

ANSWER KEY — 1 OCTOBER 2026

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

LEGAL REASONING

Q1 D Art 19(1)(b) — Freedom of Assembly **HARD**

Article 19(1)(b) expressly guarantees the freedom to assemble peaceably and without arms. A State law prohibiting peaceful protest assemblies directly abridges this specific freedom, making it the primary provision to invoke. Article 13 is the general invalidity clause, not a right in itself; it operates consequentially once a specific fundamental right identifies the violation. Article 21 protects personal liberty and has been read expansively, but where a more specific freedom — such as assembly — exists in Article 19, that provision governs. Article 32 is the procedural remedy for enforcement, not the substantive right that the petitioner must first identify as violated. The citizen therefore invokes Article 19(1)(b) as the violated right and Articles 13 and 32 as ancillary to its enforcement.

Examiner's note — the trap: Option A tempts because 'protest' resonates with personal liberty; the key is that Article 19(1)(b) is the specific provision, which overrides the general.

Q2 C Basic Structure — Art 32 as Fundamental Right **ELITE**

Kesavananda Bharati (1973) established that Parliament cannot destroy the basic structure of the Constitution through Article 368, even though it can amend. Article 32 — the right to constitutional remedies — has been held to be part of the basic structure. An amendment removing Article 32 would nullify the enforceability of all fundamental rights, striking at the very core of Part III. Option A represents the pre-Kesavananda position that Article 368 conferred plenary amendment power, which the case overruled. Option B introduces a non-existent ratification requirement. Option D adds an irrelevant condition about judicial review of ordinary legislation, which is a separate constitutional principle. The amendment is invalid because it destroys the basic structure by removing Article 32 itself.

Examiner's note — the trap: Option A reproduces the overruled pre-1973 position — the most common error for candidates who have not internalised the Kesavananda shift.

Q3 A Art 21 — Fair Procedure (Maneka Gandhi) **HARD**

Maneka Gandhi v. Union of India (1978) read Article 21 to require that procedure established by law be fair, just, and reasonable — not merely formal or enacted. Detaining a person without following even the enacted statutory procedure fails the basic 'procedure established by law' threshold and certainly fails Maneka Gandhi's additional requirement of fairness. Option B's police-power claim is squarely wrong: Article 21 constrains all State action, including preventive detention. Option C introduces a national emergency carve-out inapplicable on these facts. Option D creates a spurious distinction between liberty and property interests — Article 21 speaks of personal liberty without such a limitation. The detention is invalid under both the pre-Maneka and post-Maneka reading of Article 21.

Examiner's note — the trap: Options B and C both assert the detention is valid on public-order grounds; neither survives the plain text of Article 21 as expanded in Maneka Gandhi.

Q4 B Art 226 — Broader Writ Jurisdiction **MED**

Article 226 grants High Courts power to issue writs 'for any purpose', expressly including enforcement of rights other than fundamental rights. This is what distinguishes High Court jurisdiction under Article 226 from Supreme Court jurisdiction under Article 32, which is limited to enforcement of fundamental rights. Option A incorrectly equates Article 226 with the narrower Article 32 limitation. Option C states the exact opposite of the correct position. Option D invents a non-existent condition that the statutory entitlement must be ancillary to a fundamental right — no such condition appears in Article 226. The State's argument therefore fails: the High Court was acting squarely within the broader scope of its writ jurisdiction.

Examiner's note — the trap: Option A is the most common error — candidates import Article 32's limit (fundamental rights only) into Article 226, which has no such restriction in its text.

Q5 A HMA s.11 — Void Marriages **MED**

Section 11 of the Hindu Marriage Act renders marriages that violate Section 5(i) void ab initio — without any need for a court decree. Section 5(i) prohibits marriage while either party has a living spouse from a prior marriage. A bigamous marriage is therefore null from its inception in law: it was never a marriage. Option B wrongly introduces a limitation period applicable to voidable, not void, marriages. Option C incorrectly treats the second marriage as valid pending a Section 13 decree — Section 13 governs divorce, not the status of a void marriage. Option D misapplies Section 12, which covers voidable marriages; bigamous marriages do not fall within Section 12 but within Section 11. The void/voidable distinction is the central rule tested here.

Examiner's note — the trap: Option C is the main trap — candidates assume a court decree is always required; Section 11 expressly makes certain marriages void without any decree.

