

**ANSWER KEY — 9 MAY 2026**

<b>Q1</b>	<b>Q2</b>	<b>Q3</b>	<b>Q4</b>	<b>Q5</b>	<b>Q6</b>	<b>Q7</b>	<b>Q8</b>	<b>Q9</b>	<b>Q10</b>
B	C	B	C	D	B	B	B	B	D
<b>Q11</b>	<b>Q12</b>	<b>Q13</b>	<b>Q14</b>	<b>Q15</b>	<b>Q16</b>	<b>Q17</b>	<b>Q18</b>	<b>Q19</b>	<b>Q20</b>
B	B	B	A	B	B	B	B	C	B
<b>Q21</b>	<b>Q22</b>	<b>Q23</b>	<b>Q24</b>	<b>Q25</b>	<b>Q26</b>	<b>Q27</b>	<b>Q28</b>	<b>Q29</b>	<b>Q30</b>
B	C	B	B	B	B	C	B	B	B
<b>Q31</b>	<b>Q32</b>	<b>Q33</b>	<b>Q34</b>	<b>Q35</b>	<b>Q36</b>	<b>Q37</b>	<b>Q38</b>		
B	B	B	A	B	A	C	C		

SECTION A — LEGAL REASONING

**Q1 B**

MediKart's pharmacy assistant owed the customer a duty to verify the prescription against the medication before dispensing — pharmacies are held to the standard of an ordinarily competent professional in their field. The duty was breached by the failure to verify; the breach factually caused the liver injury (the customer would not have ingested the 100 mg dose but for the dispensing error); and the harm — drug-induced injury from a tenfold dose — is a directly foreseeable consequence of mis-dispensing, hence not too remote. Calling the lapse a 'one-off mistake' does not exonerate liability in negligence; the standard is objective, not aspirational. Manufacturer liability does not displace the dispenser's independent duty. Option A misstates the law: customers do not assume the risk of dispensing error. Option D wrongly imports an intent requirement; negligence requires breach of a standard of care, not intent.

**Q2 C**

Lord Atkin in *Donoghue v. Stevenson* (1932) defined the neighbour as one 'so closely and directly affected by my act that I ought reasonably to have them in contemplation as being so affected when I am directing my mind to the acts or omissions which are called in question.' Option C reproduces this formulation. Option A is wrong because the duty of care does not depend on contractual privity (the whole point of *Donoghue* was to extend liability beyond contract). Option B overstates the rule — the duty does not extend to 'anyone in the world,' but only to those reasonably foreseeable as affected. Option D is wrong because no written assumption of responsibility is required for a duty in negligence to arise.

**Q3 B**

Under the law of negligence, a child is judged by the standard of care expected of a reasonable child of similar age, intelligence and experience — not the adult standard. Hitting a cricket ball during ordinary play in a public park is, on these facts, the conduct of a reasonable eleven-year-old; absent evidence of recklessness or violation of express prohibitions, no breach of the duty has occurred. Option A wrongly applies the adult standard. Option C overstates the rule — children are not absolutely immune; the standard is age-adjusted, not abolished. Option D is wrong because parental liability arises only where the parent themselves was negligent (e.g. in supervision), not automatically by virtue of being a parent.

**Q4 C**

This is a classic case of contributory negligence. The driver is negligent (red-light running is a clear breach), but the pedestrian's failure to look while crossing also fell below the standard expected of a reasonable pedestrian. Under the contributory-negligence doctrine (now reflected in statutory apportionment in many jurisdictions and recognised at common law), damages are reduced in proportion to the plaintiff's share of fault. Option A is wrong because contributory negligence does affect quantum. Option B reflects the older 'all-or-nothing' rule which has been replaced by apportionment. Option D wrongly imports an intent requirement; negligence does not require intent, merely breach of the duty of care.

