

ANSWER KEY — 26 MAY 2026

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

SECTION A — LEGAL REASONING

Q1 B

Applying the Doctrine of Severability under Article 13 and the Chamarbaugwalla test (1957), Section 7 (the absolute ban on public meetings) is independently struck down because Section 8 (the 24-hour notice requirement) is a separate, internally workable provision that constitutes a reasonable restriction under Article 19(3). The two sections regulate distinct levels of restriction and the legislature would clearly have enacted Section 8 even without Section 7. The residue (Section 8 alone) forms a coherent licensing scheme. Option A wrongly assumes any restriction is unconstitutional. Option C ignores severability. Option D wrongly treats Section 8 as dependent on Section 7.

Q2 D

Option D is incorrect. The Doctrine of Severability applies to BOTH pre-Constitution laws under Article 13(1) AND post-Constitution laws under Article 13(2). The Supreme Court has consistently applied the doctrine to post-1950 statutes (e.g., in R.M.D. Chamarbaugwalla itself, the impugned Prize Competitions Act, 1955 was a post-Constitution law). Options A, B and C all correctly state the doctrine. The independence/workability requirement (A), the leading authority in Chamarbaugwalla (B), and the inextricable-mixture rule (C) are all established components of the doctrine. The temporal restriction in option D is the false statement.

Q3 B

Sections 3 (advertising ban) and 9 (wagering ban) regulate two distinct subject-matters with no operational interdependence. Under the Chamarbaugwalla test, the court asks whether (a) the two provisions are inextricably mixed and (b) whether the residue forms an intelligible workable scheme. Here, the wagering prohibition operates entirely independently of the advertising prohibition, and the legislature would plainly have enacted Section 9 standing alone. Only Section 3 is struck for violating Article 19(1)(a); Section 9 survives. Option A wrongly merges them; option C ('read down') is inapplicable where the section is facially unconstitutional; option D mistakes severability for judicial restraint.

Q4 B

The Chamarbaugwalla test is correctly captured in option B: the court asks whether the legislature would have enacted the valid portion independently and whether the residue forms an intelligible, workable scheme. Option A invents a non-existent word-count rule. Option C is wrong because severability does NOT require an express severability clause — Indian courts apply the doctrine as a default rule of construction. Option D wrongly limits the doctrine to procedural provisions; the doctrine applies to substantive provisions equally. The Chamarbaugwalla criteria are intent + workability, not form or content.

Q5 A

Although Section 5 is internally constitutional, it cannot stand on its own once Section 4 (fee provision) falls — a licensing scheme without a fee provision is operationally meaningless. Under prong (b) of Chamarbaugwalla, the residue must form an 'intelligible workable scheme.' When the invalid portion is structurally foundational, the residue collapses with it. Therefore Section 5 also falls and the entire licensing chapter is void. Option B misses the workability prong. Option C wrongly invites judicial legislation. Option D is conceptually incoherent — unconstitutionality is not self-cancelling.

Q6 A

Where only specific sections (here 2, 7 and 22) are unconstitutional and the remaining 47 sections can operate as an intelligible, workable scheme, the court severs the offending sections under Article 13(2) read with Chamarbaugwalla. Option B is wrong because the doctrine of severability is designed precisely to avoid striking the whole Act. Option C is wrong because severability applies to post-Constitution laws (see Q2). Option D is wrong because severability does not require an express severability clause; it is a default rule of constitutional interpretation. Option A correctly states the modern Indian position.

Q7 B

Metro Transit is NOT liable. The driver's two-kilometre deviation to deliver a personal tiffin to his wife is a 'frolic of his own' — a substantial departure from the master's business for purely personal purposes. The accident occurred on this frolic, taking the driver outside the course of employment (*Beard v. London General Omnibus Co.*, 1900, principle). Option A overstates the rule — driving the master's bus is not always in the course of employment. Options C and D introduce irrelevant criteria (uniform, distance threshold) not recognised in the doctrine. The test is the nature of the deviation, not its length.