Q6 D HMA s.12 — Voidable on Age Ground **HARD**

Under the Hindu Marriage Act, marriage in breach of the age condition in Section 5(iii) is voidable, not void. Section 11 covers violations of Sections 5(i), 5(iv), and 5(v) only — it does not list Section 5(iii). A marriage in breach of Section 5(iii) therefore subsists until a court sets it aside on petition. Option A wrongly applies Section 11 to the age condition. Option B asserts irrevocability, which is incorrect — either party may petition for annulment under Section 12. Option C restricts standing to the guardian, but Section 12 vests standing in the parties to the marriage themselves. Option D correctly states voidability: the marriage exists at law until a court annuls it on the petition of either party, since both were affected by the underage marriage.

Examiner's note — the trap: Option A is the classic error: applying Section 11 (void) to a Section 5(iii) age violation. Section 11 has a closed list — memorise it.

Q7 C HMA s.13B + s.14 — One-Year Bar **HARD**

Section 14 of the Hindu Marriage Act bars any divorce petition (including mutual consent under Section 13B) from being presented within one year of the marriage, unless the court grants leave on grounds of exceptional hardship or exceptional depravity on the respondent's part. Since the couple has been married only eight months, they cannot petition as of right; they must first obtain leave under Section 14. Option A incorrectly treats mutual consent as overriding Section 14 — the two provisions operate independently. Option B's absolute refusal overstates the position: Section 14 provides a conditional gateway (leave), not an absolute bar. Option D is procedurally incorrect — courts have jurisdiction over family dissolution; there is no mandatory mediation bar here.

Examiner's note — the trap: Options A and B both treat Section 14 as either irrelevant or absolutely prohibitive; Option C correctly identifies the leave mechanism as the operative pathway.

Q8 B HMA s.25 — Permanent Alimony **MED**

Section 25 of the Hindu Marriage Act expressly empowers the court to award permanent alimony or maintenance to either party to the marriage, and this power arises at the time of passing 'any decree' under the Act — including a decree of divorce. The section is fault-neutral and applicable regardless of which party petitioned or what grounds were used. Option A incorrectly confines alimony to judicial separation proceedings — a common error for candidates who have not read Section 25 directly. Option C adds a fault-based condition that does not appear in the text of Section 25. Option D invents a property-contribution requirement with no statutory basis. The respondent's argument therefore fails on the plain language of Section 25.

Examiner's note — the trap: Option A conflates 'maintenance pending suit' with Section 25 permanent alimony — the key is that Section 25 uses 'any decree' without restricting to judicial separation.

LOGICAL REASONING

Q9 D Parallel Reasoning — Causal Chain $A \rightarrow B \rightarrow C \rightarrow D$ **HARD**

The passage chains three cause-effect steps: screen time $\rightarrow$ disrupted sleep $\rightarrow$ reduced attention $\rightarrow$ lower performance. The structure is $A \rightarrow B$, $B \rightarrow C$, $C \rightarrow D$, therefore $A \rightarrow D$. Option D replicates this exactly: sleep deprivation $\rightarrow$ fatigue $\rightarrow$ inattention $\rightarrow$ lower exam scores — three genuine causal steps closing on the original initiating cause. Option A breaks the chain mid-way — its third link introduces a genetics claim unconnected to the topic. Option B reverses a causal direction in step two. Option C introduces an unrelated terminus (liver function) that does not close the chain on the original cause. Structural parallel reasoning requires each link to follow genuinely and the chain to close properly, not merely to mention the same number of concepts.

Examiner's note — the trap: Option A is the near-miss distractor — three steps, but the last step breaks the causal closure with a non-sequitur.

Q10 A Parallel Reasoning — Hidden Compensatory Gap **HARD**

The gap in the administration's reasoning is that banning phones in classrooms is assumed to reduce total screen time, ignoring compensatory use elsewhere. The flaw is location-specific compliance without whole-system effect. Option A replicates this: cameras reduce speed in camera zones only if drivers do not compensate on other roads. The gap is the same — location-specific intervention assumed to produce whole-network results. Option D is tempting but explicitly states the assumption ('assuming students cannot buy sweets elsewhere'), which makes the gap visible rather than hidden. Option C similarly makes the compensatory condition explicit ('provided students do not reduce activity'). Option B addresses a different structural issue — conditional effectiveness of a policy depending on complementary conditions (renewable pricing), not compensatory behaviour.

