CLAT Gurukul — By Ready For Exam

Daily Practice Sheet — Answers, Skills & Examiner Notes — 31 October 2026

26 Qs · 0 Min
Answer key + skill tags + examiner notes

ANSWER KEY — 31 OCTOBER 2026

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

LEGAL REASONING

Q1 A — Sub-classification of Scheduled Castes (Davinder Singh) MED

The passage records that a seven-judge Bench in State of Punjab v Davinder Singh allowed States to sub-classify Scheduled Castes, since they are not a homogeneous class, subject to two safeguards: the sub-classification must rest on quantifiable, empirical data showing inadequate representation, and the whole quota cannot be handed to a single sub-group. Applying this, the State acted on a twenty-year commission study of recruitment data, which is exactly the kind of empirical foundation required, and it gave Caste Q only half of the quota, leaving the remainder for others. Both safeguards are met, so Caste P's sole ground, that sub-classification is impermissible in principle, fails. The option stating that the State may sub-classify whenever it thinks fit also predicts failure but misstates the law, because data are a condition. The homogeneity and Parliament options revive the reasoning that the Bench rejected. The correct answer is A.

> **Examiner's note — the trap:** The trap is the last option: it reaches the right outcome for the wrong reason, dropping the empirical-data safeguard that the passage makes the real test.

Q2 C — Demolition directions: notice, hearing, order HARD

The directions require four things: a show-cause notice giving at least fifteen days to reply, service by registered post and display on the structure, a personal hearing, and a reasoned final order. Hari's case fails on several counts. The notice was only pasted on the wall, with no registered post, it gave seven days instead of fifteen, and the corporation demolished on 6 November, before even that short period had expired. There was also no hearing and no reasoned order. The exceptions in the passage cover unauthorised structures on public places such as roads, footpaths, railway land and water bodies, or demolitions ordered by a court; Hari's house stands on a private plot, so being unauthorised does not take it outside the directions. Display on the wall alone is not enough because registered post is also needed. The final option wrongly accepts seven days. The correct answer is C.

> **Examiner's note — the trap:** The tempting option is the first: students over-read 'unauthorised' as an exemption, but the passage exempts unauthorised structures only in specified public places.

Q3 D — Mineral taxation and legislative competence (MADA v SAIL) ELITE

The nine-judge Bench in Mineral Area Development Authority v Steel Authority of India decided two things that dispose of L's argument. First, royalty under the mining law is not a tax, so the premise that the State is taxing the same activity twice collapses. Second, States may tax mineral rights and mineral-bearing land under Entries 50 and 49 of List II, and the quantity extracted is a permissible measure of that tax. Entry 50 is subject only to limitations Parliament imposes by law relating to mineral development; the facts say Parliament has imposed none, so the State's power is unfettered for now. The option claiming that any parliamentary legislation on mining ousts the States misreads Entry 50, which bites only through actual limitations. The option barring output as a measure contradicts the passage directly. Hence L fails. The correct answer is D.

> **Examiner's note — the trap:** The attractive wrong answers assume that Parliament's occupation of the field ends State power, whereas the passage requires an actual limitation by law relating to mineral development.

Q4 B — Written grounds of arrest (Pankaj Bansal) HARD

In Pankaj Bansal v Union of India the Supreme Court held that the grounds of arrest under the money-laundering law must be furnished to the arrestee in writing, as a matter of course and without exception. The reasoning is that the safeguard of being informed is real only if the arrestee can read, understand and use the grounds to seek remedies; a hurried oral reading is easily forgotten, disputed and never proved. Meera heard the grounds read out but received no copy, so the officer did not comply with the rule, and the arrest is open to challenge as illegal. The option saying that oral communication suffices is exactly the argument the Court rejected. The prejudice option adds a requirement that the passage's phrase 'without exception' excludes. The preventive-detention option confuses a different branch of law with arrest under the money-laundering statute, which is the setting of the decision. The correct answer is B.

NAME: _____ ROLL NO: _____ BATCH: _____

Examiner's note — the trap: Students pick the oral-communication option because the statute says 'informed'; the passage turns that word into a written, copy-supplied duty.

