥25% trip share** in key cities.
- **P2:** Authorities cite benefits: **lower emissions, fewer accidents, time and cost savings, and industrial policy** (cluster, jobs, GDP contribution).
- **P3:** ~30,000 Dubai/Abu Dhabi cab drivers (mostly migrants) face **potential displacement** as AVs scale.
- **P4:** **Arthur D. Little** rates the UAE highly **AV-ready** (policy, smart infrastructure, PPPs).
- **P5:** **Chinese firms (WeRide)** have **raced ahead** of U.S. counterparts in UAE deployments; **TXAI** launched in 2021 with **WeRide/Space42** and **GAC** vehicles.
- **P6:** Officials envision the UAE as a “**big pilot site**”, actively **opening doors** to test technologies.

Inferences (reasonable, not verbatim)

- **I1:** With proactive policy and early pilots, **AV share is likely to rise**, not merely remain in trial mode.
- **I2:** **Chinese-linked partnerships** currently hold a **lead** in on-the-ground UAE operations.
- **I3:** Absent **mitigations/retraining**, the taxi workforce is **exposed** to substitution risk.
- **I4:** The magnitude of **net job outcomes** depends on policy choices (licensing caps, safety-operator mandates, reskilling).

Conclusions (author’s overall claim)

- **C:** The UAE is **strategically positioning** itself as a global **AV test bed** with **significant prospective gains**, but the strategy **creates real displacement risks** for a migrant taxi workforce—**policy design** will mediate outcomes.

Argument structure & warrants

- **W1 (Readiness warrant):** If a country is **AV-ready** (policy + infrastructure + PPPs) and **invites pilots**, deployment **will scale**, not stall.
- **W2 (Substitution warrant):** If **AV trip-share** rises and **regulatory frameworks** allow it to replace human-driven services, **labour displacement** follows unless jobs are **recast** (e.g., safety operators) or demand **expands**.
- **W3 (Benefit warrant):** If AVs deliver **system-level efficiencies** (safety, emissions, time), governments will **persist**, amplifying the need to **address labour impacts**.

Assumptions (unstated but necessary)

- **A1:** **AV adoption** will be **material enough** to affect taxi demand within policy timeframes (2030–2040).

- **A2: Cost/experience** advantages (or mandates) will make AVs **competitive** against human taxis.
- **A3: Job creation** in AV clusters won't **automatically** absorb displaced drivers **without** targeted pathways.
- **A4:** Public acceptance, safety performance, and **regulatory stability** will remain **favourable**.

Paradoxes / tensions

- **Paradox 1 — “Driverless” with drivers:** Policies can **slow displacement** by mandating **human safety operators**, turning displacement into **role transformation**.
- **Paradox 2 — Efficiency vs Equity:** System gains (hours saved, crashes avoided) can **coexist with concentrated losses** for low-income migrants unless **redistributive** or **reskilling** policies intervene.
- **Paradox 3 — Global tech, local labour:** A cosmopolitan **test bed** can **accelerate** innovation while **externalizing** job shocks onto local/expatriate workers.

Passage 4:

Q103) Correct option: B — Difficulty: Medium — Lines: 1, 2–4, 6–7

The narrator introduces a “young lady” (Aurelia) who is “almost heartbroken,” confused by “conflicting counsels,” and begging for “guidance” (line 1). The narrative recounts **serial postponements** after each calamity: smallpox (line 3), a leg lost in a well mishap (line 4), then one arm from a cannon and the other by a carding-machine (line 5). This culminates in her mixed feelings—compassion, prudence, and regret (“alarming depreciation,” broker simile) (line 6)—and her resolution to endure “a little longer” (line 7).

- Why B is correct: It captures the **tragicomic bind**—pity-driven delays amid cascading misfortunes—leading to the present appeal for guidance (lines 1, 2–5, 6–7).
- Why A is incorrect: No one urges immediate marriage to silence gossip; the narrator does not prescribe that (line 1 simply frames the plea).
- Why C is incorrect: The text never brands Caruthers as **morally** unfit; the accidents are mishaps, not vices (lines 3–5).
- Why D is incorrect: Friends/relatives initially **consented** (line 2); writing to a stranger is not framed as her “only mistake.”

Q104) Correct option: B — Difficulty: Easy — Line: 6

The passage explicitly says Aurelia “almost regretted... that she had not taken him at first, before he had suffered such an alarming depreciation” (line 6), using a comedic financial metaphor.

Why B is correct: It is a **verbatim premise** that undergirds the dilemma: delay appears to have **worsened** outcomes.