Examiner's note — the trap: Options C and D are near-misses that state the gap explicitly; Option A hides it in a parenthetical clause, matching the passage's structure more closely.

Q11 C Parallel Reasoning — Breaking the Chain ELITE

The passage's logical move is: even if the intervention succeeds locally, an independent variable (compensation) prevents the downstream conclusion. Option C captures this precisely: carbon taxes create an economic disincentive for fossil fuels, but whether consumers actually switch depends on a separate condition (competitive renewables) — without that condition, the causal chain from 'tax' to 'reduced fossil use' breaks. This mirrors the passage's argument that banning phones only reduces screen time if students do not compensate, i.e., an independent condition can break the chain. Option A changes the mechanism (paying the fine rather than switching behaviour). Option D inverts the example — salt added at the table is a downstream compensatory effect, not an upstream condition breaking the policy's first link. Option B introduces automation as a structural barrier, not a compensatory behaviour.

Examiner's note — the trap: Option D looks identical to the passage at first glance but targets a downstream effect rather than breaking the first causal link as the passage does.

Q12 B Parallel Reasoning — Structural Overreach MED

The administration's error is concluding 'WILL improve results' from a causal chain that may be broken by compensatory behaviour — treating a conditional causal claim as a necessary outcome without verifying the crucial assumptions. Option B commits the same overreach: 'removing fast-food outlets WILL reduce obesity' asserts a necessary outcome without checking whether students travel elsewhere for the same food — the critical assumption that makes the conclusion valid. Options C and D insert conditional qualifiers ('who are influenced by advertising', 'provided the species'), which makes the conclusions conditional rather than overclaimed. Option A introduces a causal claim stated with a reason but does not overclaim necessity — it is presented as a factual observation rather than a policy conclusion that outstrips its evidence.

Examiner's note — the trap: Options C and D include qualifying clauses that make the conclusions appropriately hedged; Option B's claim is stated as though the outcome is guaranteed.

Q13 A Method — Restatement before Refutation HARD

The first quoted statement immediately follows the critics' argument and identifies the analytical flaw in their position — confusing private cost with social cost — before the author builds the refutation through the externality example. Its function is diagnostic: it names what is wrong with the critics' view and prepares the reader for the evidence-based reply. Option B calls it the main conclusion, but the main conclusion is the last sentence about the causal inversion. Option C says it is derived from a preceding example, but the externality example comes after, not before, this statement. Option D attributes a concession to the author, but the statement is adversarial — it attacks the critics' analytical framework, not sympathises with it.

Examiner's note — the trap: Option C reverses the textual order — the bold statement precedes the example; an intermediate conclusion drawn from evidence must follow, not precede, that evidence.

Q14 D Method — Intermediate Conclusion from Example HARD

The second quoted statement follows the river-pollution example and is derived from it: the example shows that firms do not bear pollution costs, and the statement concludes from this that the market already failed to price the externality. This intermediate conclusion then underpins the main conclusion that regulation corrects, rather than creates, distortion. Option A mistakes it for a counter-premise representing critics' views — the statement is the author's own analytical finding. Option B calls it the main conclusion, which is instead the passage's last sentence. Option C says it supports the first quoted statement, reversing their logical order: the second statement is derived from the example that appears between the two bold statements, not a support for the first.

Examiner's note — the trap: Option C is the logical trap: it reverses the causal direction, suggesting the second bold statement precedes rather than follows from the externality example.

Q15 C Argument Structure Mapping MED

The passage opens with the critics' objection, reframes it using the externality concept and a concrete example, draws an intermediate conclusion that the market already failed, and then derives the final conclusion that regulation corrects distortion rather than creating it. Option C captures all four moves: acknowledge → reframe with example → intermediate conclusion → main conclusion. Option A misidentifies the opening as the author's own premise rather than the critics' objection. Option B introduces a withdrawal of the main claim, which the passage never does — the author is consistently assertive. Option D invents definitional moves that do not appear anywhere in the text; the passage uses no definitions, only the cause-effect analysis of externalities.

Examiner's note — the trap: Option A is the standard error — candidates assume a passage opens with the author's own view, but this passage deliberately opens with the adversarial position.

