

ANSWER KEY WITH EXPLANATIONS

SLA CLAT Pattern Mock Test 26 of Session 2026-27

PART I — ENGLISH LANGUAGE

- Q1. (B)** Paragraph 2 shows the astrologer going cold with recognition at the match's flare; paragraph 3 reveals he was "the man who had once driven a knife into another man and run, believing himself a murderer" — connecting these two separated moments shows he has recognised his supposed victim, alive. The option naming a former client who accused him of fraud is wrong because nothing ties the stranger to the astrologer's trade before this meeting. The option naming a rival astrologer is wrong because the stranger is introduced only as a customer wagering on a reading, never as a fellow astrologer. The option naming a debt collector is wrong because no money is owed between them apart from the wager itself.
- Q2. (D)** Paragraph 1 establishes that the astrologer's usual method is letting a worried customer "supply the very facts" fed back as revelation, but here he instead tells the stranger something specific he was never given — the well, the stabbing, the attacker's supposed death — a fact the stranger "had never spoken aloud to anyone." Recognising that contrast between his normal technique and this one occasion is what the correct option requires. The option about more elaborate props is wrong because no change in his equipment is mentioned. The option about flattering the stranger's pride is wrong because the story concerns a past attack, not an achievement to be proud of. The option about a louder, more dramatic delivery is wrong because nothing describes a change in his manner of speaking.
- Q3. (A)** Telling the truth outright would expose him as the very man who stabbed the stranger and fled; disguising it as divination lets him satisfy the wager and send the stranger away relieved without revealing who he is. The option about charging a higher fee is wrong because the passage never mentions renegotiating payment. The option about testing the stranger's belief in fate is wrong because the astrologer's own trade is explicitly built on not believing in the stars himself, so testing the stranger's faith serves no purpose for him. The option about the painted cloth is wrong because that prop is described as decorative, not something the astrologer treats as a constraint on what he can say.
- Q4. (C)** The narrator presents both the astrologer's swindle and his decades-old guilt without harsh judgment, letting the man's fear, guilt and eventual relief speak for themselves — a quietly ironic, sympathetic stance. The option calling the tone mocking and contemptuous is wrong because nothing in the narration ridicules the astrologer; his fear is treated seriously. The option calling it coldly clinical is wrong because the passage lingers on his emotional state (cold recognition, carrying the secret "alone" for thirty years), which a clinical account would not dwell on. The option calling it anxious and moralizing is wrong because the narrator never steps outside the story to warn readers about fraud.
- Q5. (D)** The astrologer has just gone "cold with recognition," and only after "recovering" does he speak steadily enough to spin a convincing tale, so the word means the calm self-control he regains after that shock. The option describing a burst of sudden inspiration is wrong because his story is a deliberate, controlled fabrication, not a flash of creativity. The option describing confidence in his mystical props is wrong because the passage has already told us he doesn't believe in the cowrie shells or diagrams himself. The option describing physical strength is wrong because nothing about the moment involves exertion; it is entirely about regaining emotional steadiness.
- Q6. (A)** This early unease, arriving before any visual recognition occurs, hints forward at the dramatic recognition the match's flare produces moments later, which is precisely what foreshadowing does. The hyperbole option is wrong because the sentence makes no exaggerated claim, only a modest description of unease. The personification option is wrong because it is the astrologer, a person, who feels unsettled — no object or abstraction is given human qualities here. The irony option is wrong because irony requires a gap between appearance and reality revealed at that moment, whereas this line only hints at something not yet revealed.
- Q7. (B)** The narrator insists at the outset that his senses were sharpened, not destroyed, yet by the end he hears a heartbeat that cannot possibly be real and is undone by it — connecting the boast at the start with the breakdown at the end shows the claim is false, not true. The option claiming it is confirmed by his calm composure is wrong because that composure itself later collapses into the same delusion. The option claiming it explains only his quiet movements is wrong because it accounts for just one detail (the stealth) and ignores the passage's larger point about his unreliable perception. The option about a medical diagnosis is wrong because no doctor or diagnosis is mentioned anywhere in the passage.
- Q8. (C)** The passage links two separate details: the imagined sound "growing steadily louder," and his belief that the officers' polite smiles meant "they were only pretending not to" hear it; taken together, these show his confession is triggered by the conviction that his visitors already knew and were mocking him with feigned ignorance. The option

describing a direct accusation is wrong because no officer speaks an accusation anywhere in the passage. The option describing the neighbour returning is wrong because the neighbour is mentioned only earlier, as the one who summoned the officers, not as returning at this moment. The option describing the old man's reappearance is wrong because the narrator hears a sound, not a visible apparition.