- Why A is incorrect: No mention of squandered fortune (lines 2–7).
- Why C is incorrect: The families **consented** initially (line 2); prohibition was not the problem.
- Why D is incorrect: Caruthers never withdrew; the sequence is misfortune-driven (lines 3–5).

Q105) Correct option: C — Difficulty: Medium–Hard — Lines: 4, 6

After each accident Aurelia “set the day forward and gave him another **chance to reform**” (line 4). The diction suggests **habitual fault** rather than **random mischance**, which is incongruous and thereby comic. Coupled with the “depreciation” and “broker” simile (line 6), the text signals a **dry, satirical** tone.

- Why C is correct: It reads the **lexical irony**—treating accidents as **reformable**—as a deliberate satirical device (lines 4, 6).
- Why A is incorrect: The narrator treats the letter earnestly enough to respond (line 1); he does not assert it's a hoax.
- Why B is incorrect: No explicit theological frame is invoked; the accidents are depicted as misfortunes, not divine judgments (lines 3–5).
- Why D is incorrect: There is no hint of blackmail; the narrator offers “guidance and instruction” (line 1).

Q106) Correct option: D — Difficulty: Medium — Line: 1

The narrator undertakes to **advise** based on a letter from someone “perfectly unknown” (line 1). For that to be rational, he must assume the **facts are reliable enough** to reason from.

- Why D is correct: It is the **necessary assumption** enabling advice: without minimally credible facts, guidance would be baseless.

- Why A is incorrect: The passage never says future accidents are impossible; in fact, the pattern suggests the opposite (lines 3–5).
- Why B is incorrect: He need not be able to rank every counsel; he only needs a **workable** account to analyze (line 1).
- Why C is incorrect: Aurelia’s emotion is presented as genuine (“heartbroken,” “tearful despair”) (lines 1, 6).

Q107) Correct option: A — Difficulty: Medium — Lines: 4, 6–7

The text links **postponement** with worsened outcomes, capped by regret that she didn’t marry “before... depreciation” (line 6). A physician’s report that **delays aggravate** risks directly **strengthens** the notion that further postponement is harmful and that **decisiveness** is preferable now.

- Why A is correct: It supplies **causal medical evidence** that time works **against** Caruthers, reinforcing the passage’s implication (lines 4, 6–7).
- Why B is incorrect: Wealth gain cuts the other way; it might **justify** waiting, not show harm from delay.
- Why C is incorrect: Friends favoring indefinite delay would **undermine**, not strengthen, the case against postponement.
- Why D is incorrect: Filling a single well addresses one past mishap; it does not show that **delay** itself worsens outcomes.

Q108) Correct option: C — Difficulty: Hard — Line: 6

Aurelia’s **compassionate postponements** after each calamity (lines 3–5) culminate in the ironic lament that she should have “taken him at first... before... depreciation,” compared to brokers who “hold on and lose” (line 6). Her kindness—meant to spare feelings—appears to **increase** the very loss she hoped to avoid.

- Why C is correct: It captures the **central irony**: benevolent delay **worse** outcome; pity **amplifies** misfortune (line 6).
- Why A is incorrect: She does not publicly mock him; her responses are pitying (lines 3–5).
- Why B is incorrect: Conflicting advice is mentioned (line 1), but the **irony** focuses on **delay vs. loss**, not obedience to all counsel.
- Why D is incorrect: She is explicitly **uncertain** and seeks help (line 1); no settled decision is shown.

Quick brief of the passage

A narrator receives a pleading letter from “Aurelia Maria,” whose fiancé, Caruthers, suffers a comically catastrophic series of accidents (smallpox scarring; leg lost; then both arms). Out of pity, Aurelia repeatedly **postpones** the wedding—only to lament that waiting has “depreciated” him, like a broker who “holds on and loses.” The tone blends pathos and dry satire: random mishaps are described as if they were **reformable** habits. The present moment is a request for guidance amid conflicting advice and an escalating, tragicomic bind.

Reading approach (how to tackle this passage)

1. **Track the timeline:** engagement illness accident(s) postponements regret renewed resolve to “bear... a little longer.”
2. **Separate content and tone:** Factual calamities are real; diction (“another chance to reform,” “depreciation,” broker simile) signals **irony** and **satire**.
3. **Identify the moving parts of the dilemma:** pity vs prudence, delay vs decision, sincerity vs absurdity of the circumstances.
4. **Expect CR-style questions:** main conclusion, explicit premise, inference about tone, a **necessary assumption** for giving advice, and classic **strengthen/paradox** moves tied to delay and outcomes.