Q16 B Method — Identifying Causal Inversion HARD

The author argues that CSR mandates respond to a pre-existing market failure — the unpriced externality. Critics claim mandates create market distortion. The author says critics have the causation backwards: the distortion already existed; the mandate corrects it. 'Inversion' means the critics have swapped which event is cause and which is effect. Option B states this correctly: critics misidentify regulation as creating distortion when the distortion pre-existed the mandate. Option A reverses the inversion itself — it would mean CSR causes the market failure, which is the critics' position and what the author is arguing against. Option C introduces transaction costs not mentioned in the passage. Option D imports a historical sequence argument (historically efficiency preceded social cost) that the passage never makes.

Examiner's note — the trap: Option A is the most dangerous distractor: it uses the passage's language but assigns the causal relationship to the direction the author is refuting.

QUANTITATIVE TECHNIQUES

Q17 **A** Rectangle Area — Identifying Correct Plots **MED**

Wheat is planted on Plots P and S. Plot P has a rectangular shape with length 200 m and breadth 150 m, giving an area of $200 \times 150 = 30,000$ sq m. Plot S has length 300 m and breadth 120 m, giving $300 \times 120 = 36,000$ sq m. Total wheat area = $30,000 + 36,000 = 66,000$ sq m. Option B adds Plot Q (a rice plot) in place of Plot S, an error from misreading the crop column of the table. Option C applies an unexplained buffer deduction with no basis in the problem. Option D counts only Plot S and wrongly identifies Plot P's crop as rice. Both calculations are straightforward rectangle-area multiplications; the primary skill tested is correctly reading the crop column to identify the two wheat plots.

Examiner's note — the trap: Option B is the common trap — candidates add Q instead of S, perhaps misreading the table row order.

Q18 **D** Triangle Area — Standard Formula **MED**

The area of a triangle = $(1/2) \times \text{base} \times \text{height} = (1/2) \times 240 \times 180 = 21,600$ sq m. Option A omits the one-half factor entirely, multiplying base $\times$ height = 43,200 sq m — the most common computational error on this type of question. Option B treats the shape as a parallelogram with base $\times$ height counted twice. Option C applies an incorrect formula that averages the two dimensions before halving. Only Option D correctly applies the standard triangular-area formula: halve the product of base and height to obtain 21,600 sq m. In farm-plot mensuration, triangular plots arise when one boundary is diagonal; the formula $(1/2) \times b \times h$ holds regardless of whether the triangle is right-angled or oblique.

Examiner's note — the trap: Option A (43,200) is the classic wrong answer — the factor of $1/2$ is forgotten. Candidates who compute base $\times$ height in one step and forget to halve will choose it.

Q19 **B** Yield Calculation — Unit Conversion **MED**

Plot Q is a square with sides of 100 m, giving an area of $100 \times 100 = 10,000$ sq m = 1 hectare. The yield for rice is 6 tonnes per hectare. Therefore, the total rice yield for Plot Q = $1 \times 6 = 6$ tonnes. The only computation required is the unit conversion from square metres to hectares by dividing by 10,000, and then multiplying by the per-hectare yield. Option A misapplies the yield by dividing area by 1,000 rather than 10,000. Option C applies yield per square metre instead of per hectare, inflating the result by a factor of 10,000. Option D doubles the answer without any justification given in the problem. Correctly converting to hectares before applying yield rates is the single critical step.

Examiner's note — the trap: Option C is the trap for students who do not convert to hectares — they apply 6 t/ha as 6 t/sq m, getting 60,000 t, then misread the option.

Q20 **C** Comparing Yields Across Plots **HARD**

Plot R produces vegetables on 21,600 sq m = 2.16 ha at 8 t/ha: $2.16 \times 8 = 17.28$ tonnes. Plot S produces wheat on 36,000 sq m = 3.6 ha at 4 t/ha: $3.6 \times 4 = 14.4$ tonnes. Plot P produces wheat on 30,000 sq m = 3 ha at 4 t/ha: $3 \times 4 = 12$ tonnes. Plot Q produces rice on 10,000 sq m = 1 ha at 6 t/ha: $1 \times 6 = 6$ tonnes. Despite Plot R having the smallest area among all the cultivated plots, its high-value crop (vegetables at 8 t/ha) gives it the largest total seasonal output at 17.28 tonnes. This question tests whether candidates correctly compute all four plots rather than assuming that the largest-area plot automatically produces the highest total yield.

Examiner's note — the trap: Option A (Plot S) is the trap for candidates who assume the largest plot wins — Plot S's bigger area is offset by the lower wheat yield of 4 t/ha.

