CLAT Gurukul — By Ready For Exam

Daily RC & CR Sheet — Answers, Skills & Examiner Notes — 25 October 2026

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

ANSWER KEY — 25 OCTOBER 2026

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

READING COMPREHENSION

Q1 A — Main idea / central argument — MED

Option A accurately captures the passage's governing thesis: that the tension between parliamentary sovereignty and judicial review is constitutionally embedded, produces periodic institutional confrontations, and is managed through convention and crisis rather than resolved by any textual provision. The passage's opening declares this relationship 'a constitutionally embedded tension', its middle sections trace the competing arguments, and its conclusion states the tension is 'perhaps irresolvable by design', resolved only through 'political convention, institutional comity, and the occasional crisis'. Option B is a misreading — the passage credits the basic structure doctrine with being a legitimate check, not a power-grab. Option C is explicitly rejected: the passage frames the tension as a feature, not a problem demanding resolution. Option D is the opposite of the author's position, which treats the 1973 judgment as foundational rather than erroneous. Option A is the only answer that matches the full arc of the argument.

> **Examiner's note — the trap:** Option B is the most attractive wrong choice for students who read only the critics' paragraph and assume it represents the author's view. The passage presents critics' arguments in order to engage with them, not to endorse them — the author's own evaluative framing ('a paradox that no constitutional text can cleanly resolve') signals balance rather than critique of the Court.

Q2 C — Vocabulary in context / authorial intent — HARD

The passage states: 'it left that task to future benches reading the spirit rather than the letter of the document. This interpretive latitude is simultaneously the doctrine's genius and its vulnerability.' The 'genius' is that open-endedness gives the Court flexibility to apply the doctrine to new constitutional challenges. The 'vulnerability' is that this same openness 'invites the charge that judges are substituting their preferences for democratic will' — i.e., that interpretation shades into law-making. Option C captures both poles of this characterisation precisely. Option A incorrectly reads intent (the bench did not 'deliberately' leave the doctrine vague as a strategic choice — the passage presents this as an inherent quality). Option B is wrong because the passage explicitly says the bench did NOT provide an exhaustive enumeration. Option D introduces a stability/crisis distinction not present in the passage's treatment of this phrase.

> **Examiner's note — the trap:** Option A is the attractive distractor because it preserves the word 'deliberately' — students may assume that judges crafting doctrine are always deliberate. The passage does not support that attribution of intent; it describes the effect of indeterminacy, not the design behind it.

Q3 B — Vocabulary in context — HARD

The passage introduces 'counter-cyclical' in the context of judicial review's defenders: 'The Court's role, on this view, is not counter-majoritarian but counter-cyclical — a check that operates precisely when legislative majorities are most likely to err.' The prefix 'counter' means 'acting against', and 'cyclical' refers to cycles of political behaviour. The combined phrase means the Court acts as a corrective at specific points in the political cycle — when majorities are most prone to constitutional excess — rather than as a permanent antagonist to democracy. Option B captures this with precision. Option A introduces the idea of 'scaling scrutiny' which is not in the passage. Option C is too vague and misplaces the emphasis on 'routine check'. Option D fabricates the idea of conscious alternation, which the passage does not suggest.

> **Examiner's note — the trap:** Option A is the primary trap because students familiar with economic usage of 'counter-cyclical' (policy that increases spending during downturns) may project that logic onto the legal context. The passage's usage refers to cycles of political behaviour, not economic cycles, making A's 'scaling upward in crisis' reading an over-literal transfer from economics.

Q4 D — Evaluating counter-arguments / logical strength — ELITE

The critics' objection has two components: (1) the basic structure doctrine has no textual anchor; and (2) there is no mechanism for democratic override. To rebut this effectively, an argument must address both components or show that the critics' framing is itself incoherent. Option D does this by arguing that the doctrine protects the very conditions — independent judiciary, free elections, fundamental rights — without which democratic legitimacy cannot be claimed. This is a self-referential rebuttal: if Parliament eliminated judicial independence through an amendment, the resulting Parliament would no longer be democratically legitimate. Option A (low override rate) is merely empirical and does not touch the principled objection. Option B (cross-jurisdictional) is relevant but too general and does not address the 'no textual anchor' charge. Option C is flatly contradicted by the passage, which explicitly says

NAME: _____ ROLL NO: _____ BATCH: _____

the doctrine has no exhaustive textual enumeration. Option D is the only response that meets both prongs of the objection on philosophical grounds.

> **Examiner's note — the trap:** Option B is the most attractive distractor because comparative constitutional law is a legitimate argument in rights discourse. Students may choose it without realising that the critics' objection is specifically textual and Indian-constitutional — cross-jurisdictional practice does not rebut a claim that the Indian text does not authorise the doctrine.

Q5 A Structure and purpose of a paragraph HARD

The final paragraph opens: 'The tension is perhaps irresolvable by design.' It then states that a constitution 'must restrain its own authors' while the institution doing the restraining 'must itself remain accountable'. It closes by describing India's management of this dilemma through 'political convention, institutional comity, and the occasional crisis'. This is not a resolution or a new argument — it is a conclusion that accepts irresolvability and describes how the system navigates it. Option A correctly characterises this: the paragraph acknowledges irresolvability and describes equilibrium-maintenance through convention and crisis. Option B is wrong — the paragraph explicitly says the tension is 'perhaps irresolvable', not that conventions have 'successfully harmonised' it. Option C introduces a normative recommendation not present in the paragraph. Option D imports electoral politics in a way the paragraph does not.

