

ANSWER KEY — 6 OCTOBER 2026

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

LEGAL REASONING

Q1 C UNCLOS Art 19 — fishing renders passage non-innocent **MED**

Article 17 of UNCLOS gives foreign ships a right of innocent passage through the territorial sea, but Article 19 qualifies it: passage is innocent only while it is not prejudicial to the peace, good order or security of the coastal State, and the passage lists specific activities that make it non-innocent, one of which is fishing. The trawler was 8 nautical miles out, well within India's 12-mile territorial sea, and its crew lowered nets and fished for two hours. The moment it engaged in a listed activity, its passage ceased to be innocent, so option C is correct. Option A wrongly treats a direct route as decisive; the route matters only for whether the ship is passing at all, not for what it does while passing. Option B misplaces the rule, since Article 19 governs conduct inside the territorial sea. Option D invents a requirement of proof of actual harm, which the listed-activity test does not demand.

Examiner's note — the trap: Option A is the trap: a continuous, direct route makes the movement 'passage', but innocence is lost by the listed activity of fishing, whatever the route.

Q2 A UNCLOS Art 33 — contiguous zone: punishing a completed customs infringement **HARD**

Article 33 allows a coastal State a contiguous zone extending to 24 nautical miles from the baseline. Within it the State may exercise the control necessary both to prevent and to punish infringement of its customs, fiscal, immigration or sanitary laws committed within its territory or territorial sea. Here the customs infringement, landing contraband on an Indian beach, was completed within Indian territory an hour earlier, and the ship is now 22 nautical miles out, inside the 24-mile limit. Boarding and detaining it to punish that infringement is exactly the control Article 33 permits, so option A is correct. Option B is wrong because, although sovereignty ends at 12 miles, the contiguous zone confers limited enforcement control beyond it. Option C misreads the Article, which expressly covers punishment as well as prevention. Option D overstates the economic zone: Articles 56 and 57 give sovereign rights over natural resources only, not over every activity of foreign ships.

Examiner's note — the trap: Option B attracts students who equate 'no sovereignty' with 'no control'; Article 33 grants limited customs control precisely in the belt where sovereignty has ended.

Q3 D UNCLOS Arts 56-58 — EEZ resource rights versus freedom of navigation **HARD**

A point 150 nautical miles from the baseline lies outside the 12-mile territorial sea and the 24-mile contiguous zone but within the 200-mile exclusive economic zone. Under Articles 56 and 57, India holds sovereign rights over the living and non-living natural resources of the waters, seabed and subsoil of that zone; natural gas in the seabed is a non-living resource, so drilling for it without India's consent infringes those rights. Article 58, however, preserves for all States the freedoms of navigation and overflight in the zone, so the foreign warship may sail through without giving notice. Option D captures both halves and is correct. Option A ignores the economic zone's resource rights altogether. Option B converts 'sovereign rights over resources' into full sovereignty, which the passage reserves for the territorial sea. Option C invents a notice requirement for navigation and wrongly assumes that only living resources are protected, although the passage expressly includes non-living resources.

Examiner's note — the trap: Option B is the trap: the word 'sovereign' in 'sovereign rights' tempts students to treat the economic zone as territory, but those rights attach only to resources.

Q4 B UNCLOS Arts 2, 17, 19 — launching aircraft; no innocent passage for aircraft **ELITE**

Two separate actors must be assessed. The carrier was 10 nautical miles out, inside India's territorial sea, and while there it launched a helicopter. Article 19 lists the launching or landing of aircraft as an activity that makes passage non-innocent, so the carrier's passage ceased to be innocent the moment the helicopter left its deck; where the helicopter later flew is irrelevant. The second aircraft flew across the territorial sea without permission. Under Article 2, India's sovereignty extends to the airspace above its territorial sea, and the passage states that there is no right of innocent passage for aircraft, so the overflight infringed India's sovereignty. Both acted wrongfully, making option B correct. Option A focuses on the helicopter's destination instead of the act of launching. Option C wrongly

extends the ships' right of passage to aircraft. Option D asserts a general immunity that the passage nowhere provides; the rules on passage apply to warships as much as to other ships.

Examiner's note — the trap: Option A is the trap: students track where the helicopter ended up, 30 miles out, and forget that Article 19 condemns the act of launching inside the territorial sea.

