

Balaji vs State of Tamil Nadu', the Supreme Court overruled its 2013 verdict and held that promises of freebies cannot be considered a corrupt practice, although the matter is still pending final decision.

58. (c) The Election Commission of India is established under **Article 324** of the Indian Constitution. This Article empowers the Election Commission to oversee the conduct of elections to the Parliament, State Legislatures, and the offices of the President and Vice-President of India. The Election Commission is an independent constitutional authority that is responsible for ensuring free and fair elections in the country.
59. (a) In **Anugrah Narayan Singh v. Harsh Vardhan Bajpayee** Supreme Court observed that no one in India votes for a candidate based on their educational qualifications and, thus providing false information about an electoral candidate's qualifications cannot be considered a "corrupt practice".
60. (c) The Indian Constitution lays down certain criteria for disqualification of candidates from contesting elections. These criteria are as follows:
 1. Age: **A person must be at least 25 years old to contest for a seat in the Lok Sabha and 30 years old for a seat in the Rajya Sabha.**
 2. Citizenship: The candidate must be a citizen of India.
 3. Criminal Conviction: A person convicted of an offense and sentenced to imprisonment for two or more years is disqualified from contesting elections for six years after the release from prison.
 4. Financial Insolvency: A person declared as insolvent or bankrupt is disqualified from contesting elections.
 5. Office of Profit: A member of parliament or a state legislative assembly is disqualified if they hold any office of profit under the central or state government.
 6. Undisclosed assets: If a candidate fails to disclose their assets and liabilities as required by the law, they may be disqualified from contesting elections.
 7. Unsound mind: A person who is of unsound mind and stands so declared by a competent court is disqualified from contesting elections.
61. (c) Sagar Parikrama program is an initiative of the Government of India aimed at **resolving issues of fisherfolk and facilitating their economic upliftment** through various fisheries schemes and programs being implemented by the Government of India.
62. (a) Phase-III of Sagar Parikrama began from Surat, Hazira Port, Gujarat on **19th February 2023**.
63. (c) Sagar Parikrama program is an initiative of the Government of India and is being conducted with the involvement of the Department of Fisheries, **Ministry of Fisheries, Animal Husbandry and**

Dairying, Government of India, and National Fisheries Development Board along with the Department of Fisheries, Government of Gujarat, Commissioner of Fisheries, Government of Maharashtra, Indian Coast Guard, Fishery Survey of India, Gujarat Maritime Board, and fishermen representatives.

64. (d) The theme of Phase-I of the Sagar Parikrama program was "KRANTI se SHANTI", it was launched in **2022 (5th – 6th Mar 2022 Mandvi, Okha-Dwarka Porbandar)**.
65. (d) **Pradhan Mantri Matsya Sampada Yojana**: This is an ambitious scheme launched by the government of India in 2020 to modernize the fisheries sector in the country. It aims to enhance fish production by 70 lakh tonne by 2024-25, double the income of fishers and fish farmers, and create additional employment opportunities in the sector. Therefore, this option is related to the fisheries sector.

Palk Bay Scheme: This scheme was launched in 2017 to promote sustainable development of fisheries in the Palk Bay region of Tamil Nadu. It aims to provide livelihood opportunities to the fishing community, promote responsible fishing practices, and conserve marine biodiversity. Therefore, this option is related to the fisheries sector.

Fisheries and Aquaculture Infrastructure Development Fund (FIDF): This fund was launched in 2018 with a total corpus of Rs. 7,522 crore to support the creation of infrastructure and modernization of the fisheries sector in India. It aims to address critical gaps in fisheries infrastructure, including fishing harbours, fish landing centres, fish markets, and fish feed plants, among others. Therefore, this option is related to the fisheries sector.

SECTION – C: LEGAL REASONING

66. (d) Option A is incorrect as a business owner has a duty to take reasonable care to ensure the safety of their customers. This might include things like maintaining safe premises and providing adequate warnings about potential hazards. If a customer is injured due to your failure to take reasonable care, you may be found negligent and held liable for any harm caused. John's failure to fix the stair or put up any warning signs could be considered a breach of his duty of care. This breach led to Sarah's injury, and John may be found negligent and held liable for any harm caused. Both option B and D provides for correct statement. But option D is considered correct as the reasoning given goes in consonance with the principle discussed in the passage. Option C is incorrect. Although it is factually correct as Sarah was negligent but the passage do not discusses the concept of contributory negligence. Hence, this statement is negated.

67. (d) Option D is the correct answer. As per the passage, an essential condition for the liability in negligence is that the plaintiff must prove that the defendant committed a breach of duty to take care or he failed to perform that duty. In the present case, John put up a warning sign and also called for the repair work to be done immediately. Hence, he will be absolved from the liability under negligence. Option A, B and C can be negated as all the three statements provides for the liability of John. Since, there is no breach of duty on John's part, he cannot be held liable.
68. (c) Negligence is the breach of a legal duty to take care which results in damage, undesired by the defendant to the plaintiff. In the current situation, as we can see Raman immediately applied brakes when a pedestrian suddenly jumps onto the street, directly into his path to avoid hitting the pedestrian. As a result, it cannot be stated that Raman was negligent; (it might have been the case if Raman was driving rashly) and he quickly hit the brakes to prevent a collision. As a result, option C is right and not option A as option A is a fact based answer and option C is a principle based answer. Answer B is inaccurate since the Raman will not be held accountable in this case. Option D is ipso facto ruled out.
69. (c) For a person to be considered someone's neighbour in order to establish negligence, it is important that one is so closely and directly affected by another's act that one ought reasonably to have them in contemplation as being so affected when one is directing one's mind to the acts or omissions which are called in question. In the present case, by no stretch of imagination can the motor-cyclist be considered to have had the pregnant woman in her mind while was driving. Hence, option C is correct. Hence nor option A or B is correct. Option D is correct but option C presents a better argument based on the information given in the passage.
70. (d) The answer will remain the same. The legal duty to take care extends only to one's neighbour. The persons who are so closely and directly affected by one's act that one ought reasonably to have them in contemplation as being so affected when one is directing one's mind to the acts or omissions which are called in question are one's neighbours. In the present case, by no stretch of imagination can the motor-cyclist be considered to have had the pregnant woman in her mind while was driving. Hence, option D is the correct answer. Option A and B are incorrect as in the present case the defendant did not owe any duty towards the plaintiff. Option C is a suggestive response and goes beyond the facts given in the question. Hence, not correct.
71. (d) The correct answer is option D and not option B. If an opportunity, of sentence hearing, is not provided by the trial court, the appellate court needs to balance various considerations and either afford an

opportunity before itself or remand back to trial court. In the present case, the trial is not vitiated, however the opportunity must be provided at the appellate stage. Option A is not correct as the passage nowhere states that pre sentence hearing is a mandatory process of law and the same cannot be dispensed with, by the trial court. Option C is not correct as para three states that even if a procedural irregularity is committed by the trial court to a certain extent on the question of hearing on sentence, the violation can be remedied by the appellate Court by providing sufficient opportunity of being heard on sentence. And thus no need to start the entire process of law again.

72. (b) The correct answer is option B. An accused needs to satisfy the appellate courts, inter alia by pleading on the grounds as to existence of mitigating circumstances, for its further consideration. This reflects that the high court cannot consider the appeal for sentence hearing if not satisfied. Option A is incorrect as the appellate court cannot reduce the sentence considering the mitigating factor if the trial court has failed to hear an accused on sentence. Option C is eliminated as it is a suggestive statement which cannot be inferred from the facts. Option D is not correct as the HC has heard the case and then uphold the sentence given by the trial case thus it can be inferred that the HC was not satisfied by the case of the accused as to existence of mitigating circumstances.
73. (a) The correct answer is option A. As the comprehension explicitly says there is no bar on pre-sentencing hearings taking place on the same day after passing the judgment of conviction, if the accused and the prosecution are ready to submit their arguments. In the present cases both parties in the case submitted arguments willingly, and therefore the stage was lawfully carried out. Hence, option B is negated as it is suggestive in nature. Option D is incorrect as it is not the case when a person who has not been given relief in terms of his sentence can appeal to the high court, but when observed that even if a procedural irregularity is committed by the trial court to a certain extent on the question of hearing on sentence, the violation can be remedied by the appellate Court by providing sufficient opportunity of being heard on sentence. Option C is negated as sentence hearing is not mere a formality.
74. (a) The correct answer is option A. As the passage suggests in para 2 at the stage of pre-sentence hearing, the accused shall be afforded a real and effective opportunity to plead his case with respect to sentencing, whether simply by way of oral submissions or by also bringing pertinent material on record. In the present case, pleading a case orally does not make the process unlawful. Ipso facto option B and D both are not considered which provides that arguments at each stage including the

stage of pre-sentence hearing shall be in writing only. Option C is not correct as the law provides for arguments to be submitted orally, and hence it cannot be stated that submitting arguments orally is a mere procedural irregularity

75. (a) The correct answer is option A. In *Accused X v. State of Maharashtra*, SC observed that even if a procedural irregularity is committed by the trial court to a certain extent on the question of hearing on sentence, the violation can be remedied by the appellate Court by providing sufficient opportunity of being heard on sentence. Hence, option B and C both are negated. Option D is not correct as if a procedural irregularity is committed by the trial court to a certain extent on the question of hearing on sentence, the violation can be remedied by the appellate Court by providing sufficient opportunity of being heard on sentence. Hence, even if there exists a procedural irregularity at the end of the trial court, the violation can be remedied by the appellate Court.
76. (a) *The reason behind the court not approving the violation of 'Nemo judex in causa sua' or rule against bias -no individual should be a judge in his own cause, or a deciding power must be neutral and impartial when examining any case, as there exists an exception and that is the doctrine of necessity. Since without the Director-General of Communication no tender can be selected and fair evaluation cannot be done. There was no option of substitution and thus the decision was not liable to be struck down. In this case, the Supreme Court applied the doctrine of necessity liberally. And hence, option A is correct and not option B. Option C is incorrect as if there exists a substitute authority for the court would not have applied the doctrine of necessity here and must have approved approve the violation of 'Nemo judex in causa sua' .Option D is not correct as here again for the similar reason.*
77. (a) Option A is the correct answer. Option B though correct for the reason being the application of section 15 of the said act that no act of CCI shall be invalid due to vacancies. But it is not considered as the statement provides no such reasoning. Option C is not correct for the same reason. Option D is not correct as the facts do not state that participation of the chairman in decision making and approval is not required in all cases.
78. (a) The doctrine of necessity disqualifies such adjudicators who resort to bias while arriving at decisions. But, there are certain exceptions wherein such biased decisions given by the adjudicator are held valid. One of the exception is There is no availability of another competent person for arbitration. It is stated in the facts that Despite this bias, Mr. Johnson continues to preside over the arbitration as there is no other competent person available for the job. Hence, not option B but option A is correct. Option C is not correct as the present

case falls under the exceptions. Option D is incorrect as the reasoning given is fact based. However, option A is backed by an appropriate reasoning as given in the passage. Hence, option A is correct.