Q5 D Identifying the unsupported statement HARD

This question asks which statement the passage does not support, so three options must be traceable to its text. The empirical-data statement matches the passage on Davinder Singh, which makes quantifiable data on inadequate representation a condition of sub-classification. The registered-post statement matches the demolition directions, which require service by registered post and display on the structure. The royalty statement matches Mineral Area Development Authority, which held that royalty is not a tax, so a State levy on mineral rights is not a second tax on the same thing. The shanty statement is different. The passage expressly says that the demolition directions do not cover unauthorised structures on land abutting a railway line, so the notice and hearing protection does not extend to such a shanty. That statement is therefore unsupported, and it is the answer. The correct answer is D.

Examiner's note — the trap: The shanty option sounds humane and procedural, which tempts students to read it as supported; the exception for railway land in the passage defeats it.

Q6 B Murder: intention to cause injury known to be likely fatal (S.101) EASY

Section 101 treats culpable homicide as murder where the act is done with the intention of causing bodily injury which the offender knows to be likely to cause the death of the person harmed. Ravi struck Sunil on the head with an iron rod and, on the facts, intended an injury that he knew was likely to kill him. Sunil died, and the question states that no exception applies, so neither provocation nor sudden fight reduces the offence. The offence is therefore murder, and the punishment lies in Section 103(1): death or imprisonment for life, together with fine. The Section 105 option fits only where an exception or a lesser mental state is present. The Section 106(1) option is for rash or negligent conduct, which this deliberate blow is not. Section 103(2) applies only to a group of five or more acting in concert on a listed ground, and the weapon used is irrelevant to that clause. The correct answer is B.

Examiner's note — the trap: Option on Section 103(2) tempts students who associate heavier punishment with a heavier weapon; the clause is about group size and motive, not the instrument.

Q7 C Sudden-fight exception and the Section 105 punishment tier HARD

The facts fit the sudden-fight exception word for word: a sudden quarrel, a fight in the heat of passion, no premeditation, both sides armed alike with sticks, and no undue advantage or cruel conduct. Under that exception, culpable homicide is not murder, so Arun cannot be punished under Section 103(1) even though he intended an injury likely to cause death. The offence is culpable homicide not amounting to murder. The next step is the punishment tier, and here care is needed. Section 105 imposes the heavier tier, imprisonment for life or five to ten years and fine, where the act is done with the intention of causing death or likely fatal injury, and the lighter tier, up to ten years or fine or both, only where there is bare knowledge. Arun acted with intention, so the heavier tier applies. A single blow does not make the act negligent, because intention is judged by the injury aimed at. The correct answer is C.

Examiner's note — the trap: The last option catches students who stop at 'Section 105' and apply the lighter knowledge tier without checking that the mental state here was intention.

Q8 A Group murder on a listed ground (S.103(2)) ELITE

Section 103(2) has three ingredients: a group of five or more persons, acting in concert, committing murder on a listed ground such as race, caste or community, sex, place of birth, language or personal belief. Removing any one takes the case out of the sub-section. If only four men act together, the numerical threshold fails, but each still shares the intention to kill and is liable for murder, punishable under Section 103(1). The lookout who strikes no blow remains a member of a group acting in concert, so the group is still five. The delay in death changes nothing, because the cause of death remains the assault and murder is complete whenever death results from the act. Place of birth is itself a listed ground, so substituting it for community leaves Section 103(2) intact. Only the reduction in numbers does what the question asks. The correct answer is A.

Examiner's note — the trap: Students wrongly think a person who strikes no blow falls outside the group; acting in concert covers every member, including one who keeps watch.

Q9 B Death by negligence by a medical practitioner (S.106(1)) MED

Section 106(1) punishes causing death by a rash or negligent act not amounting to culpable homicide. The ordinary maximum is five years with fine, but the provision reduces it to two years where the act is done by a registered medical practitioner while performing a medical procedure. Dr Kiran is a registered medical practitioner, the death occurred during a surgery, and the facts exclude both intention and knowledge of likely death, so the case does not rise to Section 105. The negligence is gross, but gross negligence still sits within Section 106(1) unless the mental state of knowledge is proved, and none is. The five-year option ignores the special reduced limit for medical practitioners. The ten-year option wrongly converts carelessness into knowledge, and the life-imprisonment option treats the mere fact of death as decisive, which it never is; the mental state fixes the offence. The correct answer is B.