**Q5 D**

Option D is the INCORRECT statement (the question asks which is incorrect). Damage that is too remote — that is, not a reasonably foreseeable consequence of the breach — is NOT recoverable, even if the breach is established. This is the rule on legal causation: foreseeability limits the scope of liability (the *Wagon Mound* rule). Option A is correct (the *Bolam* standard for professionals). Option B correctly states that reasonable foreseeability is part of legal causation. Option C correctly states the *volenti* defence. Hence D is the false statement and is the right answer to the 'INCORRECT' question.

**Q6 B**

A construction company leaving an unguarded trench overnight on a public footpath, with only a small unlit cone, has clearly fallen below the standard of a reasonable construction operator. Pedestrian use of public footpaths — including at night and in dim light — is reasonably foreseeable; the company's argument that 'few use it at night' is precisely the kind of reasoning the law rejects, since reasonable foreseeability does not require statistical frequency. The injury was the very kind one would expect from an unguarded trench. Option A misapplies the foreseeability test. Option C wrongly transfers liability to the council; the proximate negligent actor is the contractor. Option D wrongly conditions liability on land ownership when the negligent conduct itself fixes liability.

**Q7 B**

Under Puttaswamy (2017), the proportionality test requires the State to show, among other limbs, that the means chosen are necessary — i.e. no less intrusive alternative is available. A blanket biometric mandate, with no consideration of less invasive identification methods (such as opt-in registration, alternative documentary proof, or anonymised verification), fails this 'least restrictive means' limb regardless of the legitimacy of the subsidy-reform aim. Option A wrongly stops the analysis at the first limb. Option C misstates the law: Article 21 applies fully to welfare measures; legitimate aims do not exempt the State from the proportionality discipline. Option D is wrong because individual consent is not the relevant constitutional test for a generally applicable law.

**Q8 B**

The nine-judge bench in Justice K.S. Puttaswamy v. Union of India (2017) unanimously held that the right to privacy is a fundamental right intrinsic to Article 21 (right to life and personal liberty) and is also reflected across other freedoms in Part III of the Constitution. Option B captures this holding precisely. Option A is the position rejected by Puttaswamy — privacy is constitutional, not merely statutory. Option C wrongly demotes the right to a moral one; Puttaswamy made it judicially enforceable. Option D is wrong because Article 21 protections extend to all 'persons,' a category that includes non-citizens lawfully in India.

**Q9 B**

Mass facial-recognition surveillance with no defined threat, no data-retention rules, and no oversight body fails the proportionality test. The aim ('general security') is too vague to be 'legitimate' in the constitutional sense; the means are not narrowly tailored; less intrusive alternatives (targeted CCTV at entry points, community policing) appear not to have been considered; and the chilling effect on protected activity in public spaces is disproportionate. Option A wrongly assumes Article 21 stops at the threshold of public space — Puttaswamy expressly extends to informational privacy in public. Option C overstates the security-aim deference. Option D misstates the rule — consent is not the constitutional test for State-imposed surveillance.

**Q10 D**

Option D is the answer to a 'NOT one of the four limbs' question. The four limbs of the proportionality test are: (1) legitimate state aim; (2) rational connection between means and aim; (3) necessity (least intrusive means available); and (4) proportionality between the impact on the right and the importance of the aim. Approval by a parliamentary committee (Option D) is not part of the test articulated in Puttaswamy. Options A, B and C each correctly state limbs of the test. Hence D is the correct answer to the 'NOT' question.

**Q11 B**

Informational privacy — control over the dissemination of personal information — was expressly recognised in Puttaswamy as a protected zone of privacy. Medical information, particularly HIV status, lies at the core of this protected zone. While Puttaswamy concerned vertical (State) action, its principles inform horizontal duties through tort law and statutory protections (e.g. medical-confidentiality statutes), which are well established. Disclosure to a prospective employer without consent and without statutory authorisation is a clear breach. Option A wrongly limits privacy to State action. Option C is irrelevant — payment is not a relevant element. Option D misstates the law; employers are not entitled to all medical information of prospective hires absent statutory or contractual basis.