Q8 B

The classic 'control test' distinguishes a servant from an independent contractor: the employer controls not just WHAT is to be done but the manner in which it is done. A servant is subject to the employer's directions on method; an independent contractor is engaged for a result and chooses his own method. The other options describe peripheral features (mode of payment, premises, uniform) that are evidentially relevant but not decisive. The control test, supplemented by the modern multiple-factor or 'integration' test in complex cases, remains the doctrinal touchstone for vicarious liability of master for servant.

Q9 B

The owner is vicariously liable. The attendant was performing an authorised act (filling petrol) in an unauthorised and grossly negligent manner (smoking while doing so). Under the *Limpus v. London General Omnibus Co.* (1862) principle, an unauthorised mode of doing an authorised act remains within the course of employment. The attendant was on duty, at the workplace, doing his job. The fact that smoking was prohibited does not exonerate the master — express prohibition does not break vicarious liability where the prohibited conduct is incidental to the authorised task. Option A confuses the rule. Options C and D are irrelevant additions.

Q10 C

State of Rajasthan v. Vidhyawati (1962) is the landmark Supreme Court decision establishing that the State of India is vicariously liable in tort for the negligent acts of its non-sovereign employees, on the same footing as a private employer. In that case, a government driver negligently killed a pedestrian; the State was held liable. *Rylands v. Fletcher* (1868) is the strict liability foundation, irrelevant here. *Donoghue v. Stevenson* (1932) is the negligence/duty-of-care case. *Salomon v. Salomon* (1897) is a corporate veil case. *Vidhyawati* is the correct authority on State vicarious liability.

Q11 A

The bank is liable. *Lloyd v. Grace, Smith & Co.* (1912) and its Indian progeny establish that a master is vicariously liable even for the fraudulent acts of a servant committed for the servant's personal benefit, provided they are done within the apparent scope of employment using the master's authority. The clerk was working at the bank, during business hours, using bank apparatus and apparent authority — that is enough. Option B is wrong because express prohibition does not break vicarious liability where apparent authority subsists. Option C invents a non-existent approval requirement. Option D wrongly excludes all criminal acts from the doctrine.

Q12 B

Option B is incorrect. Express prohibition does NOT automatically exclude vicarious liability. Under *Limpus v. London General Omnibus Co.* (1862), even where the master expressly forbids the manner of the act (in that case, racing rival buses), the master is liable if the servant was performing an authorised task in an unauthorised manner. The other options are correct: A states the *Limpus* principle of unauthorised mode; C correctly describes a frolic; D correctly states the rule from *State of Rajasthan v. Vidhyawati* (1962). Option B is the only false statement.

SECTION B — ANALYTICAL REASONING

Q13 B

Solve step by step. From condition (1), Anya = floor 6. From (2), Esha is immediately below Anya, so Esha = floor 5. From (5), Gaurav = floor 3. From (3), Chetan lives on an even floor but not floor 2; floor 6 is taken by Anya, so Chetan = floor 4. From (6), Bhavik lives above Anya (floor 6), so Bhavik = floor 7. The remaining floors 1 and 2 must hold Dhruv and Farah; condition (4) requires Dhruv immediately above Farah, so Farah = 1 and Dhruv = 2. Chetan therefore lives on floor 4 — option B.

Q14 B

From the final arrangement (1=Farah, 2=Dhruv, 3=Gaurav, 4=Chetan, 5=Esha, 6=Anya, 7=Bhavik), Anya is on floor 6 and Gaurav is on floor 3. The persons between them occupy floors 4 and 5 — that is Chetan and Esha — giving exactly two persons between Anya and Gaurav. Option B is correct. Option A understates by one; options C and D overstate. The count strictly excludes the two endpoint floors (6 and 3) themselves.