Q5 B TPA S.122 — acceptance must be during the donor's lifetime MED

Section 122 makes acceptance an essential ingredient of a gift and fixes when it must occur: during the lifetime of the donor and while he is still capable of giving. Ramesh complied with every formality of Section 123, since the deed was registered, signed by him and attested by two witnesses, but formality alone does not complete a gift. Arjun did not know of the deed and accepted only a week after Ramesh's death. By then there was no living donor whose gift could be accepted, so the gift never came into existence and is void; option B is correct. Option A treats the Section 123 formalities as sufficient and ignores the separate requirement of acceptance in Section 122. Option C invents a doctrine of acceptance relating back to registration; the passage gives no such rule. Option D invents a requirement of personal acceptance before the registering officer, whereas acceptance may be made by or on behalf of the donee in any manner.

Examiner's note — the trap: Option A is the trap: a perfectly executed and registered deed looks complete, but without acceptance within the donor's lifetime there is no gift at all.

Q6 D TPA S.123 — delivery for movables; registered instrument for immovables HARD

Section 123 sets different modes of transfer for the two kinds of property. A gift of movable property may be effected either by a registered instrument or by delivery; the necklace was physically handed to Kavya with words of gift, and she accepted it during Meera's lifetime, so that gift is complete. A gift of immovable property, however, must be effected by a registered instrument signed by or on behalf of the donor and attested by at least two witnesses. Farmland is immovable property, and handing over keys and title papers is not a substitute for the instrument the section demands. Since no instrument was executed, the gift of the plot fails. Option D is therefore correct. Option A applies the immovable-property rule to movables as well, ignoring the alternative of delivery. Option B looks only at the Section 122 ingredients and overlooks the Section 123 form. Option C reverses the two rules, treating delivery as enough for land and denying it for jewellery.

Examiner's note — the trap: Option B is the trap: voluntariness, absence of consideration and acceptance are all present, but Section 123 adds a mandatory form for immovable property that the plot lacks.

Q7 A TPA S.126 — conditional revocation versus revocation at the donor's will ELITE

Section 126 draws a sharp line between two kinds of revocation clause. Donor and donee may validly agree that a gift will be revoked on a specified event that does not depend on the donor's will. Clause 1 ties revocation to Dev using either plot for a liquor shop, an event within Dev's control rather than Sarla's, so it is a valid condition. A gift that is revocable at the mere will of the donor, however, is void wholly or in part, as the case may be. Clause 2 lets Sarla take back the eastern plot whenever she chooses, which is revocation at her mere will, so the gift of the eastern plot is void; the western plot is untouched by Clause 2 and passes to Dev, subject to Clause 1. Option A is correct. Option B wrongly treats every revocation clause as fatal. Option C strikes down a valid condition. Option D enforces a clause that the section declares void.

Examiner's note — the trap: Option C is the trap: students who sense that revocation clauses are suspect strike both down, missing that Clause 1 depends on the donee's conduct and is valid.

Q8 C TPA S.127 — onerous gift by a single transfer HARD

Section 127 addresses a gift of several things in which one carries a burden. Where the gift is a single transfer to the same person of several things, one burdened by an obligation and the others not, the donee can take nothing by the gift unless he accepts it fully. Prakash used one deed to transfer both the house and the shop, and the shop carries the obligation to repay the secured bank loan. Vivek cannot pick the beneficial house and refuse the burdened shop; unless he accepts the whole gift, including the shop and the repayment obligation, he takes nothing. Option C is correct. Option A states the rule that applies only to separate and independent transfers, which is not the case here. Option B converts partial acceptance into full acceptance, which the section does not do; it denies the donee everything instead. Option D wrongly suggests that burdened property cannot be gifted at all, whereas Section 127 assumes that it can be.

Examiner's note — the trap: Option A is the trap: it states the rule for separate and independent transfers correctly, but Prakash used a single deed, which triggers the all-or-nothing rule.

LOGICAL REASONING

Q9 A Strengthen — comparison (control) group rules out a common cause HARD

The argument infers causation from a sequence: the registry was launched, and fraud complaints then fell by forty per cent. Its main vulnerability is that something affecting the whole region, such as a general policing drive or an economic change, might have reduced fraud everywhere. Option A supplies a comparison group: in neighbouring states that kept paper records, complaints stayed broadly level over the same period. That makes it more likely that the difference lies in the registry rather than in a regional trend, so A most strengthens the conclusion. Option B concerns cost and revenue, which say nothing about why fraud fell. Option C, rising prices and first-time buyers, is if anything a reason to expect more fraud, so it does not support the causal claim; at best it is neutral. Option D reports other states' plans, which show that the policy is popular but provide no evidence that it actually works.

