

Daily Practice — Legal Reasoning · Analytical Reasoning · Quantitative Techniques

Darken one bubble per question. Negative marking applies. Answers and detailed explanations are provided in a separate companion sheet.
Free daily practice — clatgurukul.com/daily · Pass this sheet to a friend.

SECTION A — LEGAL REASONING

Q1-12 · 12 Marks

PRINCIPLE A — DOCTRINE OF FRUSTRATION OF CONTRACT — SECTION 56 OF THE INDIAN CONTRACT ACT (Q1-6)

Section 56 of the Indian Contract Act, 1872 lays down the DOCTRINE OF FRUSTRATION. Its first paragraph declares that an agreement to do an act IMPOSSIBLE in itself is void. The second paragraph — the core of the doctrine — provides that a contract to do an act which, AFTER the contract is made, becomes IMPOSSIBLE or, by reason of some event the promisor could not prevent, UNLAWFUL, becomes void when the act becomes impossible or unlawful. In *Satyabrata Ghose v. Mugneeram Bangur* (1954), the Supreme Court held that Section 56 is EXHAUSTIVE of the law of frustration in India and operates independently of the English implied-terms theory in *Taylor v. Caldwell* (1863). Frustration applies only where the supervening event STRIKES AT THE ROOT of the contract; self-induced frustration, foreseeable contingencies and mere commercial hardship are EXCLUDED. Section 65 then provides for restitution of any advantage received.

1. A leases a hall to B for a coronation procession scheduled to pass under its windows. The coronation is cancelled because the King falls ill. B refuses to pay. On Section 56 read with *Satyabrata Ghose*:

- A. The contract is frustrated — the procession was the foundation of the contract; its cancellation strikes at the root and Section 56 applies
- B. B remains liable for the rent — the hall itself was available
- C. B is liable only for half the rent on a quantum-meruit basis
- D. B may sue A for damages because the procession was cancelled

2. X agrees to supply imported Russian wheat to Y. After contract formation, the Government of India imposes a complete ban on imports from Russia. On the doctrine of frustration:

- A. The contract is unaffected — X must source the wheat elsewhere at any price
- B. The contract is frustrated under Section 56's second limb — performance has become UNLAWFUL by reason of a supervening event the promisor could not prevent
- C. Y may sue X for damages on the original price
- D. The contract is only suspended, not terminated

3. Which of the following situations would NOT amount to frustration under Section 56?

- A. Destruction of the subject-matter without the fault of either party
- B. Outbreak of war rendering performance unlawful
- C. Death or incapacity of a party in a contract for personal services
- D. A mere RISE in the market price of raw materials, even if substantial, that makes performance more expensive but not impossible

4. Z contracts to deliver goods using his own ship 'Sagarika'. The ship is requisitioned by the Government for war service before any delivery is made. Z claims frustration; Y argues Z could have hired another vessel. On *Satyabrata Ghose*:

- A. Frustration succeeds — the ship 'Sagarika' was the specific identified means; its loss strikes at the root of the contract
- B. Frustration fails — Z must hire any available ship
- C. The contract is suspended until the ship is returned
- D. Y can sue for damages but not specific performance

5. P contracts to construct a building on Q's land within 18 months. Half-way through, a rare ground-water seepage problem makes construction substantially more expensive and adds six months to the schedule. P pleads frustration. The court will MOST LIKELY:

- A. Hold the contract frustrated — increased cost is sufficient
- B. Hold the contract frustrated — delay beyond contract period is automatic frustration
- C. Reject the plea of frustration — mere commercial hardship, delay or increased expense does not strike at the root of the contract under Indian law
- D. Discharge P from performance on equitable grounds

6. Where a contract becomes void under Section 56, the parties' rights of restitution are governed by:

- A. Section 70 — quasi-contract for non-gratuitous act
- B. Section 73 — damages for breach
- C. Section 65 — the person who has received any advantage must restore it or make compensation for it to the person from whom he received it
- D. Section 74 — liquidated damages

PRINCIPLE B — STRICT AND ABSOLUTE LIABILITY — FROM RYLANDS V. FLETCHER TO M.C. MEHTA (Q7-12)

The rule of STRICT LIABILITY originated in *Rylands v. Fletcher* (1868), where Blackburn J held that a person who, for his own purposes, brings onto his land and keeps there anything LIKELY TO DO MISCHIEF if it escapes, must keep it in at his peril, and is PRIMA FACIE answerable for all damage that is the natural consequence of its escape — without proof of negligence. The rule requires three ingredients: a NON-NATURAL USE of land, an accumulation of a DANGEROUS THING, and an ESCAPE causing damage. Recognised exceptions include Act of God, plaintiff's own default, act of a stranger, statutory authority and consent. In *M.C. Mehta v. Union of India* (1987) (the Oleum Gas Leak case), the Supreme Court evolved the rule of ABSOLUTE LIABILITY: enterprises engaged in HAZARDOUS or INHERENTLY DANGEROUS activities owe a non-delegable duty to ensure no harm results; the classical exceptions DO NOT APPLY, and liability extends to the full measure of harm caused.