79. (d) Statement I is incorrect. As per the passage, In a situation where an option is given to either let a person act in a biased manner regarding a matter or to quash the matter itself, the preference will be given to taking action in a biased manner, even though the decision might be affected by the bias of the deciding authority. In cases similar to the aforementioned situation, the rule against bias is defeated by the rule of necessity. Hence, not in every situation the rule of necessity may override the rule against bias.
Statement II is incorrect since the paragraph contains no information about the adjudicator being disqualified from hearing a similar case in the future if bias is found.
Both Statement III and IV cannot be inferred from the passage's context.
Hence, option D is correct.
80. (d) The passage states that to invoke and apply the doctrine of necessity only in such circumstances where there is an absence of a determining authority to take the decision regarding a case. In the present circumstance there is a choice with the prosecutor to transfer the case to another Judge. Hence, option D is correct and not option A and B are incorrect. Option A is incorrect as there was no option given to opt for quashing the matter. Option C is not correct as the passage do not speaks anything of rule of fair justice. Hence, it is not considered.
81. (d) Option D is the correct answer and not option A. The principle of non-refoulement prohibits States from transferring or removing individuals from their jurisdiction or effective control when there are substantial grounds for believing that the person would be at risk of irreparable harm upon return. It is clear from the facts that the minority group was continuously discriminated and humiliated in their country. Hence, even if country Y had only granted them a status of temporary refuge, they cannot be deported. Option B sounds appropriate as well, but it gives a general statement, however, option D provides for a specific reason as to why the refugees cannot be deported. Option C is not correct as the reasoning given is irrelevant for the purpose of being deported. They cannot be deported because there is a risk of persecution or ill treatment upon return.
82. (b) Both option A and B provides for correct answers, however, option A goes totally on the lines of the principle given, whereas option B states the facts and application of the principle given to her case. The principle of non-refoulement guarantees that no one should be returned to a country where they would face torture, cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment and other irreparable harm.

Hence, Option B is considered as a correct answer. Option C is not correct as it is clear from the facts that the government in her country was overthrown by rebel groups and her husband was killed, she feared for her life on been return to country. Therefore, option D is also incorrect on similar lines.

83. (d) Option D is the correct answer. Both option A and B are incorrect as they are providing additional information that is not stated in the facts. It is not clear from the given facts that either of the two countries are signatories or not to the convention. Hence, both statements A and B are incorrect. Option C is not correct Vihan's concern is about people's position and their right to live freely and securely there it is no where mentioned that Vihan might face persecution and ill treatment if returned. Hence, option D is an appropriate answer.
84. (c) As per the passage, the principle of non-refoulement guarantees that no one should be returned to a country where they would face torture, cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment and other irreparable harm. Here the facts state that Diwas was being targeted for publishing articles and pamphlets opposing the move of the government to declare it as a Christian State to the neighboring country. Hence, there is a chance that Diwas would be at risk of irreparable harm upon return to his origin country. Therefore the principle of non refoulement applies and Diwas shall stay as a refuge in the neighboring state. Therefore, option C is correct and not A. Option B is not correct as it states that the principle of non refoulement does not apply. Option D is not correct as the passage do not provide information for the states who are not signatories to the convention and hence no assumptions in this regard can be made. Hence, option D is correct.
85. (a) In situation I principle of non refoulement does not apply as in this case sending back X to its original country will not make him face torture, cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment and other irreparable harm. Conversely in situation II, the principle of non refoulement would apply as if the custody of the duo was returned to their origin state they will face persecution i.e., FGM. Hence, option A is correct.
86. (d) Option D is the correct answer. As per the passage, exception 1 of section 4 states that section does not apply to the publication of such items which are approved and justified for public interest and good. For example, if any such books, drawings or pictures are used for the purpose of learning such as science, literature or other objects of general concern, it can be published and distributed. The news articles are published for the general information of the public and thus, such publication will not constitute an offence under section 4 of the Act. Option A is therefore not correct. Option B and option C are not correct as both the statements cannot be inferred from the context of the passage, hence, not correct.

87. (c) As per the passage, the terms, "indecent representation" is defined in Section 2(c) of the Indecent Representation of Women Act as "indecent representation of women" in any way that has the effect of being indecent or derogatory of a woman or of being corrupt or susceptible to public morality, or moralistic depravity. Here, the accused announces the exhibition of a contest which may tend to lower down the reputation and dignity of women in the society or which is indecent according to the social standards. Hence, option C is a better choice. Option A is also correct but it does not specify under which section will the accusers be punished. Option B is not correct as the reasoning given is fact based moreover, the accused will be held liable as discussed in above statement. Option D is not correct as the facts do not specifies that the accused is engaged in the production, distribution, hiring, selling, circulation of any books, pamphlets, paper, slide, films, writing, drawing, painting, photograph or figures which contain material that represent or tend to represent women Indecently or in an obscene manner. Hence, not correct.
88. (a) As per the passage, Section 3 of the act particularly deals with prohibition of advertisement showcasing Indecency of a woman. It states that no person has a right to publish or intend to publish in future or make arrangements to take part in the publication or exhibition of any advertisement which may tend to lower down the reputation and dignity of women in the society or which is indecent according to the social standards. Thus, option A is correct and not option C. Both option B and D are negated as explained above, it is a case of violation of section 3.
89. (b) The stated advertisement in the present case do not represent anything which either lower down the reputation and dignity of women in the society or which is indecent according to the social standards or represent women Indecently or in an obscene manner. Hence, not option A, C or D is correct but option B.
90. (b) Option B is correct and not option A. Section 4 of the act directly deals with restricting the production, distribution, hiring, selling, circulation of any books, pamphlets, paper, slide, films, writing, drawing, painting, photograph or figures which contain material that represent or tend to represent women Indecently or in an obscene manner. Here the newspaper will be held liable as the publication depicted a nude photo. Option C is not the correct answer as this is nowhere can be implied from the facts given. Option D is not correct as the publication depicted a nude photo which attracts provision of section 4.
91. (d) Option A is not correct. As per the passage, the provisions of Section 7 of the Prevention of Corruption Act, 1988 would get attracted where public servant obtains or agrees to accept from any

person any gratification other than legal remuneration as reward for doing or forbearing to it any official act. Here the facts only state that the principal was approached by the father of one of the waitlisted students, who attempted to pay him to finalize the name of their child in management quotas despite having low grades. The provisions of section 7 would have attracted in case the principal obtains or have received a gratification. Therefore, option D is a correct answer. Option B and C are not considered as the passage do not defines a public servant.

92. (a) Option A is the correct answer. As per the passage, Section 7 in The Prevention of Corruption Act, 1988 provides for Public servant taking gratification other than legal remuneration in respect of an official act. Option B is not correct as clearly the act falls within the purview of the Prevention of Corruption Act of 1988. Both Option C and D are not correct as the factual question only asks for the liability of the secretary.
93. (b) As per passage, section 7 provides for an action against "Whoever, being, or expecting to be a public servant", hence, option B is correct. Option A is not correct as the passage do not provides for any such information. Option C is not correct as the passage do not expressly state that the clause does not allow for the prosecution of a person employed by a public official. Option D is not correct as the fact do not state that the agents disguised themselves as a public servant.
94. (c) Option A is incorrect. As the facts clearly suggests that the accused was caught red handed while taking a bribe. The passage provides that the court is required to consider the explanation offered by the accused, if any, only on the touchstone of preponderance of probability and not on the touchstone of proof beyond all reasonable doubt. The present case do not provides for a case of probability where the accused can escape liability. Option B is not correct as the passage does not provide for onto whom the burden of proof lies. Option C is therefore correct as acceptance of money is not sufficient for convicting an accused under Sections 7 and 13 (1) (d) of the Prevention of Corruption Act, 1988 and there must be evidence on record that the accused obtained any amount by corrupt or illegal means other than remuneration for doing or forbearing to do any official act. Option D is not correct as there are sufficient proofs against the accused. Hence, he will be convicted.
95. (a) The correct answer is (a). As per Section 415 of IPC, whoever cheats and thereby dishonestly induces the person deceived to deliver any property to any person, can be said to have committed the offence under Section 415 of IPC. In the present case, the accused deceived the insurance company by certifying the patient's health to induce them to issue the insurance policy. This constitutes the offence of

cheating as the company would not have done so if not for the deception.