- Q9. (A)** Placing his visitors' chairs precisely over the corpse, while feeling he had "nothing left to fear," is a needlessly daring act that only makes sense as overconfidence tipping into self-destructive risk, which the story's climax then bears out. The option describing genuine indifference is wrong because his elaborate calm is later shown to be a performance masking real anxiety, not true indifference. The option describing a calculated plan for discovery is wrong because nothing suggests he wants to be caught at this stage; he is still trying to get away with it. The option describing growing suspicion is wrong because at this point he explicitly states he had "nothing left to fear," which rules out suspicion at that moment.
- Q10. (D)** The narrator insists he is not mad, describes the murder methodically, and later welcomes the officers "smiling," combining horror with an unsettling, self-justifying calm that runs through the whole account. The option calling the tone remorseful and apologetic is wrong because he defends his sanity rather than expressing guilt for the killing itself. The option calling it frantic from the first line is wrong because his opening argument is careful and logical, not frantic — the frenzy appears only in the closing lines. The option calling it coldly indifferent is wrong because his eventual collapse into shrieking confession shows he is far from indifferent underneath the calm.
- Q11. (C)** The word intensifies "cheerfully," describing the narrator's outward, untroubled good humour while the officers sit above the body, so it means light, unconcerned cheerfulness. The option describing visible nervousness and dread is wrong because it contradicts the surrounding description of confident, pleasant conversation. The option describing loud, aggressive defiance is wrong because nothing in the scene describes hostility toward the officers, only friendliness. The option describing reluctant, forced politeness is wrong because the passage stresses that he "welcomed them in myself," suggesting willingness rather than reluctance.
- Q12. (B)** The sound exists only in the narrator's own perception and grows in step with his own rising anxiety, making it a symbol of the guilt he refuses to admit rather than any real noise in the room. The option calling it a literal clue is wrong because nothing indicates the officers hear anything at all; the confession alone brings the planks up. The option calling it a red herring is wrong because the passage never leaves any doubt about who the killer is. The option calling it proof the old man survived is wrong because the passage explicitly describes the old man being killed and dismembered earlier.
- Q13. (D)** The passage opens by stating the boundary between the fortune-teller and the clinician "has never been as clean as modern medicine likes to imagine," and its three historical episodes (the seventeenth-century treatise, the nineteenth-century anatomists, the twentieth-century genetic confirmation) all build toward that same claim. The option claiming palmistry has been scientifically vindicated overstates the twentieth-century episode, which vindicates one specific mark by accident, not palmistry as a whole method. The option claiming genetics disproved every folk belief inverts the passage's actual point, which is a partial, accidental confirmation, not a wholesale disproof. The option claiming nineteenth-century anatomists were first to study the hand scientifically is contradicted by the seventeenth-century material described in paragraph 1, which predates the nineteenth century.
- Q14. (C)** Paragraph 3 connects two separate facts across its sentences: the single crease folk tradition had "long associated with particular temperaments," and the later chromosomal confirmation that "vindicated, entirely by accident, decades of a sign that palmists had been 'reading' without ever knowing why it mattered" — together these show an accidental validation, not a planned one. The option claiming folk palm-reading directly guided the research is wrong because the passage explicitly calls the vindication accidental, meaning palmistry did not inform the geneticist's method. The option claiming all folk beliefs about palms are valid overreaches far beyond the passage, which vindicates one specific mark, not the whole tradition. The option claiming it disproved the design theory is wrong because the design-theory treatise and the chromosomal discovery are separate threads the passage never sets against each other.
- Q15. (A)** The sentence's own structure — "did not close... so much as relocate" — sets closing directly against relocating, meaning the nineteenth century shifted the same underlying problem to a new setting rather than solving it. The option describing a permanent closing of the divide is the very outcome the sentence denies happened. The option describing physically moving palmistry into hospitals is wrong because no such literal, physical relocation is described anywhere in the passage. The option describing erasing all differences overstates the sentence, which describes a persisting overlap (as shown by the very next example), not a disappearance of distinctions.
- Q16. (B)** The opening paragraph puts both figures in the same position: each looks at something on the body and reasons from it to a condition the body does not state. The third paragraph then shows that same move made twice more on one crease — read first as a temperament, later as an underlying chromosomal condition — so the label has to cover the whole span of the passage, not just its first sentence. The option about predicting the future by chance is wrong

because neither figure is described as guessing; both are reading something real. The option about testing a hypothesis under controlled conditions is wrong because no episode here involves an experiment — a seventeenth-century treatise, an anatomist's double vocabulary and a collection of handprints are all acts of interpretation. The option about memorising anatomical structures by rote is wrong because every episode turns on working out what a mark means, not on recalling structures already learned.

