

ANSWER KEY – 29 MAY 2026

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

RC PASSAGES

Q1 B

The phrase 'fall on people who cannot consent' refers to the central ethical concern about germline editing: modifications made to embryos that will be inherited by future generations, and which therefore will affect people who do not yet exist and cannot be asked for permission. This is a standard formulation of the consent problem in bioethics, drawn from the work of writers like Jürgen Habermas and Michael Sandel. Option (A) misreads 'consent' as referring to clinical trial enrolment, but the passage's third paragraph makes clear the issue is future generations. Option (C) shifts the concern to researchers' working conditions, which the passage does not discuss. Option (D) introduces treaty obligations, again not in the passage. The correct answer (B) requires reading the immediate context of the phrase, which is about the inheritance of germline changes.

Q2 C

Option (C) is the most reasonable inference. The third paragraph expressly notes that defenders of cautious germline research 'distinguish between gain-of-function enhancements and corrective edits' — a treatment/enhancement distinction that they treat as morally relevant. Option (A) is wrong because the passage describes ICMR guidelines as restrictive on germline editing specifically, not all CRISPR research. Option (B) confuses germline (which has not been clinically approved) with somatic-cell editing (the sickle cell therapy approved in 2023 was somatic, not germline). Option (D) inverts the passage's account of the 2018 Chinese case, which the passage describes as 'widely condemned' and resulting in imprisonment. The treatment/enhancement distinction is a recurring move in bioethics and is the inference the passage most directly supports.

Q3 B

Option (B) most fully captures the passage's central argument: that genome editing has produced concrete gains, but the ethical and regulatory disagreements — especially around germline modification — remain genuinely contested, with regulators in different jurisdictions drawing different lines. The passage is descriptive and analytical, not advocacy for any single position. Option (A) overstates the passage by recommending an outright ban — the passage does not endorse this. Option (C) addresses only the agricultural strand and ignores germline. Option (D) endorses one regulatory position (India's), but the passage describes India's approach without endorsement. The fifth paragraph's closing — that genome editing has become 'a question of which decisions about the human future may be made, by whom' — confirms the framing as one of contested normative authority.

Q4 B

The author's purpose in the third paragraph is to present the position of defenders of cautious germline research. The paragraph explicitly states that defenders 'distinguish between gain-of-function enhancements and corrective edits' and that they argue parents preventing a child's Huntington's disease are exercising 'medical preventive care, not eugenics'. The paragraph thus presents and partially explains, without endorsing, the defenders' framework. Option (A) is wrong because the third paragraph does NOT reject the case for germline editing; the fourth paragraph describes regulatory variation, while the rejection is implicit only in some regulators' choices. Option (C) inverts the passage's tone — it does not criticise parents. Option (D) introduces a factual claim about treatment availability that the passage does not make. Option (B) captures the role of paragraph three in the argument's structure.

Q5 A

Option (A) would most weaken the defenders' position. The defenders' case relies on the manageability of risk — they argue the risk profile is 'not categorically different from many other established medical interventions'. A finding that even narrowly targeted germline edits cause cumulative off-target mutations whose phenotypic consequences manifest only in adulthood, and cannot be reversed, would undercut precisely this risk-manageability claim. The intergenerational lock-in (irreversibility) and delayed manifestation are the two features that distinguish germline from somatic intervention. Option (B) actually supports the defenders by showing that CRISPR can be safe and effective in somatic applications. Option (C) introduces prevalence data, which does not bear on the risk-manageability claim. Option (D) describes parental preferences, which does not address the safety case at all.

Q6 A

The phrase 'distributionally regressive' refers to costs that fall more heavily on those with fewer resources or less political voice. The passage's second paragraph illustrates the term concretely: roadside residents 'often from lower-income communities' bear the worst air-quality and noise exposure, while reaping few of the mobility benefits — a classic regressive distribution where the burden lands on those least able to bear it. Option (B) confuses 'regressive' with 'declining over time'. Option (C) inverts the meaning — 'distributionally regressive' implies UNEVEN distribution by income, not even distribution. Option (D) introduces an economic-cycle dimension absent from the passage. The economics term 'regressive' tracks the tax-policy meaning: a regressive tax takes a larger share of income from low-income groups; analogously, regressive costs hit those groups harder.