Per-question strategy (for Q103–Q108)

Q103 (Main conclusion): Choose the option that synthesizes **pity-driven delays + serial misfortunes + present plea for guidance**. Avoid moral indictments of Caruthers or claims that friends were always opposed.

Q104 (Premise identification): Lift a **verbatim** premise from the text (the “depreciation” line expressing regret for not marrying earlier). Discard options inventing fortune loss/parental bans.

Q105 (Inference about tone): Key phrases (“another chance to **reform**”; broker analogy) treat accidents like habits pick the option recognizing **dry satire** rather than hoax/blackmail/divine punishment.

Q106 (Assumption—necessary): For the narrator to advise, the letter's content must be **reliable enough** to reason from. You don't need certainty about future accidents or a ranking of every friend's counsel.

Q107 (Strengthen): Evidence that **delay worsens** outcomes (e.g., medical prognosis declines with time) reinforces the implied case for **decisiveness** now. Ignore data that makes waiting attractive or irrelevant fixes (filling one well).

Q108 (Paradox/Irony): The heart of the irony = **compassionate postponement** arguably **deepens the loss**, hence the self-reproach ("before... depreciation") and "broker who holds on and loses" image.

Elaborate brief

Premises (explicit, text-based)

- **P1:** Aurelia became engaged with full family consent and was happy at first.
- **P2:** Caruthers suffered successive calamities: severe smallpox scarring; a leg amputated after falling into a well; then one arm lost to a cannon mishap and the other to a carding-machine.
- **P3:** After each event, Aurelia **postponed** the wedding out of **pity** and "gave him another chance to **reform**."
- **P4:** She now **regrets** not marrying sooner, lamenting his "alarming **depreciation**" and comparing herself to a broker who "holds on and loses."
- **P5:** She is "heartbroken," confused by "conflicting counsels," and **asks for guidance**.

Inferences (reasonable, not verbatim)

- **I1:** The diction ("reform") applied to accidents signals **comic incongruity** and a **satirical undertone**.
- **I2:** Repeated **delay** has **increased** Aurelia's anguish and complicated the decision, prompting the present appeal.
- **I3:** The problem is not morality but **misfortune** and **timing**; pity competes with prudence.

Main conclusion (author/narrator's overall point)

- **C:** Aurelia's pity-driven **postponements** in the face of repeated calamities have produced a **tragicomic dilemma**, and she now seeks **advice** to escape the "web of difficulties."

Argument structure & warrants

- **W1 (Temporal-cost warrant):** If new adverse events keep occurring during postponements, **waiting** plausibly **worsens** the situation (health, prospects, emotional burden).
- **W2 (Decision warrant):** When delay imposes cumulative costs (emotional, practical), a **decisive** course is rationally preferable to indefinite deferral.
- **W3 (Prudence/compassion tension):** Compassion motivates delay, but prudence asks whether delay **serves** compassion's aims or **undermines** them.

Assumptions (unstated but necessary)

- **A1 (Advice-usefulness):** The letter's account is **sufficiently reliable** for a stranger to analyze and provide **meaningful guidance** (supports Q106).
- **A2 (Delay-cost link):** Further waiting is **non-trivially risky** (health/accident likelihood/emotional toll), so the decision is time-sensitive (supports Q107).
- **A3 (Pity ≠ remedy):** Compassion alone **does not fix** the underlying harms; it may even **facilitate** harmful postponement.

Paradoxes / tensions

- **Paradox 1 — Compassion vs outcome:** Acts of **compassion** (postponement) may **intensify** loss—the broker simile dramatizes this.
- **Paradox 2 — Reform vs accident:** Language of "**reform**" (moral agency) is used for **accidents** (no agency), generating deadpan comic tension.
- **Paradox 3 — Certainty vs indecision:** The more calamities accumulate, the **harder** a definitive decision becomes—yet the **need** for decision grows more urgent.

SECTION E: - QUANTITATIVE TECHNIQUES

Q109. Correct Answer: A. 270 m² (Medium Difficulty)

- Field = $90 \times 50 = 4,500 \text{ m}^2$ (Line 2).
- Track along two long sides: $90 \times 1.5 = 135 \text{ m}^2$ per side.
- Both sides = 270 m^2 .

- B (300) assumes longer width.
- C (240) assumes shorter sides.
- D (225) misapplies 1.25 m width.

Q110. Correct Answer: A. ₹47,880,000 (Hard Difficulty)

- Area = $80 \times 45 = 3,600 \text{ m}^2$.
- For 50 schools = $3,600 \times 50 = 180,000 \text{ m}^2$.
- Normal cost = $180,000 \times 280 = ₹50,400,000$.
- Discount 5% $50,400,000 \times 0.95 = ₹47,880,000$.

