

ANSWER KEY — 12 JUNE 2026

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

RC PASSAGES

Q1 B
The fourth paragraph defines the term within the sentence itself: British general practitioners 'now offer social prescriptions, referring patients to gardening groups, choirs or volunteering instead of, or alongside, medication'. The phrase therefore denotes a doctor's referral of a patient to community activity as a form of treatment — option B restates this almost verbatim. Option A inverts the idea: the point of a social prescription is precisely that it is not a medicine. Option C converts a voluntary clinical referral into a coercive government order, which the passage nowhere suggests. Option D attributes the practice to social media platforms and confines it to screen-time advice, conflating this paragraph with the earlier 'digital paradox' discussion. The contextual definition supplied by the passage makes B the only sustainable reading. Hence option (B) is the correct answer.

Q2 D
The passage opens by establishing loneliness as a measurable public-health threat, distinguishes it from solitude, localises the problem for India, surveys government responses, and culminates in the final paragraph's thesis: 'The wiser course is to treat connection as public infrastructure', with parks, libraries and transit doing for relationships what roads do for commerce. Option D captures exactly this arc — a structural problem demanding collective infrastructure rather than only individual treatment. Option A contradicts the passage's whole policy orientation. Option B overstates a single paragraph: social media is presented as one strand of a 'digital paradox', not the primary cause. Option C is contradicted by the third paragraph, which says India's experience 'complicates the familiar Western narrative'. The central argument is therefore option D. Hence option (D) is the correct answer.

Q3 A
The author cites with evident sympathy the critics who say social-prescription schemes 'medicalise what is essentially a social failure', and then advances a proposal centred on shared infrastructure rather than clinical intervention. It follows that the author regards purely individual, therapeutic responses as insufficient — which is option A. Option B contradicts the second paragraph, where solitude is described as 'chosen and often restorative', expressly unlike loneliness. Option C goes far beyond the text: ministers for loneliness are mentioned as a beginning, never as a complete solution. Option D is refuted by the image of the commuter 'pressed into a crowded metro carriage' who is nonetheless 'profoundly lonely' — proximity without relationship does not cure the problem. The supported inference is A. Hence option (A) is the correct answer.

Q4 C
The passage moves through diagnosis (epidemiological evidence, the solitude distinction, India's specific predicament), weighs existing responses with measured criticism, and ends with a constructive recommendation — treating connection as public infrastructure. That trajectory is concern paired with a proposal, exactly option C. Option A fails because the treatment of governments is even-handed: the UK and Japan are credited with responding, and the criticism quoted is attributed to 'critics' rather than delivered as sarcasm. Option B fails because the passage is openly evaluative — phrases like 'the wiser course' are judgements, not neutral statistics. Option D fails because the joint family is mentioned analytically, as a dissolving 'web of connection', without sentimental longing for its return. The tone is concerned yet constructive. Hence option (C) is the correct answer.

Q5 B
The final proposal rests on a causal claim: connection infrastructure — parks, libraries, affordable transit, community halls — 'makes the desirable easy' and should therefore reduce loneliness. Option B attacks that causal link directly with controlled evidence: if cities that invested heavily in precisely this infrastructure show no lower loneliness scores even after controlling for income, the proposal's promised mechanism is in doubt. Option A is consistent with the passage's health framing and weakens nothing. Option C, if anything, mildly supports the adjacent social-prescription approach. Option D concerns the village-city distribution of loneliness and leaves the infrastructure-effectiveness question untouched. Only B confronts the author's concluding causal premise, so it is the finding that most weakens the proposal. Hence option (B) is the correct answer.

Q6 C

Every movement of the passage serves one thesis: orbits are 'a textbook commons' — unowned, collectively profitable, collectively polluted — governed by treaties that cannot in practice assign liability, and threatened by Kessler-style cascade dynamics whose 'window for acting... is narrow, and it is closing'. Option C assembles precisely these elements: an unmanaged commons whose pollution may become self-perpetuating and irreversible. Option A misreads the mega-constellation reference, which concerns congestion, not broadband affordability. Option B invents a funding grievance nowhere present; Kessler appears only as the source of the cascade warning. Option D contradicts the fourth paragraph, which says removal craft with nets, harpoons and robotic arms have already been demonstrated — the obstacle is political suspicion, not engineering impossibility. The central concern is option C. Hence option (C) is the correct answer.