- (b) is incorrect as the offense of cheating is constituted regardless of the responsibility of the insurance company, which too does not definitely exist. (c) is incorrect as fake certificates is not cheating using them to induce the company to issue the policy is cheating. Moreover, it is a fact based answer. (d) is incorrect as payment of the money is not material as issuing the policy is an act that the company would not have done if not for the deception and inducement.
96. (c) The correct answer is (c). Deceiving means to make a person believe what is false to be true or to make a person disbelieve what is true to be false by using words or by conduct. In deception, a fraudulent representation or wilful misrepresentation of a fact is made directly or indirectly with an intent to commit the offence of cheating. In order to prove the offence, it is not only important to prove that a false representation was made by the accused but also that the accused had the knowledge that the representation was false and wilfully made it in order to deceive the prosecutor. In the present case, Mike Ross portrayed to be a law graduate, using fake certificates of Harvard University to induce Jessica to give her the job. Mike was aware of such representation being false and wilfully made it which is can be very reasonably concluded. Therefore he has committed the offence of cheating. (a) is incorrect as merely falsely representing himself as a law graduate or lawyer is not enough to constitute the offence of cheating it coupled with the dishonest inducement of Jessica to give him the job, satisfies the essentials of section 420. (b) is incorrect as it is wrong because it has been established that Mike has committed the offence of cheating and moreover, it cannot be concluded from the passage if there is an offence of forgery or not. (d) is incorrect as first the information given is irrelevant and second it is cheating if the essentials of the section are satisfied and talent and knowledge are immaterial.
97. (a) The correct answer is (a). Deceiving means to make a person believe what is false to be true or to make a person disbelieve what is true to be false by using words or by conduct. When one person uses deceitful practices to convince the other person to agree on anything which is harmful to that person, it is known as Inducement. Such intentional dishonest inducement amounts to cheating as per section 420. In the present case, while the payment has been withheld, that alone does not qualify as either deceiving or inducement of any kind or form. While the act of non-payment would definitely entail a remedy but the same would not be charges under 420. (b) is incorrect for the same reasons as stated above that there was no dishonest inducement. (c) is

incorrect for the same reasons as (a) is correct i.e. absence of any dishonest/ fraudulent intention to induce or any act of deception.

98. (b) The correct answer is (b). As per Section 420 of IPC, whoever cheats and thereby dishonestly induces the person deceived to deliver any property to any person, can be said to have committed the offence under Section 420 of IPC. Therefore, to make out a case against a person for the offence under Section 420 of IPC, there must be a dishonest inducement to deceive a person to deliver any property to any other person. In the present case, there is no allegation at all against accused woman of any inducement by her to deceive and to deliver the gold jewellery. The actual act of cheating and inducing the delivery of the jewellery was done by her husband and therefore she has not been rightly charged of the offence. (a) is incorrect as first the facts are silent about her being an accomplice and even if she is found to be an accomplice, she herself cannot be charged for the offence of cheating in that case as well. (c) is incorrect as absconding itself does not satisfy all the essentials of section 420 to charge the woman for cheating. (d) is a little confusing and overlaps with (b), however it is different in terms of talking about the accused having no relation with the offence at all, which is immaterial. For a person to be charged under this section they themselves have dishonestly induced a person which is not the fact in the instant case. (b) therefore is the correct answer.
99. (b) The correct answer is (b). Cheating means whoever fraudulently or dishonestly deceiving a person in order to induce that person to deliver a property to any person or to consent to retain any property or to do or omit to do any act which he would not have done if he was not deceived to do so. In the present case, there is no such act of deceiving or inducing a person to deliver a property or to do or not do an act, in the present case the loan had already been given and there is only failure in repayment of the same. Therefore, the facts of the present case do not constitute cheating and thus Zeeshan shall not be found guilty of the same. (a) is incorrect for the same reason as above as there is no such dishonest deception to induce the creditor to do anything that they would not have if not for the deception (as the loan had already been given). (c) is incorrect as first the given statement is irrelevant and second Zeeshan had already informed the creditor of the insufficient balance in the account. (d) is incorrect as requesting an extension is not a proof of anything let alone innocence.
100. (d) The correct answer is (d). I very evidently constitutes as cheating as there is inducement to make a payment by deceptively portraying oneself as a government officer. II does not constitute as cheating as mere non-payment of debt does not mean any deception or inducement to payment, at most it would be a contractual violation. III is

incorrect as the mere fact that the chair was later found to be defective does not satisfy the essentials of cheating, in fact in the later case IV there is cheating where the same has been done knowingly with intention there is a case of cheating to induce the person to buy the chair which they wouldn't have if not for such deception that the chair has a sturdy built quality.

101. (b) The correct answer is (b). Every person of sound mind, and not a minor, can make a Will, and further a codicil is not a standalone document. This means that validity of the will depends upon the validity of the will, as it is to the will the codicil make modifications. Therefore, in event of the will being invalid, the codicil too shall be invalid. In the present case, Ram Babu made the will when he was a minor, and therefore such will is invalid. As a result, the codicil too shall be invalid and cannot be executed. Therefore, in the event of absence of a will the laws of succession shall apply and the charity would not get the possession of the house. (a) is incorrect for the same reasons as stated above that the codicil is invalid. (c) is incorrect because the mere intention of Ram Babu is irrelevant if the same is not reflected in a valid will as in the present case. (d) is incorrect as the division of the property depends upon the existence of a valid will, had the will been valid the legal heirs would not have gotten the possession of the house. So it is not for the reason of their legal right but the invalidity of the will that the children of Ram Babu get the house.
102. (d) The correct answer is (d). Certain formalities must be complied with in order to make a valid Will. It must be written, signed and attested by two people each of whom should have seen the testator signing the Will, as required by law. In the present case, the statement that was given to the magistrate was unsigned, as Shubham died instantly after finishing the sentence, as a result the statement will not qualify as a will, even though recorded by the magistrate. Therefore, the appeal shall not be allowed and Anuja and Parvind have no claim over Shubham's assets. (a) is incorrect as even though rest of the formalities are fulfilled the statement is not signed and is not a will. (b) is incorrect as it is not if the will was properly written it is for the reason that it was not signed that it cannot be considered a valid will. (c) is incorrect as being written is not merely a technicality but one of the foundations of the validity of the will, and therefore cannot be ignored by the court.
103. (a) The correct answer is (a). A testator can change his Will, at any time, in any manner he deems fit and any number of times. However, only the last Will made before his death is enforceable. In the present case, even though an earlier made will but the testator made another will, no matter howsoever much before dying, then in such case the last made

will shall be the enforceable will. Therefore, lawfully the property shall be bequeathed to the nurse and not be divided amongst the family members.

(b) is incorrect as there is no such actual limitation as given in the option, and property can be given to any one by means of a will. (c) is incorrect as the given point is first irrelevant to the question asked and second not deducible from the given passage. (d) is incorrect as the passage unambiguously says that only the last will is enforceable, in such a case the option (d) cannot obviously be true as the time before death in which the will is made is not really relevant.

104. (d) The correct answer is (d). A Will is intended to dispose off property. There must be some existing property which is being given to others after the death of the testator. In the present case, while the rest of the property shall be disposed off as per the will, in presence of the same as the will is valid, however, the house has been acquired after the will was made. The house therefore was non-existing at the time of the making of the will and cannot be bequeathed to any person. As a result, the daughter has a valid right on the house. That said, the daughter does not have any right over the rest of the properties as they shall be governed by the will.

(a) is incorrect as while daughter has no right over any of the remaining properties but she has a valid right over her share in the house. (b) is incorrect because apart from the house the daughter has no valid claim over the remaining property. (c) is incorrect as already stated the daughter has a right over the house as the same shall be governed by the intestate succession laws.

105. (c) The correct answer is (c). A Will becomes enforceable only after the death of the testator. It gives absolutely no rights to the legatee (the person who inherits) until the death of the testator. It has no effect during the lifetime of the testator. In the present case, since the seller is just a beneficiary of the will so far, the testator is alive. As long as the testator lives, the beneficiary has no right over the property, in absence of any right or title over such property it cannot be sold further as the Indian Transfer of Property law, therefore the sale is invalid.

(a) is incorrect as even if the person was aware of the specific contents it would not have made any difference because as long as the testator is alive the beneficiary has no right over the property in the will. (b) is incorrect as there is no entitlement over the property. (d) is incorrect as the beneficiary has no ownership over the property at the moment of the sale.

SECTION - D : LOGICAL REASONING

106. (b) The title "A Sky Full of Opportunities" best represents the passage as it highlights the optimism and potential for growth in India's aviation sector, as indicated by the record-breaking \$70-billion deal for Air India to purchase 470 planes from Airbus and Boeing. The passage discusses the significance of the purchase in modernizing Air India's fleet and helping it to expand its network, which is crucial for the country's booming aviation sector. While there are still challenges that need to be addressed, such as infrastructure and reforms, the passage focuses on the positive developments in the industry. Therefore, option B is the correct answer. The paragraph that supports this answer is the first and the last paragraph of the passage. Option A does not suffice as the title for the passage because the matter is not how Air India rose after collapse. Option C is too general. Also, whether it is dominance over West is not communicated in the passage. The deal is about bringing of India closer to the Western camp. Option D is written off, for the passage does not discuss the journey of Air India.

107. (a) The passage mentions that the UK Prime Minister Rishi Sunak welcomed the Air India deal and specifically pointed out that Airbus will manufacture the wings in the UK. This is a subtle detail mentioned in the paragraph that shows the potential benefits of the deal for countries involved. The rest of the options have not been mentioned.