**Q12 B**

Option B is INCORRECT. Puttaswamy expressly held that privacy is NOT an absolute right; restrictions are permissible if they satisfy the four-part proportionality test, balancing the aim, the means, necessity and proportionality. Option A is correct (informational privacy is recognised as a protected zone). Option C is correct (the proportionality test applies to all privacy restrictions). Option D is correct (privacy includes personal intimacies and family life, expressly listed in the judgment). Hence B is the false statement and is the right answer to the 'INCORRECT' question.

#### SECTION B — ANALYTICAL REASONING

**Q13 B**

Apply the constraints: R is at position 1 (constraint 1), so position 1 = R. From constraint 3, T is exactly three positions above R, so T is at position 4. Constraint 4 says Q is immediately above T, so Q is at position 5. Constraint 5 says P is immediately below T, so P is at position 3. Constraint 6 places V at position 2. Constraint 2 places S at position 7. The remaining position 6 is occupied by U (constraint 7). The unique stack from bottom (1) to top (7) is therefore: R, V, P, T, Q, U, S. Hence the box at position 1 is R. Option B is correct.

**Q14 A**

From the deduction in the previous answer, the unique stack from position 1 (bottom) to position 7 (top) is: R, V, P, T, Q, U, S. Box V is at position 2; the box immediately above V is at position 3, which is P. Therefore the box immediately above box V is P. Option A is correct. Options B (Q), C (R) and D (T) are at positions 5, 1 and 4 respectively, none of which is immediately above V. The straightforward chain of constraints (R→V→P→T→Q→U→S) makes the answer unambiguous.

**Q15 B**

From the established stack R, V, P, T, Q, U, S — running from position 1 to position 7 — box T is at position 4 and box S is at position 7. The boxes lying strictly between T and S are those at positions 5 and 6, namely Q (position 5) and U (position 6). That is two boxes between T and S. Option B is correct. Option A (One) undercounts; option C (Three) overcounts; option D (None) is contradicted by the existence of Q and U in between. The intervening count is exactly two.

**Q16 B**

Currently T is at position 4 and U is at position 6. After swapping T and U, T moves to position 6 and U moves to position 4. The new stack from position 1 to position 7 becomes: R, V, P, U, Q, T, S. Position 6 (T) is immediately below position 7 (S), so 'T is immediately below S' is true. Option B is correct. Option A is wrong (T is now at position 6, not 4). Option C is wrong (U is at position 4, not 1). Option D is wrong (T at 6 is not immediately above V at 2; the box immediately above V remains P at position 3).

**Q17 B**

From the constraints, six of the ten matches are fixed: F-H (Mon), G-J (Tue), F-K (Wed), F-J (Thu), F-G (Fri), H-K (Tue), J-K (Fri) — that is seven matches. The remaining three matches G-H, H-J and G-K must fill the second slot on Mon, Wed and Thu (Tue and Fri already have two matches each). The Monday second slot cannot involve F (already plays) or H (already plays); so it must be a pair from G/J/K. From the remaining pairs G-H, H-J, G-K, only G-K avoids both F and H. Hence Mon's second match is Gladiators-Knights. Option B is correct.

**Q18 B**

Constraint 4 directly states 'Falcons play Jaguars on Thursday'. The schedule confirms this: Thursday's two matches are F-J (the directly stated fixture) and the remaining G-H pair (the only remaining match consistent with Thu's slot, since F-J occupies one slot and G-H avoids F and J). Hence Falcons play Jaguars on Thursday. Option B is correct. Option A (Hornets) is wrong — Hornets play Knights on Tuesday, Falcons on Monday, Jaguars on Wednesday and Gladiators on Thursday's other slot is G-H; F-Hornets is on Monday, not Thursday. Options C and D place Falcons against the wrong opponent on Thursday.

