

ANSWER KEY — 24 SEPTEMBER 2026

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

LEGAL REASONING

Q1 A Section 6(a) - spes successionis MED

Section 6(a) of the Transfer of Property Act, 1882 says in terms that the chance of an heir apparent succeeding to an estate cannot be transferred. Arun is an heir apparent: while Devaki lives he has no interest in the house at all, only the possibility that he will take it if he survives her and she dies intestate without disposing of it otherwise. That possibility is spes successionis, and an assignment of it is void, which is option A. Option B misuses the words in present or in future in section 5. Those words describe when the conveyance takes effect, not what may be conveyed; a man may transfer existing property so that it vests later, but he cannot transfer a mere chance. Option C treats form as curing substance: consideration and registration cannot validate a transfer of something the statute declares untransferable. Option D imports a doctrine of consent that has no place here, and in any event Devaki owns the house and cannot be affected by her son's deed.

Examiner's note — the trap: B is the attractive wrong answer: the phrase in present or in future in section 5 looks tailor-made for a future inheritance, but it qualifies the act of conveying, never the subject matter.

Q2 D Section 52 - lis pendens HARD

Section 52 provides that while a suit in which a right to immovable property is directly in question is pending, the property cannot be transferred so as to affect the rights of any other party under the decree. Ilyas's suit for a declaration of title puts the right to the plot directly in question, so Kabir's sale during its pendency falls squarely within the section. The passage is careful about the consequence: the transfer is not void, and the transferee simply takes subject to the result. Meher therefore keeps whatever Kabir could give her, which after the decree is nothing as against Ilyas. That is option D. Options A and C both call the sale void, which the passage expressly denies; the sale is perfectly good between Kabir and Meher, and that is why she may still sue him on it. Option B offers the bona fide purchaser defence, but the passage says in terms that the transferee's good faith and want of notice do not save him, because lis pendens rests on notice imputed by the pendency itself.

Examiner's note — the trap: B is the trap: paying full value after checking the records feels like the textbook innocent purchaser, but section 52 is one of the few doctrines that defeats even a buyer without notice.

Q3 C Section 53A - part performance HARD

Section 53A opens with a contract in writing signed by or on behalf of the transferor from which the terms necessary to constitute the transfer can be ascertained with reasonable certainty. Writing is the threshold condition, and the passage states it first for that reason. Nandini's agreement is oral, so however complete Omkar's performance is, the section never begins to operate and he has no defence under it, which is option C. Options A and B each pick up a single further condition of the section, possession and part performance of the bargain, and treat it as sufficient; but the conditions are cumulative, and the first of them has failed. Note also what the section would have given him if the writing had existed: not a decree for title, but immunity from Nandini's suit. Option D is wrong as a statement of law, because possession taken in part performance of a written contract is precisely what the section protects, and it cannot be described as always revocable.

Examiner's note — the trap: A is the attractive distractor: it recites possession and willingness, which are genuine ingredients of section 53A, and invites the candidate to stop checking once two conditions are met.

Q4 B Sections 52 and 53A combined ELITE

Two provisions operate together. Under section 53A Rukmini's contract is in writing, signed by her, for consideration, its terms are certain, Sarthak has taken possession and is willing to perform; she is therefore debarred from enforcing any right in the land against him. The passage adds the words that decide this question: the bar runs against the transferor or any person claiming under him. Tarun claims under Rukmini, so the shield answers him too. Section 52 points the same way, because Tarun bought while a suit putting a right to the land directly in question was pending, and he takes subject to the decree. But the passage also says section 53A confers no title, so Sarthak cannot convert his defence into a suit for possession. He can hold what he has and no more, which is option B. Option A

ignores the shield-not-sword rule. Option C ignores section 53A altogether. Option D imports a notice requirement that neither section 52 nor section 53A contains.

Examiner's note — the trap: A is the trap: having been told that the later buyer is defeated, it is natural to conclude that the earlier one must therefore own the land, which is exactly the inference section 53A forbids.