Examiner's note — the trap: The five-year option is the ordinary rule that students recall; the medical-procedure limit is the clause that the question tests.

Q10 C Transferred intention (S.102) combined with the provocation exception ELITE

Section 102 answers the question of whose death counts. When a person, by an act intended or known to be likely to cause death, kills someone he neither intended nor knew he was likely to kill, the offence is of the description it would have been had he killed the

intended victim. Had Deepak's shot killed Eshan, the grave and sudden provocation exception would have made it culpable homicide not amounting to murder, because the intention to kill existed but the exception reduced the grade. That description therefore attaches to Farhan's death, and since the mental state was intention, Section 105's heavier tier applies. The murder option ignores that the transferred description carries the exception along with it. The no-offence option defeats the very purpose of Section 102, and the negligence option mistakes a deliberate act for a careless one. The correct answer is C.

> **Examiner's note — the trap:** The first option tempts those who remember that intention transfers but forget that Section 102 transfers the whole description, exception included.

LOGICAL REASONING

Q11 D Weighted-average inference ELITE

Town-wide ridership is the sum of ridership on the three bus-lane roads and ridership everywhere else. The whole grew by 6 per cent while one part, the bus-lane roads, grew by 14 per cent. A total can grow by less than one of its parts only if the remaining part grew by less than the total, so ridership on all other roads taken together must have grown by less than 6 per cent; it may even have fallen. This is the only claim that follows necessarily. The first alternative leaps from the group to every individual road, but one of the four roads might have grown by more than 6 per cent if another fell sharply. The second alternative asserts zero growth, which is merely possible, not required. The third asserts a majority of passengers on the lane roads, which the passage never gives; the weighting could be small and still give the same result. The correct answer is D.

> **Examiner's note — the trap:** Students choose the 'each road' option by treating an average as if it described every member of the group.

Q12 A Strongly supported conclusion MED

The passage states that the council changed neither bus fares nor bus frequencies on any road. Ridership on the three lane roads rose by 14 per cent, so whatever caused the rise, it was not a change in fares or in frequency. This is a direct consequence of the stated facts and is therefore the most strongly supported option. The registrations option attributes causation without any evidence: the passage reports the 3 per cent rise only as a separate fact, and nothing links it to the lanes. The passenger-time option confuses an average fall of 22 per cent with the experience of every passenger on every journey, which an average cannot establish. The car-owner option is plausible but speculative, because the passage gives no information about who the new riders were or where they came from; new riders might have been walkers, cyclists or people who previously stayed at home. The correct answer is A.

> **Examiner's note — the trap:** The car-owner option is the plausible story; it fails because nothing in the passage identifies who the additional passengers were.

Q13 B Spotting the non-inference MED

In an EXCEPT question three options follow from the passage and one does not. The statement about bus passengers is supported: bus times on the lane roads fell by 22 per cent while car times rose by 9 per cent, so the change favoured buses. The statement about higher town-wide ridership follows directly from the 6 per cent rise. The statement about making bus travel more attractive without changing fares or frequencies follows from the faster bus journeys and the unchanged fares and frequencies. The statement about all seven arterial roads is the one that fails. The 9 per cent rise in car times applies only to the three bus-lane roads; on the other four roads car times were unchanged. An average across all seven roads would therefore be lower than 9 per cent, and in any case the passage gives no basis for such a figure. That claim is the exception. The correct answer is B.

> **Examiner's note — the trap:** The tempting error is to carry the 9 per cent from three roads to the whole network, ignoring the four unchanged roads.

Q14 C Necessary condition ('only if') HARD

The report says a road receives a bus lane only if its bus routes carry more than 20,000 passengers a day. 'Only if' states a necessary condition: having a lane requires heavy passenger load, but heavy passenger load does not guarantee a lane. The three roads that did receive lanes therefore must each satisfy the condition, which makes the third option the valid inference. The first alternative reverses the conditional, treating the necessary condition as sufficient; some busy road might still lack a lane because of cost, width or timing. The second alternative negates both parts of the rule, concluding that the roads without lanes fail the load test, which is also invalid, since a road that meets the condition may simply not have been selected. The fourth alternative introduces car traffic, a subject on which the passage offers no ranking at all. The correct answer is C.

