

ANSWER KEY – 27 MAY 2026

Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q5	Q6	Q7	Q8	Q9	Q10
B	B	A	C	B	C	B	B	A	C
Q11	Q12	Q13	Q14	Q15	Q16	Q17	Q18	Q19	Q20
B	B	B	A	A	B	B	A	A	A
Q21	Q22	Q23	Q24	Q25	Q26	Q27	Q28	Q29	Q30
C	B	B	B	B	B	B	B	C	A

RC PASSAGES

Q1 B

The passage builds an argument with a clear two-step structure. The first paragraph concedes that CCUS appears to fill a real gap (decarbonising hard-to-abate sectors). The middle paragraphs systematically catalogue the obstacles — pilot scale, energy penalty, uncharacterised storage geology, market-size limits of utilisation. The final paragraph concludes with the precise framing: CCUS is a residual instrument for genuinely irreducible emissions, not a licence to extend the life of the coal fleet. Option B captures exactly this nuanced position. Option A overstates the author's scepticism. Option C goes further than the author (who does not call for abandonment). Option D contradicts the explicit text, which notes that decarbonising hard-to-abate sectors through renewables alone is technically impossible. Hence option B.

Q2 B

The author's tone throughout is critically realist: the first paragraph acknowledges the real gap CCUS could fill, the middle paragraphs deploy hard data (capture scale, cost increase, storage geology) to question optimistic claims, and the final paragraph proposes a measured policy reframing rather than a polemical demand. Option A overstates as polemical and dismissive; the author does not dismiss CCUS, but bounds its role. Option C is the opposite of the actual stance. Option D is incorrect because the author plainly takes a position. The critically realist label captures both the empirical grounding and the qualified scepticism of the writing. Option B is correct.

Q3 A

To weaken the author's claim that CCUS is overstated, one must produce evidence that the practical obstacles (energy penalty, cost, scale) are overstated themselves. Option A supplies exactly this: a pilot in Gujarat demonstrating capture at one-tenth the cost increase the passage cites. This directly undermines the cost-and-scale argument the author relies on. Option B (methanol demand growth) is irrelevant to the storage-geology and energy-penalty critique. Option C (reaffirmation of net-zero) does not address feasibility. Option D (new coal plant) is orthogonal. Only option A directly attacks the empirical premise on which the author's scepticism rests. Hence option A.

Q4 C

The third paragraph distinguishes utilisation (CO₂ made into urea, methanol, aggregates) from permanent geological storage. The author observes that India's entire annual methanol demand could absorb less than two percent of a single coal plant's emissions, meaning the utilisation pathway recycles CO₂ back into short-lived products that will eventually re-emit. The phrase delayed-emission scheme, not a removal one targets exactly this re-emission characteristic. Option C captures it directly. Option A is incorrect — geological storage is what the author proposes as the contrast. Options B and D are unrelated. The criticism is squarely directed at non-sequestering utilisation pathways.

Q5 B

The author's positive prescription, stated explicitly in the final paragraph, is to treat CCUS as a residual instrument for genuinely irreducible emissions, while continuing to invest in proven mitigation pathways — solar, wind, demand-side efficiency, electrified industrial heat. This is exactly the inference invited by option B (CCUS as residual tool, prioritise renewables and electrification). Option A contradicts the author. Option C (abandon NDCs) is nowhere supported. Option D (ban all coal by 2030) is an extreme policy the author does not propose. The author's measured policy stance maps cleanly onto option B.

Q6 C

The fourth paragraph states the author's measured position: cursive is not necessary for adult life, but the process of acquiring it may, for typical learners, produce cognitive benefits worth preserving in the early primary years. The author rejects both the abolish camp and the restore-fully camp, settling on a developmental-tool framing. Option C captures this exactly. Option A overstates (compulsory in board exams). Option B inverts the author's position. Option D introduces a tablet ban the author does not propose. Only option C states the central thesis accurately.

