

SURYA LAW ACADEMY
SLA CLAT SECTIONAL TEST — LOGICAL REASONING Set 1
Session 2026-27

GENERAL INSTRUCTIONS

- Total Questions: 30 Multiple-Choice Questions (MCQs)
- Total Duration: 30 Minutes
- Marking Scheme:
 - +1 mark for each correct answer
 - -0.25 marks for each wrong answer
 - 0 marks for un-attempted questions

CR PASSAGE 1 (Q1–Q6)

Corporate pledges to reach "net zero" emissions have fuelled explosive growth in the voluntary carbon market, where companies purchase offset credits generated by tree-planting and forest-protection projects, mostly in the Global South, to compensate for emissions they continue to produce at home. The logic is straightforward: a tonne of carbon dioxide absorbed by a new forest in one country is treated as equivalent to a tonne emitted by a factory in another, allowing the ledger to balance without either party changing its underlying behaviour.

Independent audits of several flagship offset schemes complicate this picture. A widely cited review of a large West African reforestation project found that more than half of its credited emission reductions failed a basic test of "additionality" — the requirement that the carbon saved would not have been sequestered anyway, absent the project. Some credited forests, investigators found, were never at meaningful risk of clearance; others were monoculture plantations of fast-growing, commercially valuable species that displaced smallholder farmers from land they had cultivated for generations, and that stored markedly less long-term carbon than the mixed-species forest they replaced, while remaining vulnerable to fire and disease in a way a natural forest is not. Critics have compared the transaction to the mediaeval sale of indulgences: a payment that quiets the conscience of the purchaser without altering the conduct — continued high emissions — that made the payment necessary in the first place.

None of this means offsetting is worthless in principle. A credit can represent a genuine reduction, but only if two conditions both hold: the sequestered carbon must be additional to what would have occurred regardless, and it must be durable over the timescale that matters for climate accounting, typically decades rather than years. A scheme that satisfies only one of these conditions — real trees, but ones that would have grown anyway, or genuinely additional trees planted in a monoculture likely to burn within a decade — cannot honestly be called an emissions reduction, whatever its marketing materials claim. Offsetting may still have a defensible role as a transitional instrument, funding conservation that would not otherwise happen, provided it is independently verified against both tests and provided it is not allowed to substitute for the harder, slower work of cutting emissions at their source. Treated as a substitute rather than a supplement, it risks becoming exactly the kind of accounting fiction its critics allege.

Source: *Adapted from Global Environmental Change Review | Published: March 2025*

QUESTIONS

Q1. According to the passage, for a carbon credit to honestly represent an emissions reduction, which condition is necessary in addition to the sequestered carbon being additional to what would have occurred anyway?

- (A) It must be durable over the multi-decade timescale climate accounting requires
- (B) It must be generated by a monoculture plantation of fast-growing species
- (C) It must be verified by the same company that purchased the credit
- (D) It must displace smallholder farmers from land they had long cultivated

Q2. What is the purpose of mentioning the "mediaeval sale of indulgences" in the second paragraph?

- (A) To illustrate a payment that eases the purchaser's conscience without changing conduct
- (B) To argue that carbon markets are historically derived from religious practice
- (C) To explain specifically why the West African project failed its additionality test
- (D) To argue offset purchases are always a deliberate act of financial fraud

Q3. Which finding, if true, would most weaken the audit's conclusion that the West African project's credits "failed a basic test of additionality"?

- (A) The credited forests were monoculture plantations of fast-growing commercial species
- (B) The project also displaced smallholder farmers from previously cultivated land
- (C) Independent satellite records show most credited forests faced documented clearance threats
- (D) Voluntary carbon markets have grown rapidly since net-zero pledges became common

Q4. If the information in the passage is correct, which of the following must necessarily be true?

- (A) Every carbon credit currently sold on the voluntary market fails at least one test
- (B) Plantation monocultures store more long-term carbon than the mixed forest they replace
- (C) Independent verification by itself is sufficient to make any offset scheme trustworthy
- (D) A genuinely additional planting can still fail to represent a real emissions reduction

Q5. The passage's claim that offsetting may serve as "a defensible role as a transitional instrument" assumes which of the following?