Q21 **D** Yield Change on Crop Conversion **HARD**

Converting Plot S (3.6 ha) from wheat to vegetables changes yield per hectare from 4 t to 8 t, a gain of 4 t/ha. Total gain = $3.6 \times 4 = 14.4$ tonnes. The question asks how Plot S's output changes, so the calculation is (new yield – old yield) $\times$ area. Option A computes only the new yield (28.8 t) without subtracting the old, treating the entire new yield as the change. Option B claims conversion to vegetables always reduces output — the reverse of the arithmetic here. Option C doubles the gain by counting both the old and new yield. Only Option D correctly computes the net change as the yield-rate difference multiplied by the plot area.

Examiner's note — the trap: Option A is the most common error: computing new yield (28.8 t) without subtracting old yield (14.4 t) — candidates forget the question asks for the change, not the new total.

Q22 **A** TSD — Basic Time Calculation **MED**

The slick travels with the river current at 30 km/h. Distance from A to B is 90 km. Time = distance $\div$ speed = $90 \div 30 = 3$ hours. The formula is elementary, but the key insight is that a pollutant slick travels at the river's own current speed — it does not decelerate, accelerate from rest, or experience viscosity effects as stated in the wrong options. Options B, C, and D all introduce physically implausible modifications — deceleration due to dispersal, two-thirds-speed viscosity loss, and acceleration from rest — that are not supported by any information given in the passage. The passage states explicitly that the slick travels with the river current, so its speed equals the current speed.

Examiner's note — the trap: Options B, C, D introduce physics-sounding modifications not in the problem — treat every modifier in an option that contradicts the passage as a distractor.

Q23 C TSD — Relative Speed (Toward Each Other) MED

The slick moves downstream toward B at 30 km/h. The boat from B moves upstream toward A at 18 km/h. They move toward each other — the closing speed is the sum of their individual speeds: $18 + 30 = 48$ km/h. Option A subtracts instead of adding, which applies when two objects move in the same direction. Option B considers only the boat's own speed, ignoring the slick's contribution to the closing rate. Option D considers only the river current, ignoring the boat's speed. The rule is: objects moving toward each other have a closing speed equal to the sum of their speeds; objects moving in the same direction have a separation speed equal to the difference.

Examiner's note — the trap: Option A (12 km/h) arises from subtracting — the standard error when students confuse 'toward each other' (sum) with 'in same direction' (difference).

Q24 D TSD — Meeting Point Calculation HARD

Let t = hours after departure. Slick position from A = $30t$. Boat position from A = $150 - 24t$. They meet when $30t = 150 - 24t \Rightarrow 54t = 150 \Rightarrow t = 150/54 \approx 2.78$ hours. This can also be framed as: the combined closing rate is $30 + 24 = 54$ km/h; initial separation is 150 km; time = $150/54 \approx 2.78$ hours. Option A rounds to 2.5 (a clean calculation error). Option B misunderstands the scenario as sequential rather than simultaneous. Option C incorrectly subtracts speeds (boat $24 -$ current $30 = -6$), concluding they never meet — but the boat is traveling upstream, so it approaches the downstream-moving slick and they do close on each other.

Examiner's note — the trap: Option C is the subtraction trap — students apply $24 - 30 = -6$ (same-direction formula) instead of $24 + 30 = 54$ (opposing-direction formula).

Q25 B TSD — Effect of Speed Change on Time MED

If the river's speed doubles to 60 km/h, the pollutant slick now travels at 60 km/h, since the passage states that the slick moves with the river current at all times. Time = distance $\div$ speed = $90 \div 60 = 1.5$ hours — exactly half the original 3 hours. This illustrates the inverse relationship between speed and time for a fixed distance: when speed doubles, time halves. Option A claims time doubles, reversing this relationship entirely. Option C says time is unchanged, incorrectly ignoring the change in current speed. Option D claims the slick only partially follows the current — a physically unsupported assumption that directly contradicts the passage's explicit statement about the slick. The key insight is trusting the passage's premise: slick speed equals river speed.

Examiner's note — the trap: Option A is a classic inversion error — students who know speed and time are inversely related sometimes misapply it by doubling time when speed doubles.