Examiner's note — the trap: Option D is the trap: imitation by other states feels like an endorsement, but plans to copy a policy are not evidence that the policy caused the fall in fraud.

Q10 D Strengthen — supporting the causal mechanism **HARD**

The department's causal story depends on a specific mechanism: buyers check the registry before paying, which exposes sellers without clear title. Evidence that buyers really do consult the registry at the critical moment directly supports that link. Option D reports that in about seven of every ten registered sales the buyer had searched that plot's record in the month before the sale, which shows the mechanism operating at scale and at the right time, so D is correct. Option A cuts the other way: if fraud fell as much where internet access is poor, where buyers can hardly consult an online registry, the decline is probably due to something else. Option B shows interest from journalists and researchers, who are not the buyers whose checking is supposed to deter fraud. Option C describes the kind of land involved in complaints, which says nothing about whether buyers used the registry before buying.

Examiner's note — the trap: Option A is the trap: an equal fall 'everywhere' sounds like strong, broad evidence, but where buyers cannot go online the mechanism cannot work, so it actually weakens the argument.

Q11 C Strengthen EXCEPT — spotting the rival cause **ELITE**

In an EXCEPT question, three options strengthen and the answer is the one that does not. Option A strengthens through timing and dose: the fall began soon after the launch and was steepest where the registry went live first. Option B strengthens by eliminating a rival explanation, a change in how the police registered complaints. Option D strengthens by a differential test: frauds the registry cannot detect, such as forged powers of attorney, did not fall, which suggests that the decline is specific to what the registry exposes. Option C, by contrast, introduces a competing cause operating in the same period: the state doubled its sub-registrar offices and began in-person verification of every seller's identity. That alternative could itself explain why fewer people sold land they did not own, so it weakens rather than strengthens the department's conclusion. C is the exception and the correct answer.

Examiner's note — the trap: Option D is the trap: 'complaints did not fall' sounds negative, but showing that only the registry-detectable frauds fell is strong support for the registry as the cause.

Q12 B Strengthen — ruling out an under-reporting explanation **HARD**

A fall in complaints can mean either that less fraud occurred or that fewer victims reported it. To rule out the second reading, we need a measure of fraud that does not depend on complaints to the police. Option B provides exactly that: independent household surveys show that the share of buyers who say they were defrauded fell by roughly the same proportion as complaints. Because the surveys track actual victimisation independently of police reporting, B most strengthens the argument in the required way. Option A, that banks file most complaints, describes who reports but does not show that reporting behaviour stayed constant. Option C actually weakens the argument by suggesting that frauds from the last three years may not have surfaced yet, so the fall could be a lag effect. Option D describes another feature of the registry, which may support the mechanism but does nothing to address the reporting question asked.

Examiner's note — the trap: Option C is the trap: it is about reporting, as the question demands, but it raises a discovery lag that makes reduced reporting more plausible, not less.

Q13 D Weaken — self-selection / pre-existing difference **MED**

The dean moves from a correlation, volunteers score twelve per cent higher, to a causal claim that clinic work improves performance. The classic weakness of such reasoning is self-selection: the students who choose to volunteer may differ from the rest in ways that themselves explain the higher scores. Option D shows precisely such a difference: volunteers entered the university with substantially higher entrance-test ranks. Stronger students may both volunteer more and score more, so the gap may reflect who volunteered rather than what the clinic did. D most seriously weakens the argument. Option A suggests a cost to studies, but a mild time cost does not explain why volunteers nonetheless score higher. Option B concerns the clinic's social value, which is irrelevant to examination performance. Option C cites individual exceptions; an average difference survives the existence of high-scoring non-volunteers, so it barely touches the argument.

Examiner's note — the trap: Option C is the trap: counter-examples feel damaging, but the dean's claim rests on an average gap, which a few high-scoring non-volunteers cannot refute.

