

ANSWER KEY – 19 MAY 2026

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

RC PASSAGES

Q1 A

The author's central problem is epistemological: HOW should a non-expert trier of fact rationally assess an expert claim whose grounds she does not herself understand? The first paragraph poses this exactly. Procedural rules — admissibility, cross-examination, qualifications — filter unreliable claims but cannot resolve the deeper recursion: assessing whether a methodology is 'reliable' or 'reflects accepted standards' is itself an expert assessment a non-expert is being asked to perform. The author treats this as the structural difficulty of expert testimony in law. Option (B) captures this exactly. Option (A) is a procedural sub-question, not the central problem. Option (C) is a specific empirical question, not the philosophical problem the passage addresses. Option (D) is a procedural choice unrelated to the epistemic problem. Answer: (B).

Q2 C

Bite-mark analysis and certain handwriting comparisons are CREDENTIALLED methodologies — they have practitioners with degrees and forensic certifications — and have nonetheless been found, on subsequent meta-analytic scrutiny (notably the 2009 NRC report and later studies), to be unreliable. The author uses them as DEMONSTRATION that credentials alone are a PROXY for reliability, not a guarantee. This motivates the move to the Daubert-style methodology inquiry: testability, falsifiability, error rates. Option (C) captures the argumentative move exactly. Option (A) over-generalises (the author does not say all forensic science is unreliable). Option (B) — replace with DNA — is a different policy proposal. Option (D) — superiority of BSA over Daubert — is unsupported. Answer: (C).

Q3 A

The author's triangulation recommendation includes an INDEPENDENT EXPERT COMMUNITY whose published critiques the court can examine. For this triangulation to work, such a community must actually EXIST in the relevant field. If a field has only the contested expert and her clients — no independent peer community, no published meta-critique — the triangulation collapses to single-source reliance. This is the hidden assumption the author's recommendation depends on. Option (B) captures it. Option (A) goes further than the author needs (he requires one independent community, not multiple). Option (C) — judges as trained scientists — would solve the problem differently and is not assumed. Option (D) — cross-examination always reveals truth — is not the author's view; he treats cross-examination as one filter among many. Answer: (B).

Q4 B

The author frames inability of one side to afford a counter-expert as a SEPARATE asymmetry concern, distinct from the substantive-reliability question. The reasoning is that adversarial expert testimony exposes methodological assumptions that a single uncontested expert cannot; even an entirely truthful and reliable expert benefits, epistemically, from being cross-examined by an opposing expert. When resource inequality means one side cannot mount that opposition, the epistemic process is DEGRADED — independently of any defect in the testimony actually offered. Option (B) captures this exactly. Option (A) wrongly conflates the two concerns. Option (C) is a different proposal (court-appointed experts) not endorsed by the passage. Option (D) misreads the passage's clear identification of the asymmetry as a justice concern. Answer: (B).

Q5 A

The author's stance is PROCEDURALLY ENGAGED and PRAGMATIC. Expert testimony is treated as INDISPENSABLE — courts cannot adjudicate complex matters without it. But the rational use of it requires TRIANGULATION across credentials, methodology, peer review, error rates, and an independent expert community, PLUS adversarial testing where feasible. This is neither skepticism (exclude experts) nor enthusiasm (credentials end the inquiry). Option (C) captures this exactly. Option (A) over-states to skepticism. Option (B) over-states to credentialism. Option (D) — indifference — misreads the author's careful engagement. Answer: (C).

Q6 A

The author's primary argument is that patent thickets impose welfare costs (sustained supra-competitive pricing, delayed generic entry) but that a flat ban on all secondary patents would chill genuine secondary innovation (improved formulations, better compliance regimens). The policy challenge is therefore FILTRATION — separating genuine from strategic secondary patents — for which Section 3(d)'s 'enhancement of efficacy' filter (Novartis, 2013), backed by a robust patent-opposition system in which generic firms and independent experts can challenge marginal secondary patents, is a workable rough cut rather than a precise instrument. Option (C) captures this exactly. Option (A) is a more extreme position the author rejects. Option (B) is contrary to the author's argument. Option (D) is contrary to the explicit endorsement. Answer: (C).

Q7 B

The author cites *Novartis AG v. Union of India* (2013) as the leading case validating Section 3(d)'s 'enhancement of efficacy' filter — a structural attempt to separate strategic evergreening (which extends monopoly without therapeutic gain) from genuine secondary innovation (which earns the patent system's reward). The Novartis judgement refused the imatinib mesylate patent on the ground that the new beta crystalline form did not enhance efficacy beyond the known imatinib substance. Option (B) captures the author's use exactly. Option (A) misreads the passage as critical. Option (C) misreads as if applicable to EU regulators. Option (D) is contrary to the author's broader pro-patent-with-filtration position. Answer: (B).