Q5 **C** **Scope of the 2024 Act - candidates** **MED**

The passage closes with the decisive sentence: the Act creates no offence by a candidate, and a candidate who cheats remains subject to the rules of the body conducting the examination. That is the design of the statute, which aims at leaks, organised rackets and service providers rather than at examinees, who are dealt with administratively by debarment and cancellation. Yusuf is a candidate and nothing links him to the leak itself, so he faces no prosecution under this Act, which is option C. Option A applies section 10 and its three to five years to him; section 10 does punish unauthorised possession of a question paper, but only where the Act applies at all, and the closing sentence takes candidates outside it. Option B borrows section 11, which is addressed only to a service provider engaged to conduct the examination. Option D borrows section 12, which requires collusion with officials or a service provider, and the facts state there is no such link.

Examiner's note — the trap: A is the attractive wrong answer: unauthorised possession of a question paper is listed in section 3 word for word, and the candidate plainly had one, so the exclusion in the last sentence is easy to miss.

Q6 **A** **Section 11 - service provider liability** **HARD**

Section 11 deals with a service provider engaged to conduct an examination and prescribes three consequences for the firm: a penalty of up to one crore rupees, recovery of the proportionate cost of the examination, and a four-year bar from being assigned any public examination. It then adds a separate and narrower rule for the human beings behind the firm: directors and senior management suffer imprisonment of three to ten years and a fine of one crore rupees only where they knowingly involved themselves. The facts say the managing director is not shown to have known anything, so the qualifying word knowingly is not satisfied and no imprisonment follows. That combination, firm penalised and barred, director untouched, is option A. Option B applies the officers provision without its condition. Option C imports the ten lakh figure from section 10, which fixes the fine for an individual offender rather than for a service provider. Option D denies corporate liability altogether, which section 11 plainly creates in the form of a monetary penalty and a bar.

Examiner's note — the trap: B is the trap: the three to ten year range does appear in section 11, and a reader who spots it there forgets that it is conditioned on the officer having knowingly involved himself.

Q7 **D** **Sections 9 and 13 - procedure** **HARD**

Three claims are made and the passage answers each. First, section 9 makes every offence under the Act cognizable, which means the police may arrest without a warrant, so the arrest is good. Second, the same section makes every offence non-compoundable, so Dhruv cannot buy his way out by compensating the examination body, and the body's willingness is beside the point. Third, section 13 requires that the offence be investigated by an officer not below the rank of Deputy Superintendent of Police or Assistant Commissioner of Police, so a head constable cannot conduct it. Only option D states all three correctly. Option A denies the cognizable character that section 9 confers. Option B assumes that a compoundable offence exists wherever a single injured party can be identified, which is not how section 9 works; the Act treats the offence as one against the integrity of public recruitment. Option C reads the rank requirement out of section 13, which fixes it expressly.

Examiner's note — the trap: B is the attractive wrong answer, because compounding genuinely does turn on the injured party's consent in many statutes; here section 9 removes that route regardless of who consents.

Q8 **B** **Section 12 - organised crime** **ELITE**

Section 12 is triggered where an unfair means offence is committed by a person or a group of persons in collusion with officials of the examination authority or with a service provider. Here a centre superintendent, who is an official of the examination authority, a coaching institute owner and a press employee acted in collusion, which is the section's own description. The punishment it prescribes is imprisonment of not less than five years extending to ten years and a fine of not less than one crore rupees, and it applies to the participants in the organised crime, which is option B. Option A applies section 10, the ordinary provision for an individual offender, and so understates both the imprisonment and the fine; section 12 exists precisely to lift the punishment above that floor once collusion is shown. Option C mixes in the three to ten year range, which section 11 reserves for directors and senior management of a service provider. Option D misreads collusion as requiring every participant to be an official.

Examiner's note — the trap: A is the trap: every element of section 10 is satisfied on these facts, so a candidate who stops at the first provision that fits will never reach the aggravated one that also fits.

LOGICAL REASONING

Q9 **C** **Weaken - alternative cause** **MED**

Ishita reasons from a correlation in time to a cause: fees were removed in January and borrowing rose thereafter, so removing fees raised borrowing. The standard way to weaken such reasoning is to supply another change that occurred at the same time and could produce the same rise. Option C does exactly that. Four new branches opened in the most crowded neighbourhoods in the very month the fees went, and more branches closer to more people would raise borrowing whatever happened to fees. The rise is therefore no longer evidence for her conclusion, and it is also no longer evidence for the recommendation she builds on it, since a library that adds no branch may see nothing. Option A tells us the libraries differ, which bears on nothing. Option B removes a seasonal objection and so

mildly helps Ishita rather than hurting her. Option D concerns how long books were kept, not how many were borrowed, and the conclusion is about borrowing volume alone.