Q14 B Weaken — the prediction from voluntary to compulsory participation **HARD**

The question asks us to grant that the clinic helped those who volunteered and to attack only the prediction that compelling every second-year student will raise the batch average. The prediction assumes that the benefit will transfer to students who do not wish to take part. Option B directly undermines that assumption: at a sister university, students assigned to a clinic against their stated preference showed no gain in examination scores. If unwilling participants do not benefit, making the clinic compulsory may add little to the batch average, so B is correct. Option A shows a dose-response pattern among volunteers, which supports rather than weakens the causal story. Option C reports student satisfaction, which does not show any effect on scores. Option D, that examinations increasingly test problem-solving on real disputes, would if anything strengthen the dean's mechanism, because clinic skills would then be more directly rewarded.

Examiner's note — the trap: Option D is the trap: it is about examinations and sounds relevant, but it makes clinic skills more valuable in the examination and so supports the dean.

Q15 A Weaken EXCEPT — the option that controls for a confounder **ELITE**

Three options weaken the dean's argument and one does not. Option B points to reverse causation: many volunteers joined only after their results had already placed them near the top, so high performance preceded clinic work. Option C shows selection on merit: the clinic picks volunteers partly by first-year marks, so volunteers were stronger to begin with. Option D introduces a confounder: volunteers more often lacked part-time jobs and so had more hours for study, which could itself explain the higher scores. Option A does the opposite. By comparing students with identical entrance ranks and still finding the same gap, it removes one major alternative explanation, prior ability as measured at entry, and so makes the dean's causal claim more plausible. A is the exception and therefore the correct answer.

Examiner's note — the trap: Option C is the trap: selection by first-year marks sounds like an administrative detail, but it means volunteers were pre-selected for academic strength, which weakens the argument.

Q16 C Weaken — a confounder that survives the control **HARD**

The dean's reply controls for one rival explanation, prior ability measured by entrance ranks. To weaken the argument after that reply, an option must offer a different alternative cause that is not removed by matching entrance ranks. Option C does this: volunteers are far likelier to attend optional tutorials and moot practice, each independently linked to higher scores. Two students with the same entrance rank can differ in this commitment, so the score gap may stem from the extra tutorials and moots rather than from clinic work. C is correct. Option A, that entrance ranks predict final scores, actually supports the dean's choice of control. Option B, a constant gap across batches, is consistent with a genuine clinic effect and does not weaken it. Option D notes that a few volunteers dropped out, which says nothing about why the remaining volunteers outperform their peers of equal entrance rank.

Examiner's note — the trap: Option A is the trap: it mentions entrance ranks and sounds critical, but it actually validates the very control the dean relied on in his reply.

QUANTITATIVE TECHNIQUES

Q17 A Ratio — dividing a total in a given ratio **MED**

Ward Q has 42,000 registered voters divided between men and women in the ratio 4 : 3. A ratio of 4 : 3 means the total is made of 4 + 3 = 7 equal parts. Each part is $42,000 / 7 = 6,000$ voters. Women take 3 parts, so the number of registered women is $3 \times 6,000 = 18,000$, and men take 4 parts, $4 \times 6,000 = 24,000$. Check: $18,000 + 24,000 = 42,000$, and $24,000 : 18,000$ reduces to 4 : 3 on dividing both by 6,000. The answer is therefore 18,000, option A. Option B, 24,000, is the number of men, obtained by attaching the larger term of the ratio to women. Option C, 16,800, results from wrongly taking 40 per cent of the total, and option D, 21,000, is simply half the roll, which would apply only if the ratio were 1 : 1, as it is in Ward S but not in Ward Q.

Examiner's note — the trap: Option B is the trap: it is the correct figure for men, produced by reading the ratio Men : Women in the wrong order.

Q18 C Ratio — combining parts across groups **HARD**

Ratios cannot be added directly; each ward must first be converted into actual numbers. Ward P: 36,000 in 5 : 4 gives parts of $36,000 / 9 = 4,000$, so men 20,000 and women 16,000. Ward Q: 42,000 in 4 : 3 gives parts of 6,000, so men 24,000 and women 18,000. Ward R: 30,000 in 7 : 8 gives parts of 2,000, so men 14,000 and women 16,000. Ward S: 24,000 in 1 : 1 gives 12,000 each. Total men = $20,000 + 24,000 + 14,000 + 12,000 = 70,000$. Total women = $16,000 + 18,000 + 16,000 + 12,000 = 62,000$. Check: $70,000 + 62,000 = 132,000$, the sum of all registered voters. Women : men = $62,000 : 70,000 = 31 : 35$ on dividing by 2,000. The answer is option C. Option A, 35 : 31, is the men-to-women ratio, the question reversed. Option B, 16 : 17, comes from adding the ratio terms directly (women $4+3+8+1 = 16$, men $5+4+7+1 = 17$), which ignores that the wards have different sizes; option D is an arithmetic slip.