- Q17. (C)** Paragraph 2 sets a benevolent-design treatise beside a rival evolutionary account in the very same century, then shows an anatomist using the language of formal anatomy and the language of traditional palm-reading "as though the two were simply different dialects describing the same terrain" — one subject approached two ways, which is what let the overlap survive instead of closing. The option claiming belief in design had vanished by then is contradicted by the passage naming a design-based treatise as active in that very century. The option claiming Darwin's work eliminated all earlier religious readings overstates the passage, which presents the evolutionary book as a rival account, not one that erased the other. The option claiming anatomists limited themselves strictly to laboratory data is directly contradicted by the anatomist example, which is built on blending, not strict separation.
- Q18. (A)** Phrases like "vindicated, entirely by accident" and treating the fortune-teller/clinician boundary as never fully clean show the author enjoying the historical irony rather than condemning anyone involved. The option calling the attitude contemptuous is wrong because no physician or palmist is mocked or criticised anywhere in the passage. The option calling it anxious about a reversion to superstition is wrong because the passage looks backward at history, expressing no worry about the present or future of medicine. The option calling it a strictly neutral chronology undersells the passage's clear framing of these events as ironic and connected, not just a list of dates.
- Q19. (D)** Paragraph 1 establishes the site's near-inaccessibility (three miles of jungle, a name meaning "there is no road"), and paragraph 3 separately states the city "was never resettled, looted or built over" — connecting these shows the same isolation that made the city hard to find is also why its final-era monuments survived intact. The option about weather-resistant stone is wrong because no claim about the stone's durability appears anywhere in the passage. The option claiming satellite imagery had already mapped the site directly contradicts paragraph 1, which states satellite images alone could never have resolved it. The option about the canopy preventing fading is unsupported; the canopy is described as concealing the site, not preserving its carvings from weathering.
- Q20. (B)** The passage reports the discovery method, the site's features and the collapse-era dating in steady, factual language without dramatizing or doubting any of it, which is a measured, evidentiary tone. The option calling the tone skeptical is wrong because the passage treats the survey's findings as established fact throughout, not as claims to be doubted. The option calling it alarmist is wrong because looting is mentioned only about the past, at other sites, not as an ongoing threat to this one. The option calling it satirical is wrong because the site's name is explained matter-of-factly, with no mocking or humorous framing.
- Q21. (A)** Paragraph 2 fixes the carving to the middle of the ninth century. Paragraph 3 then supplies two separate facts about that century, and the question turns on holding both: the civilisation's collapse ran across it, and it came "after several hundred years in which its urban centres had grown steadily larger and more elaborate." Set the date against both halves of that timeline and the monument sits at the closing edge of a long expansion rather than anywhere in its middle — which is why when it was carved tells us more than what it shows. The option calling it the region's oldest securely dated monument is an unsupported superlative the passage never claims. The option about an undeveloped writing system is contradicted by glyphs precise enough to date the carving to a particular period. The option generalising decapitation to all Maya cities overreaches from one carving at one site to a claim about the whole civilisation, which the passage never makes.
- Q22. (C)** Paragraph 1 links two separated facts: three years in which the archaeologist "had turned up only sites that looters had already stripped bare," followed by a laser survey that flagged shapes "that satellite images alone could never have resolved" — together these show the new method succeeded specifically because it could see structures invisible to the approaches used in the earlier, fruitless years. The option about the reserve being recently opened is an unsupported claim never made in the passage. The option about switching to a different country is wrong because the site is explicitly located within the same Calakmul Biosphere Reserve in Mexico as the earlier searches. The option about looters reporting sites is contradicted by the passage's whole point that this site had escaped looters entirely.
- Q23. (B)** The sentence contrasts what satellite images could achieve with what the ground-level laser survey achieved, so the word here means detecting and distinguishing the site's shapes with enough clarity to identify them, an imaging sense of the word. The option about physically travelling to the site confuses this imaging sense with the later machete-cutting journey described afterward, a separate step. The option about restoring a structure is wrong because nothing in that sentence concerns repair. The option about settling a dispute applies an unrelated everyday sense of the word that has no connection to the sentence's subject.

- Q24. (D)** The phrase is glossed by the very next clause, "evidence... in the decades immediately before that decline," so the "snapshot" is figurative for a preserved, unaltered record of the builders' final period, not a literal photograph. The option describing a photographic archive at the city's founding is wrong both because no camera exists in this context and because the passage specifies the record is from just before the collapse, not the founding. The option claiming it proves exactly when the collapse began overstates the passage, which says the civilisation's collapse is "still only partly explained," not precisely dated by this find. The option describing a precise count of every monument is wrong because the passage gives only an approximate count ("more than a dozen") elsewhere, not an exhaustive tally implied by this phrase.

PART II — CURRENT AFFAIRS & GENERAL KNOWLEDGE

- Q25. (D)** A fixed annual amount split into three equal instalments and transferred directly to landholding farmer families, with no crop-insurance or irrigation component, describes PM-KISAN (Pradhan Mantri Kisan Samman Nidhi); the crop-insurance scheme, the irrigation scheme and the agriculture-infrastructure scheme named among the options are structured around premiums, water infrastructure and capital investment respectively, not a flat per-household cash transfer.
- Q26. (C)** PM-KISAN was launched in 2019; the other years correspond to unrelated agricultural initiatives, not this scheme's launch.
- Q27. (B)** the farm-income-support scheme is administered by the Ministry of Agriculture & Farmers Welfare; rural development, fisheries/animal husbandry/dairying and food & public distribution are separate ministries with unrelated mandates, even though all four sit broadly within the rural economy.
- Q28. (C)** the scheme's exclusion list expressly carves multi-tasking staff and Class IV / Group D employees out of the bar on government employees and pensioners, so a retired Group D employee who owns cultivable land stays eligible; serving Central Government officers, registered practising professionals such as doctors, lawyers and architects, and former Ministers and sitting MPs are all categories the norms exclude.
- Q29. (A)** PM-KISAN is a Central Sector Scheme, financed wholly out of the Union Budget with no State cost-share; a Centrally Sponsored Scheme is the cost-shared category it is most often confused with, while a State Plan scheme and an externally aided corpus describe funding routes this transfer does not use at all.
- Q30. (C)** an event combining ten separate track-and-field disciplines across two days is, by definition, the decathlon; the heptathlon (seven events, the standard women's multi-event) and pentathlon (five events) involve fewer disciplines, and the triathlon is a swim-cycle-run event outside track and field altogether.
- Q31. (D)** Tejaswin Shankar is the decathlete credited with this milestone; Sable is a distance/steeplechase runner, Chopra a javelin thrower, and Singh a sprinter linked to a different record in this same athletics season, none of them decathletes.
- Q32. (C)** the teenaged record-setter referenced is a hammer thrower; javelin, discus and shot put are separate throwing events in which this particular record was not set.
- Q33. (B)** the passage treats the review as a planning tool for identifying disciplines and emerging athletes worth investing in, which is an input into where future resources go; the option calling it a disciplinary audit of underperforming athletes is wrong because the passage frames the review as forward-looking planning rather than censure; the option treating it as a ranking device for national team selection is wrong because the passage never connects the review to selection at all; and the option calling it a publicity exercise timed to sponsorship cycles is wrong because the passage presents the shift as a planning change, with no mention of sponsors.
- Q34. (D)** a narrow strait, centuries of religious/cultural/maritime ties and a nearly four-decade gap since the last Defence Minister-level visit together point to Sri Lanka; the Maldives, Bangladesh and Myanmar do not fit this specific combination of geography and diplomatic history.
- Q35. (C)** Rajnath Singh holds the Defence portfolio and undertook this visit; Jaishankar heads External Affairs, Shah heads Home Affairs, and Sitharaman heads Finance — none of them the Defence Minister.
- Q36. (C)** the Palk Strait is the narrow channel separating India's southeastern coast from Sri Lanka; the Strait of Malacca lies far to the east near Southeast Asia, the Ten Degree Channel separates the Andaman and Nicobar island groups, and the Gulf of Mannar is a gulf, not a strait, lying further south.
- Q37. (D)** the passage treats the seniority of the visiting office-holder and the frequency of exchanges at that level as a proxy for how central a relationship sits in each side's priorities, so a rise in frequency signals the relationship being elevated. The option about substituting symbolism for working-level cooperation is the tempting cynical reading,

