

ANSWER KEY – 15 MAY 2026

Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q5	Q6	Q7	Q8	Q9	Q10
C	B	B	B	A	B	D	B	C	B
Q11	Q12	Q13	Q14	Q15	Q16	Q17	Q18	Q19	Q20
D	C	A	C	D	D	A	D	B	D
Q21	Q22	Q23	Q24	Q25	Q26	Q27	Q28		
A	C	D	A	C	D	C	B		

RC PASSAGES

Q1 C

The second paragraph's primary function is to ESTABLISH THE CENTRAL PARADOX of the passage: a high-volume jurisdiction (thousands of patent suits) that produces remarkably little law (thin precedent base). The paragraph explicitly characterises the situation as 'a problem disguised as efficiency' and frames the result as a paradox. This paradox motivates the structural critique that follows in paragraphs 3 and 4. Option (A) misreads the paragraph as merely additional data — it does more analytical work than that. Option (C) is wrong; the IPD is introduced in paragraph 3, not paragraph 2. Option (D) overstates — the paragraph does not argue for abolition. Answer: (C).

Q2 B

The author's underlying claim in paragraph 3 is that the INCENTIVE STRUCTURE pushes most cases to early settlement, starving doctrine. A finding that the average TIME TO TRIAL had recently fallen from twelve years to four years would directly affect this incentive: a much shorter time to trial reduces the cost-and-risk premium that makes settlement rational, and could shift the equilibrium toward more cases going to reasoned judgment. Option (C) identifies this as the claim most directly affected. Option (A) — the 4% statistic — is itself the OUTCOME the time-to-trial change would alter, not the underlying incentive. Option (B) — defensive patenting — is a DOWNSTREAM consequence, several steps removed. Option (D) — the IPD's order count — is a separate factual matter unaffected by time to trial.

Q3 B

Option (B) is the most analogous scenario. The author's structure of concern is: a high volume of disputes resolved by early settlement, leaving few precedents to guide future actors on the scope of doctrine. A consumer-protection jurisdiction in which most disputes are mediated to settlement, leaving few precedents on the scope of statutory rights, mirrors this structure precisely. Option (A) inverts the pattern — high trial rate, not high settlement rate. Option (C) — advisory opinions — is a different doctrinal device entirely. Option (D) — universal publication of every order — is the OPPOSITE problem (over-precedent rather than under-precedent). Only option (B) captures the analogous structure of settlement-driven doctrinal thinness.

Q4 B

The final paragraph argues that companies over-invest in DEFENSIVE patenting and under-invest in actual research because transactional uncertainty makes defensive patents more predictable. This argument depends on the unstated assumption that defensive patenting and substantive research are PARTIAL SUBSTITUTES in firms' R&D allocation decisions — that is, money diverted to one comes at the expense of the other. If they were entirely independent (e.g., funded from different budget lines), the diversion claim would not follow. Option (B) makes this assumption explicit. The other options identify claims that are either explicitly stated or unrelated to the argument's logic.

Q5 A

The phrase 'a problem disguised as efficiency' is a rhetorical move that signals a SURFACE/DEPTH contrast: on the surface, settlement-driven outcomes appear efficient (capping cost and risk), but in fact this efficiency masks a hidden systemic cost (doctrinal underdevelopment). Option (A) captures both halves of the disguise: surface appearance of efficiency, deeper systemic cost. Option (B) inverts the meaning. Option (C) is too sweeping — the author does not say settlements are universally inefficient, only that the AGGREGATE outcome of mass settlement is structurally costly. Option (D) is the opposite of the author's stance.

Q6 B

The author's primary purpose is to DIAGNOSE the technical and sociological reasons for poor monsoon model performance and draw a SPECIFIC POLICY IMPLICATION for infrastructure design (handling a wider range of futures, building to model spread rather than model means). Paragraphs 2 and 3 deliver the diagnosis (technical: coupling errors, resolution; sociological: funding skew). Paragraph 4 delivers the policy translation. Option (B) captures this dual purpose. Option (A) is wrong — the author is critical, not celebratory. Option (C) is too narrow and inflammatory — the author criticises funding structure, not the IMD's existence. Option (D) is wrong — the author explicitly disclaims a single-number forecast.