Q15 C

From the final arrangement (1=Farah, 2=Dhruv, 3=Gaurav, 4=Chetan, 5=Esha, 6=Anya, 7=Bhavik), floor 1 is occupied by Farah. Option C is correct. Bhavik lives on floor 7, Chetan on floor 4, and Dhruv on floor 2 — none of them is on floor 1. The chain of deductions in question 1 fully fixes Farah at the ground floor by elimination (floors 1 and 2 are the only ones remaining for {Dhruv, Farah} and condition (4) forces Dhruv above Farah).

Q16 A

Original arrangement: Esha = 5, Bhavik = 7. After swap, Bhavik moves to floor 5 and Esha moves to floor 7. Immediately above Bhavik (now on floor 5) is floor 6, which continues to be occupied by Anya. Option A (Anya) is therefore correct. Chetan (floor 4) is below Bhavik, not above. Dhruv (floor 2) and Gaurav (floor 3) are also below. The swap leaves Anya in place, so she becomes Bhavik's new upstairs neighbour.

Q17 C

Find the intersection of sentences (a) and (c). Sentence (a) 'tax cuts hurt growth' = pim ron sak dol. Sentence (c) 'jobs growth needs tax' = vex sak nip pim. The common English words are 'tax' and 'growth'; the common code words are 'pim' and 'sak'. From the intersection of (a) and (b) we already deduced that 'cuts', 'hurt', 'growth' share codes 'ron', 'sak', 'dol' (so growth is one of these three). Cross-referenced with $(a) \cap (c) = \{pim, sak\}$, growth must be 'sak'. Option C.

Q18 C

From the intersection of (a) and (b), the words common to both ('cuts', 'hurt', 'growth') correspond to the common codes {ron, sak, dol}. Growth = 'sak' (Q1). From clue (d), the sentence 'pim ron nip qua' contains no word from 'hurt'; since pim=tax and nip=needs and qua=to, this means ron \neq hurt, so ron = cuts. The remaining word, 'hurt', must therefore correspond to 'dol'. Option C is correct.

Q19 C

From sentence (b) minus (a), the extra words are 'to' and 'jobs' and the extra codes are 'vex' and 'qua'. So {to, jobs} = {vex, qua}. From sentence (c), 'jobs' shares the code 'vex' with sentence (b) (since the only common code between b and c besides growth=sak is vex). Therefore jobs = vex and consequently to = qua. Option C is correct: 'qua' represents the English word 'to'.

Q20 D

The codes derivable are: tax=pim, cuts=ron, hurt=dol, growth=sak, jobs=vex, to=qua, needs=nip. Option A ('jobs needs tax' = vex nip pim) is fully expressible. Option B ('growth cuts hurt' = sak ron dol) is fully expressible. Option C ('tax hurt jobs' = pim dol vex) is fully expressible. Option D contains the word 'profit', for which NO code can be derived from the given statements. Hence option D is the sentence that cannot be fully expressed.

SECTION C — QUANTITATIVE TECHNIQUES

Q21 B

FY25 total = \$28 bn; North America = \$11.5 bn. Share = $11.5 / 28 \times 100 = 41.07\%$. Rounded to the nearest whole per cent gives 41%. Option B. Option A (38%) understates; option C (44%) overstates by treating the FY24 number; option D (47%) is far too high. The correct ratio calculation is straightforward: \$11.5 bn out of \$28 bn is roughly 4/10, i.e., ~41%.

Q22 D

YoY growth rates from the table: North America +15.0%, Africa +15.0%, EU +10.0%, ASEAN +20.0%, Rest of World 0.0%. The highest growth rate is ASEAN at +20.0% (driven by capacity-building in Vietnam, Indonesia and the Philippines). Option D. The intermediate growth options (A, B, C — all $\leq 15\%$) are eclipsed by ASEAN. Note: both North America and Africa tie at +15%, but neither matches ASEAN's +20%.