108. (d) Because the author argues that Air India's purchase of hundreds of aircraft has geo-economic and geopolitical ramifications and enhances the image of corporate India, highlighting the India Story as "vibrant and interesting." Therefore, if the purchase of new aircraft does not represent a positive sign for India's economy, it would weaken the author's argument. The paragraph that justifies this answer is the last one, where the author calls for the government to prioritize infrastructure, such as airport expansion, and expedite reforms to ensure smaller towns have access to air travel. The author suggests that an imminent boom in the aviation sector is heartening, but this relies on improvements in infrastructure and reforms. Option A has been mentioned in the passage by the author, but with respect to congestions at the airports, but since the passage is about how the purchase will inform the world about the vibrant and interesting India Story, and the economic gains along with strategic placing of India globally, it does not weaken the fundamentals of the passage. Option B cannot weaken for it is a future impact that cannot be taken as one of the options. Option C only strengthens the claims made in the passage.

109. (c) The author argues that the authorities must prioritize airport expansion to ensure the success of the recent aircraft purchase by Indian carriers. This is

between India and Japan would work on the agenda covered in the India-Japan Energy Dialogue 2007 and will subsequently expand into areas of mutual benefit.

57. (c) Japan's Asia Energy Transition Initiative (AETI), launched in **2021**, initially supported the Association of South East Asian Nations (ASEAN) countries towards achieving net zero emissions, including financial assistance of \$10 billion for renewable energy.
58. (c) India has set an ambitious target of achieving net zero by 2070. Japan has initiated a goal of becoming net zero by **2050**. The countries are utilising new technologies and economic models that would help reduce emissions.
59. (d) As per the information provided, India's **Western Dedicated Freight Corridor (DFC) project** is funded by a soft loan provided by Japan International Cooperation Agency under Special terms for economic partnership (STEP).
60. (b) Headquartered at **Jakarta**, Indonesia, The Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN) is a regional intergovernmental organization comprising ten countries in Southeast Asia. Its member countries include Brunei, Cambodia, Indonesia, Laos, Malaysia, Myanmar, the Philippines, Singapore, Thailand, and Vietnam. ASEAN was founded on August 8, 1967, with the signing of the ASEAN Declaration or the Bangkok Declaration.
61. (d) Sale of gold jewellery and gold artefacts hallmarked without a **six**-digit alphanumeric HUID — unique identification number — shall not be permitted from April 1, the government said.
62. (a) The Bureau of India Standards (BIS) has prohibited the sale of hallmarked gold jewelry or gold artefacts without 6-digit alphanumeric Hallmark Unique Identification Number (HUID) after 31st **March 2023**.
63. (c) In India, at present, two precious metals, namely **gold and silver**, have been brought under the purview of Hallmarking.
64. (b) The most commonly used method to check the purity of a diamond is the **Loupe Test**. A Loupe is a small magnifying glass that allows jewelers to examine the diamond closely for any imperfections, scratches, and blemishes. The jeweler will examine the diamond under magnification to look for any inclusions, which are impurities or other imperfections within the diamond that can affect its clarity and value. The Loupe Test is a quick and easy way to determine the quality of a diamond and is considered to be the most accurate method of assessing diamond quality. While other methods such as the Scratch Test or Fire Test can be used to test the hardness and authenticity of a diamond, they are less reliable and less commonly used in the jewelry industry. The UV Light Test can also be used to detect some treatments on diamonds, but it

is not a reliable method for determining the purity of a diamond.

65. (a) India is not a major producer of gold, but it has significant gold reserves. The primary gold mines in India are located in **Karnataka**, Jharkhand, Rajasthan, and Andhra Pradesh. The largest gold mine in India in terms of reserves is located in the state of Karnataka. The Kolar Gold Fields (KGF) is a gold mine located in the Kolar district of Karnataka. The mine was closed in 2001 due to low gold prices and increasing production costs. However, recent reports suggest that the mine might reopen due to rising gold prices.

SECTION – C: LEGAL REASONING

66. (a) Both Statement I and II are correct and the same can be inferred from the last para of the passage that states that Sub-clause (e) of Article 102(1) says an MP will lose his membership of the House “if he is so disqualified by or under any law made by Parliament”. The law in this case is the RP Act. Section 8 of the RP Act deals with disqualification of a lawmaker for conviction in certain offences. Hence, it can be said that Sub-clause (e) of Article 102 provides for disqualification under any law made by Parliament, and it includes the Representation of the People Act. Statement III is not correct as no such information can be inferred from the context of the passage. Statement IV is not correct as Once the conviction has been stayed during the pendency of an appeal, the disqualification which operates as a consequence of the conviction cannot take or remain in effect. Therefore option A is correct.
67. (c) Option C is correct as article 102 deals with the disqualification of a member of a parliament and not a member of legislative assembly. Option A is therefore not correct as Rajesh will win as his disqualification is not valid under Article 102 of the Constitution. Option B and D are thus incorrect because his disqualification meets all of the elements of section 8 but not of section 102.
68. (c) Option C is correct and not option D. AS per the passage, Article 102 of the Constitution deals with grounds for disqualification of a parliamentarian. Sub-clause (e) of Article 102(1) says an MP will lose his membership of the House “if he is so disqualified by or under any law made by Parliament”. The law in this case is the RP Act. Section 8 of the RP Act deals with disqualification of a lawmaker for conviction in certain offences. In pursuance of this information it can be safely concluded that the reasoning given for the disqualification of Rahul is valid. Option A is incorrect as Sub-clause (e) of Article 102(1) says an MP will lose his membership of the House “if he is so disqualified by or under any law made by Parliament. It is not the case that the

disqualification could only be made by a law made by Parliament and not under any other law as even the Constitution under Article 102 provides for grounds of disqualification.

Option B is certain towards declaring RP act as a law made by the parliament. As it says Parliament has the power to enact laws providing for disqualification of MPs on various grounds, and such laws could include the Representation of the People Act. But the most appropriate answer in this case would be option C and not B, as it is directly related to the reasoning given by the committee. Hence, option B is incorrect.

69. (a) The passage states that Section 8(3) of the Representation of the People Act, 1951 states that “a person convicted of any offence and sentenced to imprisonment for not less than two years shall be disqualified from the date of such conviction and shall continue to be disqualified for a further period of six years since his release.” Here Mr. X was merely tried by the court and it has not yet convicted or acquitted Mr. X. Hence, it can be said that Mr. X is not disqualified as a member of parliament since he was only being tried in court. Thus, option A is correct. Thus, option A is correct and Option D is incorrect

Option B is incorrect since the passage does not say that a Member of Parliament is disqualified until the court's ruling. Option C is incorrect because if a member of parliament is acquitted, he will remain a member of parliament and will not be disqualified.

70. (d) As per the passage, it is only when the conviction has been stayed during the pendency of an appeal, the disqualification which operates as a consequence of the conviction cannot take or remain in effect. Hence, the act of refraining Mr. X from entering the assembly is valid. Thus, option A is incorrect and option D is correct. Option B is not correct as the question refers to Mr. X as a Member of Parliament and not legislative assembly. Option C is not correct as if his conviction was not stayed while his appeal was pending then refraining Mr. X from entering the assembly is constitutional.

71. (d) Option A is not correct. As per the paragraph makes no mention of the authorities having to show sufficient evidence for detaining a person without a formal charge or trial. Option B is not correct as the reasoning given is irrelevant to the order of detention. He was arrested as he is considered a potential threat to national security due to his alleged involvement in extremist activities and his affiliation with a group that had been linked to terrorist organizations in the past. Hence, option D is correct as the Act allows the state to detain a person without a formal charge and without trial to prevent them from acting in any manner prejudicial to the security of the state. Option C while may be true factually but no such information can be inferred directly from the passage.

72. (b) Option B is the correct answer. As per the passage, Article 22 of the Indian Constitution lays down the procedure for preventive detention and provides certain safeguards to the individual who has been detained. It includes the right to make an effective representation before an independent advisory board, which consists of three members, chaired by a member who is, or has been, a judge of a high court. Therefore, option A is incorrect as Article 22 does not specifically address the issue of inhumane conditions of detention and states that the rights available to an arrested person will not be applicable in case of preventive detention.

Option C is not correct as the inhumane conditions of John's detention were not authorized by law, and therefore, they were a violation of his fundamental rights. However it would not affect the validity of his detention under Article 22, unless there was a violation of the procedures and safeguards provided under Article 22. Option D is correct but the argument given is not specific to the situation given. It states, Article 22 of the Indian Constitution lays down the procedure for preventive detention and provides “certain safeguards” to the individual who has been detained. Hence, option B is correct.

73. (d) Option D is correct. As per the information given in last line of para two, that states that “It is an administrative order passed by the Divisional Commissioner or the District Magistrate, and not detention ordered by police based on specific allegations or for a specific violation of the law”. Here, it can be seen that the police acted on the information received and arrested Mark. Hence, the Mark's claim will succeed and his arrest is not justified. Option A, while may be true on facts, but cannot be considered as the police did not follow the procedure given by the act. Option B is also incorrect for similar reason. Option C would have been correct if Mark was detained on an order passed by the Divisional Commissioner or the District Magistrate.

74. (d) Option D is correct. Both option A and B are individually correct and suggests right defence to both the parties. As per the passage an individual can be detained without a charge for a maximum period of 12 months. His parent's contention was also correct as one crucial procedural safeguard under the NSA is granted under Article 22(5), where all the detained persons have the right to make an effective representation. Option C is incorrect as the statement provides for an argument which cannot be inferred from the facts given.