Examiner's note — the trap: B looks like an attack because it mentions the measurement, but comparing with the same six months a year earlier controls for seasonality and therefore strengthens the inference.

Q10 B Weaken - overlooked cost **HARD**

Jairam's argument has a hidden step. He measures the financial effect of abolishing fees by the size of the fee income alone, three per cent of the budget, and concludes that the finances cannot have suffered. That holds only if forgone fee income is the sole financial consequence of the change. Option B destroys that step by naming a second and larger consequence on the cost side: books now stay out so much longer that the Board must buy many more copies of each title. Acquisition spending of that kind can easily exceed three per cent of a budget, so the abolition may have hurt the finances badly even though the lost revenue was trivial. Option A tells us other libraries are similarly placed, which says nothing about this one. Option C reports a growing budget, which is consistent with the amnesty having made it grow more slowly. Option D compares fee income across earlier years and leaves the three per cent figure, and Jairam's reasoning, untouched.

Examiner's note — the trap: C is the attractive wrong answer: a decade of budget growth sounds like evidence about financial health, but growth from other causes cannot show what this particular decision cost.

Q11 A Weaken - ruling out the rival motive **HARD**

Kalpna argues that because overdue returns did not rise once the penalty was withdrawn, borrowers must be returning books from civic habit rather than fear of a penalty. The inference works only if the amnesty actually left borrowers facing no penalty. Option A shows that it did not: a borrower who keeps a book past the date is now barred from borrowing until he brings it back, which is a penalty, and for a regular reader a sharper one than a small fee. The steady return rate is then explained by fear of the new penalty just as well as by civic habit, and Kalpna's conclusion loses its support. Option B concerns when a return is counted as overdue and applies equally before and after, so it shifts nothing. Option C is a single anecdote about one member and cannot bear on the population. Option D describes libraries that never charged fees at all and so were never part of the comparison Kalpna is drawing.

Examiner's note — the trap: D tempts by seeming to offer a control group, but libraries that never charged a fee tell us nothing about how behaviour changed at the one that withdrew a fee.

Q12 D Weaken - breaking the causal chain **ELITE**

Ishita's second claim runs along a chain: extra borrowings save residents the price of books, those savings are spent or held by residents, and the savings reappear as higher municipal tax collections. Option D cuts the chain at its last link and reverses its direction. If readers who borrow more buy fewer books from shops that pay the city's trade tax, then the very saving Ishita relies on arrives at the municipal treasury as a fall in taxable trade, not a rise. The scheme is then further from paying for itself the better it works, which is the strongest possible form of weakening. Option A makes books dearer and so makes the saving per borrowing larger, which helps her. Option B explains why people borrow rather than buy but says nothing about tax. Option C concerns the composition of the borrowing figures and leaves the financial argument exactly where it stood, since fiction and non-fiction are bought and taxed alike.

Examiner's note — the trap: A is the trap: rising book prices feel like bad news and sit near the argument's subject matter, but a larger saving per borrowing is precisely what Ishita's claim needs.

Q13 D Strengthen - eliminating a rival cause **MED**

Bimal infers a cause from a sequence: the store was built, incomes then rose eighteen per cent. The obvious rival explanation is that something affecting all onion growers, a good run of prices or of weather, lifted incomes everywhere. Option D removes that rival by supplying a comparison group. Neighbouring cooperatives without cold stores saw no income rise over the same three years, so whatever happened at Amaltas was local to Amaltas and the store is the salient difference. That is the classic strengthener for a causal claim, and it also supports the recommendation, since it implies the neighbours have something to gain. Option A tells us members differ in plot size and soil, which if anything muddies the picture. Option B concerns the source of the loan and is irrelevant to what the store did. Option C notes that growers joined after the store opened, which raises the possibility that the average rose because better-off growers joined, and so weakens Bimal rather than helping him.

Examiner's note — the trap: C is the attractive wrong answer: new members arriving looks like proof the store is working, but a changed membership is an alternative explanation for a rise in the average.