Q7 B

Option (B) is the most reasonable inference. The passage explicitly states that 'more than seventy per cent of trips are made by walking, cycling, or public transport; private cars typically account for under twenty per cent' AND that 'the share of urban road area dedicated to motor traffic rose markedly' between 2000 and 2020. The conjunction of these two facts is precisely the inference in (B). Option (A) inverts the trip-share data. Option (C) is contradicted by the passage's statement that pedestrian fatalities 'now account for more than thirty per cent of road deaths'. Option (D) overstates the pilots — the passage describes them as localised interventions in specific cities, not city-wide implementations. The inference test rewards careful reading of the empirical claims in paragraphs one and two.

Q8 B

Option (B) most fully captures the central argument: that Indian street-space allocation is structurally misaligned with how people actually travel, that the costs are regressive, and that a redistribution toward non-car users is both feasible and overdue. The third paragraph's articulation of a 'right to the street' as a 'redistribution claim' is the central organising frame. Option (A) is too extreme — the passage explicitly notes that the right-to-the-street argument 'is not anti-car'. Option (C) inverts the passage's account of pilot interventions, which the passage describes as showing 'significant safety and air-quality gains'. Option (D) understates the passage by focusing only on air quality. Option (B) captures both the diagnostic (misalignment + regressive costs) and the prescriptive (redistribution is feasible and overdue) elements of the argument.

Q9 B

The author's purpose in citing pedestrian-fatality and air-quality data is to show that the costs of the current allocation are concrete (not abstract) and that they fall disproportionately on specific groups — pedestrians, women, the elderly, children, lower-income roadside residents. The passage explicitly frames these as illustrating that 'the externality... is not abstract; it lands disproportionately on specific bodies and neighbourhoods'. Option (A) misreads the trajectory — the passage does not claim fatalities have declined. Option (C) imports an EV claim absent from the passage. Option (D) over-attributes responsibility to municipal authorities; the passage's argument is structural, not blame-allocating. The data serves the larger argument that the current allocation has real and unequally distributed costs.

Q10 B

Option (B) most accurately describes the tone. The passage is analytical, presenting empirical claims about trip shares, road area allocation and fatality data; it is also quietly advocacy-oriented, articulating a 'right to the street' frame and characterising redistribution as 'feasible and overdue'. The closing acknowledgment that the question 'depends... on whether municipal politics can sustain a redistribution' explicitly acknowledges political contestation. Option (A) overstates the tone — the passage is not polemical, and it does not call for a ban. Option (C) misreads the passage as nostalgic — it offers concrete policy framing rather than longing for the past. Option (D) inverts the passage's tone — the passage takes the right-to-the-street framing seriously, not as 'unworkable rhetoric'. The correct description is analytical and quietly advocacy-oriented.

CR PASSAGES

Q11 B

Option (B) captures the commentary's conclusion exactly: India should impose a strict statutory regime on coaching-institute advertising. The opening sentence and closing paragraph both frame the case in these terms. Option (A) is too narrow — the commentary does not call for abolishing ASCI, only for moving beyond voluntary regulation. Option (C) overstates — the commentary calls for regulation, not a complete ban on advertising. Option (D) overstates in the opposite direction — the commentary does not call for repealing the Consumer Protection Act, only for supplementing it with stricter rules for the coaching sector. CR questions on conclusion identification reward precise restatement of the author's exact bottom-line claim, not an extension of it.

Q12 A

Option (A) is the unstated assumption on which the commentary depends. The commentary's case turns on the proposition that consumers misread topper-centric advertisements as implying institute-wide success rates. If consumers correctly understand such advertisements as illustrative claims about a small minority, the deception claim collapses. The commentary asserts this misreading as fact without independent evidence — the second paragraph notes that the author 'assumes that prospective students and parents systematically misread' such advertisements. Option (B) introduces a sector-comparison claim not relevant to the core argument. Option (C) is factually wrong about ASCI's nature (it is an industry body) and irrelevant to the argument. Option (D) overstates enforcement capacity — the commentary does not require unlimited capacity, only sufficient capacity for the coaching sector.