Q7 B

The author introduces children with dyspraxia and dysgraphia not to dismiss handwriting altogether, but to acknowledge a legitimate counter-argument made by the move-away-from-cursive camp. The construction is concessive: the author grants that for a substantial minority of children, the demand to produce neat cursive can be a source of lasting humiliation. This counter-argument is then weighed against the cognitive evidence, producing the measured middle position. Option B captures this rhetorical role. Option A overstates the author's concession. Option C misattributes causation. Option D contradicts the second paragraph's neuroimaging-based case. Hence option B.

Q8 B

Relic in the first paragraph is used metaphorically — cursive looked like a relic of the fountain-pen era. The intended sense is that of a survival from an earlier era, not a treasure (option A — too positive), not a modern innovation (option C — opposite), and not a religious artefact (option D — literal but unintended here). Option B is the most accurate contextual meaning. The choice reflects English-as-Language vocabulary-in-context skill: the answer is determined by the surrounding clauses (irrelevant in classrooms where eight-year-olds were already typing) which signal obsolescence.

Q9 A

To strengthen the author's claim that cursive instruction in early schooling produces measurable cognitive benefits, the strongest evidence would be a longitudinal Indian study demonstrating that cursive-taught children outperform their peers later. Option A supplies exactly this. Option B (90% of adults never write cursive) actually supports the OPPOSING argument that cursive is irrelevant for adult life. Option C (tablet ownership doubled) is irrelevant to cognitive outcomes. Option D (CBSE further relaxed norms) is a policy fact, not evidence on the cognitive question. Only option A directly strengthens the central empirical claim. Hence option A.

Q10 C

The author's overall stance is a measured middle position: cursive is not necessary for adult life, but learning it may produce developmental cognitive benefits that justify retaining it as a teaching tool in the early primary years, without penalising students who continue to print in later examinations. Option C captures exactly this distinction between developmental value and adult utility. Options A and B represent the two extreme positions the author explicitly rejects. Option D (indifference) misreads the engaged tone of the writing. Hence option C, which mirrors the author's nuanced two-part conclusion.

CR PASSAGES

Q11 B

The proponents' main conclusion, stated across the second paragraph, is that the existing item-by-item ban is gamed routinely, and only a categorical national ban with the threat of licence withdrawal can break this pattern. The fourth paragraph (proponents' reply) re-affirms 1 April 2028 as the implementation date. Option B captures both the substance and the enforcement mechanism. Option A is the opposite. Option C re-affirms the status quo, which the proponents reject. Option D (compulsory recycling) is not a proponents' demand in the passage. Hence option B.

Q12 B

The proponents' argument depends on two unstated assumptions: (a) that the licence-withdrawal threat can actually be operationalised by the regulator, and (b) that compostable alternatives can in fact be scaled in the three-year window from rule-making to implementation in 2028. If either of these assumptions fails, the proposed ban collapses into either an unenforceable rule or a humanitarian crisis. Option B captures both. Option A inverts the proponents' actual claim. Option C and D are not the assumptions the proponents need; in fact, the passage explicitly acknowledges informal-sector employment. Hence option B.

Q13 B

To weaken the proponents' argument, one must show that a critical premise — that alternatives can be scaled in time — is empirically false. Option B does exactly this: an independent technological assessment concluding that compostable alternatives for vaccine-cold-chain film will NOT be viable before 2032, four years beyond the proposed 2028 ban. This directly undermines the three-year scaling timeline. Option A (microplastics in Punjab groundwater) actually strengthens the proponents. Option C (grant to start-ups) is neutral. Option D (more state endorsements) bolsters the proponents. Only option B directly attacks a load-bearing assumption.

Q14 A

To strengthen the proponents, one must produce evidence that a hard ban can be implemented without the catastrophic employment loss that critics fear. Option A supplies exactly this: a pilot ban in three districts demonstrating a 70% drop in plastic waste with negligible employment loss because retraining grants were deployed in parallel. This vindicates both the environmental claim AND the proponents' answer to the employment objection. Option B (one company withdrawing one line) is marginal. Option C (open burning offence) is enforcement. Option D (Bay vs Arabian Sea) is geographic detail. Only option A is genuinely strengthening. Hence option A.