Q7 D

Paragraph 2 identifies low spatial resolution of global models as one of the technical reasons for poor monsoon reproduction. If a new generation of regional models at 10-km resolution consistently reproduced historical monsoon variability, that would directly weaken the resolution-as-binding-constraint claim — it would suggest the constraint can be overcome with better resolution. Option (B) captures this. Option (A) — the funding claim — is a sociological claim independent of technical capability and would not be weakened by improved modelling. Option (C) — the 70% rainfall claim — is an empirical fact unaffected by modelling. Option (D) — the infrastructure-design implication — is a policy conclusion that survives even if some technical issues are resolved, since the funding skew remains.

Q8 B

The author's tone is best described as DIAGNOSTIC and SYMPATHETIC. The passage identifies specific limitations of current modelling — coupling errors, resolution constraints, funding skew — without ever attacking the modellers' competence or integrity. The author treats the modellers as skilled professionals working within structural constraints they did not choose. Option (C) captures this. Option (A) 'hostile' overstates — the author is critical of structural conditions, not of the modellers themselves. Option (B) 'adulatory' is the opposite extreme. Option (D) 'indifferent' contradicts the careful and engaged analysis throughout.

Q9 C

Option (B) — 'Why Climate Models Fail in India — and What That Means for the Embankments We Build' — captures both the diagnostic core (paragraphs 1-3) and the specific policy implication (paragraph 4) of the passage. It signals BOTH the technical-failure analysis AND the engineering consequence. Option (A) is the opposite of the passage's stance — the author explicitly disclaims a definite forecast. Option (C) is too narrow — the passage is not a textbook on convection. Option (D) is unrelated — the IMD is mentioned only incidentally as part of the funding-pattern argument.

Q10 B

Option (B) is best supported. The passage explicitly endorses BOTH higher-resolution regional models (paragraph 2: 'higher-resolution regional models do better') AND a deliberate rebalancing of funding toward long-horizon projection alongside operational forecasting (paragraph 3: 'Both are scientifically necessary; one is preferentially funded'). The combined implication points squarely to a research direction that advances on both fronts. Option (A) — entirely foreign-funded — is unsupported. Option (C) — eliminating uncertainty by 2030 — is contradicted by the author's emphasis on irreducible uncertainty. Option (D) — discontinuing monsoon work — is the opposite of what the passage advocates.

CR PASSAGES

Q11 D

Option (C) operates on the SAME STRUCTURE of reasoning as the author's first argument. The author's structure is: when participation is voluntary, the resulting attention is biased toward those who DO participate; mandatory engagement of all stakeholders ELIMINATES this distortion at its source. Option (C) mirrors this exactly: regulators systematically attend more closely to lobbying industries; mandatory engagement of all stakeholders eliminates the distortion. The structural parallelism — 'voluntary participation produces biased attention; mandatory participation removes the bias' — is identical. Option (A) is unrelated (raising speed limits to match practice). Option (B) is the inverse logic (defer to preferences). Option (D) is irrelevant. Only option (C) preserves the parallel structure.

Q12 C

Option (B) provides a principle that, if accepted, would BEST RESOLVE the dispute. The author and the Lockean objector disagree on whether a burden on liberty is permissible. Option (B) provides a TWO-PART RESOLVING PRINCIPLE: a burden is justified if (a) the substantive liberty interest is preserved and (b) the burden imposed is no greater than civic burdens already accepted. Both halves map directly onto the author's argumentative moves: (a) the right to spoil one's ballot preserves the substantive interest; (b) the comparison to military conscription and jury duty shows the burden is no greater than already-accepted burdens. Option (A) is too absolute. Option (C) inverts the answer. Option (D) is rigid and wouldn't resolve the dispute — it would simply side with the Lockean.

Q13 A

The author's response to the administrative objection rests on the unstated assumption captured by option (B): stage-wise implementation can deliver MEANINGFUL improvement in turnout even before the full administrative apparatus is mature, AND the partial improvement is preferable to the status quo. If staged implementation could not deliver meaningful improvement at any stage, or if partial improvement were not preferable to the status quo, the 'don't make perfect the enemy of the good' move collapses. Option (A) is too strong — the author concedes administrative differences. Option (C) is fabricated — the author explicitly says the roll is imperfect. Option (D) is contradicted by the author's acknowledgment of cost.