75. (b) Option B is correct. As per the passage, one crucial procedural safeguard under the NSA is granted under Article 22(5), where all the detained persons have the right to make an effective representation before an independent advisory board, which consists of three members, chaired by a member who is, or has been, a judge of a high court. Hence

in the present case, Rajesh's parents cannot claim violation of article 22(5) as the case of related to quashing of writ petition and not a case where Rajesh has been denied of his right under article 22(5). Hence, option A is not in favor of Rajesh. Thus, not correct. Option C is not correct as the passage is silent on the information that no petition of habeas corpus can be filed in cases of preventive detention. Option D is incorrect as the passage suggests one safeguard to detained person i.e., right to effective representation. Hence, it cannot be said that there are no right available to an arrested person in cases of preventive detention

76. (c) Option C is the right answer. There is not a matter of sexual harassment since the senior's actions do not establish a situation in which continuous insistence on turning on the camera amounts to creating intimidating, offensive, or unpleasant work environments for workers, which constitutes sexual harassment. Therefore, option D is negated. Option A and B are not correct as physical contact between the accused and the victim is irrelevant while determining a case of sexual harassment under POSH.
77. (a) From the very first paragraph of the passage, it is clear that that sexual acts in work from home will also come under POSH ACT. Hence, clearly option A is the correct answer. Option B is not correct as it states that the employee is not correct.. Option C is not correct as Home is also a workplace as all the employees were working from home due to COVID. Option D is ipso facto negated.
78. (a) Option A is right since it is evident that Shalini's senior employee merely wants her to turn on the camera so that he ensures shalini is working and not fooling around. As a result, he will not be held accountable, and options B and D will be rejected. Option C is incorrect since the passage does not clarify that sexual harassment allegations under POSH may be lodged exclusively against an employer, not an employee.
79. (c) Option C is the right answer. According to the last paragraph of the passage, an employee is any female who works or is associated with a workplace purpose to earn remuneration. In the present case Trapti worked here only to learn and not to earn remuneration. As a result, she is not an employee, therefore the answer is C. Option D is not correct as the firm will be deemed to be workplace. Option A is incorrect as it is clear from the facts that Trapti was subjected to sexual harassment. The rationale in Option B is correct, but the answer is no since Trapti is not an employee and so Rajeev cannot be held accountable under the POSH Act.
80. (b) Preferential treatment in the workplace associated with any act or behaviour of sexual harassment may amount to sexual harassment, although there was no incident of sexual harassment that can be seen in the facts given. As a result, the correct answer is B.

Option A is thus ruled out. Option D is erroneous since the facts show no evidence of interference with Trapti's work. Option D is another statement that cannot be deduced from the facts provided. As a result, it is incorrect.

81. (a) Option A is correct. "A transgender person may make an application to the District Magistrate for issuing a certificate of identity as a transgender person" Option B is not correct as no information is provided regarding challenging the law on the basis of law being discriminatory. Option C is not correct as the Bill also mandated the imposition of screening committees and stripped members of the trans community of the right to self-determination of their gender identity. Option D is not correct as it is a suggestive answer with no reasoning backed from the passage.
82. (a) Option A is correct. "The 2018 Bill also stipulated a punishment of only up to two years for sexual violence against a trans person as opposed to seven years of imprisonment for sexual violence against non-trans women." Therefore, option B is negated. Option C is not correct as the passage is silent on the information that perpetrators will only be punished after the accusations are proved by the victim. Option D is incorrect because the passage only refers to the penalty under the Transgender Act, not the IPC.
83. (d) Option D is correct. Though as per our general understanding the property should be shared among all the legal heirs yet there is no information regarding the right to inheritance been granted to transgender in the given passage and therefore answer is option D.
84. (b) Option B is correct. The 2018 Bill stipulated a punishment of only up to two years for sexual violence against a trans person. Here since Varun Shohar was sexually assaulted by his manager. Hence, he will succeed. Option A is negated as the passage is silent on the right of privacy of a trans person. Option C is not correct as it provides a preachy response. Option D might be correct, but the facts do not provide any information on the subject that whether or not Varun holds an identity certificate. Hence, this option is not considered.
85. (d) Option D is correct. According to the passage, the 2018 bill does not include a provision for transgender community reservation. As a result, it is unclear whether Yashika will continue or leave college now that she is no longer identified as a female.
86. (b) Option B is correct. Bill that required members of the community to reside with their birth family or be placed at a rehabilitation centre. The passage do not states that she can live separately only if her family abandons her. Hence, option A is negated. Option C and D both are suggestive responses.
87. (d) D is the correct answer with respect to the question asked because as per the passage, "The Bench

clarified that the Joseph Shine Judgment did not apply to members of the armed forces who are accused of 'conduct unbecoming' and dismissed the application.", the said option runs contrary to this statement, thereby rendering it incorrect. The rest of the options are correct and can be directly concluded from the passage itself.

88. (b) The correct answer is B because, according to the passage, the decriminalization of adultery does not apply to the Armed Forces. Option A and D are also eliminated for the same reason. C is incorrect because it provides a correct answer but incorrect reasoning.
89. (c) The correct answer is C because, according to the passage, the Joseph Shine Judgment did not apply to members of the armed forces accused of "conduct unbecoming." J shall not be held liable because he was not yet employed or serving the armed forces when he committed the said act and was only a citizen of the country for which the offense had been decriminalized. Options A and D are also eliminated for the same reason. B is not the correct answer because the exception includes the Army, Navy, and Air Force.
90. (b) The correct answer is B and not option D. In Joseph Shine Judgment, the SC struck down Section 497 of the IPC that criminalised adultery, ruling that it was unconstitutional and violated women's right to equality in treating them as inferior to their husbands. Hence, the contention of W is correct as he is a retired officer and the passage states that the Joseph Shine Judgment did not apply to serving members of the armed forces who are accused of 'conduct unbecoming' and dismissed the application. Option A is negated as W is a retired officer and hence cannot be held liable for the offence of adultery. Option C is negated as it is a suggestive response.
91. (b) The correct answer is option B, since G became sexually involved with a married woman when he was posted. As per the passage, Armed forces would be at liberty to initiate disciplinary proceedings against serving officers and personnel for adultery notwithstanding that the Supreme Court had decriminalized the offence in 2018. Hence, the charge is valid and option B is correct and not option A. Option C and D are eliminated as both give suggestive response.
92. (c) The correct answer is C. The Supreme Court in multiple judgments has held that without prior TIP, first time identification in the Court is considered as very weak evidence. In the present case, Akash identified Mohit directly in the court, which is weak evidence and can, thus, lead to acquittal. As a result option A is incorrect and hence cannot be considered. option B is not correct as the TIP is to be conducted without any delay as the main purpose of the TIP is to identify the accused person before the memory of the witness fades. The unexplained

delay in conducting TIP may be fatal to the case of the prosecution. Although it was not the case that the police had no explanation for the delay, the judge rejected the case since Mohit was recognised in court by Akash without any previous TIP undertaken by the police. Option D is incorrect because, in the absence of prior TIP, first-time identification in court is regarded as very weak evidence.

93. (a) The correct answer is option C. After the identification of the accused, it is relevant that the witness identifies the accused person before the Court as well and it is then the TIP becomes substantive evidence. In the present case, the victim failed to identify the suspect in the court, therefore identification in the TPI alone does not become substantive evidence. Hence, both option B as well as option D is not correct as they state that identification in the TIP suffices as the evidence. Option C is though correct but option A is considered correct as it takes into consideration both the result of identification parade conducted by police and the instance where the accused could not be identified before the court by the victim.
94. (b) The correct answer is (B). The TIP is to be conducted without any delay as the main purpose of the TIP is to identify the accused person before the memory of the witness fades. The unexplained delay in conducting TIP may be fatal to the case of the prosecution. In the present case, the delay was due to lackadaisical attitude of the police, which is without any reasonable explanation. Therefore, accused shall not be reasonably convicted on the result of TPI alone. Hence, option A is incorrect as delay in conduction of TIP plays a vital role in the investigation process. Option C is incorrect as the argument given is suggestive in nature. It certainly cannot be concluded that Accused shall be convicted as legal procedure, if followed properly, even with delay leads to the same conclusion. The court shall rely on the identification and convict the accused.
95. (a) The correct answer is option A. The TIP is to be conducted by the investigating agency in presence of the magistrate, it is through these identification parades the investigating agency ascertains whether the suspect of the crime is the real culprit or not. In the present case, TIP was conducted in absence of a magistrate and thus cannot be relied on. Option D is therefore incorrect as it cannot be said that the procedure of TIP was proceeded with the order of the magistrate and thus was conducted under the supervision of the magistrate. Option B is not correct as the accused were identified in pressure and in the absence of the magistrate. Hence, the accused cannot be convicted. Option C is true but a fact based answer. However, option A is the correct answer.
96. (b) The correct answer is option B. The passage mentions that the TIP shall be conducted without

any delay but no such time period of one week is mentioned in the passage. All the other options can be inferred from the passage directly from para 1 and para 3 of the passage.

97. (d) The correct answer is option D. Even though Shina had invited her to see the drawing room only but since there was no wall between the kitchen and the drawing room, if the area to which a person is lawfully invited and one which is the prohibited area has not been properly marked, a person does not become a trespasser merely by going beyond the area of invitation

Option A is incorrect as even though Meena was only invited to the drawing room, the boundary between the drawing room and the kitchen was not clearly visible due to which her, entering the kitchen won't amount to trespass.

Option B is incorrect as Shina gave permission to Meena impliedly to enter the drawing room; Meena's entering the kitchen due to inability to view the boundary between the two won't in itself make her liable.

Option C is incorrect as intention is not that essential here. There is no trespass not just because she did not have an intention.