Q7 A

The word appears in the second paragraph: 'proving fault — the attribution of a specific fragment to a specific launch made decades earlier — is close to impossible in practice'. The em-dash construction makes the sentence self-defining: attribution is the act of connecting a given piece of debris to the launch, and hence the operator, that produced it. Option A restates this exactly. Option B plays on the everyday sense of attributing credit for a phrase, irrelevant to the liability context. Option C concerns transfer of satellite ownership, a registration matter the passage never raises. Option D concerns quantifying damages, which is a separate stage of a liability claim from identifying whose fragment caused the collision. In context, attribution means tracing the fragment to its responsible source — option A. Hence option (A) is the correct answer.

Q8 D

The fourth paragraph supplies the implication: 'every remediation technology is dual-use — a craft that can grapple a dead satellite can equally disable a live military one — so states view one another's clean-up missions with deep suspicion'. The reluctance is thus grounded in the weapon-potential of removal craft, which option D reproduces. Option A raises cost, which the passage discusses only through fee and bond proposals, never as the source of suspicion. Option B misstates the Liability Convention, which the passage describes as imposing fault-based liability, not as prohibiting contact with foreign objects. Option C invents an orbital-slot revenue motive found nowhere in the text. The author's stated reason is the dual-use character of the technology, so the answer is D. Hence option (D) is the correct answer.

Q9 B

The passage says the voluntary deorbit guideline 'is honoured unevenly at best', and the final paragraph generalises the doubt: 'Voluntary restraint has never kept terrestrial commons clean, and there is little reason to expect orbit to be different', before demanding binding duties and market incentives. The attitude is therefore scepticism about the guideline's sufficiency — option B. Option A reverses the assessment; nothing suggests transformed operator behaviour. Option C is wrong because the author engages with the guideline seriously enough to build an argument around its failure; that is criticism, not indifference. Option D attributes to the author an optimism the closing paragraph explicitly rejects, since the entire point of proposing a modernised treaty is that voluntary compliance will not become universal on its own. The answer is B. Hence option (B) is the correct answer.

Q10 A

The case for orbital-use fees rests on an economic premise: pricing a previously free commons changes behaviour, making polluters internalise costs they now ignore. Option A supplies a striking real-world confirmation of that mechanism — a modest fee on plastic bags, another free-disposal commons problem, cut consumption by over eighty per cent — and analogical evidence that pricing works is exactly what strengthens a pricing proposal. Option B is neutral at best; the concentration of operators says nothing about whether fees would alter their conduct. Option C, by suggesting debris counts have stabilised, would actually reduce the urgency on which the author insists. Option D weakens the adjacent performance-bond idea rather than strengthening fees. The answer is A. Hence option (A) is the correct answer.

CR PASSAGES

Q11 D

The argument announces its destination in the opening sentence — India 'should prohibit the trading of private cryptocurrencies outright rather than attempt to regulate it' — and returns to it in the closing sentence: 'the welfare costs of a legal crypto-trading market exceed its benefits, and Parliament should enact a statutory prohibition'. Option D reproduces this conclusion, including its cost-benefit rationale. Option A overstates a subsidiary premise: the passage concedes blockchain offers speed, programmability and low cost, arguing only that the digital rupee supplies them. Option B distorts another premise — the digital rupee is offered as an available alternative, never as a compulsory one. Option C describes the regulatory half-way house the argument explicitly rejects. The main conclusion is the statutory prohibition, option D. Hence option (D) is the correct answer.

Q12 B

The argument concedes that a ban 'will not eliminate crypto trading entirely', yet predicts participation will shrink 'dramatically' because underground markets 'reach far fewer households than a legal, heavily advertised, celebrity-endorsed market does'. That prediction holds only if the bulk of today's participation is in fact generated by the legal, advertised, mainstream channels a ban would dismantle — if most volume already flowed through ban-resistant underground channels, prohibition would change little. Option B states precisely this necessary assumption; negate it and the conclusion collapses, the classic test for an assumption. Option A is stronger than required — the argument never claims universal deterrence. Option C concerns ransomware operators, peripheral to household participation. Option D involves comparative returns on the digital rupee, which the argument never invokes. The answer is B. Hence option (B) is the correct answer.

Q13 C

The argument's central empirical bet is that prohibition shrinks participation and protects small savers, because underground markets are 'thinner, riskier and reach far fewer households'. Option C reports that in countries which actually imposed bans, volumes recovered within two years through offshore and peer-to-peer channels while fraud complaints rose — direct counter-evidence on both halves of the bet: participation did not stay shrunk, and consumer harm worsened, vindicating the very critics the passage tries to rebut. Option A marginally improves the regulated status quo but does not address what happens under a ban. Option B notes some investors profited, which the argument can absorb since it concerns aggregate welfare. Option D, reduced celebrity endorsement, weakly supports rather than weakens the claim that marketing drives participation. The strongest weakener is C. Hence option (C) is the correct answer.