Q14 C Strengthen - closing the cost gap **HARD**

Chandni compares two figures, storage charges collected and the annual loan instalment, and concludes that the loan will be repaid on schedule. The gap in her reasoning is that charges must cover the store's running costs before anything is left for the instalment; a cold store consumes a great deal of electricity and needs staff. Option C closes exactly that gap, and closes it for the right period: electricity and staff costs are met by a separate grant lasting the loan's full term, so the charges are free to service the loan for as long as the loan runs. Option A offers an extension of the repayment period, which contemplates the schedule being missed and so tells against her. Option B makes the charges revisable each year by a vote, which makes future collections less secure and also weakens her. Option D states the store's capacity as a share of the members crop, which fixes no revenue and no cost and leaves the argument where it was.

Examiner's note — the trap: A is the trap: a cooperative bank willing to grant more time sounds reassuring, but the claim on trial is repayment on schedule, which an extension concedes rather than supports.

Q15 B Strengthen - natural experiment **HARD**

Devanshi claims a spillover: withholding stock from the market just after harvest lifts the price every grower in the district gets, members and non-members alike. What would support it is evidence that the price moves with the withholding. Option B supplies precisely that in the strongest form available, a natural experiment. In the one year the store lay shut for repairs, so that nothing was withheld, district prices after harvest fell sharply. The presence of the mechanism goes with the higher price and its absence with the lower one, which is what a causal claim about the district-wide price needs. Option A places members sales in the district's own market, which is a precondition for any effect but is no evidence that the effect occurred. Option C counts non-members relative to members, which bears on how many people benefit, not on whether the price rose. Option D compares the size of this district's crop with others and touches neither the mechanism nor the price.

Examiner's note — the trap: A is attractive because the spillover could not work at all unless members sold locally, and a necessary condition is easily mistaken for evidence that the thing happened.

Q16 A Strengthen - ruling out displacement **ELITE**

Bimal infers from a fall of one third in what the cooperative discards that the store has cut waste. The inference is exposed to a displacement objection: the cooperative discards less because onions that would once have rotted in its yard now rot at members homes before they reach the store, or because it simply handles less. Option A answers the first and more serious form of that objection directly. Spoilage at members own homes is measured separately and has not risen since the store opened, so the loss has not merely moved, and the fall at the cooperative is a genuine net reduction. Option B describes the weighing procedure, which tells us the figure is recorded carefully but not that total waste fell. Option C compares onions with other vegetables, which is beside the point. Option D compares Amaltas with two neighbours, and a lower share than someone else's is consistent with the store having done nothing at all.

Examiner's note — the trap: B is the trap: a monthly weighing recorded in a register makes the one-third figure sound reliable, but reliability of a measurement is not the same as the measurement capturing all the waste.

QUANTITATIVE TECHNIQUES

Q17 B Ratio of parts of two wholes **MED**

Split each roll in its given ratio. Kesari has 48,000 registered voters dividing between men and women as 5 : 3, so there are 8 parts and one part is 48,000 divided by 8, which is 6,000; the men number 5 times 6,000, that is 30,000. Neelgiri has 36,000 registered voters dividing as 7 : 5, so there are 12 parts and one part is 36,000 divided by 12, which is 3,000; the women number 5 times 3,000, that is 15,000. The required ratio is 30,000 : 15,000, and dividing both terms by 15,000 gives 2 : 1, which is option B. The standard error is to treat the ratio parts as though they could be compared across wards without converting them into numbers first, since 5 and 5 both appear; but a part in Kesari is 6,000 voters and a part in Neelgiri is only 3,000, so the parts are not the same size and must be valued separately.

Examiner's note — the trap: Option C, 5 : 3, is the trap: it is simply Kesari's own men to women ratio, which a reader picks up if he stops at the first ratio the question mentions.

Q18 A Comparing rates expressed as fractions **HARD**

Turnout is votes polled divided by voters registered, so compute all four. Kesari gives 30,000 divided by 48,000, which is 0.625. Neelgiri gives 27,000 divided by 36,000, which is 0.75. Pampa gives 39,000 divided by 60,000, which is 0.65. Suryagarh gives 36,000 divided by 54,000, which is two thirds, about 0.667. The highest is Neelgiri at 0.75 and the lowest is Kesari at 0.625. Their ratio is 0.75 : 0.625, and multiplying both terms by 1,000 gives 750 : 625, which on dividing by 125 is 6 : 5. That is option A. Note that the largest roll and the largest number of votes polled both belong to Pampa, yet Pampa is neither the highest nor the lowest on turnout; size of the roll and rate of turnout are independent, and the question asks only about the rate.

