

ENGLISH LANGUAGE & LOGICAL REASONING**1. Correct Answer: B**

Explanation: The author repeatedly underscores the significance of PRS 2024 as a **data-driven, diagnostic tool** that provides “a roadmap” for reform. He stresses scientific, evidence-based policymaking — not replacement of assessments.

2. Correct Answer: B

Explanation: He writes that India has “not only recovered but, in many cases, surpassed earlier benchmarks.” Hence, foundational learning outcomes have advanced, not merely rebounded.

3. Correct Answer: A

Explanation: He explicitly warns that comparing Grade V data from NAS 2021 to PRS 2024 is “methodologically unsound,” because PRS focuses on *competencies*, not rote outcomes.

4. Correct Answer: A

Explanation: He emphasizes that PRS provides *district-level insights* and that real impact will come from “what is done at the school and district levels.”

5. Correct Answer: C

Explanation: He advocates connecting “learning to livelihood,” integrating *qualitative, large-scale skills assessments* with academic learning.

6. Correct Answer: D

Explanation: The line “PRS provides district-level insights” assumes such data can be interpreted meaningfully by states and schools.

7. Correct Answer: A

Explanation: Independent verification of the same improvement would empirically reinforce the claim that interventions “are beginning to bear fruit.”

Why Other Options Are Incorrect:

- **B/C/D:** All weaken the argument.

8. Correct Answer: A**Explanation:**

He clearly states such comparison is “methodologically unsound” because PRS uses a *competency-based* framework aligned with NEP 2020.

Why Other Options Are Incorrect:

- **B:** Relevant but secondary.
- **C:** Not his key criticism.
- **D:** Not mentioned.

9. Correct Answer: B

Explanation: He writes: “The Centre will continue to provide guidance, frameworks, and resources.” That’s precisely the solution he envisions.

Why Other Options Are Incorrect:

B/C/D: All contradict his decentralised, evidence-based, concurrent action approach.

10. Correct Answer: A

Explanation: He describes PRS as a *diagnostic tool* and *roadmap*—identifying gaps and guiding interventions, not judging or ranking.

Why Other Options Are Incorrect:

- **B:** Overstates; PRS is continuous assessment, not summative.
- **C/D:** Contradict his praise for evidence-based reform.

Legal Reasoning

11 → Correct Answer: D

Suspension orders in public interest require procedural fairness and reasonable consultation with States.

Explanation: The passage emphasizes that while the Union can suspend State licences for national interest, *such power must not be unilateral*. The doctrine of cooperative federalism requires meaningful consultation and procedural fairness. Even “public interest” cannot be used as an undefined blanket justification to override State autonomy without hearing.

12 → Correct Answer: B

The Amendment is presumptively valid; vested rights may be limited if Parliament provides statutory transition mechanisms.

Explanation: The passage recognises Parliament’s power under Entries 53–54 List I but insists on procedural safeguards. Vested rights are not absolute when public interest and statutory rationalisation are involved; transitional frameworks can constitutionally adjust existing contracts if they respect fairness and proportionality.

13 → Correct Answer: A

Environmental protection and energy security must be balanced; strategic designation cannot dispense with enforceable safeguards.

Explanation: The passage clearly asserts that while energy transition is legitimate, ecological protection under Article 21 and Article 48A remains non-negotiable. The Court insists on *proportionality* — strategic goals cannot displace enforceable environmental safeguards.

14 → Correct Answer: C

The NHA’s design is vulnerable unless States have meaningful, decision-making participation on core matters.

Explanation: The passage criticises token advisory roles and reiterates that cooperative federalism demands real participation, not perfunctory consultation. A structure excluding decisive State input risks being struck down for procedural imbalance.

15 → Correct Answer: D

Proportionate penalties that consider prompt remedial action and self-reporting should guide enforcement.

Explanation: The Court's reasoning highlights proportionality and remedial fairness as constitutional components of environmental justice. Punishment must deter but remain balanced. Over-punishment for self-reported incidents violates this doctrine.

16 → Correct Answer: B

Continuing environmental obligations attach to all operators; evolving standards can legitimately impose additional reporting.