B (50,400,000) ignores discount.

C (48,600,000) is a 3.5% discount.

D (46,800,000) is a 7% discount.

Q111. Correct Answer: D. 39.6 m³ (Medium Difficulty)

- Bengaluru = 288 m^3 (Line 3).
- Mumbai = $9 \times 6 \times 4.6 = 248.4 \text{ m}^3$.
- Difference = $288 - 248.4 = 39.6 \text{ m}^3$.

A (40) rounds up.

B (42) exaggerates.

C (45) is overestimate.

Q112. Correct Answer: A. ₹86,400 (Medium Difficulty)

- Bengaluru dimensions: $12 \times 6 \times 4$.
- Wall area = $2(12 \times 4) + 2(6 \times 4) = 96 + 48 = 144 \text{ m}^2$.
- Cost = $144 \times 600 = ₹86,400$.

B (96,000) assumes 160 m² walls.

C (103,200) assumes 172 m² walls.

D (108,000) assumes 180 m² walls.

Q113. Correct Answer: C. 3.5% (Hard Difficulty)

- Delhi turf = $90 \times 50 = 4,500 \text{ m}^2 \times 280 = ₹1,260,000$.
- Track = $429 \times 120 = ₹51,480$.
- Storage = $10 \times 6 \times 4 \text{ SA} = 248 \text{ m}^2 \times 600 = ₹148,800$.
- Total = 1,460,280.
- Track % = $51,480 \div 1,460,280 \approx 3.53\%$

A (3.5%) is rounded too high.

B (4.0%) is overstated.

D (3.2%) is understated.

Q114. Correct Answer: A. ₹780,000 (Medium Difficulty)

- Field area = $80 \times 45 = 3,600 \text{ m}^2$.
- With 1 m track: $(82 \times 47) - 3,600 = 3,854 - 3,600 = 254 \text{ m}^2$.
- With 1.5 m track: $(83 \times 48) - 3,600 = 3,984 - 3,600 = 384 \text{ m}^2$.
- Extra = $384 - 254 = 130 \text{ m}^2$ per school.
- For 50 schools = $130 \times 50 = 6,500 \text{ m}^2$.
- Cost = $6,500 \times 120 = ₹780,000$.

B, C, D are inflated miscalculations.

Passage Summary & Reading Approach

This passage presents a **numerical case-study** about government-funded sports infrastructure in Delhi, Bengaluru, and Mumbai. It specifies the **dimensions of football fields**, the **width of jogging tracks**, the **modifications in storage room**

design, and the **construction costs** per unit area. The test requires application of **geometry (area, perimeter, surface area, volume)**, **percentages (increase/decrease, discount)**, and **ratios/proportions**.

Approach:

1. While reading, **note all numerical values** (length, width, height, percentages, and costs).
2. Mentally group them into **three categories**: *fields + tracks, storage rooms, cost calculations*.
3. Expect questions that mix **geometry with arithmetic** (areas/volumes \times cost) and sometimes compare across cities.
4. The passage is of **medium-to-hard difficulty**: careful calculation and error-checking are key, especially when percentages or surface areas are involved.

Question-Specific Approach

Q109 – (Jogging track partial construction)

Focus on the idea that the track is built **only along the two longer sides**. Compute **area = length \times width \times 2**. Avoid the mistake of including all sides.

Q110 – (Bulk discount on turfing)

Compute the **total football field area** for 50 schools, multiply by turf rate, then apply a **5% discount** correctly. Be careful: apply discount on the final cost, not per field.

Q111 – (Volume difference between storage rooms)

Use formula **$L \times B \times H$** for Mumbai's altered dimensions, compare with Bengaluru's enlarged volume, and subtract. Watch out for rounding traps in options.

Q112 – (Walls-only painting cost)

Identify that **only four walls** are considered (no ceiling/floor). Compute **$2 \times \text{length} \times \text{height} + 2 \times \text{width} \times \text{height}$** , then multiply by the rate. Don't include extra surfaces.

Q113 – (Percentage contribution of jogging track cost)

Calculate the **per-school costs** of turf, storage, and track. Then form the ratio **track \div total \times 100**. This tests cost breakdown comprehension, not just area.

Q114 – (Extra cost for wider jogging track)

Find the difference in track area between **1 m** and **1.5 m widths**, multiply by 50 schools, then apply cost per m^2 . This is a "what if" adjustment problem.