Q14 A

The conclusion claims a ban will 'shrink participation dramatically... and protect the small saver who is least equipped to absorb catastrophic losses'. Option A offers exactly the confirming evidence: in a jurisdiction that actually banned exchanges, household crypto losses reported to police fell sharply within eighteen months — the predicted protective effect materialising in practice. Option B weakens rather than strengthens, suggesting demand grows despite policy friction such as heavy taxation. Option C undermines the fourth premise by casting doubt on the digital rupee's reliability as the promised alternative. Option D weakens the ban's practical bite, implying existing holders would simply retain their coins and the market would persist dormant rather than disappear. Only option A supplies real-world validation of the argument's causal prediction, so it most strengthens the argument. Hence option (A) is the correct answer.

Q15 D

The passage dismisses regulation because a regulator 'cannot supervise peer-to-peer wallets, offshore platforms or decentralised protocols', concluding that half-measures fail. The logical gap is the leap from 'regulation cannot police every channel' to 'regulation fails on its own terms' — it ignores the intermediate possibility that supervising the mainstream exchanges where most ordinary savers actually trade could still capture most of the harm-reduction benefit. That is a false-choice (false dilemma) flaw, which option D names. Option A raises an evidentiary quibble about loss statistics, not a flaw in the regulation-versus-ban reasoning. Option B alleges an ad hominem the passage barely commits, since it does engage lobbyists' proposal on the merits. Option C exaggerates: the argument doubts supervision of decentralised channels specifically, not of every financial product. The best criticism is D. Hence option (D) is the correct answer.

Q16 A

The conclusion is stated at the end of the first paragraph — 'The experiment should now be made mandatory for all benches of the Supreme Court and the High Courts' — and is restated in the final sentence with its qualification: 'Mandatory live-streaming, subject to narrow exceptions recorded in writing... the Supreme Court should adopt it without further delay'. Option A reproduces both the mandate and the carve-out structure. Option B inverts the passage's use of Swapnil Tripathi, which is invoked as supportive authority, not as a precedent to overturn. Option C contradicts an express limitation: the proposal 'covers constitutional courts', which 'only rarely examine witnesses', so trial-court witness examination is outside it. Option D converts a premise about the inadequacy of second-hand reporting into a censorship demand the author never makes. The conclusion is A. Hence option (A) is the correct answer.

Q17 C

The accountability premise asserts that sharp practice, discourtesy and adjournment culture 'all shrink under observation'. For observation to shrink misconduct, it must be true that being watched by a larger public audience actually changes how judges and lawyers behave — option C. Negating it destroys the premise: if behaviour were indifferent to the audience, streaming would create no accountability. Option A is not assumed; the argument needs only that some misconduct exists and responds to scrutiny, not that it pervades most hearings. Option B overshoots — accountability through observation does not require the extreme remedy of impeachment. Option D is contradicted by the author's own counter to the grandstanding objection, which concedes that 'performance incentives already exist in packed courtrooms', i.e. an audience is already present. The necessary assumption is C. Hence option (C) is the correct answer.

Q18 B

Two of the argument's load-bearing premises are that direct access corrects the distortions of compressed second-hand reporting, and that visibility improves public understanding of how courts reason. Option B reports that streaming's actual output — short clips edited out of context — has spread more misinformation than newspaper reporting ever did, turning the transparency mechanism against its stated purpose. If streaming worsens public misunderstanding, the open-justice case for mandating it is substantially undercut. Option A is a logistical hurdle about bandwidth and staffing that implementation funding could cure; it does not touch the principle. Option C supports the proposal through professional endorsement. Option D likewise helps the author by demonstrating public appetite for streamed hearings. The statement that most weakens the argument is therefore option B. Hence option (B) is the correct answer.

Q19 D

The argument predicts institutional benefits from mandatory streaming: accountability, accurate public understanding, and a judiciary no longer misunderstood. Option D supplies direct empirical confirmation from comparable settings — jurisdictions that adopted comprehensive courtroom streaming recorded a significant measured rise in public trust in the judiciary — which is precisely the outcome the author promises. Evidence that the policy produced its predicted effect elsewhere is the strongest available support. Option A addresses feasibility of access, a background condition rather than a reason the policy is beneficial. Option B is a mixed blessing: shorter judgments under observation could equally suggest haste, and the author never claims this benefit. Option C concerns abolition of in-camera proceedings, which the author does not advocate — the proposal expressly preserves carve-outs. The greatest strengthening comes from option D. Hence option (D) is the correct answer.

