

**Daily Practice — Legal Reasoning · Analytical Reasoning · Quantitative Techniques**

Darken one bubble per question. Negative marking applies. Answers and detailed explanations are provided in a separate companion sheet.  
Free daily practice — clatgurukul.com/daily · Pass this sheet to a friend.

**SECTION A — LEGAL REASONING**

**Q1-12 · 12 Marks**

**PRINCIPLE A — NEGLIGENCE — DUTY OF CARE, BREACH AND RESULTING DAMAGE (Q1-6)**

Negligence as a tort is the breach of a legal duty to take care which results in damage to the claimant. Three essentials must coexist. First, the defendant must owe the claimant a duty of care; the foundational test is the 'neighbour principle' laid down in *Donoghue v Stevenson* (1932) — a person must take reasonable care to avoid acts or omissions which can reasonably be foreseen to injure persons so closely and directly affected by the act. Second, there must be a breach: the defendant failed to meet the standard of the reasonable, prudent person, judged objectively (*Blyth v Birmingham Waterworks*). The standard rises with the magnitude of the foreseeable risk. Professionals are judged by the standard of a reasonably competent member of that profession (the Bolam standard). Third, the breach must cause damage that is not too remote a consequence (*The Wagon Mound*). Where the facts speak for themselves, the maxim *res ipsa loquitur* shifts the evidential burden to the defendant. Contributory negligence by the claimant reduces, but does not always defeat, the claim.

**1. A pharmacist, while dispensing medicine, mislabels a strong sedative as a vitamin tablet because he was distracted by a phone call. A customer suffers harm after taking it. Applying the principles above, which is the most accurate position?**

- A. The pharmacist is not liable because he did not intend to cause any harm to the customer, and this holds whatever the parties may privately have intended.
- B. The pharmacist is liable, as he breached the standard of care reasonably expected of his profession.
- C. The pharmacist is liable only if the customer can prove the sedative was banned by law.
- D. The customer alone is responsible for verifying the contents before consuming the tablet.

**2. A cyclist rides at night without any lights or reflectors and is struck by a car whose driver was speeding well above the limit. Both contributed to the collision. Which doctrine most directly governs the apportionment of damages?**

- A. *Res ipsa loquitur*, because the accident could not have happened without negligence.
- B. Remoteness of damage, because the harm was an unforeseeable consequence of speeding.
- C. Contributory negligence, because the cyclist's own want of care contributed to the injury.
- D. *Volenti non fit injuria*, because the cyclist voluntarily accepted the risk of all harm, regardless of the surrounding circumstances of the particular case.

**3. Which of the following best describes the 'neighbour principle' as articulated in *Donoghue v Stevenson*?**

- A. One must take reasonable care to avoid acts or omissions likely to injure persons closely and directly affected.
- B. One owes a duty of care only to persons with whom one has entered into a valid contract, on the same facts and subject to the usual statutory exceptions.
- C. One is liable for all harm caused, whether or not the harm could reasonably be foreseen.
- D. One owes a duty of care only to persons who live in physical proximity to one's home.

**4. Which of the following statements about the tort of negligence is INCORRECT?**

- A. The standard of care expected rises as the magnitude of the foreseeable risk increases.
- B. A professional is judged by the standard of a reasonably competent member of that profession, unless the contrary is clearly established by reliable evidence.
- C. The damage suffered by the claimant must not be too remote a consequence of the breach.
- D. Proof of a duty and its breach alone suffices, even if no damage at all results to the claimant.

**5. Workers negligently spill oil into a harbour. Days later, in an extraordinary and unforeseeable manner, the floating oil is ignited by molten metal from welding, destroying a wharf. On the principle of remoteness, the spillers are most likely:**

- A. Liable for the fire, because they were the factual cause of the oil being in the harbour.
- B. Liable for the fire, because anyone who pollutes water is strictly answerable for all results, as has long been recognised by courts considering similar disputes.
- C. Not liable for the fire damage, because that kind of harm was not a reasonably foreseeable consequence.
- D. Not liable at all, because the wharf owner should have anticipated the danger of welding.

**6. A newly qualified junior doctor, performing a routine procedure, makes an error that an ordinary competent doctor would not make, and pleads inexperience. Which is the most accurate position?**

- A. Inexperience is no defence; the junior is judged by the standard of a reasonably competent doctor for that post.
- B. The junior owes no duty of care at all until he completes several further years of training, provided that no overriding consideration of policy intervenes.
- C. The junior is liable only if he acted with a deliberate intention to harm the patient.
- D. The hospital alone is liable, since a junior doctor can never personally owe a duty of care.