- (A) Independent verification bodies can reliably distinguish additional, durable projects from flawed ones
- (B) Corporate net-zero pledges will be entirely abandoned within the next decade
- (C) Monoculture plantations are inherently more profitable than mixed-species natural forests
- (D) Cutting emissions at their source is no longer a technologically viable option

Q6. Which of the following best captures the passage's overall conclusion?

- (A) Carbon offset markets should be abolished immediately because of widespread fraud
- (B) Every West African reforestation project is a monoculture plantation harmful to farmers
- (C) Corporate net-zero pledges are the primary cause of deforestation in the Global South
- (D) Offsetting is legitimate only as a verified supplement, never a substitute

CR PASSAGE 2 (Q7–Q12)

The "right to be forgotten", established by the European Court of Justice in its 2014 ruling against Google Spain, allows individuals to request that search engines delist links to lawfully published information about them once that information becomes "inadequate, irrelevant or no longer relevant" to the purposes for which it was processed. The right rests on a coherent premise: personal dignity and the capacity to move on from past mistakes can be meaningfully eroded when a single search permanently resurfaces an old, decontextualized fact, effectively denying a person the ordinary human experience of being forgotten by all but those who knew them.

Journalists and open-justice advocates have raised a persistent objection: the mechanism asks a commercial search engine, not a court or a public authority, to make the first-instance judgment about whether the public interest in a piece of information has expired. In practice, delisting requests have been used by individuals convicted of serious financial fraud, by former public officials seeking to obscure records of misconduct, and by companies attempting to bury unfavourable but accurate reporting — precisely the categories of information in which the public retains the strongest, not the weakest, continuing interest. Because delisting removes a page from search results without deleting the underlying publication, its practical effect is narrower than outright censorship, but its cumulative effect on searchability can still be to make true, once-public information effectively unfindable.

The right does not achieve its stated purpose of protecting dignity unless it excludes exactly the information the public has a continuing legitimate interest in knowing; a mechanism that cannot reliably draw that line is not protecting dignity so much as offering reputation management to whoever files a request. This does not make the underlying right indefensible — the harm it targets, of an indefinitely persistent and decontextualized digital record, is real. What may be misdesigned is the institutional arrangement: entrusting the initial newsworthiness determination to the very platform being asked to delist, rather than to an independent body applying a public-interest override before any removal takes effect, at least when the request concerns a public figure or a matter of continuing public record. Whether such a body could operate at the scale the right requires, without becoming a bottleneck that defeats the right's purpose, remains genuinely unresolved.

Source: *Adapted from International Journal of Law & Technology | Published: November 2024*

QUESTIONS

Q7. What is the relationship between the second and third paragraphs?

- (A) The third paragraph refutes the second paragraph's examples as factually inaccurate
- (B) The third paragraph merely repeats the second paragraph's examples without further analysis
- (C) The third paragraph uses the second paragraph's evidence to propose a narrower institutional fix
- (D) The third paragraph contradicts the first paragraph while ignoring the second entirely

- Q8.** Which of the following, if true, would most strengthen the objection raised in the second paragraph?
- (A) Courts worldwide have praised search engines' delisting judgment as consistently accurate
 - (B) The total number of delisting requests filed each year has declined steadily
 - (C) Most delisted pages remain fully accessible through the original publisher's own website
 - (D) A study finds most approved delisting requests involve officials contesting accurate, still-relevant reporting
- Q9.** With which of the following would the author most likely disagree?
- (A) Delisting has a narrower practical effect on information than outright censorship does
 - (B) The harm the right to be forgotten targets, a persistent decontextualized record, is real
 - (C) Delisting requests have been filed by individuals convicted of serious financial fraud
 - (D) An independent body would definitely resolve the right's institutional flaws at the scale required
- Q10.** Which of the following scenarios is most analogous to the concern raised about the right to be forgotten?
- (A) A court appointing an independent auditor to review a company's environmental compliance record
 - (B) A newspaper voluntarily retracting a factually inaccurate story after receiving a correction request
 - (C) A polluting factory being permitted to self-certify whether its own emissions exceed a legal limit
 - (D) A government requiring all companies to publish annual sustainability reports for public review
- Q11.** What is the purpose of mentioning that companies have used delisting "to bury unfavourable but accurate reporting"?
- (A) To illustrate a category of request in which the public retains a strong continuing interest
 - (B) To prove that every company that files a delisting request is acting in bad faith
 - (C) To show that search engines profit financially from approving delisting requests
 - (D) To argue that companies should be legally barred from ever filing delisting requests
- Q12.** The author's tone toward the right to be forgotten, across the passage as a whole, is best described as:
- (A) Dismissive, treating the underlying right as fundamentally illegitimate
 - (B) Sympathetically critical, endorsing the underlying value while questioning its institutional design
 - (C) Uncritically supportive of the right's current institutional implementation
 - (D) Indifferent, presenting the debate without offering any evaluative judgment