Examiner's note — the trap: Option C, 15 : 13, is the designed trap: it is the ratio of Neelgiri's turnout to Pampa's, which a reader gets by treating the second lowest figure, 0.65, as the lowest.

Q19 C Dividing a quantity in a three-part ratio **HARD**

Pampa polled 39,000 votes, and these divide between Party X, Party Y and the others in the ratio 7 : 5 : 3. The total number of parts is 7 plus 5 plus 3, which is 15, so one part equals 39,000 divided by 15, that is 2,600 votes. Party X takes 7 parts, which is 18,200 votes, and Party Y takes 5 parts, which is 13,000 votes. The lead is 18,200 minus 13,000, which is 5,200 votes. The same figure comes faster from the difference in parts: X exceeds Y by 7 minus 5, that is 2 parts, and 2 times 2,600 is 5,200. That is option C. Note that the division is of the votes polled, 39,000, and not of the 60,000 voters on the roll; the 21,000 who did not vote belong to no party's share.

Examiner's note — the trap: Option A, 2,600, is the attractive wrong answer: it is the value of one part, which is what a reader reports if he subtracts the ratio terms and forgets to multiply back.

Q20 D Ratio after unequal addition **HARD**

First convert Suryagarh's ratio into numbers. It has 54,000 registered voters dividing as 4 : 5, so there are 9 parts and one part is 54,000 divided by 9, that is 6,000; the men number 4 times 6,000, which is 24,000, and the women 5 times 6,000, which is 30,000. Now add the new enrolments to each group separately: the men become 24,000 plus 3,000, that is 27,000, and the women become 30,000 plus 1,500,

that is 31,500. The new ratio is 27,000 : 31,500, and dividing both terms by 4,500 gives 6 : 7, which is option D. The point of the question is that a ratio cannot be updated by adding to its terms; 4 : 5 does not become 7 : 6.5 or anything of the kind. The additions must be made to the actual numbers, and a fresh ratio taken afterwards.

Examiner's note — the trap: Option A, 27 : 32, is the trap for a reader who adds correctly but slips on one figure, taking the women to 32,000 instead of 31,500 and then cancelling by 1,000.

Q21 C Applying a common rate to unequal bases ELITE

Neelgiri's turnout is 27,000 divided by 36,000, which is 0.75. Apply that rate to each roll and compare with what was actually polled. Kesari at 0.75 of 48,000 would poll 36,000 against 30,000 actual, a shortfall of 6,000. Neelgiri is already at the rate, so it needs nothing. Pampa at 0.75 of 60,000 would poll 45,000 against 39,000 actual, a shortfall of 6,000. Suryagarh at 0.75 of 54,000 would poll 40,500 against 36,000 actual, a shortfall of 4,500. The total is 6,000 plus 0 plus 6,000 plus 4,500, which is 16,500 votes, option C. The shortcut is to work on the whole: 0.75 of the combined roll of 198,000 is 148,500, and the actual combined poll is 132,000, giving the same 16,500. The rate must be applied to each roll, since equal rates on unequal rolls yield unequal numbers of votes.

Examiner's note — the trap: Option D, 18,000, is the trap: it comes from applying the 6,000 shortfall found for Kesari and Pampa to Suryagarh as well, as though the three deficient wards were alike.

Q22 A Arithmetic mean of a series MED

The average is the sum of the figures divided by the number of figures. The revenue receipts are 420, 465, 510, 555 and 600 crore rupees. Adding them, 420 plus 465 is 885, plus 510 is 1,395, plus 555 is 1,950, and plus 600 is 2,550 crore rupees. Dividing by 5 gives 510 crore rupees, which is option A. There is a faster route worth noticing, because it recurs. The receipts rise by exactly 45 crore rupees each year, so they form an arithmetic progression, and the mean of an arithmetic progression with an odd number of terms is its middle term. The middle term here is Year 3, whose receipts are 510 crore rupees, giving the answer without any addition at all. The same shortcut will not work on the expenditure column, whose steps are 30, 60, 45 and 60, so it is not an arithmetic progression.

Examiner's note — the trap: Option C, 600 crore, is the trap: it is the five-year average of the expenditure column, which sits immediately beside the receipts column in the table.