Examiner's note — the trap: Option A is the trap: it is the correct ratio of men to women, so a student who reverses the order of the question loses the mark despite correct working.

Q19 B Ratio — comparing two rates (turnout) **HARD**

Turnout is votes polled divided by registered voters in the same ward. Ward R: $24,000 / 30,000 = 4/5 = 0.80$, or 80 per cent. Ward Q: $29,400 / 42,000 = 0.70$, or 70 per cent; check: $42,000 \times 0.7 = 29,400$. The ratio of turnout in R to turnout in Q is therefore $4/5 : 7/10$. Multiplying both terms by 10 gives 8 : 7, so option B is correct. Option A, 7 : 8, reverses the order and gives Q to R. Option C, 16 : 15, is the ratio of R's 80 per cent to Ward P's 75 per cent turnout ($27,000 / 36,000$), so it results from reading the wrong row. Option D, 10 : 9, has no basis in the figures. A common error is to compare votes polled directly, $24,000 : 29,400 = 40 : 49$, which ignores the different sizes of the two rolls; turnout is a rate and must be computed before comparing.

Examiner's note — the trap: Option A is the trap: students who compute both turnouts correctly can still lose the mark by writing Q first, giving 7 : 8.

Q20 D Ratio — finding unknowns from a new ratio **ELITE**

Ward P has 36,000 voters in the ratio 5 : 4, that is, 20,000 men and 16,000 women. Let w new women and $(6,000 - w)$ new men be added. The new roll has $20,000 + 6,000 - w = 26,000 - w$ men and $16,000 + w$ women, and these must stand in the ratio 11 : 10. So $10 \times (26,000 - w) = 11 \times (16,000 + w)$, giving $260,000 - 10w = 176,000 + 11w$, so $84,000 = 21w$ and $w = 4,000$. Check: men = 22,000 and women = 20,000, and $22,000 : 20,000 = 11 : 10$; total $42,000 = 36,000 + 6,000$. The answer is 4,000, option D. Option A, 2,000, is the number of new men, the complementary figure. Options B and C, 3,600 and 2,400, are the two parts of 6,000 split in the ratio 3 : 2, a guess that skips the equation altogether.

Examiner's note — the trap: Option A is the trap: 2,000 appears naturally in the working as the number of new men, and students who solve for the wrong variable select it.

Q21 C Averages — simple arithmetic mean EASY

The average of a set of values is their sum divided by the number of values. Adding the five capital-expenditure figures: $1,240 + 1,380 = 2,620$; $2,620 + 1,460 = 4,080$; $4,080 + 1,620 = 5,700$; $5,700 + 1,800 = 7,500$. The total over five years is Rs 7,500 crore, and dividing by 5 gives Rs 1,500 crore. A quick check by deviations from 1,500: the differences are -260, -120, -40, +120 and +300, which sum to zero, confirming that 1,500 is the mean. The answer is option C. Option A, Rs 1,460 crore, is the middle value of the series, its median, which differs from the mean because the later figures rise more steeply. Option B, Rs 1,520 crore, is the mean of only the first and last values, $(1,240 + 1,800) / 2$, and option D, Rs 1,875 crore, divides the correct total of 7,500 by 4 instead of 5. The deviations check is the fastest safeguard.

Examiner's note — the trap: Option A is the trap: 1,460 is the median of the five figures, and students who pick the middle entry of an ordered list confuse the median with the mean.

Q22 A Averages — comparing averages over different periods MED

First compute the five-year average revenue deficit. The sum is $460 + 410 + 380 + 330 + 270$: $460 + 410 = 870$; $870 + 380 = 1,250$; $1,250 + 330 = 1,580$; $1,580 + 270 = 1,850$. Dividing by 5 gives Rs 370 crore. Next, the first four years: $460 + 410 + 380 + 330 = 1,580$, and $1,580 / 4 =$ Rs 395 crore. The four-year average exceeds the five-year average by $395 - 370 =$ Rs 25 crore, so option A is correct. A check: removing 2024-25's figure of 270, which is 100 below the five-year average of 370, raises the average of the remaining four by $100 / 4 = 25$, the same result. Option D, Rs 125 crore, is the gap between the first-four total divided by four and the excluded figure $(395 - 270)$, a mistaken comparison. Option B, Rs 20 crore, divides the 100-crore deviation by 5 instead of by 4, and option C, Rs 30 crore, rounds the four-year average up to 400 before subtracting 370.