> **Examiner's note — the trap:** The two reversed-conditional options are the trap: 'only if' never licenses reasoning from a high passenger load to a bus lane.

Q15 A Resolving a paradox MED

The puzzle is that a rule meant to curb misuse coincided with fewer legal antibiotic sales yet more admissions for resistant infections. A resolution must show how reduced licensed sales could still be accompanied by more resistance. If patients moved to unlicensed sellers who supply loose tablets that are taken in incomplete courses, then antibiotic exposure continues but in the form most likely to breed resistance: partial, unsupervised dosing. Licensed sales fall, resistance rises, and the paradox disappears. The neighbouring-district option offers a comparison that explains neither the rise in Dhanapur nor the link with the rule. The few-fines option says only that enforcement was light, which, if anything, deepens the puzzle. The longer-stay option concerns the severity of resistant infections, not why more patients were admitted with them, so it leaves the paradox untouched. The correct answer is A.

Examiner's note — the trap: The few-fines option looks relevant to the rule, but it speaks to enforcement rather than to the cause of the rise in resistant infections.

Q16 D Deepening a paradox HARD

The paradox rests on an expectation: if antibiotic use falls, resistance should not rise. Any fact that blocks the natural escapes from this expectation makes the puzzle harder. If total antibiotic use from every source, licensed or not, fell by about a third, then the escape route of 'people simply bought elsewhere' is closed, and a fall in overall exposure coexists with a rise in resistant infections. That is the sharpest deepening of the puzzle. The unlicensed-seller option and the new-reporting option are resolutions: they respectively supply a mechanism and an artefact of counting. The option about infections that respond to standard antibiotics also rose is subtler. It suggests a general increase in admissions, perhaps because of better reporting or population movement, which partly explains the rise in resistant admissions and therefore eases rather than sharpens the paradox. The correct answer is D.

Examiner's note — the trap: Students pick an option that merely repeats the surprising facts; the question needs one that removes an escape route.

Q17 B Identifying the option that does not resolve HARD

Three options provide a mechanism or an artefact that reconciles the fall in sales with the rise in resistant admissions. Reduced stocking means patients take part-courses, which is the pattern that breeds resistance. Routine testing at hospitals means more infections are classified as resistant than before, so the recorded rise reflects better identification and not a real increase. Stockpiling and self-medication in sub-therapeutic doses likewise supplies resistance-promoting exposure despite lower sales. The remaining option, that pharmacists found the paperwork time-consuming, is about the administrative burden on staff. It says nothing about how patients take antibiotics, how infections are classified, or why admissions should rise, so the contradiction between the expected and observed outcomes stays exactly where it was. Because the question asks for the option that does not help, this is the answer. The correct answer is B.

Examiner's note — the trap: The paperwork option mentions the new rule, which gives it surface relevance; it still does not address antibiotic exposure or recorded admissions.

Q18 C Undermining a proposed resolution HARD

The proposed explanation says that the extra resistant infections arose among patients who left licensed pharmacies for unlicensed sellers and took incomplete courses. To undermine it we need evidence that the additional patients did not follow this path. If most of them had completed full prescribed courses bought at licensed pharmacies, then incomplete courses from unlicensed sellers cannot account for them, and the explanation fails for the very group whose growth created the paradox. The option that unlicensed sellers operate in other districts is neutral about Dhanapur's pattern. The prosecutions option has little effect: some sellers being prosecuted does not show that patients did not use them, and may even indicate that such sellers were active. The lower-prices option strengthens the explanation, because cheaper antibiotics make the shift more attractive to patients. The correct answer is C.

Examiner's note — the trap: Students choose the prosecutions option as 'bad news' for the explanation, but it says nothing about who the additional resistant patients were.