Q8 A

The trade-off the author identifies is ACCESS VS INNOVATION. Refusing all secondary patents lowers prices in the short run (better access to affordable medicines) but chills genuine secondary innovation that produces real therapeutic gain. Granting all secondary patents sustains monopolies, delays generic entry, and concentrates welfare losses on patients and budgets. The filtration approach tries to do BOTH at an acceptable cost — allowing genuine innovation while screening out strategic extensions. Option (B) captures this exactly. Option (A) treats innovation and profit as flatly opposed, which the author does not. Option (C) introduces a domestic/foreign distinction not in the passage. Option (D) — process versus product — is irrelevant to the access-innovation trade-off. Answer: (B).

Q9 B

The author endorses Section 3(d) PLUS a robust opposition system as a workable rough cut. For the rough cut to actually function, the patent-opposition machinery must be SUFFICIENTLY RESOURCED AND INDEPENDENT to scrutinise secondary patents at scale. If opposition is in practice rare or under-resourced — if generic firms cannot afford to oppose at scale, or if the opposition tribunal is captured — the filtration is paper-only and no actual filtering happens. The author's endorsement therefore HIDDENLY ASSUMES sufficient opposition infrastructure. Option (B) captures this. Option (A) over-states (not every patent need be opposed; just enough to maintain the filtering). Option (C) — unlimited capital — is not assumed. Option (D) — recognition abroad — is unrelated to the domestic filtration. Answer: (B).

Q10 C

On the author's framework, the argument 'all secondary patents should be granted to encourage continuous innovation' would be STRONGLY REJECTED. Granting all secondary patents would sustain supra-competitive pricing past the originator's genuine monopoly period, defer generic entry on patents that reflect strategic extension rather than genuine therapeutic gain, and undermine Section 3(d)'s entire structural purpose. The author's whole argument is that filtration is required precisely because not all secondary patents reflect genuine innovation; refusing to filter is the policy failure he warns against. Option (C) captures this exactly. Options (A), (B), (D) all misread the author's clear filtration-as-balance position. Answer: (C).

CR PASSAGES

Q11 C

The MAIN CONCLUSION is stated in paragraph 1: India should NOT fully privatise the Railways, though DELIMITED private participation in specific segments (rolling stock, station modernisation, dedicated freight corridors) is appropriate. The three arguments — universal-service, British cautionary precedent, freight-passenger cross-subsidy — defend this negative case. Option (C) captures the conclusion with appropriate qualifications. Option (A) is the opposite. Option (B) over-states (the author concedes targeted PPPs). Option (D) is unsupported. Answer: (C).

Q12 A

The bus-services argument extrapolates from one set of cases (city bus services) to a general conclusion about ANY public utility — a classic single-case-to-general inferential move. The author's SECOND argument cites Britain's privatisation experiment (1993-2021) and infers caution about India's privatisation — appearing PARALLEL in structure. The honest answer recognises the appearance of parallelism while also noting the author's explicit qualification that India's network is 'materially larger, denser, more socially central, and lower-fare' — making the cross-case inference rationally supported rather than blindly extrapolated. Option (B) captures both the parallel structure AND the author's mitigation through structural-similarity argument. Options (A), (C), (D) misidentify the parallel. Answer: (B).

Q13 C

INFERENCE-WHICH-MUST-BE-TRUE asks which proposition follows by direct entailment from the author's first argument. The premise is that a private operator's commercial logic systematically prioritises high-density profitable routes; the entailed conclusion is that, absent counter-regulation, thin-density routes will be reduced or abandoned. This is a direct logical consequence of the commercial-logic premise. Option (C) captures this entailment exactly. Option (A) — private operators are inherently dishonest — is a different proposition (and not the author's view). Option (B) — all public services should be permanently public — over-states. Option (D) — Indian Railways currently profitable — is unrelated and undefended. Answer: (C).

Q14 D

STRENGTHEN-EXCEPT asks which option does NOT strengthen (and may indeed weaken) the author's case. Option (A) — comparative evidence from Japan, Argentina — strengthens the cautionary-precedent argument. Option (B) — DFCC efficiency under public ownership — strengthens the response to the efficiency objection. Option (C) — cross-subsidy essentiality — strengthens the cross-subsidy argument. Option (D) — POST-2021 renationalised Britain performing WORSE on every measure — directly WEAKENS the author's reliance on the British experiment as a cautionary precedent; if renationalisation has actually produced worse outcomes, the cautionary inference is undermined and one might argue privatisation was the better state after all. Option (D) is the strengthen-EXCEPT answer. Answer: (D).

Q15 D

Hasty generalisation is the inference from a single (or insufficient) case to a general conclusion. A nominal hasty-generalisation critique of the author's second argument would say: 'You cite one country's experience and infer caution about a different country.' On inspection, the author EXPLICITLY says India's network is 'materially larger, denser, more socially central, and lower-fare' — providing structural-similarity reasons for the cross-case inference rather than blindly extrapolating from one case. The hasty-generalisation flaw therefore looks applicable in form but is mitigated by the author's structural argument. Option (B) captures this nuanced answer — naming the flaw, explaining why it does not in fact apply with full force. The question tests whether students can identify a NOMINAL parallel flaw and recognise the author's pre-emption. Answer: (B).