Q23 C Average of a derived series HARD

Work out the deficit of each year first, as expenditure minus receipts. Year 1 gives 510 minus 420, which is 90. Year 2 gives 540 minus 465, which is 75. Year 3 gives 600 minus 510, which is 90. Year 4 gives 645 minus 555, which is 90. Year 5 gives 705 minus 600, which is 105. The deficits are therefore 90, 75, 90, 90 and 105 crore rupees, and their sum is 450 crore rupees. The average is 450 divided by 5, which is 90 crore rupees. The Year 5 deficit is 105 crore rupees, so it exceeds the average by 105 minus 90, that is 15 crore rupees, which is option C. A shortcut: the average of the deficits equals the average expenditure, 600, minus the average receipts, 510, which is again 90, because the mean of a difference is the difference of the means.

Examiner's note — the trap: Option D, 30 crore, is the trap: it comes from dividing the total deficit of 450 by six rather than five, an easy slip when the passage is already talking about a sixth year.

Q24 B Finding a missing term from a target average HARD

If the average of six numbers is to be 540 crore rupees, their total must be 540 multiplied by 6, which is 3,240 crore rupees. The five known receipts are 420, 465, 510, 555 and 600, and they total 2,550 crore rupees. The sixth year must therefore supply 3,240 minus 2,550, which is 690 crore rupees, and that is option B. The deviation method reaches the same answer with lighter arithmetic. Measure each known year against the target of 540: Year 1 is 120 below it, Year 2 is 75 below, Year 3 is 30 below, Year 4 is 15 above and Year 5 is 60 above. Those deviations sum to minus 150, so the five known years fall short of the target by 150 crore rupees in all. Year 6 must make that shortfall good on top of meeting the target itself, so it must be 540 plus 150, which is 690 crore rupees. The target of 540 lies well above the present five-year average of 510, which is why the sixth year has to be so large.

Examiner's note — the trap: Option A, 645 crore, is the trap: the receipts rise by exactly 45 every year, so a reader who simply continues the pattern gives next year's natural figure instead of the figure the target average demands.

Q25 D Effect of removing a term on the mean ELITE

The five expenditures are 510, 540, 600, 645 and 705 crore rupees. Their sum is 3,000 crore rupees, so the five-year average is 3,000 divided by 5, which is 600 crore rupees. The highest expenditure is that of Year 5, 705 crore rupees. Removing it leaves 3,000 minus 705, that is 2,295 crore rupees, over four years, so the new average is 2,295 divided by 4, which is 573.75 crore rupees. The shortfall is 600 minus 573.75, which is 26.25 crore rupees, and that is option D. The result also follows from a general rule: dropping one term that exceeds the mean by an amount d from a set of n terms lowers the mean by d divided by n minus 1. Here d is 705 minus 600, that is 105, and n minus 1 is 4, so the fall is 105 divided by 4, which is 26.25 crore rupees.

Examiner's note — the trap: Option A, 21.00, is the trap: it is 105 divided by 5 rather than by 4, the error of dividing the excess by the original count instead of by the number of terms that remain.