but the passage expressly allows that day-to-day cooperation continues quietly at lower levels regardless of visit frequency; the option about responding chiefly to pressure from a third power mistakes the passage's background mention of competing powers for the driver of the exchanges; and the option about folding defence ties into a wider trade framework inverts the passage's point that a defence-specific visit keeps security as a track in its own right rather than folding it into a broader economic relationship.

- Q38. (B)** the Colombo Security Conclave is the trilateral, later expanded, maritime-security framework linking India, Sri Lanka and the Maldives; the Quad involves a different four-country Indo-Pacific grouping, IORA is a broader economic rim association, and BIMSTEC is a separate Bay-of-Bengal regional bloc.
- Q39. (D)** the IMF publishes the World Economic Outlook, a flagship half-yearly report ranking economies in current dollar terms; the IFC is a private-sector-lending arm of the World Bank Group, the World Bank itself focuses on development lending, and the ADB is a regional lender, none of which compiles this particular ranking.
- Q40. (B)** India's national income statistics, including periodic base-year revisions, are compiled under the Ministry of Statistics and Programme Implementation; Finance, Corporate Affairs and Commerce & Industry are separate ministries with unrelated statistical-compilation roles.
- Q41. (C)** the five economies ranked above India in the IMF's current dollar-GDP table are the United States, China, Germany, Japan and the United Kingdom; Brazil is not among them, making it the one NOT on that list.
- Q42. (D)** India's national-income base year was revised from 2011-12 to 2022-23; the other years listed are not the base year this revision moved to.
- Q43. (D)** the passage explains that currency movement mechanically changes an economy's dollar-denominated size regardless of real performance, so a strengthening rupee would mechanically raise India's dollar-GDP and could improve its rank even with no real change; a further worsening, no change, or an uncalculable rank all contradict this mechanical, currency-driven logic.
- Q44. (A)** a UNESCO-listed medieval capital in southern India that once controlled most of the peninsula south of the Krishna river before a dramatic sixteenth-century fall is Hampi; Belur and Halebidu are Hoysala-era temple towns in Karnataka, and Warangal was a separate Kakatiya capital in the Deccan, none of them the site described.
- Q45. (D)** Hampi was the capital of the Vijayanagara Empire; the Chola, Hoysala and Kakatiya were separate, earlier or contemporaneous South Indian dynasties with different capitals.
- Q46. (A)** the Vijayanagara Empire's decisive sixteenth-century defeat came at the Battle of Talikota (1565); Panipat and Haldighati involve North Indian powers, and Plassey is an eighteenth-century Bengal battle, none connected to this empire's fall.
- Q47. (B)** the Group of Monuments at Hampi was inscribed on the UNESCO World Heritage list in 1986; the other years listed do not mark this inscription.
- Q48. (A)** the empire was founded in the fourteenth century (1336) and reached its zenith under Krishnadevaraya, so statements I and II are correct. Statement III is wrong: four successive dynasties — Sangama, Saluva, Tuluva and Aravidu — ruled the empire across its history.
- Q49. (B)** a prize for a single translated work of fiction, splitting its winnings equally between author and translator, is the International Booker Prize; the English-language-only Booker Prize is its older parent award referenced in the passage itself, the Nobel honours a body of work rather than one book, and the Pulitzer is a US-only fiction prize — none matches the translated-fiction, split-prize format described.
- Q50. (A)** the winning novel, framed as a rediscovered 1930s travel memoir by a Japanese writer touring a Japan-administered island, is Taiwan Travelogue; The Vegetarian and Kairos are earlier winners of this same prize from different years, and Tomb of Sand is the 2022 winner, none the novel this passage describes.
- Q51. (B)** Tomb of Sand, translated from Hindi, was the first work translated from any Indian language to win this prize, in 2022; The White Tiger and Interpreter of Maladies were originally written in English, not translated works at all, and The Ministry of Utmost Happiness is an English-language novel, not a Hindi-to-English translation.
- Q52. (A)** Lin King translated this year's winning novel and shared the prize with its author; Deborah Smith, Daisy Rockwell and Anton Hur are translators of other, different prize-linked or shortlisted works, not this year's winning translator.