98. (c) The correct answer is option C. Bheem will be liable of TRESPASS AB INITIO. Even though he had originally lawfully entered there, the law considers him to be a trespasser from the very beginning and presumes that he had gone there with that wrongful purpose in mind.

Option A is incorrect as he had the lawful authority only to enter Raju's garden. Since he exceeded his authority and entered Raju's room, he will be liable of trespass to land.

Option B is incorrect as when a person enters certain premises under the authority of some law and after having entered there, abuses that authority by committing some wrongful act there, he will be trespasser ab initio to that property. The law considers him to be a trespasser from the very beginning and presumes that he had gone there with that wrongful purpose in mind.

Option D is incorrect as the passage here talks about trespass. Bheem might be liable of theft but that is not the point of discussion here. Keeping the situation given here in mind and analysing all the facts, we can say that Bheem is liable of trespass ab initio.

99. (b) The correct answer is option B. Hari can sue Munna as Trespass is a wrong against possession rather than ownership. Therefore, a person in actual possession can bring an action even though, against the true owner, his possession was wrongful.

Option A is incorrect as one need not necessarily be the owner of the land to sue for trespass. Mere possession can bring an action against defendant for trespass.

Option C is incorrect as a person in actual possession can bring an action even though, against the true owner, his possession was wrongful. The trespasser is not allowed to take the defence of "jus tertii."- title of 3rd person, i.e., the trespasser cannot plead that as between some third party and the person in possession, the title of the third party is better.

Option D is incorrect as it is irrelevant here whether the third party is government or some private entity. Mere status of third party would not make any change in the general principle here.

100. (a) The correct answer is option A. Sakina will not be liable of trespass as when there is no inference with the possession and the defendant has been merely deprived of certain facilities like gas and electricity, such a scenario cannot be termed as Trespass

Option B is incorrect as even though the short circuit had caused discomfort to Hamidabut merely that will not make Sakina liable of trespass as one of the essentials of trespass is the interference with the possession which is absent here.

Option C is incorrect as even though the short circuit was caused due to the work at Sakina's home but that in itself will not make her liable of trespass.

101. (a) The correct answer is option A. He will be liable of trespass since there is an authorised right to be on the land, that right must not be exceeded or abused, otherwise, a trespass may have been committed. He has committed trespass by not leaving the premise even after told by the authorities.

Option B is incorrect as even though he entered the premise with a ticket but due to his unlawful act of plucking the flower, he was asked by the authorities to leave the place. By not adhering to this instruction, he had committed trespass.

Option C is incorrect as even though the monument was a public place, there still were certain restrictions imposed. Not following them amounted to trespass.

Option D is incorrect as even though he is liable of trespass but the reasoning given is not sufficient as per the facts given here.

102. (a) The correct answer is option A. Since here the bill passed was violating article 19 of the constitution which is only available to the citizens of India, it will be declared void as per Article 13.

Option B is incorrect as though it may be termed as a fact-based answer, without any reason attached as to arriving to such a decision. Thus, much better answer in this case, will be option A.

Option C is incorrect as even though article 19 is subject to certain limitations but those limitations should be reasonable. Here since the limitations were not reasonable, we can say that there is a violation of article 19 and so the law will become void to some extent.

Option D is incorrect as there is a clear-cut violation of article 19 of the constitution. Passing such bill

puts a limitation of freedom of speech given to the citizens under part III of the constitution.

103. (b) The correct answer is option B. Since the section which abridges the fundamental right can be severed from the act then by applying the doctrine of severability, only the offending provision would be declared void by the court and not the entire act under Article 13 of the constitution.

Option A is incorrect as the given section is not important so much that it cannot be severed from the statute. Since it can be severed from the act then only the section will become void and rest of the statute will still be effective under article 13 of the constitution.

Option C is incorrect as from the fact situation given it can be easily inferred that there is a violation of right to privacy. Since there is a violation then by applying the doctrine of severability, that part of the statute which violated the fundamental right will be declared void under article 13.

Option D is incorrect as even though the section will become void but by applying the doctrine of severability and not the doctrine of eclipse.

104. (b) The correct answer is option B. There is no violation of article 13 as it is clearly provided that it makes only those laws void that are inconsistent with the fundamental rights given under part III of the constitution. In this case, there is violation of a legal right only.

Option A is incorrect as there is no violation of article 13 as this article does not include violation of legal right but only the violation of fundamental rights.

Option C is incorrect as firstly there is no violation and secondly the reasoning given is flawed.

Option D is incorrect as even though there is no violation of article 13 but the reasoning given is not correct. What makes a law void under this article is not the fact whether it is justified or not but that it should not be inconsistent with the fundamental rights.

105. (c) The correct answer is option C. As per clause (1) of article 13 any law that had been in force in the country before the commencement of the constitution if found to be inconsistent with the fundamental rights, would be declared void to the extent of its inconsistency. Since section 5 violated the fundamental right of minority, it will be declared void.

Option A is incorrect as both sections will not be declared void just because they are pre-constitutional. Under Article 13(1), only those pre-constitutional laws are declared void which are inconsistent with the fundamental rights. Here, only Section 5 dealt with the violation of fundamental right.

Option B is incorrect as only Section 5 will be declared void under article 13 of the constitution as it is inconsistent with the fundamental rights. Article

17 will not be declared void under this article since it talks about violation of a legal right and not a fundamental right.

Option D is incorrect as even if we apply the doctrine of severability here, the whole act will not be struck down since only one section here violated the fundamental right and that after getting severed from the act does not in itself make the act ineffective altogether.

SECTION - D : LOGICAL REASONING

106. (b) The passage's main idea is that the G20 Finance Ministers and Central Bank Governors met in Bengaluru and released a summary note highlighting the need to address debt vulnerabilities of low and middle-income countries, progress made on cryptocurrencies, and the difficult task ahead for India's G20 presidency. The passage mentions that the meeting did not release a communique condemning Russia's war on Ukraine due to a lack of consensus among the members. Option A is incorrect because the passage explicitly mentions that the meeting could only release a summary note, not a communique. Option C is incorrect because the passage mentions progress made on several agenda items, including debt vulnerabilities and cryptocurrencies. Option D is incorrect because the passage mentions progress made on the issue of cryptocurrencies, and the need to address debt vulnerabilities of low and middle-income countries was discussed in the summary note.

107. (c) The passage mentions that the G20 Finance Ministers and Central Bank Governors meeting in Bengaluru could not release a communique due to lack of consensus in the wording of the text, as Russia and China opposed the paragraphs in the communique that condemned Russia's war on Ukraine. The passage further states that "the Ukraine war is likely to shadow Delhi's G20 presidency," indicating that the conflict played a major role in the meeting's outcome. Option a is incorrect because the passage explicitly states that the meeting did not release a detailed communique. Option b is partially correct, as the meeting did address the debt vulnerabilities of low and middle income countries, but this was not the main focus of the meeting. Option d is also partially correct, as the meeting did make progress towards developing an international governance architecture for cryptocurrencies, but this was not the primary focus of the meeting either.

108. (c) The author emphasizes the importance of the G20 Finance Ministers and Central Bank Governors meeting, arguing that it covered a lot of ground on important issues like international financial architecture and sustainable finance. Option C weakens this argument by suggesting that the G20 failed to address other important concerns like

- (°C) in this century, thereby failing the Paris Agreement's mandate.
58. (a) India has planned to execute its 6G project in **two** stages, the initial phase being between 2023 and 2025, followed by the second phase from 2025 to 2030.
59. (d) Modi formally launched 5G services in **October 2022** and said at the time that India should be ready to launch 6G services in the next 10 years.
60. (d) As opposed to 5G, which at its peak can offer internet speeds up to 10 Gbps, 6G promises to offer ultra-low latency with speeds up to **1 Tbps**.
61. (c) Aatmanirbhar Bharat Abhiyan is the mission started by the Government of India on **13th May 2020**, towards making India Self-reliant.
62. (b) 6G networks will operate by using signals at the higher end of the radio spectrum. LG, a South Korean company, unveiled this type of technology based on adaptive beamforming in 2021.
63. (d) To fund research and innovation on 6G, the document recommended the creation of a corpus of **Rs 10,000 crore** to facilitate various funding instruments such as grants, loans, VC fund, fund of funds, etc. for the next 10 years. "Two tiers of grants are proposed i.e. up to Rs 20 crore to service funding requirements ranging from small to medium and grants above Rs 20 crore for high impact projects," the document said.
64. (c) In India Internet service was first thrown open to the public on **August 15, 1995**.
65. (c) In a bid to revive the ailing telecom firm BSNL, the government in July 2022 had approved its merger with Bharat Broadband Network Ltd (BBNL). The Union Cabinet approved a revival package of **Rs 1.64 lakh crore**, telecom minister Ashwini Vaishnaw said. The package has a cash component of Rs 43,964 crore and a non-cash component of Rs 1.2 lakh crore spread over 4 years.