Q14 C

Option (B) provides counter-evidence that would MOST SUBSTANTIALLY weaken the author's reliance on Australia. The author cited Australia's six generations of compulsory voting without 'discernible democratic backsliding'. Option (B) provides exactly the kind of evidence that contradicts this: documented decline in deliberation quality, rising spoiled ballots, eroding party-membership engagement. If the Australian record actually shows democratic costs the author missed, the empirical refutation argument fails. Option (A) — preferential voting — is irrelevant to compulsory voting. Option (C) — geographic size — is not the basis of the author's analogy. Option (D) — varying state populations — is also irrelevant.

Q15 D

Option (B) captures the function of the comparison precisely. The author cites military conscription and jury duty to establish, BY ANALOGY, that constitutional democracies routinely impose civic burdens of comparable or greater weight without controversy. The implicit argumentative move: if heavier burdens are accepted, a much lighter burden of compulsory voting cannot be objected to in PRINCIPLE — only the IMPLEMENTATION can be debated. This weakens the in-principle Lockean objection. Option (A) is wrong — the author is not advocating reintroducing conscription. Option (C) is the opposite of the argument. Option (D) is wrong — the comparison is structurally relevant, not a distraction.

Q16 D

Option (B) captures the author's use of the analogy precisely. The author EXPLICITLY ACKNOWLEDGES the analogy is imperfect — 'forests are not gardens' — and then turns the imperfection into ANALYTICAL CONTENT: the difference between gardens and forests is itself an area for productive refinement. This is a sophisticated rhetorical move: an analogy presented WITH its limits flagged is more useful than one presented as perfect, because the limits direct attention to the right next questions. Option (A) — definitive proof — is the opposite of what the author does. Option (C) — mere rhetorical flourish — undersells the analytical work. Option (D) — horticultural model — misreads the analogy literally.

Q17 A

The author's principle (paragraph 3) is that ecological systems have a recovery capacity that intensive human management persistently underestimates. Option (A) describes rigorous evidence that DIRECTLY rejects this: degraded Indian forests systematically fail to recover without continuous intensive management, and all documented recovery cases involve sustained intervention. If true, this would mean the principle is empirically false — and the case for rewilding would collapse, exactly as the author concedes. Option (B) — Kuno project fatalities — is anecdotal and tied to one project, not a refutation of the principle. Option (C) — comparative cost — does not engage the principle. Option (D) — popularity in Europe — is sociology, not empirical refutation.

Q18 D

Option (B) identifies the FALLACY OF NO TRUE SCOTSMAN. The author replies to the third objection (uneven scientific quality) by saying 'bad rewilding is bad conservation' and implicitly excluding the bad instances from 'real' rewilding. This is the classic No True Scotsman move: any instance of the category that fails to support the argument is redefined as not really in the category. Option (A) — no flaw — misses this. Option (C) — circular reasoning — misnames the move; the author is not assuming the principle being challenged. Option (D) — ad hominem — is wrong; the author is not attacking proponents personally. The No True Scotsman label is the precise diagnosis.

Q19 B

Option (B) accurately describes the author's rhetorical move. The author RE-FRAMES the first objection: accepting the premise that India lacks Yellowstone-scale wilderness, but rejecting the underlying assumption that rewilding REQUIRES such large blocks. The reply is supported by a specific empirical citation (Indian studies showing recovery on landscapes of well under 100 sq km). This is a textbook re-framing — challenging not the surface premise but the unstated assumption that links the premise to the conclusion. Option (A) is wrong — there is no appeal to patriotism. Option (C) is wrong — the author engages substantively. Option (D) is wrong — Article 48A is not invoked.

Q20 D

Option (B) captures the FUNCTION of the concession precisely. The author concedes 'bad rewilding is bad conservation' but follows the concession with a structural defence: weak instances do not invalidate the underlying principle, supported by the analogy to judicial review (weak judgments do not invalidate the principle). The concession DEFUSES the empirical force of the objection (yes, some projects are weak) while PRESERVING the normative principle. This is a strategic concession-and-distinction move. Option (A) — surrender — is wrong; the author retains the underlying claim. Option (C) — undermining accidental admission — misreads the structure. Option (D) — factual claim about cost — is incorrect; the concession is normative, not empirical.

SECTION C — RAPID-FIRE GK & CURRENT AFFAIRS

Q21 A

The official currency of Argentina is the PESO (denoted ARS — Argentine Peso). Argentina has had the peso as its currency in various forms since 1881, with periodic redenominations to address inflation. The Brazilian Real (option A) is the currency of Brazil. The Bolívar (option C) is the currency of Venezuela. The Sol (option D) is the currency of Peru. Only the Peso is correct for Argentina. Argentina has experienced sustained high inflation in recent years, leading to widespread informal use of US dollars alongside the peso. Answer: (A) Peso.