PART III — LEGAL REASONING

- Q53. (D)** The passage holds that a State action can violate equality even where it is traceable to a source of authority that does exist in law, because arbitrariness is treated as the very antithesis of equality. Refusing one applicant alone, for no assigned reason, while granting every similarly placed applicant the same licence is exactly this kind of unreasoned differentiation. Treating the statute's grant of discretion as making any exercise of it automatically lawful ignores that the passage tests the exercise of power, not merely its source. The free-expression argument is a moral-filter distractor pointing to a real but different constitutional value. Demanding proof of a specific intention to cause financial loss invents an evidentiary threshold the passage's arbitrariness test does not require.
- Q54. (C)** The passage holds that a procedure depriving personal liberty is not "established by law" merely because a competent legislature enacted it through the correct process; the procedure itself must additionally be right, just and fair. Denying the detained person any knowledge of the grounds of detention or any opportunity to be heard is exactly the kind of procedural unfairness the passage's test excludes. Treating valid enactment alone as sufficient ignores this substantive requirement entirely. The hardship-based argument is a moral-filter distractor that never engages the passage's actual test. Requiring proof of legislative bad faith invents a precondition the passage's fairness test does not impose.
- Q55. (A)** The passage's second Diceyan principle is that every person, whatever their rank or office, is equally subject to the same law administered by the same ordinary courts, so that no official stands above the process an ordinary citizen faces. The off-duty negligence claim here is an ordinary civil claim to which that principle applies without qualification. The public-service argument is a moral-filter distractor about a policy consequence, not about what the passage's principle actually requires. Conditioning the citizen's suit on the government's own permission, and treating negligence claims as categorically stricter than other claims, both invent requirements the principle does not impose.
- Q56. (B)** The passage's own two decisions show that a validly enacted law authorising an action is not, for that reason alone, immune from challenge: arbitrariness is treated as the antithesis of equality, and a procedure touching personal liberty must independently be right, just and fair. The Assertion's claim that valid enactment and express authorisation put a law beyond challenge however arbitrarily it is exercised is exactly what these decisions reject, making A false. The Reason accurately states this substantive test and is precisely why the Assertion fails, making R true and explanatory.
- Q57. (D)** The passage's liquor-prohibition illustration confirms that a genuinely incidental trade effect does not defeat a law whose dominant object lies within the enacting legislature's own field. The "any effect at all" rule would invalidate most legislation; the traders'-cost claim is a moral-filter distractor; and no prior Union consent is ever required.
- Q58. (B)** The doctrine looks past a misleading title to the statute's true, dominant character — here, banking regulation disguised as cooperative-society regulation. Relying on the title alone is exactly the label-based reasoning the test rejects; the depositor-protection claim is a moral-filter distractor; and no prior parliamentary sanction is ever required.
- Q59. (A)** This mirrors the passage's anti-terrorism illustration: a law's cross-border, international dimension can place it within Union competence despite an incidental local effect. Treating all violent crime as automatically "public order" ignores this; demanding zero incidental touch misstates the tolerant incidental-effect rule; and the civil-liberties claim is a moral-filter distractor.
- Q60. (C)** This is the false statement: the passage says a genuinely incidental encroachment does NOT invalidate a law, the opposite of treating any minor incidental effect as automatically fatal regardless of dominant object. The other three statements each restate the passage's own description of the test and its two illustrations directly.
- Q61. (B)** Pollution control is a public-health, local-industry matter within State competence, and only the dominant object matters, not an incidental trade burden. The small-manufacturer hardship claim is a moral-filter distractor; the "any cost increase" rule would strike down ordinary State regulation; and demanding proof of zero cost increase is an invented, impossible precondition.
- Q62. (D)** The provision requires continuing activity shown by more than one chargesheet within ten years, which a single first-time act cannot satisfy. Listing extortion as a qualifying offence doesn't waive this threshold; the first-time-offender sympathy is a moral-filter distractor; and financial loss alone cannot substitute for the chargesheet-count test.
- Q63. (C)** The group's three prior chargesheets within six years, for listed offences carried out jointly through intimidation for financial benefit, match the passage's definition exactly, including this fresh instance. Requiring identical offences or convictions each invents a threshold the passage doesn't impose; the landowner's-hardship claim reaches the right result for an irrelevant reason.