7. A chemical factory's reservoir of toxic effluent bursts and floods a neighbouring farm. Applying Rylands v. Fletcher in classical form, the factory is:

- A. Not liable unless negligence is proved
- B. Strictly liable — the storage of toxic effluent is a non-natural use; the escape was the natural consequence; classical exceptions do not appear to apply
- C. Liable only if the harm was foreseeable
- D. Liable only for the damage to crops, not to the soil

8. Which of the following is NOT a recognised exception to the rule in Rylands v. Fletcher in its CLASSICAL form?

- A. Act of a stranger over whom the defendant had no control
- B. Plaintiff's own default
- C. Act of God — an extraordinary natural event
- D. Lack of profit motive in the defendant's enterprise

9. An enterprise dealing in chlorine gas suffers a leak. Some affected residents argue that the leak was caused by sabotage by a stranger. On M.C. Mehta v. Union of India (1987):

- A. The enterprise escapes liability — act of a stranger is a recognised defence
- B. The enterprise is liable only if it negligently allowed the sabotage
- C. Liability is ABSOLUTE — the classical Rylands exceptions, including the act-of-a-stranger defence, do NOT apply to hazardous-enterprise liability
- D. Liability is shared between the enterprise and the saboteur

10. Which of the following BEST captures the conceptual distinction between strict liability (Rylands) and absolute liability (M.C. Mehta)?

- A. Strict liability requires intention; absolute liability does not
- B. Strict liability admits of recognised exceptions (Act of God, stranger, plaintiff's default, statutory authority, consent); absolute liability admits of NO such exceptions for hazardous enterprises and the deterrence dimension may inform quantum
- C. Strict liability applies only to natural disasters; absolute liability applies only to man-made events
- D. Strict liability applies only in tort; absolute liability applies only in criminal law

11. A farmer's bull, kept on his land, escapes and gores a neighbour's cattle. The farmer pleads that bulls are a 'natural' use of farming land. On Rylands v. Fletcher:

- A. Liability is automatic — Rylands applies to all escapes
- B. Liability under Rylands is doubtful because the keeping of a domesticated bull on agricultural land may not amount to a NON-NATURAL USE; the case is better analysed under cattle-trespass or scienter rather than Rylands
- C. Strict liability applies — bulls are dangerous animals
- D. Absolute liability applies because the farm is a commercial enterprise

12. Suppose the M.C. Mehta absolute-liability standard were extended to ALL commercial activities, not merely hazardous ones. The MOST DIRECT consequence would be:

- A. Commercial enterprises would be liable for damage from ordinary commercial operations without any of the classical Rylands defences, regardless of how dangerous the activity is — a dramatic enlargement of tort liability beyond the doctrinal anchor in 'hazardous or inherently dangerous' activity
- B. Rylands would be overruled entirely
- C. All commercial activity would become unlawful
- D. Only the foreseeability test would matter

SECTION B — ANALYTICAL REASONING

Q13–20 · 8 Marks

PUZZLE 1 — LINEAR SEATING — NORTH AND SOUTH FACING ROWS (Q13–16)

Eight friends — P, Q, R, S, T, U, V, W — sit in two parallel rows of four chairs. One row faces NORTH, the other faces SOUTH; rows face each other so each person directly faces one person opposite. Conditions:

1. P is in the north-row, second from the left end.
 2. R sits at an extreme end of the south-row.
 3. Directly opposite R is T.
 4. Q sits at the extreme right of the north-row.
 5. S sits immediately to T's right (in T's row, from T's perspective).
 6. U is in the south-row but is not adjacent to R.
 7. V sits directly opposite P.
 8. W is in the same row as Q.
- All positions are uniquely determined.