QUANTITATIVE TECHNIQUES

Q19 C Percentage utilisation MED

Utilisation equals actual spending divided by allocation for the same year, multiplied by 100. Education: 19,640 divided by 20,240 is 0.97036, which is 97.0 per cent. Health: 11,040 divided by 11,520 is 0.95833, or 95.8 per cent. Roads: 11,340 divided by 12,600 is exactly 0.90, or 90.0 per cent. Agriculture: 8,360 divided by 8,800 is 0.95, or 95.0 per cent. Social welfare: 7,125 divided by 7,500 is also 0.95, or 95.0 per cent. Comparing the five percentages, 97.0 per cent for Education is the highest, followed by Health at 95.8 per cent, then Agriculture and Social welfare at 95.0 per cent each, and finally Roads at 90.0 per cent. The sectors with the largest rupee allocations are not necessarily the best utilisers, so the comparison must be done on percentages and not on the absolute amounts spent. The correct answer is C.

Examiner's note — the trap: Health or Social welfare attract students who look at the largest percentage rise in allocation, which is a different measure from utilisation.

Q20 A Percentage change of totals HARD

First add the allocations for each year. For 2024-25 the total is 18,400 + 9,600 + 14,000 + 8,000 + 6,000 = 56,000. For 2025-26 the total is 20,240 + 11,520 + 12,600 + 8,800 + 7,500 = 60,660. The increase is 60,660 minus 56,000, which is 4,660. Percentage increase equals the increase divided by the base year amount, multiplied by 100: 4,660 divided by 56,000 is 0.08321, or 8.3 per cent to one decimal place. A frequent mistake is to average the sector-wise percentage changes, which are 10, 20, minus 10, 10 and 25 per cent, whose simple mean is 11 per cent; that ignores the very different sizes of the sectors. Roads, with the second largest allocation, actually fell by 10 per cent, which drags the overall figure well below the simple mean. The correct answer is A.

Examiner's note — the trap: The simple mean of sector percentages, 11 per cent, is the intuitive trap; the weighted total change is what the question asks.

Q21 D Ratio of differences MED

The unspent amount in a sector is its allocation minus its actual spending for 2025-26. For Education this is 20,240 minus 19,640, which is 600. For Social welfare it is 7,500 minus 7,125, which is 375. The required ratio is therefore 600 : 375. Divide both terms by their highest common factor, 75: 600 divided by 75 is 8 and 375 divided by 75 is 5, giving 8 : 5. The inverse ratio, 5 : 8, would be the answer if the question asked for Social welfare to Education, so the order of the two terms must be checked. Comparing unspent amounts is also different from comparing utilisation: Education has the higher utilisation percentage, yet it left the larger rupee amount unspent because its allocation is much larger than that of Social welfare. The correct answer is D.

> **Examiner's note — the trap:** The reversed ratio 5 : 8 is the order trap; the other ratios come from comparing allocations or spending, not the unspent amounts.

Q22 B Proportional sharing and percentage ELITE

Roads left 12,600 minus 11,340, which is 1,260 unspent. It is shared in the ratio of the Education and Health allocations for 2025-26, which is 20,240 : 11,520. The sum of these terms is 31,760, so Education receives 1,260 multiplied by 20,240 and divided by 31,760, which is about 802.97. Education's actual spending would then have been 19,640 plus 802.97, and the increase relative to the original spending is 802.97 divided by 19,640, which is 0.04088, or 4.1 per cent. The figure 6.4 per cent results from giving the whole 1,260 to Education, since 1,260 divided by 19,640 is 0.0642. The figure 2.3 per cent results from using Health's share of about 457 instead, since 457.03 divided by 19,640 is 0.0233. Both traps ignore the proportional split asked for in the question. The correct answer is B.

> **Examiner's note — the trap:** The 6.4 per cent option arises from giving Education the whole unspent amount; the question specifies a proportional share between two sectors.

Q23 D Central angle to share to number HARD

Every 3.6 degrees of the pie corresponds to one per cent of the 48,000 patients. A sector of 108 degrees is 108 divided by 3.6, which is 30 per cent, and the table shows that 30 per cent belongs to the district hospital; it treats 30 per cent of 48,000, which is 14,400 patients. A sector of 54 degrees is 54 divided by 3.6, which is 15 per cent, belonging to the medical college hospital, which treats 7,200 patients. The difference is 14,400 minus 7,200, which is 7,200. The distractors reflect common slips: 14,400 is the district hospital's number alone, 4,800 is the sub-centre's load, and 9,600 is the CHC's load. A quicker route avoids finding each number: the difference in shares is 15 per cent of 48,000, which is 7,200 directly. The correct answer is D.