Q115. Answer: A. 47.3 L

Difficulty: Medium

Explanation:

- Cylinder surface (curved + top) = $2\pi rh + \pi r^2 = 2\pi(2)(6) + \pi(2^2) = 24\pi + 4\pi = 28\pi \approx 87.96 \text{ m}^2$.
- For 4 cylinders: $4 \times 87.96 = 351.84 \text{ m}^2$.
- Hopper lateral = $\pi r \ell$; slant height $\ell = \sqrt{(1.5^2 + 4^2)} \approx 4.272$; area $\approx \pi(1.5)(4.272) \approx 20.13 \text{ m}^2$.
- For 6 hoppers: $6 \times 20.13 = 120.78 \text{ m}^2$.
- Total surface = $351.84 + 120.78 = 472.62 \text{ m}^2$.
- Two coats = $472.62 \times 2 = 945.24 \text{ m}^2$.
- Primer = $945.24 \div 20 \approx 47.3 \text{ L}$.

B = doubled coats incorrectly.

C = only one coat.

D = wrong coverage assumption.

Q116. Answer: B. 28.8 h

Difficulty: Hard

Explanation:

- Cylinder rates: A = $1/6$, B = $1/9$. Combined = $5/18$ per h. For 4 cylinders: $4 \div (5/18) = 14.4 \text{ h}$.
- Hopper rates: A = $1/4$, B = $1/6$. Combined = $5/12$ per h. For 6 hoppers: $6 \div (5/12) = 14.4 \text{ h}$.
- Total = $14.4 + 14.4 = 28.8 \text{ h}$.

2026

A = ignores slower painter.

C = overestimate.

D = underestimates.

Q117. Answer: D. ₹6,912

Difficulty: Medium

Explanation:

- From Q116, total elapsed painting time (both working together) = 28.8 h.
- Since both painters work throughout (and their rates keep the work split 3:2), each works 28.8 h.
- Total person-hours = $28.8 \times 2 = 57.6$ h.
- Wage @ ₹120/h = $57.6 \times 120 = ₹6,912$.
- (The 3:2 workload split is satisfied by the rate ratio itself; there's no need to split the time 3:2.)

Why others are wrong:

- ₹5,760 assumes 48 h;
- ₹7,200 assumes 60 h;
- ₹6,000 assumes 50 h—none match 57.6 h.

Q118. Answer: C. 400,000 L

Difficulty: Easy

Explanation:

- Pump rates: $20,000 + 30,000 = 50,000$ L/h.
- For 8 h = $50,000 \times 8 = 400,000$ L.

A = 6 h.

B = 7 h.

D = 9 h.

Q119. Answer: B. ₹2,400

Difficulty: Easy

Explanation:

- Operators = 2, Hours = 8 each, Rate = ₹150.
- Cost = $2 \times 8 \times 150 = ₹2,400$.

A = wrong rate (₹100).

C = inflated rate.

D = rate ₹125.

Q120. Answer: A. 2.88 : 1

Difficulty: Hard

Explanation:

- Painters' wages (Q117) = ₹6,912.
- Operators' wages (Q119) = ₹2,400.
- Ratio = $6,912 : 2,400 = 2.88 : 1$ (exact).
- 3 : 1 rounds up; 2.50 : 1 and 4 : 1 misstate the proportion.

Passage Overview & Reading Approach

This passage combines **geometry (areas, volumes)**, **work-rate (time and efficiency)**, and **labour cost analysis**.

Theme: Mensuration + Time & Work + Wages.

Difficulty: Medium-to-hard. Requires multiple-step reasoning, especially with surface areas, coats, and rates.

Approach:

- Group into three buckets: **(i) Surface Areas & Primer**, **(ii) Painting Times & Wages**, **(iii) Pump Rates & Operator Costs**.
- Carefully note units (m^2 for area, litres for volume, hours for work).

- Expect questions asking for **quantities (litres, m²)**, **times (combined work)**, and **ratios/costs**.

Question-by-Question Approach

1. **Q115 – Primer Requirement:** Calculate curved + top area of cylinder, slant height & lateral area of cone, multiply by number of units, double for coats, divide by coverage.
2. **Q116 – Painting Time:** Use Painter A and B's work rates (reciprocals of time), find combined time for 4 cylinders and 6 hoppers.
3. **Q117 – Painter Wages:** Multiply total labour-hours × wage rate.
4. **Q118 – Water Volume Pumped:** Add pump rates, multiply by time, confirm that this equals 75% of total capacity.
5. **Q119 – Pump Operator Wages:** Compute wages = hours × operators × rate.
6. **Q120 – Ratio of Wages:** Divide painters' wages by operators' wages.



NISHANT PRAKASH
LAW CLASSES

Gurukul for CLAT & AILET