13. Who sits at the extreme LEFT of the NORTH-facing row?

- A. U
- B. W
- C. S
- D. T

14. Who sits directly OPPOSITE Q?

- A. U
- B. R
- C. T
- D. S

15. Which of the following pairs sit at the two extreme ends of the SOUTH-facing row?

- A. R and S
- B. R and U
- C. T and S
- D. U and S

16. Who sits to the immediate LEFT of P (from P's own perspective in P's own north-facing row)?

- A. Q
- B. W
- C. T
- D. V

PUZZLE 2 – BLOOD RELATIONS – THREE-GENERATION FAMILY TREE (Q17–20)

A family of nine members spans three generations. The known relations are:

1. Anil is married to Bhavna; they have two children — Chandra (son) and Divya (daughter).
 2. Esha is Anil's only sister; she is married to Faruq; they have one son — Gaurav.
 3. Heena is Chandra's wife; they have one son — Ishaan.
 4. Divya is unmarried.
 5. There are exactly nine living members: Anil, Bhavna, Chandra, Divya, Esha, Faruq, Gaurav, Heena and Ishaan.
 6. No member is related to any other in more than one way except as logically required by the given relations.
- All relations between pairs of family members — including 'maternal uncle', 'paternal aunt', 'cousin', 'grandfather', 'sister-in-law', and so forth — are derivable from the above five primary facts.

17. How is Esha related to Ishaan?

- A. Maternal aunt
 B. Paternal grandmother
 C. Paternal grand-aunt
 D. Paternal aunt (i.e., Ishaan's father's father's daughter)

18. How is Gaurav related to Divya?

- A. Brother
 B. Nephew
 C. Maternal cousin
 D. Paternal cousin (Gaurav's mother Esha is Divya's father Anil's sister)

19. How is Faruq related to Bhavna?

- A. Husband
 B. Father-in-law
 C. Brother-in-law (Faruq is the husband of Bhavna's husband's sister)
 D. Co-brother-in-law

20. How is Heena related to Esha?

- A. Daughter
 B. Sister-in-law
 C. Niece-in-law (Heena is the wife of Esha's brother's son)
 D. Daughter-in-law

SECTION C – QUANTITATIVE TECHNIQUES**Q21–30 · 10 Marks****DATA SET 1 – OTT PLATFORM SUBSCRIBERS IN INDIA, 2021–2025 (IN MILLIONS) (Q21–25)**

The table records paid-subscriber counts (in millions) for the four leading streaming-video-on-demand (SVOD) platforms operating in India for the five calendar years 2021 to 2025. The Indian SVOD market has been characterised by aggressive pricing experiments, periodic content windfalls (cricket rights, regional original-language programming), and a steady migration from advertising-supported to paid plans. The questions that follow ask for both ABSOLUTE comparisons across platforms and RELATIVE growth comparisons across years; note that growth-rate leadership and absolute leadership can move in opposite directions, since a platform with a small starting base can post a larger percentage gain even while remaining smaller in absolute size. Note also that 'subscriber' counts may include duplicated households where a single household subscribes to more than one platform; the figures here are platform-level paid accounts, not unique households.

Platform	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Platform A	40	55	70	85	100
Platform B	20	28	40	52	60
Platform C	10	15	22	30	40
Platform D	5	8	12	18	25

21. What is the TOTAL number of paid subscribers across all four platforms in 2025 (in millions)?

- A. 200
 B. 215
 C. 225
 D. 230

22. Across the five-year period, which platform showed the HIGHEST percentage growth between 2021 and 2025?

- A. Platform A — grew from 40 to 100 (+150%)
 B. Platform B — grew from 20 to 60 (+200%)
 C. Platform C — grew from 10 to 40 (+300%)
 D. Platform D — grew from 5 to 25 (+400%)

23. In 2023, Platform A's subscribers were what percentage of the combined total of Platforms B, C and D in the same year? (Round to the nearest whole per cent.)

- A. 85%
 B. 94%
 C. 100%
 D. 112%

24. Between 2024 and 2025, which platform recorded the SMALLEST absolute increase in subscribers (in millions)?

- A. Platform A (+15)
 B. Platform B (+8)
 C. Platform C (+10)
 D. Platform D (+7)

25. What is the AVERAGE annual subscriber count of Platform B across the five years (in millions)?

- A. 38
 B. 40
 C. 42
 D. 44

DATA SET 2 – PUBLIC HOSPITAL ADMISSIONS BY DEPARTMENT, FY25 (SINGLE TERTIARY-CARE HOSPITAL) (Q26–30)