Examiner's note — the trap: Option B is the trap: students who reason through the deviation of 100 often divide it by the original count of 5 instead of by the 4 years that remain.

Q23 D Averages — required next value to hit a target average HARD

For the six-year average to be Rs 1,600 crore, the six-year total must be $6 \times 1,600 =$ Rs 9,600 crore. The five years already recorded total Rs 7,500 crore, as found by adding $1,240 + 1,380 + 1,460 + 1,620 + 1,800$. The capital expenditure required in 2025-26 is therefore $9,600 - 7,500 =$ Rs 2,100 crore. Check: $(7,500 + 2,100) / 6 = 9,600 / 6 = 1,600$. An alternative route: the current average is 1,500, so raising a six-value average by 100 requires the new value to be $1,600 + 5 \times 100 = 2,100$, because it must also make up the shortfall of 100 in each of the five existing years. The answer is option D. Option A, Rs 1,900 crore, adds the 100-crore increase to the last year's 1,800. Option B, Rs 2,000 crore, adds 5×100 to the current average of 1,500 instead of to the target. Option C, Rs 1,600 crore, simply equates the new value with the target average.

Examiner's note — the trap: Option B is the trap: students sense that the new value must lift five earlier years and add 500 but anchor on the old average of 1,500 instead of the target of 1,600.

Q24 B Averages — effect of excluding one value HARD

The five-year total of capital expenditure is Rs 7,500 crore, so the five-year average is Rs 1,500 crore. Leaving out 2021-22, whose figure is Rs 1,380 crore, the remaining total is $7,500 - 1,380 =$ Rs 6,120 crore across four years, and $6,120 / 4 =$ Rs 1,530 crore. The four-year average is therefore Rs 30 crore higher than the five-year average, and option B is correct. A quick check by deviations: 1,380 is 120 below the average of 1,500, so removing it raises the average of the remaining four by $120 / 4 = 30$. Option A gets the direction wrong: removing a below-average value must raise the average, never lower it. Option C, Rs 24 crore higher, divides the deviation of 120 by 5 instead of by the 4 remaining years. Option D, Rs 120 crore higher, reports the deviation itself without dividing it among the remaining years at all.

Examiner's note — the trap: Option C is the trap: dividing the 120-crore deviation by the original five years, rather than the four that remain, is the most common slip in exclusion problems.

Q25 C Averages — two simultaneous target averages ELITE

The five-year averages are Rs 1,500 crore for capital expenditure (total 7,500) and Rs 370 crore for revenue deficit (total 1,850). The six-year capital average must be $1,500 + 50 = 1,550$, so the six-year total is $6 \times 1,550 = 9,300$ and $X = 9,300 - 7,500 =$ Rs 1,800 crore. The six-year revenue-deficit average must be $370 - 10 = 360$, so the six-year total is $6 \times 360 = 2,160$ and $Y = 2,160 - 1,850 =$ Rs 310 crore. Therefore $X - Y = 1,800 - 310 =$ Rs 1,490 crore, option C. A shortcut confirms this: a new value shifts an average of six by one-sixth of its deviation, so $X = 1,500 + 6 \times 50 = 1,800$ and $Y = 370 - 6 \times 10 = 310$. Option B, Rs 1,190 crore, simply adds 50 and subtracts 10 from the averages $(1,550 - 360)$. Option A, Rs 1,430 crore, multiplies the shifts by 5 instead of 6 $(1,750 - 320)$. Option D, Rs 1,550 crore, is the new capital average alone.

Examiner's note — the trap: Option B is the trap: it treats the new year's values as equal to the new averages, ignoring that one value must shift the mean of all six years.

RAPID FIRE — ANSWERS

1. UNCLOS — maximum breadth of the territorial sea? — **12 nautical miles**
2. Transfer of Property Act, 1882 — section defining a 'gift'? — **Section 122**
3. Divide 42,000 in the ratio 4 : 3 — the larger part? — **24,000**
4. Average of 330, 270 and 360? — **320**
5. UNCLOS — how far from the baseline may the contiguous zone extend? — **24 nautical miles**
6. UNCLOS — maximum breadth of the exclusive economic zone? — **200 nautical miles**