**Q19 C**

Working through the schedule: the remaining three matches after the seven fixed pairs are G-H, H-J and G-K. Mon takes G-K (deduced earlier), and Thu takes G-H (the only remaining pair avoiding F and J). The last unplaced pair, H-J, must therefore fall on Wednesday's second slot. Wed's first slot is F-K (constraint 3); Wed's second slot must avoid both F and K, and H-J satisfies this. Hence Hornets play Jaguars on Wednesday. Option C is correct. Options A (Mon), B (Tue) and D (Thu) place H-J on the wrong day, contradicting the constraint chain.

**Q20 B**

Wednesday's two matches are F-K (constraint 3) and H-J (deduced above). The teams playing on Wednesday are therefore Falcons, Knights, Hornets and Jaguars — four of the five teams. The team that does NOT play on Wednesday is Gladiators. Option B is correct. Option A (Falcons) is wrong because Falcons play Knights on Wednesday. Option C (Hornets) is wrong because Hornets play Jaguars on Wednesday. Option D (Jaguars) is wrong because Jaguars play Hornets on Wednesday. Gladiators sit out Wednesday, having played Tue (G-J), Mon's second slot (G-K), Thu (G-H) and Fri (F-G).

## SECTION C — QUANTITATIVE TECHNIQUES

**Q21 B**

Compute total registrations FY24 versus FY25 for each state and the percentage growth: Maharashtra 200 to 250 is twenty-five per cent; Karnataka 135 to 205 is approximately fifty-two per cent; Delhi 70 to 90 is approximately twenty-nine per cent; Tamil Nadu 100 to 155 is fifty-five per cent; Gujarat 75 to 110 is approximately forty-seven per cent. The highest percentage growth is Tamil Nadu at fifty-five per cent. Option B is correct. Karnataka comes second at fifty-two per cent. The arithmetic for Tamil Nadu: FY24 total equals 90 plus 10 equals 100k; FY25 total equals 135 plus 20 equals 155k; growth equals 55 over 100, which is fifty-five per cent.

**Q22 C**

Sum the FY25 four-wheeler column across all five states: Maharashtra 30 plus Karnataka 25 plus Delhi 15 plus Tamil Nadu 20 plus Gujarat 10. Add stepwise: 30 plus 25 equals 55; 55 plus 15 equals 70; 70 plus 20 equals 90; 90 plus 10 equals 100. The combined FY25 four-wheeler EV registration across all five states is 100 thousand. Option C is correct. Options A (90), B (95) and D (105) are arithmetic errors. The exact total is 100k, matching exactly the value in option C; no rounding is required since the input figures are themselves stated to thousand-unit precision.

**Q23 B**

Compute each state's FY24 total: Maharashtra 180 plus 20 equals 200k; Karnataka 120 plus 15 equals 135k; Delhi 60 plus 10 equals 70k; Tamil Nadu 90 plus 10 equals 100k; Gujarat 70 plus 5 equals 75k. Summing: 200 plus 135 equals 335; plus 70 equals 405; plus 100 equals 505; plus 75 equals 580. The total across all five states is 580k. Average per state equals 580 divided by 5 equals 116k. Option B (116) is the closest match. Options A (112) and D (124) under- or over-shoot, and C (120) is rounded too aggressively. The exact arithmetic average of the five state totals is 116 thousand.

**Q24 B**

Maharashtra FY24 total equals two-wheeler 180 plus four-wheeler 20, which is 200 thousand. Maharashtra FY25 total equals two-wheeler 220 plus four-wheeler 30, which is 250 thousand. Percentage growth equals the change of 50 thousand divided by the FY24 base of 200 thousand, multiplied by 100, which equals 25 per cent. Option B is correct. The arithmetic chain: 250 minus 200 equals 50; 50 over 200 equals 0.25; 0.25 multiplied by 100 equals 25. Maharashtra grew at exactly 25 per cent year-on-year, which makes option B the precise answer with no rounding.