**PRINCIPLE B — RIGHT OF PRIVATE DEFENCE (SECTIONS 34-44, BHARATIYA NYAYA SANHITA, 2023) (Q7-12)**

Every person has a right to defend his own body, and the body of any other person, against any offence affecting the human body, and to defend property against theft, robbery, mischief or criminal trespass, subject to important limits. Nothing is an offence which is done in the lawful exercise of this right. The right is essentially preventive and not punitive or retributive: it begins when a reasonable apprehension of danger arises and continues only so long as that apprehension lasts. The harm inflicted must be proportionate — a defender may not inflict more harm than is necessary to repel the threat. The right to cause death is available only in enumerated situations, such as a reasonable apprehension of death or grievous hurt, rape, or kidnapping. Crucially, there is no right of private defence against an act of a public servant acting in good faith under colour of his office, nor in any case in which there is time to have recourse to the protection of the public authorities. These provisions in the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023, broadly carry forward the position formerly contained in the Indian Penal Code, 1860.

**7. Z, armed with a knife, suddenly lunges at X threatening to stab him. X, in the heat of the moment and reasonably fearing for his life, strikes Z hard with a stick, causing Z grievous hurt. Z is repelled. X's act is most likely:**

- A. An offence, because X used a weapon and thereby exceeded any lawful right he may have had, according to the view generally taken by most commentators.
- B. An offence, because X ought to have first run away rather than confront his attacker.
- C. Not an offence only if X can later prove that Z had previously threatened him in writing.
- D. Not an offence, as X acted under a reasonable apprehension of death or grievous hurt and the force was proportionate.

**8. A thief snatches a bag and runs. Several minutes later, when the thief is far away and the police have already been informed, the victim tracks him down and beats him. On the principles above, the beating is most likely:**

- A. Justified, because the right of private defence of property never ends until the goods are recovered, whatever the precise motive of the parties may have been.
- B. Not justified, because the apprehension had ceased and there was time to seek the protection of public authorities.
- C. Justified, because any person may punish a thief who has stolen movable property from him.
- D. Not justified only if the value of the goods stolen was below a fixed statutory threshold.

**9. Which statement best describes the nature of the right of private defence under the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023?**

- A. It is preventive and not punitive, available only against an imminent threat and only to the extent necessary.
- B. It is punitive, permitting a victim to inflict retribution upon a wrongdoer after the danger has passed, and this holds whatever the parties may privately have intended.
- C. It is absolute, allowing any degree of harm to be caused once any offence has been committed.
- D. It is available chiefly to allow citizens to assist the police in punishing convicted offenders.

**10. Which of the following statements about the right of private defence is INCORRECT?**

- A. The right continues only so long as the reasonable apprehension of danger continues to exist.
- B. The harm inflicted in private defence must be proportionate to the threat sought to be repelled, regardless of the surrounding circumstances of the particular case.
- C. The right may be freely exercised against a public servant acting in good faith under his office.
- D. The right to voluntarily cause death is confined to certain enumerated grave situations.

**11. After an attacker is clearly disarmed and lying helpless on the ground, the defender continues to beat him severely out of anger, causing fresh and serious injuries. The continued beating is best characterised as:**

- A. A lawful exercise of private defence, since the defender was originally entitled to use force, on the same facts and subject to the usual statutory exceptions.
- B. An offence, because the right ended once the apprehension of danger ceased and the force became excessive.
- C. No offence, because a victim may always ensure that an attacker can never threaten him again.
- D. An offence only if the attacker eventually dies of the fresh injuries received.

**12. A landowner discovers that his neighbour intends to build a wall encroaching on his land next week. There is ample time to approach the authorities. If he instead assaults the neighbour today to 'defend' his property, his conduct is:**

- A. Protected, because defence of immovable property justifies the use of force at any time whatever.
- B. Protected, because the apprehension of a future trespass is enough to trigger the full right.
- C. Excused, because a threatened encroachment on land is always treated as an ongoing offence.
- D. Not protected, because there was time to seek the protection of the public authorities.

## SECTION B — ANALYTICAL REASONING

Q13-20 · 8 Marks

### PUZZLE 1 — WEEKLY SCHEDULE — SEVEN GUEST SEMINARS (Q13-16)

A college schedules seven guest seminars — on Economics, Finance, Geography, History, Law, Physics and Sociology — exactly one on each day from Monday to Sunday. No two seminars share a day, and every subject is used exactly once. The following conditions apply:

1. The Law seminar is held on Wednesday.
  2. The Physics seminar is held on Monday.
  3. The Sociology seminar is held on Sunday.
  4. The Geography seminar is held on Saturday.
  5. The History seminar is held on the day immediately before the Economics seminar.
- Use these conditions to determine the complete day-wise schedule of all seven seminars.

**13. Which seminar is scheduled on Friday?**

- A. History
- B. Finance
- C. Geography
- D. Economics