CR PASSAGE 3 (Q13–Q18)

Ride-hailing and food-delivery platforms have built their business model on classifying drivers and couriers as independent contractors rather than employees. This classification lets workers set their own hours and log on and off at will, a flexibility that surveys of platform workers consistently rank as the aspect of the job they value most; it also excludes them from minimum-wage guarantees, paid leave, and employer contributions to social security, benefits that traditional employees receive as a matter of course.

Several jurisdictions have pushed back against this arrangement. In its 2021 ruling in *Uber BV v Aslam*, the UK Supreme Court held that Uber's drivers were "workers" — an intermediate category under British law, entitled to minimum wage and holiday pay while stopping short of full employee status — because the degree of control Uber exercised over fares, routes, and ratings was inconsistent with genuine independent contracting. Platforms responded by warning that reclassification would raise costs and reduce the flexibility that workers valued; data released after similar rulings elsewhere showed platforms did subsequently reduce the number of drivers permitted to log on simultaneously during off-peak hours, since guaranteed minimum pay made keeping surplus drivers idle on the app newly expensive. Worker advocates counter that a flexibility preserved only by keeping workers uninsured and unpensioned is not a benefit but a cost shifted onto the worker.

This trade-off suggests the binary itself — employee or independent contractor, with no stable middle ground — may be the wrong instrument, rather than either side of it being simply correct. A worker classified as an employee gains security but may lose the scheduling freedom that drew many to platform work in the first place; a worker left as a contractor keeps that freedom but bears the full risk of illness, injury, and old age alone. Some jurisdictions have begun experimenting with portable benefits, in which contributions for health coverage or retirement attach to the worker across multiple platforms and gig arrangements rather than to a single employer, preserving the option to log on and off at will while still accumulating protection over time. Whether such schemes can be funded at a level that meaningfully replaces the protections lost under contractor status, particularly for workers who piece together income from several platforms rather than one, has not yet been demonstrated at scale, and the answer will likely determine whether portable benefits become a genuine third way or merely a more comfortable label for the same unprotected arrangement.

Source: *Adapted from Comparative Labour Law Review | Published: July 2025*

QUESTIONS

Q13. Which of the following best expresses the passage's main conclusion?

- (A) The binary classification itself may be the wrong instrument, and portable benefits remain unproven
- (B) The UK Supreme Court's Aslam ruling permanently resolved the gig-worker classification debate
- (C) Independent contractor status offers no genuine benefit to any platform worker whatsoever
- (D) Uber's control over fares, routes and driver ratings was inconsistent with genuine independent contracting

Q14. Which finding would most weaken the worker advocates' claim that flexibility preserved via contractor status is "a cost shifted onto the worker"?

- (A) Surveys show platform workers still rank scheduling flexibility as their most valued feature
- (B) Platforms already fund equivalent insurance and pension cover for most contractor drivers
- (C) Platforms reduced off-peak simultaneous log-on numbers after the Aslam ruling took effect
- (D) The Aslam ruling created a new intermediate "worker" category under British law

Q15. Which additional finding, if true, would most strengthen the platforms' warning that reclassification reduces the flexibility workers value?

- (A) Reclassified drivers were denied log-on access at times they most valued
- (B) Most reclassified workers reported no change at all in their weekly working hours
- (C) Courts in several other countries have declined to adopt the UK's "worker" category
- (D) Overall demand for ride-hailing services increased in the years after the ruling

Q16. Which argument follows the same reasoning pattern as the passage's claim that an employee gains security but may lose scheduling freedom, while a contractor keeps that freedom but bears risk alone?

- (A) A student who studies every subject equally will underperform relative to a specialist in one field
- (B) An insurance policy buys peace of mind at the cost of a recurring annual premium
- (C) A long lease buys stability at the cost of mobility; monthly tenancy reverses the trade
- (D) What a buyer saves by haggling, the seller gives up in exactly equal measure

Q17. If the information in the passage is correct, which of the following must necessarily be true?