Q23 B

EU FY24 = \$4.0 bn, FY25 = \$4.4 bn, increase = \$0.4 bn. ASEAN FY24 = \$2.5 bn, FY25 = \$3.0 bn, increase = \$0.5 bn. Combined increase = \$0.4 + \$0.5 = \$0.9 bn. Option B. Option A understates by \$0.2 bn; option C and D overstate. The two regions' increments are simply summed; no weighting is required because the question asks for absolute dollar-billion combined growth.

Q24 B

Africa FY24-FY25 absolute increase = \$4.6 - \$4.0 = \$0.6 bn. If FY26 grows by the same \$0.6 bn from FY25, then FY26 Africa exports = \$4.6 + \$0.6 = \$5.2 bn. Option B. Option A (\$5.0) ignores the increment; options C (\$5.4) and D (\$5.6) over-project. The question specifies absolute, not percentage, growth — so the dollar increment, not the rate, is carried forward.

Q25 C

FY24: Africa = \$4.0 bn, ASEAN = \$2.5 bn, combined = \$6.5 bn. FY24 total = \$25.0 bn. Share = $6.5 / 25.0 \times 100 = 26.0\%$. Option C. Option A (22%) understates; option B (24%) undershoots; option D (30%) overshoots. The arithmetic is exact: $6.5/25 = 0.26 = 26\%$. Note the question asks about FY24 (not FY25), so the FY25 numbers must not be substituted.

Q26 C

Q4 FY26 total industry AUM = ₹71.0 lakh crore; Equity-oriented AUM = ₹33.0 lakh crore. Share = 33.0 divided by 71.0 multiplied by 100 = 46.48 per cent. Rounded to the nearest whole per cent, this gives 46 per cent. Option C is therefore correct. Option A (41 per cent) significantly understates the equity share, option B (44 per cent) is close but still understates, and option D (49 per cent) overstates. The equity share of total industry AUM has risen markedly during FY26 on the back of sustained retail SIP inflows and a strong rally in mid-cap and small-cap indices.

Q27 A

QoQ growth rates from the table: Equity +10.0%, Debt +4.0%, Hybrid +10.0%, Index & ETF +15.0%, Solution-oriented +5.0%. The lowest growth rate is Debt-oriented at +4.0%. Option A. Solution-oriented (+5.0%) is the second-lowest. The Equity and Hybrid categories tied at +10%, and Index & ETF led with +15%. Investor flows in Q4 FY26 visibly tilted toward equity and passive products at the expense of duration risk in debt.

Q28 C

The codes derivable from the four statements are: tax = pim, cuts = ron, hurt = dol, growth = sak, jobs = vex, to = qua, needs = nip. Option A ('jobs needs tax' = vex nip pim) is fully expressible. Option B ('growth cuts hurt' = sak ron dol) is fully expressible. Option C ('tax hurt jobs' = pim dol vex) is fully expressible. Option D contains the English word 'profit', for which NO code can be derived from the given statements. Hence option D is the sentence that cannot be fully expressed in the coded language.

Q29 B

Equity-oriented absolute increase Q3→Q4 FY26 = ₹33.0 - ₹30.0 = ₹3.0 lakh crore. If Q1 FY27 grows by the same absolute ₹3.0 lakh crore from Q4 FY26's ₹33.0 lakh crore, then Q1 FY27 Equity AUM = ₹33.0 + ₹3.0 = ₹36.0 lakh crore. Option B. Option A undershoots, options C and D overshoot. The question fixes the absolute increment, not the growth rate.

Q30 B

Q4 FY26 Debt = ₹15.6 lakh crore; Hybrid = ₹8.8 lakh crore. Ratio = 15.6 : 8.8 = 1.773 : 1. Compare options: 3:2 = 1.50; 7:4 = 1.75; 5:3 = 1.667; 9:5 = 1.80. The closest match to 1.773 is 7:4 (1.75), with deviation 0.023, marginally tighter than 9:5 (deviation 0.027). Option B. The ratio calculation requires dividing the two AUM figures and matching the decimal to each given fraction.