> **Examiner's note — the trap:** The option 14,400 comes from stopping after computing the larger sector and forgetting to subtract the smaller one.

Q24 A Share of share HARD

The PHC treats 25 per cent of 48,000, which is 12,000 patients, and 32 per cent of these are referred onward: 12,000 multiplied by 0.32 equals 3,840. The CHC treats 20 per cent of 48,000, which is 9,600 patients, and 25 per cent of them are referred: 9,600 multiplied by 0.25 equals 2,400. Together the two facility types refer 3,840 + 2,400 = 6,240 patients a day. The distractors come from including the wrong facilities. The figure 5,760 is the combined referrals of sub-centres and PHCs, 1,920 plus 3,840. The figure 8,160 adds the sub-centres to the PHCs and CHCs, 1,920 plus 3,840 plus 2,400. Always apply the referral percentage to the facility's own OPD load and not to the district total, since the table states the percentage as a share of that facility's patients. The correct answer is A.

> **Examiner's note — the trap:** Applying a referral percentage to the district total of 48,000 instead of the facility's own load produces the wrong totals; the table defines the base.

Q25 C Weighted overall rate HARD

Compute the referrals from each facility type and add them. Sub-centres: 10 per cent of 48,000 is 4,800 patients, of whom 40 per cent, or 1,920, are referred. PHCs: 12,000 patients, 32 per cent, giving 3,840. CHCs: 9,600 patients, 25 per cent, giving 2,400. District hospitals: 14,400 patients, 10 per cent, giving 1,440. Medical college hospitals: 7,200 patients, 10 per cent, giving 720. The total number referred is 1,920 + 3,840 + 2,400 + 1,440 + 720 = 10,320. As a percentage of the district's 48,000 OPD patients, this is 10,320 divided by 48,000, which is 0.215, or 21.5 per cent. The figure 23.4 per cent is the simple average of the five referral percentages, 40, 32, 25, 10 and 10, which is wrong because the facilities treat very different numbers of patients; the rate must be weighted by load. The correct answer is C.

> **Examiner's note — the trap:** The unweighted average of the referral percentages, 23.4 per cent, is the standard trap in a weighted-rate question.

Q26 D Compound change in share, rate and total ELITE

This year, district hospitals refer 10 per cent of 14,400 patients, which is 1,440 a day. Next year's total load is 48,000 multiplied by 1.25, which is 60,000. District hospitals' share becomes 35 per cent, so they treat 21,000 patients. Halving the referral percentage from 10 to 5 per cent gives 21,000 multiplied by 0.05, which is 1,050 referrals. The fall is 1,440 minus 1,050, which is 390, and as a percentage of the current figure it is 390 divided by 1,440, which is 0.2708, or 27.1 per cent. The figure 41.7 per cent arises if the growth in the total load is forgotten, since 48,000 multiplied by 0.35 and 0.05 gives 840. The figure 72.9 per cent is the new number as a percentage of the old, not the fall. The figure 18.8 per cent comes from comparing against a wrong base. The correct answer is D.

> **Examiner's note — the trap:** Students forget the 25 per cent growth in the total load, or report the new figure as a percentage of the old instead of the fall.

RAPID FIRE — ANSWERS

1. Which seven-judge Bench decision of August 2024 allowed States to sub-classify Scheduled Castes? — **State of Punjab v Davinder Singh**

2. What is the minimum notice period for demolition under the Supreme Court's November 2024 directions? — **Fifteen days**

3. Which BNS section defines murder? — **Section 101**

4. Which BNS section punishes murder? — **Section 103 (103(1) for murder; 103(2) for group murder on a listed ground)**

5. What is the minimum size of a group for Section 103(2) of the BNS? — **Five or more persons acting in concert**

6. Which BNS section covers transferred intention in culpable homicide? — **Section 102**

7. Which BNS section punishes death by a rash or negligent act? — **Section 106(1)**

8. In which case did the Supreme Court hold that grounds of arrest under the money-laundering law must be given in writing? — **Pankaj Bansal v Union of India (2023)**