Q22 C

The G20 summit hosted by Brazil in November 2024 in Rio de Janeiro produced the Rio de Janeiro Leaders' Declaration. The headline initiative formally launched at the summit was the GLOBAL ALLIANCE AGAINST HUNGER AND POVERTY, pioneered by President Lula da Silva, which seeks to coordinate international action on food security and poverty reduction. Option (B) — a binding climate-finance treaty — was discussed but not signed at G20. Option (C) confuses the AU's admission, which actually occurred at the New Delhi summit in 2023 under India's presidency. Option (D) — a global minimum corporate tax of 30% — is incorrect (the actual OECD agreement is at 15%). Answer: (C) Global Alliance Against Hunger and Poverty.

Q23 D

A 'sycophant' is a person who acts obsequiously toward someone in order to gain advantage — one who flatters powerful people insincerely and excessively. The closest synonym is 'flatterer'. The word is often used pejoratively to describe courtiers, advisors, or staff who tell their superior what they want to hear rather than the truth. Option (A) 'critics' is the OPPOSITE of sycophants. Option (C) 'advisors' is a more neutral and broader term that does not capture the obsequious flattery. Option (D) 'strangers' is unrelated. Only option (B) captures the distinctive insincere-flattery meaning. Answer: (D) Flatterers.

Q24 A

The idiom 'to gild the lily' originates from Shakespeare's King John (Act 4, Scene 2): 'To gild refined gold, to paint the lily ... is wasteful and ridiculous excess.' The idiom now means to add unnecessary ornamentation or improvement to something already beautiful — the OVER-DOING of the embellishment often makes the original worse. Option (A) captures this nuance precisely. Option (B) — deceptive advertising — is a different concept entirely. Option (C) — accepting duty without complaint — has no connection to the idiom. Option (D) — literal gardening — is a category error. Answer: (A).

Q25 C

The phrasal verb 'back out of' means to withdraw from a previous commitment, agreement, or undertaking. In the sentence, the company decided to WITHDRAW from its acquisition bid after three weeks of negotiations — 'back out of' fits perfectly. Option (A) 'take up' means to adopt or pursue, which is the opposite. Option (B) 'follow through on' means to complete what was started, also the opposite. Option (D) 'look into' means to investigate, which does not fit the 'three-week negotiations' setup. Only 'back out of' carries the withdrawal meaning required. Answer: (C) back out of.

Q26 D

Option (B) is correct. Article 368(2) requires ratification by not less than half of the State Legislatures for amendments that affect the FEDERAL STRUCTURE — including changes to (i) the manner of election of the President (Articles 54 and 55), (ii) the extent of executive power of the Union and States, (iii) the Supreme Court and High Courts, (iv) distribution of legislative powers, (v) representation of States in Parliament, and (vi) the provisions of Article 368 itself. An amendment to Article 54 or 55 (presidential election) clearly falls within this category. Option (A) — Preamble alone — does not require state ratification. Option (C) — administrative Schedule — typically does not. Option (D) — judges' pension rules — falls under ordinary amendment power. Answer: (D).

Q27 C

At Paris 2024, Manu Bhaker won two Olympic medals in SHOOTING — bronze in the 10m air pistol women's individual event and bronze in the 10m air pistol mixed team event (with Sarabjot Singh). She became the first Indian since Independence to win two Olympic medals at a single Olympic Games. Option (A) Archery is incorrect; (C) Wrestling — Aman Sehrawat won bronze in wrestling but only one medal; (D) Boxing — Indian boxers did not win two medals. Only Shooting matches Bhaker's achievement. Answer: (C) Shooting.

Q28 B

The Padma Vibhushan is the SECOND highest civilian award of the Republic of India. The order of precedence is: (1) Bharat Ratna — the highest civilian award; (2) Padma Vibhushan — for exceptional and distinguished service; (3) Padma Bhushan — for distinguished service of a high order; (4) Padma Shri — for distinguished service. The Padma awards were instituted in 1954 and are conferred annually on Republic Day (26 January) by the President of India. Option (A) First is incorrect — that is the Bharat Ratna. Option (C) Third refers to the Padma Bhushan. Option (D) Fourth refers to the Padma Shri. Answer: (B) Second.