Q15 A

The proponents argue that the item-by-item ban fails because manufacturers re-label or marginally alter products to escape the prohibition list — classic regulatory arbitrage. Option A offers the strongest analogy: a speed-limit law enforced only by spot-checks at known camera locations lets drivers slow down only at the camera; an averaging-across-the-stretch approach defeats this arbitrage. The structural similarity (rule-evasion through technical compliance) is precise. Options B, C and D fail to capture the rule-evasion dynamic. Only option A is the correct parallel reasoning.

Q16 B

The proponents' main conclusion is that the 2023 cautious opening should be expanded to permit further liberalisation, because this will deliver efficiency gains to Indian clients and competitive pressure that improves the domestic profession. Option B captures both halves of the conclusion (expansion + benefits). Option A states the opposite view. Option C (repeal Advocates Act) is more radical than the proponents demand. Option D (Indian lawyers should emigrate) inverts the proponents' point that liberalisation would REDUCE the need to emigrate for international work. Hence option B.

Q17 B

The opponents' structural concern is that opening Indian commercial law work to direct competition would lead the most able Indian lawyers to migrate into the local offices of foreign firms, leaving domestic firms unable to retain partners. This depends on the unstated assumption that, given a free choice of employer, Indian top-tier lawyers would PREFER the foreign firms' Indian offices over the Indian domestic firms. If that preference does not hold (e.g., domestic firms can match compensation, prestige and work quality), the structural concern dissolves. Option B captures this assumption precisely. Options A, C, D are not assumptions the opponents need. Hence option B.

Q18 A

To weaken the proponents' efficiency claim, one must show that the costs and inefficiencies of retaining separate Indian and foreign counsel are overstated. Option A does exactly this: independent surveys of in-house counsel at Indian listed companies show no meaningful efficiency loss from the two-firm arrangement. If true, the core efficiency argument the proponents rest on collapses. Option B (Magic Circle in Singapore) is neutral. Option C (Indian firms growing) is neutral. Option D (advertising guidelines) is irrelevant. Only option A attacks the load-bearing efficiency premise. Hence option A.

Q19 A

The opponents' regulatory concern is that foreign firms answer to home-jurisdiction bar associations on conflicts, confidentiality and money-laundering, and the Bar Council of India lacks the extra-territorial reach to discipline them effectively. The strongest evidence for this concern is a concrete instance: a foreign firm's Mumbai office disciplined by its home bar for a conflict the Indian regulator could not have detected. Option A supplies exactly this case study. Options B (expanded BCI committee), C (more arbitration awards) and D (reciprocity) actually weaken the opponents' regulatory concern. Hence option A.

Q20 A

The opponents' third argument is that international transactions are a small share of Indian legal demand, hence foreign firms add little value. The flaw, as option A correctly identifies, is that it conflates the share of a market with the MARGINAL VALUE generated in that share. International deals, though numerically few, may produce disproportionate revenue and prestige, fundamentally changing the competitive dynamics within Indian firms. Treating market share as identical to marginal value is a classic compositional fallacy. Options B (internal contradiction), C (litigation assumption) and D (no flaw) miss the analytic point. Hence option A.

SECTION C — RAPID-FIRE GK & CURRENT AFFAIRS

Q21 C

Bengaluru is situated on the Vrishabhavathi river (a tributary of the Arkavathy and ultimately the Cauvery), not directly on the Cauvery itself. The Cauvery flows further south through Mysuru, Srirangapatna, and Tiruchirappalli, but does not pass through Bengaluru. Patna lies on the Ganga; Lucknow on the Gomti; Vijayawada on the Krishna. Therefore the option containing the geographically inaccurate pairing (Bengaluru-Cauvery) is option C. The Cauvery does not flow through Bengaluru city.

Q22 B

The 2024 Nobel Prize in Physics was awarded jointly to John J. Hopfield and Geoffrey E. Hinton for foundational discoveries and inventions that enable machine learning with artificial neural networks. The Royal Swedish Academy of Sciences recognised their work on associative memory (Hopfield networks) and Boltzmann machines / backpropagation (Hinton). Option B is correct. Options A, C and D refer to other notable physics topics but not to the 2024 award. The 2024 Chemistry Nobel went to AlphaFold-related protein-structure work; the Physics prize specifically recognised neural-network foundations.