SECTION – C: LEGAL REASONING

66. (c) The correct answer is (c). Option (a) is incorrect as NPTV's actions do not threaten the integrity, security, sovereignty of India by merely criticising the government. Similarly, option (b) is incorrect. Option (d) justifies the acts of NPTV by talking about absolute fundamental right to freedom of expression which is incorrect and irrelevant in context of the passage. Option (c) rightly points out that being critical of the government does not make NPTV liable under UAPA, and therefore, it is the correct option.
67. (d) The correct answer is (d). Option (a) is incorrect because the statement is clearly an opinion of hers and sedition is irrelevant in the context of the passage. Option (b) is incorrect because a mere opinion of a person with no eventual consequences does not undermine or threaten the unity, security or sovereignty of India. Although option (c) is partially

- correct that Vamulya is not guilty, the reasoning given is incorrect. The fundamental right to freedom of expression comes along with reasonable restrictions and is not absolute. This makes option (c) incorrect.
68. (a) The correct answer is option (a). Option (b) is incorrect because her statement is not anti-national. Being critical of the government policies does not make one an anti-national or liable under UAPA. Option (c) might seem like the correct option but it is not owing to the fact that the protests were peaceful and there was no threat to the security or integrity of India. While it is true that Vamulya's right to freedom of expression is not absolute, option (d) is incorrect as Vamulya is not guilty under UAPA. Therefore, option (a) is correct as mere criticism of the government followed by peaceful protests does not make one liable under UAPA.
69. (c) The correct option is (c). Option (a) is irrelevant because it is highlighting the liability of PunalPamra in context of sedition. Option (b) is incorrect because it does not matter if PunalPamra took part in the protests or not. His statement of changing the regime through 'trial by combat' following which a group of people started attacking the parliament inspired by his statement is enough to make him liable under UAPA. And therefore, option (c) is correct. Option (d) is incorrect because it is irrelevant whether his statement was right or wrong.
70. (b) The correct answer is option (b). Option (a) is incorrect as it is mentioned in the passage that the ruling party tried to paint the protest in a bad light by alleging it to be foreign funded, and therefore, we cannot say for surety that the protest is actually foreign funded. Option (c) is clearly incorrect because the passage talked nothing about the organisation to which Irfan belonged. Option (d) is incorrect because reasonable restrictions over fundamental rights is not mentioned in the passage and therefore, irrelevant.
71. (c) Option C is a correct answer. Mukesh Mehra put Om on fear and caused him threat by saying that he will put Shanti on fire. Om who is pyrophobic (fear of fire) got scared and delivered his one lakh. Here Muksh has committed extortion as while doing so he had mala fide intention. option A is also correct but it provides an incomplete statement, hence, option C is considered. Option B is not correct as there was no injury caused he only put Om in fear of injury. Option D is incorrect as he possessed mala fide intention to make Om transfer one lakh rupees to him which he won at Film Fare Awards.
72. (c) Option C is the correct answer. The three essential elements mentioned in the above passage are not fulfilled in the given situation. The third ingredient of "deliver property or valuable security" is not fulfilled and therefore it will not amount to the case of extortion. Hence, both option A and B are negated as Mr. Joss will not succeed. Option D is not correct

- as no such reference can be inferred from the passage.
73. (b) Option B is correct. Putting a person in fear of injury to body, property or reputation is an important ingredient from causing extortion. The same is missing in the present case and therefore Rachel will not be held liable. Option A is therefore not correct. Option C is incorrect as Rachel had dishonest intention as she was only interested in getting the possession of the mug. Option D is a suggestive option. Hence, the same is negated.
74. (b) Option B is correct and not option C. Whoever intentionally puts any person in fear of any injury to that person, or to any other, and thereby dishonestly induces the person so put in fear to deliver to any person any property or valuable security, or anything signed or sealed which may be converted into a valuable security, commits "extortion". As there was no demand for valuable security or property, this will not amount to a case of extortion. Also option A is not correct as it mentions another offence of outraging the modesty of a woman which forms no mention in the passage.
75. (c) Option C is the correct answer. "It is a non-bailable offence and cannot be compounded." And therefore it cannot be settled outside the court. Therefore both option A and B are negated as it states that it is bailable offence and can be settled outside the court. Option D is incorrect as extortion is a non-bailable offence.
76. (d) As per the passage CCTV footage as evidence is enough to establish the actus reus at the instance of the accused person if such footage is proper and clear and the origin of the CCTV is proved beyond reasonable doubt. In the present case, even though the origin of the footage might not be in question, but the footage is not proper and clear, and therefore is not an absolute proof of actus reus and hence culpability. Option A is incorrect for the same reasons as stated above, that if the footage is unclear it cannot be used as an evidence, even though the description of the perpetrator deduced from the footage perfectly matches the accused. Option B is incorrect as the video does not even prove that the conductor took Parth with him, as the footage was unclear. Option C is incorrect as the information in the passage is not enough to deduce whether unclear CCTV footage when corroborated by other evidence is enough to prove culpability.
77. (a) The correct answer is option A. The Apex Court in *Tomaso Bruno v State of U.P.*, observed that CCTV footage is a strong piece of evidence which could establish the crime. If the CCTV footage is proper and clear and the origin of the CCTV is proved beyond reasonable doubt, it will be enough to establish the actus reus at the instance of the accused person. Therefore option A is correct. option B is incorrect as evidentiary value of the footage has nothing to do with the two accused's knowledge regarding the comic books in the store. option C is incorrect as the requirement of certificate was done away with in *Arjun Panditrao's case*, if the original document itself is produced before the Court for inspection. option D is incorrect because the passage suggests no such requirement of authentication by an authority.
78. (d) The correct answer is D. Assertion is incorrect as even when the recording and the testimony of eyewitnesses are not corroborating with each other, if the origin of the CCTV is proved beyond reasonable doubt, it will be enough to establish the actus reus at the instance of the accused person. This means even when there is a contradiction between the two, CCTV footage can still be an evidence the criminal act of the accused person. Statement given in R for the same stated reasons is very evidently correct.
79. (c) The correct answer is option C. As per the passage in *Arjun Panditrao's case*, the requirement of certificate was held unnecessary if the original document is produced as evidence. However, in case of a secondary document, as in the present case, a certificate is still required to be submitted along with the electronic document to prove it as evidence in a court, as per section 65B (4) of the Indian Evidence Act. Therefore Option C is correct. Option A is incorrect as corroboration of the footage by a witness is not a requisite to submit electronic evidence before the court. Option B is incorrect as the passage does not state that electronic evidence cannot be solely relied on by the court to determine guilt of an accused. Option D is incorrect as it states a speculation which is not even a material consideration to the question asked.
80. (b) The correct answer is option B. The question is not asking you to determine the guilt, the use of words 'can' in the option means if CCTV can be used to determine the guilt. Even when the recording and the testimony of eyewitnesses do not corroborate with each other, if the CCTV footage is proper and clear and the origin of the CCTV is proved beyond reasonable doubt, it will be enough to establish the actus reus at the instance of the accused person. In the present case, there are not doubts against the footage in which case it would be clear and proper. Thus, option B is correct and option A is incorrect. Option C is incorrect as it is false, as the passage does not talk about any non-visual aspects of the crime scene not covered by the CCTV. Option D is incorrect as it is also false and there is no certainty from the passage on whether CCTV footage is preferred as an evidence or not.
81. (b) The correct answer is option B. The certificate under section 64B (4) is unnecessary if the original document itself is produced before the Court for inspection. This proposition was upheld by the Supreme Court in *Arjun Panditrao's case*. In the present case, since the hard drive where the data is

originally stored has been furnished there is no need for the certificate as stipulated in the section 65B (4) of the Evidence Act. Therefore, option B is correct and option C is incorrect and therefore eliminated. Option A is incorrect as the original hard drive has itself been produced before the court, hence the option is false. Option D is incorrect as corroborating evidence is not a material consideration while deciding on the requirement of the certificate under section 65B (4).

82. (c) C is the correct answer because the passage discusses the concept of promissory estoppel, which is a doctrine used to enforce agreements that lack consideration. The Supreme Court listed out a checklist in the Chhaganlal Keshavalal Mehta v. Patel Narandas Haribhai case for applying the doctrine of promissory estoppel. The checklist includes three elements: a clear and unambiguous promise, the plaintiff acting reasonably relying on that promise, and the plaintiff suffering a loss. C accurately summarizes the three elements listed in the checklist, making it the correct answer. A, B, and D do not accurately reflect the details of the passage hence they can be eliminated.
83. (c) The correct answer is C, because according to the passage; a valid contract under law requires an agreement to be made with sufficient consideration. Since there was no consideration in this case, there is no valid agreement. B is not the correct answer because of the lack of consideration. Option A is eliminated because there could be a contract between friends. D is not the right answer because it lacks legal reasoning.
84. (a) The correct answer is A because, according to the passage, in order to apply the doctrine of promissory estoppel, there must first be a clear and unambiguous promise. Given that X only discussed his plans with T and did not specifically promise to buy any oil, there was no clear promise made by X, and thus he cannot be held liable under promissory estoppel. As a result, options C and D are incorrect answers. B is incorrect because it provides irrelevant reasoning.
85. (c) The correct answer is D, because the passage includes a checklist for when the doctrine can be used. First, a clear and unambiguous promise must be made. Second, the plaintiff must have acted reasonably based on the promise. Third, the plaintiff must have suffered some sort of loss. Promissory estoppel cannot be used in this case because the last two requirements have not been met. As a result, options B and C are eliminated. A is incorrect because it provides irrelevant reasoning.
86. (d) D is the correct answer with respect to the question asked because as per the passage, multiple factors are looked at while assessing a request for compassionate appointments, such as the financial condition of the family, among other factors. Option A is incorrect as the government servant must retire

on medical grounds before the age of 55. Option B is incorrect as the government servant must have been appointed on a regular basis, not on a daily wage basis. Option C is incorrect as the family members of an Armed Forces employee who is unfit for civil employment are eligible for compassionate appointments.