- Q64. (A)** The passage separately punishes knowingly harbouring an organised-crime offender as its own graded offence distinct from the primary one, covering Priya's conduct exactly. Denying all liability, or equating her with the primary offender, both ignore this distinct offence; the family-loyalty defence is a moral-filter distractor with no textual basis.
- Q65. (D)** The punishment tier turns objectively on whether the crime "results in death," not on any member's intent to kill. The sympathy-based and specific-intent claims both ignore this objective test, and distinguishing an intentional killing from death during resistance invents a distinction the passage never draws.
- Q66. (B)** The passage lets an indemnity-holder enforce the promise once liability has become absolute, even before actual payment, which the decree here establishes. Requiring prior payment contradicts this rule directly; the commercial-unfairness claim is a moral-filter distractor; and no formal, registered instrument is ever required.
- Q67. (C)** A surety's liability is co-extensive with the principal debtor's, letting the creditor recover directly from the surety without first exhausting remedies against the debtor. Demanding prior unsatisfied execution, or calling the liability merely "secondary," both contradict this co-extensive rule; the fairness-to-the-debtor claim is a moral-filter distractor.
- Q68. (A)** The passage discharges a surety for transactions after an unconsented variance "regardless of" any actual prejudice, resolving this exactly. Demanding proof of measurable loss contradicts that language directly; the no-real-harm claim is a moral-filter distractor; and discharge applies only prospectively, never retrospectively to the whole debt.
- Q69. (D)** The passage gives the surety the benefit of any security the creditor holds, and discharges the surety to the extent of its value where the creditor parts with it, exactly as here. Confining discharge to formal contract variance ignores this separate ground; the honest-motive claim is a moral-filter distractor; and discharge is only partial, not total.
- Q70. (C)** With no contrary agreement, the Assertion's claim that X may compel Y to an equal share is true, since co-sureties are, absent a contrary contract, liable to contribute equally — which is also the Reason's own stated rule, so R correctly explains A.
- Q71. (B)** This mirrors the passage's own illustration: uninvited strangers who voluntarily accepted the risk of a lift could not recover where the mishap was a pure accident, not negligence. The compensation-regardless claim is a moral-filter distractor; a signed waiver is never required; and no "absolute" duty to every rider exists.
- Q72. (A)** Consenting to travel as a passenger is not consent to the driver's own reckless driving unless that specific risk was also knowingly accepted — general road-risk awareness differs in kind. The "accepts every risk" rule is the sweeping claim this limit rejects; the moral-failing and audible-protest claims are both invented reasoning.
- Q73. (D)** Volenti does not apply where a statute imposes a non-contractable duty, and a statutory safety-guard requirement is exactly that, so the worker's written consent cannot defeat his claim. Treating written acknowledgment as sufficient ignores this statutory-duty limit; the employer-blameworthiness and implied-waiver claims are both moral-filter or invented reasoning.
- Q74. (B)** The passage's rescuer exception treats an instinctive intervention to save someone from a danger the defendant created as no voluntary assumption of risk, covering the passerby exactly. Calling the rescue "fully informed and deliberate" mischaracterises instinct as calculation; the safe-escape and defendant-irrelevance claims both invent unstated conditions.
- Q75. (C)** The passage voids a talaq pronounced "in electronic form, or in any other manner whatsoever" and separately makes the husband liable to imprisonment and a fine. Confining voidness to text messages, excusing anger, or claiming the talaq still dissolves the marriage all contradict this express wording.
- Q76. (A)** The passage restricts cognizability to information from the wife herself or her specified blood/marriage relatives, which an unrelated neighbour's report does not satisfy. The any-member-of-the-public claim ignores this restriction; the good-intentions claim is a moral-filter distractor; and personal police-station appearance is never required.
- Q77. (B)** The passage allows compounding at the wife's instance with the Magistrate's permission, and conditions bail on the Magistrate hearing the wife and finding reasonable grounds. Barring compounding outright, letting the wife compound alone, or applying ordinary bail procedure, and the harmful-message claim, all contradict these express conditions.
- Q78. (D)** The passage entitles the wife to claim subsistence allowance "for herself and for any dependent children," fixed by a Magistrate, directly covering her minor children too. Confining the claim to the wife alone, requiring a prior conviction, or framing this as double punishment all contradict this express wording.

- Q79. (A)** The passage lists evading a legal obligation as a ground for lifting the veil, and shifting assets into a new shell to defeat creditors before judgment is exactly that. The never-lift claim contradicts the passage's own purpose for the doctrine; the entrepreneur-discouragement claim is a moral-filter distractor; no naming statute is required.
- Q80. (C)** Separate legal personality remains the default absent evidence of evading an obligation, defeating a statute, fraud, or a disguised single enterprise — none alleged here. Treating shared parentage alone as sufficient contradicts this default; the sympathetic-creditor claim is a moral-filter distractor; and no fixed shareholding threshold exists.
- Q81. (D)** The doctrine's contours are fact-dependent, not fixed by a closed list, and a wholly-owned, exclusively-supplying power company can, on these facts, be one enterprise with its group. Claiming separate personality is "absolute" contradicts this; the employee-dignity claim is a moral-filter distractor; and no winding-up is required.
- Q82. (B)** The passage treats statutory object, public interest, and effect on the parties as relevant, case-by-case considerations, contradicting the claim that they should never be examined. A single universal test is the fixed-formula approach the passage rejects; the tax-authority-deference claim is a moral-filter distractor; no statute-naming restriction exists.

PART IV — LOGICAL REASONING

- Q83. (D)** The passage's reform ties compliance to a manufacturer's own verified collection, concluding this would redirect waste toward regulated recyclers. Smaller manufacturers' compliance costs go undiscussed; "only a handful" contradicts the passage's own "most manufacturers"; registering informal recyclers into the certificate system inverts a reform meant to replace it.
- Q84. (B)** The mandate only works if a manufacturer's tonnage can be verified and traced to a formal recycler; otherwise compliance collapses into an unverifiable claim. Manufacturers already owning that infrastructure would make the incentive pointless, worker re-employment is the critics' concern, and penalty spending falls outside the argument.
- Q85. (C)** If the same auditors who approved certificates also certify "verified" collection volumes and manipulate both equally, the reform's central distinction — real collection versus a paper certificate — collapses. Manufacturers welcoming the mandate, rising e-waste generation, and increased media coverage are all neutral facts that do not touch this specific mechanism.
- Q86. (D)** Evidence that an audited-collection mandate elsewhere coincided with a rise in formal recycling is real-world precedent for the same causal claim the passage's proponents make for India. Certificate-system revenue, historical resistance to regulation, and rising awareness campaigns are all beside the specific point the argument needs supported.
- Q87. (B)** Reported certificate volumes exceeding the country's total estimated e-waste is impossible if certificates tracked real physical collection, so the detail shows the figures must be disconnected from actual collection, directly supporting the reform argument. It proves no specific offence, does not question the total-waste estimate, and says nothing about recyclers' spare capacity.
- Q88. (A)** The first objection assumes the mandate fails to change behaviour, while the second assumes it succeeds enough to divert waste from informal workers — both cannot describe the reform's actual effect. A difference in subject-matter is not a tension, the first objection does engage the penalty, and neither objection defends certificate trading.
- Q89. (C)** The deterrence claim works only if an offender can weigh a guaranteed future punishment before choosing to drive drunk — exactly what the critics' first objection disputes. Severity-based deterrence misreads the argument's reliance on certainty, sample representativeness bears on the disparity finding instead, and ranking disparity against intoxication is a comparison the argument avoids.
- Q90. (B)** If offenders are typically incapable of the forward-looking calculation deterrence theory requires at the moment they decide to drive, the certainty-based mechanism has nothing to act on, directly undermining the argument. Unrelated prior convictions, disparity in other offence categories, and rising public support for stricter laws do not address this rational-actor premise.
- Q91. (C)** Controlled evidence that the reform itself, rather than other factors, actually reduced repeat offending is the most direct support the deterrence-based argument could receive. Reduced overcrowding elsewhere, general public approval, and judges' disagreement with the policy are all irrelevant to whether the mechanism actually deters reoffending.
- Q92. (A)** Certainty of punishment can only shape a decision the offender knows about in advance, so minimal awareness of the guaranteed sentence is necessary. Knowing about the disparity itself is not, retained judicial discretion would defeat that certainty, and the proponents place the deterrent effect apart from disparity.