**Q25 B**

First compute the FY25 totals across the five existing states: Maharashtra 220 plus 30 equals 250; Karnataka 180 plus 25 equals 205; Delhi 75 plus 15 equals 90; Tamil Nadu 135 plus 20 equals 155; Gujarat 100 plus 10 equals 110. Sum stepwise: 250 plus 205 equals 455; plus 90 equals 545; plus 155 equals 700; plus 110 equals 810. Adding Telangana's contribution of 80 plus 8 equals 88: total equals 810 plus 88 equals 898. The all-state FY25 total including Telangana is 898 thousand. Option B is correct.

**Q26 B**

From the table, the Education share is fifteen per cent of sixty thousand rupees, equalling nine thousand rupees per month. The Transport share is ten per cent of sixty thousand rupees, equalling six thousand rupees per month. Adding the two: nine thousand plus six thousand equals fifteen thousand rupees per month. Option B (₹15,000) is correct. Option A undercounts; options C and D overcount. The arithmetic uses straightforward percentage-of-total computations on the budget anchor of sixty thousand. Hence the family's combined monthly spend on Education and Transport is exactly fifteen thousand rupees.

**Q27 C**

Education is split equally between school fees and tutoring. The total Education spend is fifteen per cent of sixty thousand rupees, which equals nine thousand rupees per month. Splitting equally means both school fees and tutoring receive half each: nine thousand divided by two equals four thousand five hundred rupees. The family therefore spends four thousand five hundred rupees on tutoring each month. Option C (₹4,500) is correct. Option A (₹3,500), option B (₹4,000) and option D (₹5,000) result from arithmetic errors or unequal splits not stated in the passage.

**Q28 B**

Transport currently absorbs ten per cent of the budget. If Savings rises by five percentage points, those five percentage points must come from Transport (per the question), so Transport falls from ten per cent to five per cent. Five per cent of sixty thousand rupees equals three thousand rupees. The new monthly Transport amount is three thousand rupees. Option B (₹3,000) is correct. Option A (₹2,400), option C (₹3,600) and option D (₹4,200) result from incorrect percentage shifts. Verification: the new Savings becomes seventeen per cent of sixty thousand, equalling ten thousand two hundred rupees, while total spending remains sixty thousand rupees.

**Q29 B**

Within the Transport budget, the passage states that two-thirds is fuel and one-third is public transport. The ratio of fuel expense to public transport expense is therefore two-thirds to one-third, which simplifies to two to one. Option B (2 : 1) is correct. In rupee terms, total Transport equals six thousand: fuel equals two-thirds of six thousand equals four thousand rupees; public transport equals one-third of six thousand equals two thousand rupees. The ratio four thousand to two thousand simplifies to two to one. Options A, C and D are all distorted ratios that contradict the stated split.

**Q30 B**

Original Rent equals twenty-one thousand rupees. A ten per cent rise gives a new Rent of twenty-one thousand multiplied by one point one zero, which equals twenty-three thousand one hundred rupees. The increase is two thousand one hundred rupees. To keep total spending at sixty thousand, Savings must absorb the increase: original Savings equals seven thousand two hundred minus two thousand one hundred equals five thousand one hundred rupees. The new Savings is five thousand one hundred rupees. Option B (₹5,100) is correct. Verification: 23,100 plus 12,000 plus 4,800 plus 9,000 plus 6,000 plus 5,100 equals exactly sixty thousand rupees.

## SECTION D — RAPID-FIRE MIXED REASONING &amp; GK

**Q31 B**

A is B's brother (so A and B are siblings). B is C's sister (so B and C are siblings, meaning A and C are also siblings). C is D's father, so D is C's child. A, being C's brother, is therefore D's father's brother — that is, D's uncle. Option B is correct. Option A (Father) is wrong because C is the father, not A. Option C (Brother) is wrong because A is one generation above D. Option D (Cousin) is wrong because cousins share grandparents, whereas A and D share a parent-of-A's-sibling relationship, which is uncle-niece/nephew.