- (A) Portable benefit schemes have already been proven to replace protections lost under contractor status
- (B) All platform workers will eventually be reclassified as full employees
- (C) Cross-platform portable benefits address at least one drawback of contractor status
- (D) The UK Supreme Court classified Uber's drivers as full employees under British law

Q18. The passage's suggestion that portable benefits could become "a genuine third way" assumes which of the following?

- (A) Cross-platform contributions can be funded highly enough to replace lost protections
- (B) All gig workers earn their income from only a single platform at any given time
- (C) Courts will stop recognising the intermediate "worker" category altogether
- (D) Employers will voluntarily contribute to portable benefit funds without any regulatory requirement to do so

AR SET 4 (Q19–Q24)

Eight people — A, B, C, D, E, F, G and H — sit in a single row of eight chairs, numbered 1 to 8 from left to right, all facing north (so their left hand points toward seat 1 and their right hand points toward seat 8). Each person occupies exactly one seat, and each seat is occupied by exactly one person. The following is known:

1. F sits at the extreme left end of the row (seat 1).
2. A sits second from the left end of the row.
3. D sits immediately to the right of A.
4. Exactly one person sits between D and C.
5. H sits immediately to the left of C.
6. Exactly three people sit between A and E.
7. B sits immediately to the right of E.
8. G sits at one of the extreme ends of the row.

Source: *Original Constructed Logic Puzzle (No external source required)*

QUESTIONS

Q19. How many people sit between F and E?

- (A) Three
- (B) Five
- (C) Two
- (D) Four

Q20. If A and C interchange their seats, who would then sit immediately to the left of D?

- (A) H
- (B) F
- (C) A
- (D) C

Q21. All of the following statements about the seating arrangement are true EXCEPT:

- (A) Exactly three people sit between C and G
- (B) Exactly two people sit between D and E
- (C) H sits immediately to the right of D
- (D) G sits at the extreme right end of the row

Q22. If D leaves the row and everyone seated to D's right moves one seat to the left to close the gap, who would then sit third to the left of B?

- (A) C
- (B) E
- (C) A
- (D) H

Q23. How many people sit to the right of H?

- (A) Three
- (B) Five
- (C) Six
- (D) Four

Q24. Which two people occupy the two middle seats of the row (seats 4 and 5)?

- (A) A and D
- (B) D and H
- (C) H and C
- (D) C and E

AR SET 5 (Q25–Q30)

A family consists of exactly eight members: Vinod, Sarita, Arjun, Kavita, Meera, Rajesh, Priya and Rohan, spanning three generations. The following is known about them:

1. Vinod is the husband of Sarita.
2. Arjun and Kavita are the only children of Vinod and Sarita.
3. Arjun is Kavita's brother.
4. Meera is married to Arjun.
5. Rajesh is Kavita's husband.
6. Priya is the daughter of Arjun and Meera.
7. Rohan is the son of Kavita and Rajesh.

Source: *Original Constructed Logic Puzzle (No external source required)*

QUESTIONS

Q25. How is Priya related to Sarita?

- (A) Daughter
- (B) Granddaughter

- (C) Niece
- (D) Daughter-in-law

Q26. How is Rajesh related to Vinod?

- (A) Vinod's son, born to him and Sarita
- (B) Vinod's son-in-law, married to his daughter Kavita
- (C) Vinod's brother-in-law through marriage
- (D) Vinod's nephew by his sister's marriage

Q27. If Rajesh says, "Priya's father is my brother-in-law," how is the speaker's wife related to Priya?

- (A) Maternal aunt (mausi) of Priya
- (B) Grandmother of Priya
- (C) Paternal aunt (bua) of Priya
- (D) Mother of Priya

Q28. All of the following statements about the family are true EXCEPT:

- (A) Vinod is Rohan's maternal grandfather
- (B) Sarita is Priya's maternal grandmother
- (C) Arjun is Rohan's maternal uncle
- (D) Meera is Priya's mother

Q29. How many female members are there in the family?

- (A) Three
- (B) Four
- (C) Five
- (D) Six

Q30. Priya and Rohan are related to each other as:

- (A) First cousins, since their parents are brother and sister
- (B) Siblings, born of the same parents
- (C) Aunt and nephew
- (D) Niece and uncle