Q16 C

The MAIN CONCLUSION is stated in paragraph 1: Prasar Bharati should be funded primarily through a MANDATORY HOUSEHOLD LEVY on television-owning households, on the BBC / ARD-ZDF model, with exemptions for BPL and single-pensioner households and a means-tested rebate for low-use households. The remaining paragraphs defend this. Option (C) captures the conclusion with all qualifications. Option (A) — privatisation — is contrary. Option (B) — pure commercial advertising — is what the author argues against in the second argument. Option (D) — fold into MIB — is the opposite of the editorial-independence rationale. Answer: (C).

Q17 C

INFERENCE-WHICH-MUST-BE-TRUE: which proposition follows by direct entailment from the decoupling argument? The premise is that funding-dependence on annual ministerial discretion makes editorial pressure — overt or subtle — materially more likely. The entailed conclusion (the conditional) is: IF the broadcaster's funding depends on annual ministerial discretion, THEN editorial pressure is materially more likely than under a fixed-formula levy renewed at long intervals. Option (C) captures this conditional entailment exactly. Option (A) — all ministers corrupt — is a stronger and unjustified claim. Option (B) — always produce editorial bias — overstates 'always'. Option (D) — BBC has zero bias — overstates the comparative claim. Answer: (C).

Q18 A

The property-tax argument commits the FLAW of treating mere objection as a decisive ground for abolition. The PARALLEL FLAW question asks which of the author's responses shares this pattern. The author's response to the CHOICE objection EXPLICITLY REJECTS this pattern: choice-based objection is acknowledged to have force but NOT treated as decisive; the levy is retained with calibrated BPL / single-pensioner exemptions, and the author accepts that 'some compulsion is intrinsic to the public-good logic of broadcasting'. Option (B) captures the pre-emption — the author's response does NOT exhibit the flawed pattern; it expressly rejects the pattern by carving exceptions while preserving the rule. The question tests recognition of an apparent parallel that the author has pre-empted. Answer: (B).

Q19 D

STRENGTHEN-EXCEPT: which does NOT strengthen the author's case? Option (A) — BBC and ARD/ZDF scoring higher on editorial-independence indices — strengthens decoupling. Option (B) — programming-priority convergence under ad-funding — strengthens advertiser-distortion. Option (C) — discom-based collections working in two states — strengthens the response to the collection-cost objection. Option (D) — evidence from BBC's funding crisis that household-levy models produce LOWER independence than grant models — directly WEAKENS the decoupling argument by suggesting the proposed levy model itself is editorially insecure at renewal. Option (D) is the strengthen-EXCEPT answer. Answer: (D).

Q20 B

The exemptions the author concedes (BPL, single-pensioner, means-tested rebate) reveal the author's position: the levy is treated as the DEFAULT — the proposed rule — but with calibrated equity exceptions at the margins where the unmitigated burden would be regressive. These carve-outs are designed to PROTECT the levy by addressing the most compelling equity counter-cases (the very poor; pensioners on fixed incomes; low-use households), consistent with the targeting-by-use logic of the proposal. The author does not abandon the levy; he secures it. Option (B) captures this exactly. Option (A) — opposes the levy — is contrary to the explicit endorsement. Option (C) — wants public broadcasting abolished — is contrary. Option (D) — indifferent to equity — misreads the careful calibration. Answer: (B).

SECTION C — RAPID-FIRE GK & CURRENT AFFAIRS

Q21 D

Article 61 of the Constitution lays down the PROCEDURE for impeachment of the President. The President can be removed from office only by impeachment for VIOLATION OF THE CONSTITUTION. The charge may be preferred by either House of Parliament; the preferring resolution requires (i) a notice signed by at least one-fourth of the total members of that House, (ii) fourteen days' notice in writing of the intention to move the resolution, and (iii) passage by a majority of not less than TWO-THIRDS of the TOTAL MEMBERSHIP of the House. The other House then INVESTIGATES the charge; if it sustains the charge by a similar two-thirds majority, the President stands removed from the date the resolution is passed. Article 56 (term of office) and Article 74 (Council of Ministers) and Article 124 (Supreme Court) are unrelated to impeachment procedure. Answer: (B).

Q22 A

'Perfunctory' (adjective) means CARRIED OUT WITH A MINIMUM OF EFFORT OR REFLECTION — done as a routine duty, mechanically, without genuine attention or interest. From Latin perfunctorius (carelessly performed), itself from perfungi (to discharge a duty). The opposite would be 'thorough', 'careful', or 'attentive'; a synonym would be 'cursory' or 'mechanical'. Option (B) captures the meaning exactly. Option (A) 'thorough' is the antonym. Option (C) 'elaborate' is the antonym in a different direction. Option (D) 'anxious' is an unrelated emotional adjective. Only Option (B) captures perfunctory's distinctive shade of going-through-the-motions without genuine engagement. Answer: (B).