- Q93. (D)** The charge-bargaining point shows that eliminating a judge's discretion at sentencing does not eliminate discretion from the system, since a prosecutor can exercise equivalent discretion earlier, at the charging stage. It does not blame prosecutors for all disparity described earlier (traced to judges), claim discretion increases elsewhere, or assert no legislature has considered restricting plea-bargaining.
- Q94. (B)** Both scenarios involve a rule restricting discretion at one point being circumvented by relabelling the underlying case earlier in the process, so the intended check relocates rather than disappears — matching the critics' charge-bargaining objection. Salary increases, a records-system change, and a staffing-driven error-rate fall all describe unrelated causes with no such relocation of discretion.
- Q95. (B)** The proponents argue that guaranteed procurement demand supplies the scale that lowers costs, after which the same reasoning permits relaxing the requirement — this is the argument's actual structure. Domestic equipment already being cheaper, a blanket ban on foreign sourcing, and voluntary consumer premiums are all positions the passage attributes elsewhere or never claims.
- Q96. (A)** The mechanism needs reserved tender volume big enough to carry a manufacturer to competitive scale; if public demand falls short of that threshold, guaranteed orders cannot produce convergence. Reliable quality assessment answers the sceptics instead, already-lower domestic costs contradict the passage, and retaliation is a risk the scale argument sets aside.
- Q97. (C)** If a comparable mandate ran for over a decade without domestic costs ever converging toward global levels, the scale-to-competitiveness mechanism the proponents rely on would be directly contradicted by precedent. Missed procurement deadlines, growing global demand, and current employment figures are all consistent with the argument and do not touch its central causal claim.
- Q98. (A)** A comparable manufacturer's costs actually falling to import-price levels after guaranteed large-volume orders is direct evidence for the same scale-to-competitiveness mechanism the proponents claim will operate here. Past use of tariffs instead of procurement mandates, international criticism of trade policy, and general price fluctuation are all unrelated to whether guaranteed demand lowers costs.
- Q99. (D)** The passage states that the scale argument, framed purely in cost terms, "does not address" retaliation risk "at all," so the sceptics would disagree with any claim that it fully accounts for that risk. The other three statements are the sceptics' own stated concerns about cost, retaliation and deployment pressure, which they plainly hold.
- Q100. (C)** The proponents' own reasoning is that the requirement is justified only by manufacturers' need for scale; once costs converge, that same justification no longer supports keeping the requirement in place. Immediate cancellation of existing contracts, no country ever needing such a mandate again, and automatic tariff elimination are all claims the passage never makes.
- Q101. (C)** The claim that delivery times would lengthen only modestly after relocation holds only if commercial or light-industrial land sits within a delivery-viable distance of the affected neighbourhoods. A congestion-versus-convenience trade-off, who bears relocation costs, and a year-on-year complaint trend are all things the corporation's cross-sectional comparison does without.
- Q102. (B)** A citywide map showing viable commercial land is often too far away directly contradicts the corporation's premise that relocation would lengthen delivery times only modestly, striking at the argument's factual basis. Resident support for the ordinance, dark stores opening elsewhere, and the length of the data-collection period do not bear on this distance premise.
- Q103. (A)** Evidence that relocated dark stores elsewhere saw only a slight rise in delivery times after moving to commercial zones directly supports the corporation's claim that relocation here would not meaningfully disrupt service. Rapid platform expansion, organised resident opposition, and proposed parking additions are all unrelated to whether relocation itself preserves delivery speed.
- Q104. (D)** The operators' point is that a general rise in citywide delivery traffic could explain the complaint pattern as well as dark stores specifically, so the cited correlation does not establish dark stores as the added cause. Unverified anonymous records, retroactive application, and complaints against unrelated riders never occurring are not this objection.
- Q105. (A)** Both describe a relocation rule that, where no viable nearby site exists, withdraws a service rather than moving it — the operators' zoning-availability structure exactly. A successful relocation, an outright ban, and a relocation with confounded complaint data each break that structure.
- Q106. (D)** Since all cups are plates and no plate is a spoon, no cup can be a spoon (I); since cups exist and none is a spoon, some cups are not spoons (II) — brute-force checking confirms both hold in every valid arrangement. Only-I, only-II and neither are ruled out, since both conclusions are always forced together.