Explanation: Environmental duties are *continuing and dynamic*. The passage stresses that evolving regulatory standards are permissible so long as they are rational, proportionate, and linked to constitutional environmental goals.

17 → Correct Answer: A

Statutory environmental obligations and private civil liability coexist; compliance does not automatically discharge private claims.

Explanation: The passage underscores that statutory compliance does not preclude independent tortious or constitutional claims for harm. EPI metrics are *evidentiary, not exculpatory*; private remedies under environmental law survive.

18 → Correct Answer: C

The Centre's allocation formula is binding as a valid statutory policy subject to constitutional review if arbitrary.

Explanation: The Court's reasoning permits strong central legislation in shared economic matters but subjects it to judicial review for arbitrariness or disproportionality. Revenue sharing reflects legislative policy, not constitutional right.

19 → Correct Answer: D

Public interest litigation complements statutory oversight and NGOs may invoke judicial review to prevent regulatory capture.

Explanation: The Court's language in the passage favours transparency and oversight. When statutory agencies risk capture, public-interest actions are vital to ensure accountability, consistent with *MC Mehta* and *Vineet Narain* precedents.

20 → Correct Answer: B

The Centre may act for national interest but must provide meaningful consultation and procedural participation to the States affected.

Explanation: The passage makes clear that national interest cannot erase procedural fairness. States must be consulted in good faith before unilateral Central decisions affecting shared resources — preserving cooperative federalism.

General Knowledge

21 — A. 1 and 2 only (P)

Explanation : Passage + PIB/IUCN notes state the Vision 2025–2030 was unveiled at the IUCN Congress (Oct 2025) and that the roadmap envisages assessment of ~11,000 species (7,000 plants; 4,000 animals). The passage does **not** say NRLA restricts assessments only to endemic taxa — in fact it prioritises endemics but assesses broad taxa.

22 — A. ZSI & BSI (P)

Explanation : The passage and PIB state the programme is spearheaded by the Zoological Survey of India (ZSI) and the Botanical Survey of India (BSI), in collaboration with IUCN-India and the Centre for Species Survival.

23 — A. Adopt IUCN criteria but adapt protocols to India's context (O)

Explanation : The passage says NRLA will adopt internationally accepted IUCN criteria “suitably adapted for national conditions.” This implies use of IUCN methodology with national adaptations (peer review, data reality adjustments). Options B–D contradict the adaptation + transparency intent.

24 — A. Publish National Red Data Books by 2030 (P)

Explanation : Passage explicitly reports the target to publish National Red Data Books for flora and fauna by 2030. Options B–D are false and not in the roadmap.

25 — B. 1, 2 and 3 only (P)

Explanation : The Vision document and press coverage state India occupies about 2.4% of land area and harbours ~8% of global flora and 7.5% of fauna, with ~28% endemic plants (the passage gives these figures). (All three figures are reported in cited materials.)

26 — C. Unlimited immediate budget... (O)

Explanation : The passage lists real constraints (taxonomic gaps, data deficiency, capacity shortfalls). The statement that funding is unlimited and there is no need to prioritise is unrealistic and not a challenge — it is the only non-challenge among the options.

27 — A. Training and certifying assessors (O)

Explanation : The passage refers to assessor training, capacity building and use of citizen science and museum collections; training/certification of assessors is therefore a roadmap measure. Options B–D contradict the collaborative and transparent ethos.

28 — A. 1 and 2 only (P/O)

Explanation : Passage explicitly mentions linkages to the Wild Life (Protection) Act and alignment with the Kunming–Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework (KM-GBF). The Montreal Protocol (on ozone) is unrelated to NRLA's purpose.

29 — A. Prioritise endemic, threatened and legally protected species (O)

Explanation : Given limited capacity and the passage's emphasis on prioritisation and legal linkages, early years will likely prioritise endemic/threatened/protected taxa — this is the most sensible operational priority; the other options are unrealistic.

30 — A. A nationally coordinated, science-based system... (P)

Explanation : The passage and official statements describe NRLA exactly as a national, inclusive, science-based system aligned with international standards (IUCN). Options B–D contradict the passage.