Q20 C

The author's principle has a distinctive structure: for public power, openness is the default rule, and any departure into secrecy is an exception that bears the burden of specific justification. Option C replicates that structure exactly in a parallel domain — government contracts (public power) must by default be published in full, and any redaction (the exception) must be specifically justified by the department. Option A inverts the default, making confidentiality the rule for private commercial information. Option B is a simple means-end argument about choice and satisfaction, with no default-and-exception architecture. Option D argues from the value of participation to compulsion, again without any rule-exception burden structure. Parallel-reasoning questions turn on matching the form of the argument, not its subject, and only option C mirrors the form. The answer is C. Hence option (C) is the correct answer.

SECTION C — RAPID-FIRE GK & CURRENT AFFAIRS

Q21 B

The FIFA World Cup 2026 is being hosted jointly by three countries — the United States, Canada and Mexico — making it the first World Cup with three host nations. It is also the first edition expanded to 48 teams. Matches are distributed across sixteen host cities, with the majority in the United States, while Canada and Mexico stage games in cities such as Toronto, Vancouver, Guadalajara, Monterrey and Mexico City. The answer is three. Hence option (B) is the correct answer.

Q22 A

Alacrity means brisk and cheerful readiness or eager willingness to do something — as in 'she accepted the invitation with alacrity'. The closest synonym among the options is eagerness. Hostility denotes antagonism and is unrelated. Slowness is closer to an antonym, since alacrity implies promptness and speed in response. Indifference denotes a lack of interest, the very opposite of the willing readiness that alacrity describes. The correct choice is eagerness. Hence option (A) is the correct answer.

Q23 D

Taciturn describes a person who is habitually reserved and uncommunicative, saying very little in conversation. Its opposite is a word denoting talkativeness, and garrulous — meaning excessively talkative, especially about trivial matters — fits precisely. Silent and uncommunicative are themselves near-synonyms of taciturn rather than opposites. Morose means sullen and gloomy, which describes mood rather than the quantity of speech and often accompanies taciturnity. The answer is garrulous. Hence option (D) is the correct answer.

Q24 C

To 'bite the bullet' means to summon the courage to face a painful, unpleasant or difficult situation that can no longer be avoided. The phrase is commonly traced to battlefield surgery before anaesthesia, when wounded soldiers were said to bite on a bullet to endure the pain of an operation. Option A concerns rash speech, option B revenge, and option D abandonment of a task — none reflects the idiom's sense of enduring hardship with resolve. The answer is option C. Hence option (C) is the correct answer.

Q25 B

In *Kesavananda Bharati v. State of Kerala* (1973), a thirteen-judge bench of the Supreme Court — the largest ever — held by a 7:6 majority that while Parliament's power to amend the Constitution under Article 368 is wide, it cannot alter the Constitution's 'basic structure'. *Golak Nath* (1967) had earlier held fundamental rights unamendable but did not propound the basic-structure doctrine; *Kesavananda* partly overruled it. *Maneka Gandhi* (1978) expanded Article 21 due process, and *Minerva Mills* (1980) applied the basic-structure test to strike down parts of the 42nd Amendment. The answer is *Kesavananda Bharati*. Hence option (B) is the correct answer.

Q26 D

Article 21A, inserted by the Constitution (Eighty-sixth Amendment) Act, 2002, obliges the State to provide free and compulsory education to all children of the age of six to fourteen years, in such manner as the State may by law determine. The implementing statute is the Right of Children to Free and Compulsory Education Act, 2009. The other age ranges in the options do not correspond to the constitutional text. The answer is 6 to 14 years. Hence option (D) is the correct answer.

Q27 C

The Bharat Ratna, India's highest civilian award, was instituted in 1954, and its first three recipients that year were C. Rajagopalachari, Dr S. Radhakrishnan and Dr C. V. Raman. Jawaharlal Nehru received the award later, in 1955. B. R. Ambedkar was honoured posthumously only in 1990, and Sardar Vallabhbhai Patel posthumously in 1991. Among the options, only C. Rajagopalachari belongs to the inaugural 1954 list. The answer is C. Rajagopalachari. Hence option (C) is the correct answer.

Q28 B

The United Nations Security Council has five permanent members, often called the P5: the United States, the United Kingdom, France, Russia and China, each holding a veto over substantive resolutions. Germany is not a permanent member; like India, Japan and Brazil, it has served as an elected non-permanent member and is part of the G4 grouping that campaigns for permanent seats in a reformed Council. The answer is Germany. Hence option (B) is the correct answer.