RAPID FIRE — ANSWERS

- Article that declares FR-violating laws void — **Article 13**
- Case that introduced the basic structure doctrine — **Kesavananda Bharati v. State of Kerala (1973)**
- Article guaranteeing freedom of assembly peaceably — **Article 19(1)(b)**
- Case that read fair procedure into Article 21 — **Maneka Gandhi v. Union of India (1978)**
- High Courts issue writs under Article — **226**
- Article 226 writ jurisdiction is ___ than Article 32 — **Broader**
- Section of HMA under which a bigamous marriage is void ab initio — **Section 11**
- Minimum age of groom under HMA 1955 — **21 years**
- Minimum age of bride under HMA 1955 — **18 years**
- A marriage void ab initio requires a court decree — true or false? — **False**
- Section of HMA governing voidable marriages — **Section 12**
- Section of HMA requiring leave to petition for divorce within one year — **Section 14**
- Section of HMA that allows divorce by mutual consent — **Section 13B**
- Minimum separation required before a Section 13B petition — **One year**
- Section of HMA that provides for permanent alimony — **Section 25**
- Article 32 is itself a fundamental right — true or false? — **True**
- An argument with the same logical form as another is a ___ argument — **Parallel argument**
- When two objects move toward each other, closing speed = — **Sum of their speeds**
- When two objects move in the same direction, relative speed = — **Difference of their speeds**
- Formula for area of a triangle — **$(1/2) \times \text{base} \times \text{height}$**
- Number of square metres in one hectare — **10,000**
- Wheat yield given in the farm problem (tonnes per hectare) — **4 t/ha**
- Rice yield given in the farm problem — **6 t/ha**
- Vegetable yield given in the farm problem — **8 t/ha**
- Area of Plot Q (100 m $\times$ 100 m) — **10,000 sq m = 1 ha**
- Area of Plot S (300 m $\times$ 120 m) — **36,000 sq m**
- Speed = Distance $\div$ ___ — **Time**
- River speed in the pollution problem — **30 km/h**
- Distance from Point A to Point B in the river problem — **90 km**
- A cost shifted to society rather than borne by the polluter is a negative ___ — **Externality**
- CSR stands for — **Corporate Social Responsibility**
- Bold-face function questions ask about the role of ___ in an argument — **Highlighted (bold) portions**
- An intermediate conclusion is drawn from evidence and ___ a further conclusion — **Supports**
- The basic structure doctrine limits Parliament's power under Article — **368**
- Kesavananda Bharati was decided in the year — **1973**
- Freedom to practise any profession is guaranteed under Article 19(1) (___) — **(g)**
- Slick travel time from A to B at 30 km/h over 90 km — **3 hours**
- Closing speed between the slick (30 km/h) and boat from B (18 km/h upstream) — **48 km/h**
- Second boat intercept time: 150 km at combined closing speed 54 km/h — **≈ 2.78 hours**
- If river speed doubles to 60 km/h, slick time from A to B becomes — **1.5 hours**

41. Plot R crop (triangle, base 240 m, height 180 m) — **Vegetables; area = 21,600 sq m**

42. Plot R yield: $2.16 \text{ ha} \times 8 \text{ t/ha} =$ — **17.28 tonnes**

43. Doctrine of colourable legislation — a law coloured as regulatory but truly penal is judged on its ___ — **Pith and substance**

44. Article 226 writs can be issued against — only State OR State + private bodies? — **Both State and private bodies performing public duties**

45. Section 5(i) HMA prohibits marriage while a ___ from a previous marriage is living — **Spouse**

46. The Parallel Reasoning question type asks you to find an argument with the same ___ — **Logical structure**

47. Bold-face questions in CLAT appear only in which section? — **Logical Reasoning / Critical Reasoning**

48. Compensation paid for converting a triangular plot from wheat to vegetables is based on ___ difference — **Yield rate**

49. TSD formula: closing speed when objects move toward each other = — **Sum of their speeds**

50. Closing speed when objects move in the same direction = — **Difference of their speeds**

51. $1 \text{ km} \times 1 \text{ km} =$ how many hectares? — **100 hectares**

52. Section 11 HMA makes a marriage void for violating Section 5(__), 5(iv) or 5(v) — **5(i)**

53. The basic structure doctrine first applied to invalidate which type of amendment? — **Amendments destroying judicial review / fundamental rights enforcement**

54. Article 13(2) prohibits the ___ from making any law abridging fundamental rights — **State**

55. In a causal chain argument, an intermediate conclusion is both a conclusion AND a ___ — **Premise (for the next step)**

56. In the externality argument, the company shifting pollution cost to the public is an example of a ___ externality — **Negative externality**