1. Which clause of section 6 of the Transfer of Property Act bars the transfer of spes successionis? — **Clause (a) - the chance of an heir apparent succeeding to an estate.**
2. Does a transfer made during the pendency of a suit become void under section 52? — **No. It is valid, but the transferee takes subject to the decree.**
3. Can a purchaser plead absence of notice to escape lis pendens? — **No. Good faith and want of notice are no defence under section 52.**
4. Name the one requirement of section 53A that an oral agreement can never satisfy. — **A contract in writing signed by the transferor.**
5. Is section 53A a sword or a shield? — **A shield. It bars the transferor's claim but confers no title.**
6. Under section 58, who retains ownership after a mortgage is created? — **The mortgagor. Only an interest in the property passes, as security for a debt.**
7. Distinguish section 54 from section 105 in one line each. — **Sale transfers ownership for a price; lease transfers a right to enjoy for a term, for rent.**
8. When was the Public Examinations (Prevention of Unfair Means) Act, 2024 brought into force? — **21 June 2024.**
9. What is the punishment under section 10 of that Act for an individual offender? — **Three to five years imprisonment and a fine of up to ten lakh rupees.**
10. What three consequences does section 11 impose on an errant service provider? — **Penalty up to one crore rupees, recovery of proportionate exam cost, and a four-year bar.**
11. What does section 12 prescribe for an organised crime under the Act? — **Five to ten years imprisonment and a fine of not less than one crore rupees.**
12. Are offences under the 2024 Act bailable or compoundable? — **Neither. Section 9 makes them cognizable, non-bailable and non-compoundable.**
13. What is the minimum rank of the officer who may investigate under section 13? — **Deputy Superintendent of Police or Assistant Commissioner of Police.**
14. What is the quickest way to weaken an argument that infers cause from a rise following a change? — **Name another change that occurred at the same time and could produce the same rise.**
15. Dropping the largest of n numbers lowers the mean by how much? — **By its excess over the mean, divided by n minus one.**
16. Two wards have the same men-to-women ratio. Are their ratio parts equal in size? — **No. A part equals the roll divided by the total parts, so it differs with the roll.**
17. What does 'spes successionis' mean? — **A bare chance of succeeding to property - not transferable (s.6(a) TPA)**
18. Is a right of re-entry on breach of a lease transferable apart from the land? — **No (s.6(c) TPA)**
19. Can an easement be transferred apart from the dominant heritage? — **No (s.6(c)/(d) TPA)**
20. Is a right to future maintenance transferable? — **No - it is personal to the holder (s.6(dd) TPA)**
21. What is the doctrine of lis pendens meant to protect? — **The court's power to decide - a pending suit must not be defeated by a transfer**
22. Name the three core requirements of part performance under s.53A. — **A written contract for consideration, possession taken or continued, and willingness to perform**
23. In a sale, what passes to the buyer? — **Ownership itself (s.54 TPA)**
24. In a lease, what passes to the lessee? — **A right to enjoy the property for a term (s.105 TPA)**
25. What is a simple mortgage? — **Personal liability to repay plus a right to have the property sold (s.58(b))**
26. What is adverse possession, in one line? — **Possession that is open, hostile and continuous for the statutory period, defeating the owner's title**
27. Which Act does the 2024 exam-integrity law apply to - state or central examinations? — **Public examinations of specified central authorities**
28. Can a candidate be prosecuted under the 2024 Act? — **No - candidates are excluded from its penal provisions and face board rules instead**
29. What does a Weaken answer have to do to a causal claim? — **Give an alternative cause, or show the effect without the cause**
30. What does a Strengthen answer typically rule out? — **An alternative explanation for the same evidence**
31. Does a Strengthen answer have to prove the conclusion? — **No - it need only make it more likely**
32. Adding a value equal to the current mean changes the mean how? — **Not at all**
33. If a:b = 3:4 and b:c = 2:5, what is a:c? — **3:10**
34. Weighted average of two groups lies where? — **Between the two means, nearer the larger group**
35. Turnout percentage = ? — **Votes polled / electors x 100**
36. A ratio 15:13 and 6:5 - which is larger? — **6:5 (1.20 vs about 1.15)**
37. Who is a 'transferee for consideration without notice'? — **A bona fide purchaser who paid value and had no notice of the prior claim**
38. What are the three kinds of notice in property law? — **Actual, constructive and imputed**
39. Does registration of a document amount to notice? — **Yes - registration is constructive notice of the transaction**
40. What is an actionable claim? — **A claim to an unsecured debt or beneficial interest in movable property not in possession**
41. Can a mere right to sue be transferred? — **No (s.6(e) TPA)**
42. What is a usufructuary mortgage? — **The mortgagee holds possession and takes rents or profits in lieu of interest (s.58(d))**
43. What is an English mortgage? — **Absolute transfer with a covenant to re-transfer on repayment (s.58(e))**
44. Lease vs licence, in one line? — **A lease transfers an interest in land; a licence only permits an act on it**
45. What is the difference between void and voidable? — **Void has no effect at all; voidable binds until the aggrieved party avoids it**
46. What is an 'organised crime' under the 2024 exam law, in one line? — **An unlawful act by a group or in collusion, for wrongful gain in a public examination**
47. What is 'collusion' in an exam-leak case? — **Secret cooperation between insiders and outsiders to defeat the exam process**
48. Assumption vs Strengthen - the key difference? — **An assumption is required by the argument; a strengthener merely helps it**