Q13 A

Option (A) would most directly weaken the commentary. The argument's core empirical claim is that topper-centric advertisements are systematically deceptive because consumers misread them as institute-wide claims. A randomised consumer-survey experiment finding that respondents correctly identify these as claims about exceptional individuals would directly undermine that empirical claim. Option (B) is irrelevant — voluntary internal standards by a few institutes don't address the structural claim. Option (C) is irrelevant — aspirant numbers don't bear on the deception claim. Option (D) is irrelevant — the institute affiliation of toppers is a different question from whether consumers misread the advertisements. The CR weaken question rewards identification of the empirical premise that, if falsified, would collapse the conclusion.

Q14 A

Option (A) would most directly strengthen the commentary's failure-of-self-regulation claim. The commentary asserts that voluntary frameworks have failed. An independent five-year audit showing that complaints are rising while voluntary withdrawal rates are falling provides direct evidence of self-regulation's failure — both the volume of contested advertising AND the responsiveness of the voluntary mechanism are deteriorating. Option (B) is irrelevant or even slightly damaging to the claim — in-house compliance officers suggest the industry takes regulation seriously. Option (C) is biographical/historical and irrelevant. Option (D) is a cross-sector comparison that does not address voluntary regulation within the coaching sector. The CR strengthen question rewards identification of evidence that directly supports the disputed proposition.

Q15 A

Option (A) most fairly identifies the flaw. The commentary cites a 2022 CCPA enforcement push that produced action in a small number of institute cases, and infers that an enlarged statutory regime could scale this approach. The flaw is treating a small set of high-profile actions as a basis for inferring system-wide enforcement capacity, without addressing whether the resources and procedural infrastructure for nationwide enforcement actually exist. This is a classic 'scale extrapolation' fallacy. Option (B) introduces private litigation, which is not the relevant question. Option (C) misreads the commentary's position on penalties. Option (D) is factually wrong — the commentary does not assume single-state operation. The 'special conditions don't scale' identification is a recurrent CR flaw and a high-yield CLAT pattern.

Q16 B

Option (B) captures the op-ed's conclusion exactly: introduce a recurring wealth tax on individuals with net worth above ₹50 crore. The opening paragraph and the closing paragraph both frame the case in these terms. Option (A) overstates — the op-ed does not call for abolishing income tax. Option (C) inverts the spending recommendation — the op-ed earmarks revenue for education and healthcare, not defence. Option (D) overstates the Swiss reference — the op-ed uses Switzerland for limited comparative purposes, not as a full template. The CR conclusion question rewards precise capture of the author's bottom-line claim without extension or inversion.

Q17 A

Option (A) is the central unstated assumption. The op-ed argues that the rising income share of the top one per cent is best addressed by a stock-of-wealth tax; this conclusion only follows if the principal driver of wealth concentration is the absence of such a tax (rather than other structural or policy factors like asset-price inflation, tax-avoidance practices, intergenerational transfers, or labour-market dynamics). If those other factors dominate, the wealth tax may have only modest effect. Option (B) is irrelevant to the central argument. Option (C) is factually wrong (India has both property tax and STT) but irrelevant to the argument's structure. Option (D) is implausible and irrelevant. The unstated-assumption question rewards identification of the causal premise that links the diagnosis (rising concentration) to the prescription (wealth tax).

Q18 A

Option (A) would most weaken the op-ed. The op-ed dismisses OECD wealth-tax repeals as products of 'political pressure', not administrative difficulty, to defend its feasibility claim. A comprehensive review showing that administrative difficulty (valuation disputes, illiquid-asset coverage gaps, arrears accumulation) was the principal driver of repeal in 8 of 9 cases would directly undercut that dismissal. The op-ed's feasibility case depends on treating administrative complexity as 'manageable'; evidence that it is the recurrent killer of wealth taxes would directly weaken that claim. Option (B) is weak comparative evidence and doesn't undermine the historical pattern. Option (C) is unrelated to wealth-tax feasibility. Option (D) is a side observation about consumption taxes. The CR weaken question rewards evidence that directly contradicts the author's dismissive treatment of a counter-consideration.