**Q32 B**

Place Rohit at the origin (0, 0). Walking 6 km north takes him to coordinates (0, 6). Turning right (now facing east) and walking 8 km takes him to (8, 6). Turning right again (now facing south) and walking 6 km takes him to (8, 0). The displacement from the starting point (0, 0) to (8, 0) is 8 km purely east. He is 8 km east of the start. Option B is correct. The 'right then right' from north results in facing east then south; the final position lies due east of the origin at distance 8 km. Options A, C and D misread direction or distance.

**Q33 B**

Statement 1 is universal positive: 'All poets are dreamers.' Statement 2 is particular positive: 'Some dreamers are realists.' Conclusion I says 'Some poets are realists' — this does NOT follow because the dreamers who are realists may not include any poet (the 'some dreamers' subset may consist entirely of non-poet dreamers). Conclusion II says 'Some realists are dreamers' — this is the conversion of Statement 2 ('Some dreamers are realists' converts to 'Some realists are dreamers'), which is logically valid. Hence only Conclusion II follows. Option B is correct.

**Q34 A**

Identify the cipher pattern. LIGHT codes to MJHIU. Compare letter by letter: L to M is plus one; I to J is plus one; G to H is plus one; H to I is plus one; T to U is plus one. So each letter advances by one position in the alphabet. Apply this rule to HEAVY: H plus one equals I; E plus one equals F; A plus one equals B; V plus one equals W; Y plus one equals Z. The coded form is IFBWZ. Option A is correct. Options B, C and D each contain at least one wrong substitution and so do not match the consistent plus-one shift.

---

**Q35 B**

Identify the recurrence. Differences: 7 minus 3 equals 4; 16 minus 7 equals 9; 35 minus 16 equals 19; 74 minus 35 equals 39. The differences themselves follow a pattern: 4, 9, 19, 39 — each is the previous doubled plus one (4 times 2 plus 1 equals 9; 9 times 2 plus 1 equals 19; 19 times 2 plus 1 equals 39). The next difference is 39 times 2 plus 1, which equals 79. Adding to the last term: 74 plus 79 equals 153. The next term is 153. Option B is correct.

---

**Q36 A**

Set the cost price at one hundred for clean arithmetic. Marked price equals one hundred multiplied by one point four zero, which equals one hundred and forty. A twenty-five per cent discount on the marked price gives selling price equal to one hundred and forty multiplied by zero point seven five, which equals one hundred and five. Profit equals one hundred and five minus one hundred, which is five. Profit percentage equals five over one hundred, multiplied by one hundred, equalling five per cent. Option A is correct. The full chain: mark up forty per cent then discount twenty-five per cent leaves one point four zero multiplied by zero point seven five, equalling one point zero five — a five per cent profit on cost.

---

**Q37 C**

When a train crosses a platform, the total distance covered equals the train's length plus the platform's length. Total distance equals two hundred plus three hundred, which is five hundred metres. Time taken equals twenty-five seconds. Speed equals distance divided by time, equalling five hundred divided by twenty-five, equalling twenty metres per second. Convert to kilometres per hour by multiplying by eighteen-fifths (or three point six): twenty multiplied by three point six equals seventy-two. The train's speed is seventy-two kilometres per hour. Option C is correct. Options A, B and D arise from arithmetic or conversion errors.

---

**Q38 C**

Article 17 of the Constitution of India abolishes 'untouchability' and forbids its practice in any form. The enforcement of any disability arising out of untouchability is an offence punishable under law (the Protection of Civil Rights Act, 1955, and now also relevant provisions of the Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes (Prevention of Atrocities) Act, 1989). Article 14 deals with equality before law; Article 15 with prohibition of discrimination on grounds of religion, race, caste, sex or place of birth; Article 21 with protection of life and personal liberty. Hence option C (Article 17) is the correct answer to this question.