SECTION D — RAPID-FIRE MIXED REASONING & GK

Q31 A

P is the brother of Q, Q is the sister of R, so P, Q and R are siblings. R is the father of S. Therefore P, a brother of R, is the uncle of S. Drawing the family tree: P-Q-R are siblings of the same generation; S is in the next generation as R's child. P is S's uncle. Option B (Father) would require P to be S's parent, but P is only an uncle. Option C (Brother) requires same generation, but S is one generation below P. Option D (Grandfather) requires two generations of separation, but here there is only one.

Q32 B

Aman walks 8 km East from home, then turns left (now facing North) and walks 5 km, then turns left again (now facing West) and walks 8 km. The two East-West movements (8 km East and 8 km West) cancel out exactly. The only net displacement is the 5 km Northward leg. So Aman is 5 km North of his home. Visualise: start (0,0) → (8,0) → (8,5) → (0,5). Distance from origin = 5 km; direction = North. Option A and C ignore the cancellation. Option D wrongly adds the East-West legs to the North leg.

Q33 B

Only conclusion II follows. From 'Some pencils are erasers,' the converse 'Some erasers are pencils' is necessarily true in Aristotelian syllogism (particular affirmative is convertible). Conclusion II therefore validly follows. Conclusion I ('Some pens are erasers') does NOT follow: all pens are pencils, but only SOME pencils are erasers — the pens may fall entirely within the non-eraser portion of pencils. Without a guaranteed overlap between the 'pen' subset and the 'eraser' subset of pencils, no valid conclusion connects pens to erasers. Hence only II follows.

Q34 A

In the code 'LEARN' → 'OHDUQ', each letter shifts by +3 (L→O, E→H, A→D, R→U, N→Q). Apply the same +3 shift to 'TEACH': T→W, E→H, A→D, C→F, H→K. The coded form is 'WHDFK'. Verify each letter: T(20)+3=W(23); E(5)+3=H(8); A(1)+3=D(4); C(3)+3=F(6); H(8)+3=K(11). All match option A. Options B, C and D contain incorrect letters at the 4th or 5th position, breaking the +3 shift pattern.

Q35 C

Each term in the series doubles the previous term: $3 \times 2 = 6$; $6 \times 2 = 12$; $12 \times 2 = 24$; $24 \times 2 = 48$; $48 \times 2 = 96$. The common ratio is 2. The next term is therefore 96. Option A (64) is the 7th power of 2 — irrelevant here. Option B (72) breaks the doubling pattern. Option D (120) adds 72, which has no consistent rule with the rest of the series. The unambiguous doubling pattern fixes the answer at 96.

Q36 A

Let cost price = 100. Marked price = $100 + 40\% = 140$. Discount = 25% of 140 = 35. Selling price = $140 - 35 = 105$. Profit = $105 - 100 = 5$. Profit per cent = $(5 / 100) \times 100 = 5\%$. The shopkeeper's profit is 5%. Option B (10%) ignores the discount step. Option C (15%) treats the 40% markup as net profit. Option D (20%) wrongly subtracts 25% from 40%. The correct chain is markup → discount on marked price → compare to cost.

Q37 B

Article 14 of the Constitution of India guarantees the right to equality before the law and the equal protection of the laws within the territory of India. It is the cornerstone of the equality code in Part III (Fundamental Rights). Article 12 defines 'the State'. Article 19 deals with the six freedoms (speech, assembly, association, movement, residence, profession). Article 21 deals with the right to life and personal liberty. Article 14, with its twin guarantees, is the right to equality and is the correct answer.

Q38 B

'Audi alteram partem' is a Latin maxim meaning 'hear the other side' — one of the two principal rules of natural justice (the other being 'nemo iudex in causa sua', no one shall be a judge in his own cause). It requires that no person be condemned unheard. Option A states the OTHER rule of natural justice. Option C is 'caveat emptor', a contract-law maxim. Option D is a maxim of equity. Audi alteram partem is invoked in administrative law to ensure fair hearing before adverse action.