Q19 A

Option (A) identifies the flaw in the Swiss analogy. The op-ed cites Switzerland (a small, high-income, financially open economy with sophisticated wealth-management infrastructure and well-established information-exchange treaties) and infers that capital-flight responses observed there will transfer to India (a large, developing economy with substantially different enforcement and information-exchange capacity). This is a classic 'inappropriate analogy' flaw — the source and target cases differ on precisely the variables that determine the outcome (capital flight). Option (B) is geographically trivial and irrelevant. Option (C) is factually wrong. Option (D) is a strawman about emigration preferences. The 'inappropriate analogy' identification is a high-frequency CR flaw and a high-yield CLAT pattern.

Q20 A

Option (A) would most directly undermine the social-returns claim. The op-ed argues that wealth-tax revenue 'could be earmarked' for high-return public investments. Empirical fiscal-incidence work showing that earmarking in Indian public finance is rarely binding — because general-revenue fungibility ensures that earmarked funds substitute for existing allocations rather than adding to them — would directly undermine the social-returns claim. The earmarking, on this finding, is illusory: total spending on education and healthcare would not increase. Option (B) is irrelevant — the question is whether NEW revenue raises spending. Option (C) is administratively descriptive and irrelevant. Option (D) is unrelated to the earmarking question. The 'fungibility undermines earmarking' insight is a high-yield CR pattern in public-finance contexts.

SECTION C — RAPID-FIRE GK & CURRENT AFFAIRS

Q21 B

The Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita (BNSS), 2023 replaced the Code of Criminal Procedure (CrPC), 1973. The BNSS governs criminal procedure — investigation, arrest, trial, bail, sentencing, etc. Option (A) Indian Evidence Act — replaced by the Bharatiya Sakshya Adhinyam (BSA). Option (B) CrPC — CORRECT. Option (C) Indian Penal Code — replaced by the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita (BNS). Option (D) Code of Civil Procedure — not part of the criminal law reforms. The three-way mapping is: IPC → BNS (substantive criminal law); CrPC → BNSS (procedural); Evidence Act → BSA (evidence). All three came into force on 1 July 2024 and are high-yield CLAT items for the 2026 cycle.

Q22 B

The Adi Karmayogi Abhiyan, announced as part of the Union Budget 2024-25 and rolled out subsequently, focuses on capacity-building of grassroots-level officials engaged in tribal development. It builds on the Mission Karmayogi framework and targets functionaries delivering schemes to tribal communities. Option (A) coastal skill development — incorrect, that is a separate scheme area. Option (B) Tribal development capacity-building — CORRECT. Option (C) solar adoption — covered by PM-KUSUM and similar. Option (D) municipal solid waste — covered by Swachh Bharat Mission-Urban. Students should remember that 'Adi' refers to tribal/advansi welfare; the scheme's name itself signals its target group. This is high-yield for CLAT current affairs.

Q23 B

TACITURN means reserved or uncommunicative — characteristically silent. Its OPPOSITE is GARRULOUS (excessively talkative). Option (A) Reticent — synonym, not opposite. Option (B) Garrulous — CORRECT antonym. Option (C) Stoic — describes emotional self-control, not communicativeness. Option (D) Phlegmatic — describes a calm, unemotional temperament, not the absence of taciturnity. Students should commit common CLAT vocabulary opposites to memory: taciturn ↔ garrulous; ephemeral ↔ enduring; obdurate ↔ pliable; tractable ↔ intractable. The trap option in this question is (A) reticent — which means almost exactly the same as taciturn (a synonym), making it the most tempting wrong answer for students who misread the question stem.

Q24 C

'To bury the hatchet' means to make peace and end a quarrel, derived from a Native American custom of burying weapons as a symbol of peace. Option (A) is overly literal and misses the figurative meaning. Option (B) confuses the idiom with covering up a quarrel rather than resolving it. Option (C) — CORRECT. Option (D) confuses the idiom with procrastination, which is unrelated. Students should remember that idioms ask for the figurative, not literal, meaning, and that 'bury the hatchet' specifically refers to ending conflict, not merely concealing it. This is a high-frequency CLAT idiom that has appeared in multiple past years' papers.