- Q107. (D)** Since some teachers are writers and all writers are readers, that overlapping teacher is also a reader, so some teachers are readers (I) in every valid arrangement, confirmed by brute-force checking. Readers need not all be writers (II), since some readers may lie outside that group — so only conclusion I is correct.
- Q108. (A)** With no apples being bananas and no bananas being cherries, apples and cherries may be fully overlapping or fully disjoint without breaking either statement, so brute-force checking finds neither conclusion holds every time. But the two conclusions are exact opposites, so exactly one must always be true, making "either follows" the forced answer.

PART V — QUANTITATIVE TECHNIQUES

- Q109. (C)** Alloy P (60 kg, 3:2) has 36 kg copper and 24 kg zinc; Alloy Q (40 kg, 1:4) has 8 kg copper and 32 kg zinc; melted, R has 44 kg copper and 56 kg zinc, so copper:zinc = 44:56 = 11:14. Option (A) 2:3 wrongly adds the ratios term-by-term, (3+1):(2+4); option (B) 3:2 is just Alloy P's own ratio; option (D) 14:11 reverses the two metals.
- Q110. (A)** Alloy R contains 44 kg copper and 56 kg zinc (see Q109); stirring in 10 kg of pure zinc raises the zinc to 56 + 10 = 66 kg while copper stays at 44 kg, giving 44:66 = 2:3. Option (B) 3:2 reverses this new ratio; option (C) 11:14 wrongly ignores the added zinc altogether; option (D) 27:28 comes from mistakenly adding the 10 kg to copper instead of zinc (54:56).
- Q111. (D)** Alloy R weighs 100 kg in total (60 kg + 40 kg) and contains 56 kg of zinc, so zinc's share is 56/100 = 56%. Option (A) 44% is copper's share, not zinc's; option (B) 60% comes from adding the ratio terms across the two alloys instead of the actual masses, (2+4) zinc parts out of (3+2)+(1+4) = 6/10; option (C) 50% assumes the two alloys contribute zinc equally, ignoring their 3:2 and 1:4 compositions altogether.
- Q112. (B)** Alloy R has 44 kg copper and 56 kg zinc; at Rs 450/kg and Rs 150/kg respectively, the value is (44 × 450) + (56 × 150) = 19,800 + 8,400 = Rs 28,200. Option (D) Rs 31,800 comes from swapping the two prices; option (C) Rs 30,000 wrongly uses the unweighted average price, (450+150)/2 = 300, times the full 100 kg; option (A) Rs 19,800 counts only the copper's value and forgets the zinc entirely.
- Q113. (D)** Stock alloy Q (40 kg, 1:4) holds 8 kg copper and 32 kg zinc, so its metal value is (8 × 450) + (32 × 150) = 3,600 + 4,800 = Rs 8,400, and 8,400 / 40 = Rs 210 per kg. Option (A) Rs 300 is the unweighted average of the two prices, (450+150)/2, ignoring that Q is four-fifths zinc; option (C) Rs 390 swaps the two metal prices; option (B) Rs 330 applies alloy P's 3:2 split to Q's 40 kg instead of Q's own 1:4.
- Q114. (A)** 25 kg of alloy in P's 3:2 ratio contains 15 kg copper and 10 kg zinc; cost = (15×450)+(10×150) = Rs 8,250; at 20% profit, selling price = 8,250×1.20 = Rs 9,900. Option (B) Rs 6,600 applies a 20% loss instead of profit; option (C) Rs 1,650 is only the profit amount; option (D) Rs 8,100 swaps the two metal prices before costing the 25 kg — (15×150)+(10×450) = Rs 6,750 — and then still adds the 20% profit, 6,750×1.20 = Rs 8,100.
- Q115. (C)** Train A covers its own 180 m length in 12 seconds, so speed = 180÷12 = 15 m/s = 15×18/5 = 54 km/h. Option (A) 15 km/h mislabels the m/s value as km/h; option (B) 45 km/h multiplies by 3 instead of 3.6; option (D) 36 km/h is actually Train B's own speed.
- Q116. (B)** At Train A's speed of 15 m/s, distance covered crossing the platform in 32 s is 15×32 = 480 m; subtracting the train's own 180 m length gives 480–180 = 300 m. Option (A) 480 m forgets to subtract the train's length; option (C) 660 m adds the length instead of subtracting; option (D) 390 m subtracts only half the train's length.
- Q117. (A)** Train B's speed of 36 km/h converts to 36 × 5/18 = 10 m/s. Option (B) 36 m/s simply carries over the km/h figure without converting; option (C) 20 m/s comes from dividing by 1.8 instead of 3.6; option (D) 12 m/s comes from dividing by 3 instead of 3.6.
- Q118. (D)** To overtake Train B, Train A must cover both trains' combined length, 180+240 = 420 m, at their relative speed, 15–10 = 5 m/s, taking 420÷5 = 84 seconds. Option (A) 420 seconds forgets to divide by the relative speed; option (B) 36 seconds uses only Train A's length (180÷5); option (C) 48 seconds uses only Train B's length (240÷5).
- Q119. (B)** Train A travels at 15 m/s and Train B at 10 m/s, giving speed ratio 15:10 = 3:2. Option (A) 2:3 reverses the correct ratio; option (C) 3:4 uses the ratio of the trains' lengths (180:240) instead of speeds; option (D) 9:4 squares the correct ratio, a common wrong instinct.
- Q120. (C)** At the increased speed of 20 m/s, Train A covers its own length plus the platform, 180+420 = 600 m, taking 600÷20 = 30 seconds. Option (A) 40 seconds uses the old speed, 15 m/s, instead (600÷15); option (B) 21 seconds forgets the train's own length, using only the platform (420÷20); option (D) 9 seconds forgets the platform, using only the train's length (180÷20).