31 — A. 1 and 3 only

Explanation: The passage explicitly states “saturation-based convergence” of schemes (statement 1) and mentions monthly KPI dashboards and district ranking (statement 3). Statement 2 (replaces state plans entirely) is false — the design relies on district/state collaboration, not replacement. (Sources: PIB / PMIndia)

32 — B. 2 only

Explanation: The passage states ₹24,000 crore annual outlay and that PMDDKY converges 36 schemes — in practice, financing will be a mix of existing scheme funds (convergence) plus additional allocations and likely state contributions/co-funding where applicable; there is no indication of a new exclusive crop-levy (statement 3 false). Direct routing mechanics (statement 1) are not explicitly detailed in the passage and therefore cannot be assumed. So the safest, evidence-based inference is (2) only. (Inference based on typical central-state schemes and press coverage.)

33 — A. 1 and 2 only

Explanation: The passage lists selection criteria as low productivity, moderate/low cropping intensity and below-average credit access, and says selection will be proportionate to net-cropped area — statement 3 (existing high productivity) contradicts the selection logic. (Sources: Drishti / PIB / Indian Express)

34 — A. 1 and 2 only

Explanation: District Dhan-Dhaanya Samiti chaired by the District Collector and assistance by agri universities/technical partners are explicitly stated. Statement 3 (sole authority to reallocate central funds without state concurrence) is not supported and would contradict collaborative design. (Sources: PMIndia / PIB)

35 — A. 1 and 2 only

Explanation: Improving panchayat/block level post-harvest storage and promoting crop diversification & sustainable practices are explicit objectives; universal basic income is not mentioned and is outside the scheme’s stated goals. (Sources: PIB / Indian Express)

36 — A. 1 and 3 only

Explanation: The passage warns of coordination complexity (converging 36 schemes) and stresses need for state cooperation and timely funds — both statements 1 & 3 are realistic challenges. Statement 2 (monthly 117 KPIs will be simple) is implausible and contradicted by passage inference that robust data systems/capacity are needed. (Inference + passage). (Sources: PMIndia / press analysis)

37 — A. 1 and 3 only

Explanation: The passage explicitly lists allied activities including livestock, fisheries, beekeeping, agro-forestry and horticulture (statement 1). Statement 3 (diversify incomes & reduce climate risk) is a reasonable inference of including allied sectors and is consistent with passage language on livelihood enhancement. Statement 2 contradicts the passage. (Sources: PIB / Drishti)

38 — A. 1 and 2 only

Explanation: The passage specifies appointment of central nodal officers, NITI review, monthly monitoring through 117 KPIs on dashboards and district ranking system. Statement 3 (purely paper-based monitoring) is false. (Sources: PMIndia / PIB)

39 — A. Aspirational Districts Programme

Explanation: The passage states the scheme is inspired by the Aspirational Districts Programme (convergence, competition, technical assistance). MGNREGA/Monetisation Pipeline are unrelated comparators. (Sources: PIB / press commentary)

40 — A. A mission-mode, convergence initiative to uplift lagging districts...

Explanation: This is precisely how the passage describes PMDDKY; the other options misrepresent it (short-term, export-only, centralising state role). (Sources: PIB / PMIndia)

Quantitative Technique

41. D, (155:170 = 31: 34)

42. C (264/170 x 100 = 160 cr)

43. D (CND)

44. D 70% = 4.2

170% = ?

? = 170 x 4.2 / 70 = 10.2 cr

45. A, 155: 140 = 31:28

Let income of both the year = P

Exp =

2005 : 2006 = :

:= 155 : 140 = 31: 28

Explanation :

A : B : C

25000 x 12 : 20000 x 12 + 5000 x 8 : 40000 x 8

Ratio of profit = 300000 : 280000 : 320000

= 15:14:16

Total profit = Rs. 44000

A's salary = 44000 x 10 % = 4400

Remaining profit = 44000- 4400 = 39600

46. (B) B' share in profit = 39600 x 14/45 = Rs. 12320

47. (D) A' s share of profit = 15 x 100/45 = 33.33%

48. (C) 4400 + 39600 x 15/45 , 17600

49. (A) 15:16

50. (A) Less investment = 40000-25000 = 15000

% less = 15000 x 100/400 00 = 37.5%