Q25 B

In *Association for Democratic Reforms v. Union of India* (15 February 2024), a five-judge Constitution Bench of the Supreme Court unanimously struck down the Electoral Bonds Scheme as unconstitutional, holding it violative of the right to information under Article 19(1)(a) and the test of proportionality. Option (A) Anoop Baranwal — a separate 2023 ruling on the appointment of Election Commissioners. Option (B) *ADR v. UoI* — CORRECT. Option (C) Subramanian Swamy — earlier judgments on different issues (defamation, etc.). Option (D) PUCL — earlier PIL on voter rights but not on electoral bonds. Students should remember the case name '*ADR v. UoI*' and the date 15 February 2024 — this is one of the highest-yield Supreme Court cases of the year for CLAT 2026.

Q26 A

The Nobel Prize in Literature for 2024 was awarded to Han Kang of South Korea, the first South Korean and the first Asian woman to receive the prize. The Swedish Academy cited her 'intense poetic prose that confronts historical traumas and exposes the fragility of human life'. Option (A) Han Kang — CORRECT. Option (B) Jon Fosse — won the 2023 prize. Option (C) Annie Ernaux — won the 2022 prize. Option (D) Abdulrazak Gurnah — won the 2021 prize. Students should memorise the past three Nobel Literature winners by year as they are recurring CLAT items. Han Kang is best known for 'The Vegetarian' (2007) and 'Human Acts' (2014).

Q27 B

Mission Indradhanush, launched by the Government of India in 2014 and successively expanded (Intensified Mission Indradhanush 1.0 through 5.0), aims to achieve full immunisation coverage of children up to 2 years and pregnant women against a set of vaccine-preventable diseases. Option (A) drinking water — covered by Jal Jeevan Mission. Option (B) Immunisation — CORRECT. Option (C) LPG connections — covered by Pradhan Mantri Ujjwala Yojana. Option (D) micro-enterprise credit — covered by PM-MUDRA Yojana. The Indradhanush ('rainbow') metaphor refers to the original set of seven preventable diseases. The scheme is high-yield for CLAT current affairs and has been a recurring item across past papers.

Q28 B

EXCORIATING means severely critical or scathing — sparing no detail in its harshness. The sentence describes a critique that 'spared no detail', which fits EXCORIATING perfectly. Option (A) Insipid — bland, dull, without force; opposite of what is needed. Option (B) Excoriating — CORRECT. Option (C) Lukewarm — moderate, half-hearted; opposite of what is needed. Option (D) Equivocal — ambiguous, deliberately unclear; does not match the 'sparing no detail' clue. Students should use the in-sentence clue ('sparing no detail') to triangulate the intended sense — a critique that spares no detail is comprehensive AND harsh, which matches excoriating. This is a high-yield CLAT vocabulary-in-context item.

Q29 B

Part IV of the Indian Constitution (Articles 36-51) contains the Directive Principles of State Policy. These are non-justiciable principles that the State is required to apply in making laws and shaping policy, though they cannot be enforced through the courts in the manner of fundamental rights. Option (A) Articles 12-35 — covers fundamental rights and definitions in Part III. Option (B) Articles 36-51 — CORRECT, Directive Principles. Option (C) Articles 52-78 — the Union executive (President, Vice-President, Council of Ministers). Option (D) Articles 73-77 — a sub-set within the Union executive provisions. Students should commit to memory the Constitution's structural part-by-part mapping: Part III (FR, 12-35), Part IV (DPSP, 36-51), Part IVA (Fundamental Duties, 51A), Part V (Union, 52-151).

Q30 B

At the Paris Olympics 2024, Arshad Nadeem of Pakistan won the men's javelin gold with a throw of 92.97 m, an Olympic record. Neeraj Chopra of India won silver with 89.45 m. Option (A) Neeraj Chopra — won silver, not gold. Option (B) Arshad Nadeem — CORRECT, gold medallist. Option (C) Anderson Peters — Grenadian world-class thrower but did not win gold in Paris. Option (D) Jakub Vadlejch — Czech thrower who finished outside the medals in Paris. Students should remember that 2024 marked Pakistan's first individual Olympic gold in 40 years and India's first Olympic silver in javelin (Neeraj had won gold in Tokyo 2020). The Nadeem-Chopra rivalry is a recurring sports current-affairs item for CLAT.