Q23 B

Telangana became the first Indian state to launch a dedicated AI policy framework specifically for schools in 2025, integrating AI literacy modules from class 6 onwards and partnering with private edtech and IIIT Hyderabad. Karnataka, Tamil Nadu and Maharashtra have all issued broader IT and innovation policies, but the dedicated AI-for-schools framework of 2025 is Telangana's. Option B is correct.

Q24 B

Perspicacious means having keen insight, mental sharpness or shrewd judgment. Shrewd (option B) is the closest synonym. Stubborn (option A) is an antonym in spirit. Cowardly (option C) and Indifferent (option D) are unrelated. The Latin root perspicere (to see through clearly) supports the meaning of penetrating mental discernment, which is captured by shrewd. The other options are calibrated distractors testing whether the student has correctly applied the operative rule rather than surface association; rejecting them follows directly from the analysis above. The correct option (B) is the only one that satisfies every condition in the question stem without introducing an extraneous assumption, and is therefore the canonical CLAT answer for this item.

Q25 B

Ephemeral means lasting for a very short time; transient; fleeting. The antonym is long-lasting (option B). Option A (brief) is a synonym, not an antonym. Options C (visible) and D (repetitive) are unrelated. The Greek root ephemerous (lasting only a day) directly opposes long-lasting. Hence option B. The other options are calibrated distractors testing whether the student has correctly applied the operative rule rather than surface association; rejecting them follows directly from the analysis above. The correct option (B) is the only one that satisfies every condition in the question stem without introducing an extraneous assumption, and is therefore the canonical CLAT answer for this item.

Q26 B

The idiom to bell the cat originates from Aesop's fable in which the mice debate who will tie a bell around a sleeping cat's neck to warn of its approach; the task is universally agreed to be useful but no mouse volunteers. The idiom therefore means to undertake a risky task for the benefit of others. Option B captures this meaning precisely. Options A, C and D are unrelated. The idiom is a staple of competitive English vocabulary.

Q27 B

The Basic Structure Doctrine was authoritatively laid down by the Supreme Court in *Kesavananda Bharati v. State of Kerala* (1973), a 13-judge bench decision by 7:6 majority. The doctrine holds that Parliament's amending power under Article 368 does not extend to altering the basic structure of the Constitution. Option B is correct. Option A (*Golaknath* 1967) held that fundamental rights could not be amended, but did not articulate the basic-structure doctrine. Option C (*Minerva Mills* 1980) reaffirmed the doctrine; option D (*Indira Gandhi* 1975) applied it to election law. *Kesavananda* is the foundational authority.

Q28 B

The Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 (BNS) replaced the Indian Penal Code, 1860 (IPC). It was passed by Parliament in December 2023 and brought into force on 1 July 2024, together with the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita (replacing CrPC) and the Bharatiya Sakshya Adhinyam (replacing the Indian Evidence Act). Option B is correct. Option A confuses BNS with BNSS. Option C confuses it with the Sakshya Adhinyam. Option D is unrelated; the Code of Civil Procedure 1908 remains in force.

Q29 C

Article 21 of the Constitution of India provides: No person shall be deprived of his life or personal liberty except according to procedure established by law. It is the cornerstone of the Indian fundamental rights regime and has been judicially expanded since *Maneka Gandhi v. Union of India* (1978) to include the rights to dignity, privacy (*Puttaswamy* 2017), shelter, education, health, livelihood and many others. Option C is correct. Option A (Article 14) deals with equality. Option B (Article 19) with six freedoms. Option D (Article 32) with constitutional remedies. Only Article 21 protects life and personal liberty.

Q30 A

Under Section 3 of the Protection of Human Rights Act, 1993 (as amended in 2019), the Chairperson of the National Human Rights Commission of India must be a person who has been Chief Justice of India OR a Judge of the Supreme Court of India. Earlier the requirement was strictly former Chief Justice of India; the 2019 amendment expanded the pool to include former Supreme Court Judges. Option A captures this correctly. Options B, C and D refer to other constitutional offices irrelevant to the NHRC chairperson qualification.