87. (b) The correct answer is B because, in accordance with the passage, a government employee's dependent family members may also receive a compassionate appointment. T's wife has no cause to ask for a compassionate appointment because T worked for a private company. As a result, options A and C are excluded. Because the company's discretion is insignificant, answer D is incorrect.
88. (c) The correct answer is C because, according to the passage, Section 39 aims to give employment to dependent family members of a government employee who dies in the line of duty or retires due to illness, leaving the family without a source of assistance. His daughter is ineligible for a compassionate appointment because R did not retire for any medical reasons. As a result, we rule out option A. B is the wrong answer because it presents false information. Since R's son is already employed and cannot claim a compassionate appointment, D is not the right answer.
89. (c) The correct answer is C because, in accordance with the passage, a number of factors are taken into account when evaluating a request for compassionate appointments, including the family's financial situation, the presence of wage earners, the size of the family, the ages of the children, and the family's basic needs. Her claim might be turned down because there were other family members with earnings. This invalidates the justifications offered in options B and D as well. A is not an appropriate answer because it provides flawed logic of only including men in the compassionate appointment category which is not a criteria at all.
90. (d) The correct answer is D because, according to the passage, the government employee must have been hired on a regular basis rather than as a daily wage employee, casual worker, apprentice, ad hoc hire, contract worker, or rehire in order to be eligible for a compassionate appointment. As a result, we rule out options A and C because V's son lacks the legal justification for his claim of appointment. As a result of its irrelevant justification, option B is incorrect.
91. (c) The correct answer is option C because as per the passage, Section 73: Compensation for loss or damage caused by breach of contract: When a contract has been broken, the party who suffers by such breach is entitled to receive, from the party who has broken the contract, compensation for any loss or damage caused to him thereby. Such compensation is not to be given for any remote and indirect loss or damage sustained by reason of the breach, and since here the time was stipulated, and

there was a breach thereof by Sumair, so Sumair would be liable to pay Karan, the resultant damages. Option A is not correct answer because it does not matter ten hours is not a long time, because there is anyway anyhow a breach in contract because the time stipulated was 1st and the ship reached on 2nd. Option B is not the correct answer because there is no mention about whether Karan suffered from a loss or not, further just because the time period was not huge, we will not assume there were no losses suffered.

Option D is not the correct answer because it would fall under the category of unliquidated damages under section 73 of Indian contracts act, and it does not matter whether there was a clause regarding the same or not.

92. (a) The correct answer is option A because there was no breach in contract by B here. They had mentioned that the seeds being delivered were of the finest quality, however, there was no mention about a particular brand or anything, and so finest would mean different things for different people. This would not be called a breach of contract.

Option B is not the correct answer because again though we know that under contracts the parties have to agree on the same thing in the same manner, but since there is nothing mentioned about the same in the passage, we will not choose this option.

Option C is not the correct answer because again this goes beyond the scope of the passage, there is no such thing mentioned in the passage and we will not choose emotionally charged or an illogical option because this has no legal connotation to it.

Option D is not the correct answer because again the issue is not about delivery but it is about the word finest and the connotations to it, hence we will not choose this option.

93. (b) The correct answer is option B because delivery was an essential part of the entire contract and so, refusing delivery would lead to a breach in the contract, and so, since he refused delivery, he will be liable to compensate B.

Option A is not correct because him communicating he would not take the delivery still means that he is breaching the contract, so nevertheless still a breach.

Option C is not correct because again though that is true that they did not agree on a time, and so B could deliver anytime, however the issue is breach of contract which was because of A refusing the delivery, so this would not be the right answer.

Option D is not correct because unliquidated damages are covered under section 73 where we do not need any contract for the same.

94. (a) The correct answer is option A because since there was no mention of time period in the contract, three days, five days or two weeks would not be counted because it would not mean that the contract is broken or breached.

Option B and C are not the correct options because again, it does not matter if the time is two weeks or three weeks, since the party did not agree on any particular time period, they cannot claim a breach for the same.

Option D is not correct because though sure timely performance in contract is important and non-negotiable it would still not accrue here, because time was not mentioned by the parties in the contract so they cannot claim a failure here.

95. (a) The correct answer is option A because as the passage mentions, Secondly, to claim damages, the party making such claim must establish the loss as the existence of a loss or injury is indispensable for such claim of liquidated damages, and since here there was no loss suffered, there will be no sustenance for the claim of damages.

Option B is not correct because though sure the contract was breached, since there was no loss suffered, there will be no compensation awarded.

Option C is not correct answer because though Amar was still able to go to the fair what matters is that he did not suffer any loss and hence, no claim would be sustained, which is mentioned in option A so we will choose A.

Option D is not correct because though the clause mentioned that there will be awarding of damages by a party breaching the contract, still as the passage mentions that Secondly, to claim damages, the party making such claim must establish the loss as the existence of a loss or injury is indispensable for such claim of liquidated damages, and

since here there was no loss suffered, there will be no sustenance for the claim of damages, since there was no loss suffered there will be no compensation awarded.

96. (c) C is correct because the passage explicitly states that the Bombay High Court ruled that a daughter's right to family property will not be extinguished even if dowry was provided to her at the time of marriage, and that the deed transferring the petitioner daughter's property to her brothers without her consent was quashed. A is incorrect because the passage does not mention that the petitioner's brothers were declared as the rightful owners of the property beneath the suit shop. Option B is incorrect because while the petitioner's claim was challenged by her brothers on the basis of the statute of limitations, the court's ruling did not depend on this argument. D is also incorrect because the court did not find that the brothers' provision of sufficient dowry entitled them to the suit shop.

97. (b) The correct answer is B because, according to the passage, a daughter's right to family property does not expire even if dowry is given to her at the time of marriage. We eliminate options A and D because the Goa Bench of the Bombay High Court issued such a decision. C is not the correct answer because

- it provides for the share of the in laws in the dowry, the same is vague and irrelevant to the instant case.
98. (b) The correct answer is B because the passage states that a lawsuit to revoke a contract, annul a court order, or set aside an instrument must be filed within three years of the person knowing about it. Option A has been eliminated because P adhered to the limitation period. Because it contradicts the ruling of the Bombay High Court's Goa Bench, C is not the right answer. D is not the right answer because it offers no legal justification.
99. (c) The correct answer is C since according to the passage, the period of limitation prescribed for a suit to cancel or set aside an instrument or a decree or for the rescission of a contract is three years. Option A and D are eliminated because F followed the limitation period. B is not the correct answer because it is not in consonance with the reasoning laid out in the passage.
100. (a) The correct answer is A because, according to the passage, Article 59 of the Schedule to the Limitation Act of 1963 specifies a three-year limitation period for actions to annul, set aside, or rescind contracts. This period of time starts to run when the plaintiff first learns the facts that give him the right to have the instrument, decree, or contract annulled. We rule out options B and C because she only found out after the contract had been in effect for six years. D is not the right answer because it deviates from the Limitation Act's logic.
101. (b) B is the correct answer because, the assertion states that only registered medical practitioners with recommendations from the MCI or the Central government's AYUSH Department can run primary health clinics or Community health centres in rural areas. The reason provided states the definition of a registered medical practitioner as someone who possesses a government recognized medical qualification and is enrolled in the register of the respective medical councils or boards. While the reason is true, it does not directly explain the assertion as it does not mention the requirement of recommendations from the MCI or AYUSH Department. Therefore, both the assertion and reason are true, but the reason is not the correct explanation of the assertion, making option B the correct answer.
102. (b) The correct answer is B because, according to the passage, professionals are not permitted to operate a clinic in Tamil Nadu unless they have received a recommendation from the Medical Council of India or the AYUSH Department. Because this decision was limited to Tamil Nadu and Z was from Madhya Pradesh, it would not apply here. Option A and D are also eliminated for the same reason. C is not the correct answer because it lacks relevant reasoning as per the passage criteria of being eligible in the state of Tamil Nadu.

103. (d) The correct answer is D because, according to the passage, doctor refers to and includes a Registered Medical Practitioner who provides consultations or treatment under AYUSH. Option A and C are also eliminated for the same reason. B is not the correct answer because it lacks legal reasoning.
104. (a) The correct answer is A because, according to the passage, a Registered Medical Practitioner is someone who has any of the government-recognized medical qualifications and has been enrolled in the respective Council's register. B is incorrect because it provides irrelevant reasoning apart from the criteria that registration should be present with either MCI or AYUSH. C is the incorrect answer because it relies on an assumption. D is not the correct answer because the reasoning is not in consonance with the passage.
105. (c) The correct answer is C, because the passage defines a Registered Medical Practitioner as "a person who possesses any of the Government recognized medical qualifications and has been enrolled in the respective Council's register." Option B is also eliminated for the same reason. A is not the correct answer because it lacks a plausible justification. D is incorrect because no such restriction is mentioned in the passage.

SECTION - D : LOGICAL REASONING

106. (b) Throughout the passage, the author emphasized the RBI's commitment to durable price stability and their resolve in raising the benchmark policy rate in order to achieve this goal. The Monetary Policy Committee's primary mandate is to steer inflation towards a 4% target and they voted to continue tightening policy because core price gains have remained above 6% for 20 months. The MPC is aware of the challenges that rising credit costs could pose to the post-pandemic recovery but the resilience of the Indian economy has provided comfort to monetary policymakers. Option A is not the main point as it goes against the essence of the passage. In the passage, the author gives a qualified approval to how the RBI and MPC are handling to curb inflation at 4%, and that Indian economy has shown resilience in the given times, option A is severe in the context. Option C is extreme and contradictory. Option D has not been contended in the passage.
107. (c) The correct answer is C. Throughout the passage, the author emphasizes the MPC's commitment to durable price stability and their resolve in raising the benchmark policy rate in order to achieve this goal. The MPC's primary mandate is to steer inflation towards a 4% target, and they voted to continue tightening policy because core price gains have remained above 6% for 20 months. The MPC is aware of the challenges that rising credit costs could pose to the post-pandemic recovery but the