> **Examiner's note — the trap:** Option B is attractive because it uses the word 'equilibrium', which appears in the passage. However, the passage says crises 'reset the equilibrium without ever definitively settling' the tension — this is explicitly not a successful harmonisation but a perpetual process of destabilisation and partial restabilisation.

Q6 B Character motivation / narrative inference MED

The passage states: 'She sat with her hands folded in her lap, too still for innocence, which meant she was holding something back. He recognised that stillness. It was the stillness of a person who has already decided.' This direct authorial commentary establishes that Ananya's course of action is internally settled. She then confirms this indirectly through her answer ('They give people who have no voice a way to be heard') — a response that is personal and moral, not academic. The passage further shows she 'had stopped needing him to name the reason. She needed only to know whether he would stand in the way of it.' This sequence makes clear that she is not seeking guidance but confirmation and clearance. Option B captures this precisely. Option A (contempt) is not supported — the text shows no contempt, only stillness. Option C (overwhelm/passivity) contradicts the 'already decided' characterisation. Option D (strategic performance) over-reads in the opposite direction.

> **Examiner's note — the trap:** Option C is the attractive wrong choice because students may read Ananya's stillness as emotional shutdown rather than resolved determination. The key discriminating phrase is 'too still for innocence, which meant she was holding something back' — the narrator's explicit gloss establishes the correct reading.

Q7 D Narrative technique / authorial purpose HARD

The double question — 'Tell me what a lawyer does' followed by 'No' then the same question again — creates a distinction between Ananya's first answer (a factual, institutional description: 'They argue cases. They defend rights.') and her second answer (a moral, values-based one: 'They give people who have no voice a way to be heard.'). The technique is that of a Socratic correction: the elder dismisses the rote formulation and demands a deeper accounting. This tests not knowledge but vocation — whether she understands the purpose behind the profession rather than merely its function. Option D captures this precisely. Option A (comic/impatient) is contradicted by the passage's solemn register and the elder's evident thoughtfulness. Option C (coaching) is plausible but overstated — the text does not indicate Sitaram has 'already decided in her favour' at this moment. Option B is correct and option C is the trap; C conflates Sitaram's wisdom with strategic advocacy for Ananya.

> **Examiner's note — the trap:** Option C is the most seductive wrong answer because Sitaram does ultimately support Ananya. Students may retroactively read his coaching intent into the double question. The passage's chronology places the question before Sitaram has decided — his decision follows his reflection on his own daughter, which occurs after the exchange.

Q8 C Inference about character psychology HARD

The passage presents Sitaram's internal monologue immediately before he places the pen on the letter: 'He thought of his own daughter, married at seventeen, who had learned to shrink herself so efficiently that she now took up almost no space in any room she entered. He had not stopped it. He had told himself he was honouring tradition. He understood, now, that he had been honouring his own comfort.' This reflection is the emotional engine of his decision. Placing the pen is therefore not only an act of support for Ananya but a correction of a past failure — a retrospective gesture of the intervention he did not make for his daughter. Option C names this 'retrospective atonement' directly. Option A (impulse, not considered) is directly contradicted by the extended internal monologue. Option B (strategic ambiguity) is plausible but secondary — the text gives us his internal state, not a political calculation. Option D (comforting the mother) is not supported by the internal monologue, which is entirely about his daughter.

> **Examiner's note — the trap:** Option B is the strongest distractor because it is sociologically coherent — a village elder would naturally be attentive to community dynamics. Students applying real-world logic may prefer it. However, the passage gives explicit access to Sitaram's interior, and that interior is about his daughter, not about managing the mother's response.

Q9 A Tone identification HARD

The passage's tone is established through its narrative register: the cracked plaster, the dusk gathering, Sitaram's interior reflections delivered in short, weighted sentences. The prose is restrained and non-judgmental — it does not editorially endorse Ananya's choice (Option D's 'celebratory and didactic' is wrong) nor does it satirise the mother or the village (Option A's 'satirical and detached' is wrong). The passage does carry a quiet grief — Sitaram's reflection on his daughter is elegiac in quality — but it is not retrospective

nostalgia for a dying way of life (Option B's 'nostalgic and elegiac' mislabels the grief as social mourning). Option C ('measured and quietly elegiac') best names the register: the prose holds emotional weight in restraint, uses silence and gesture rather than declaration, and allows the reader to feel the moral stakes without being told what to feel.

> **Examiner's note — the trap:** Option D is the most common wrong choice among students who read the ending (the pen on the letter) as the passage's thesis — a vindication of modernity over tradition. The passage's craft lies precisely in refusing that endorsement; the mother's final sound, unresolved, prevents any celebratory reading.

Q10 B Authorial purpose / narrative ending ELITE

The final image of the story is deliberately ambiguous and emotionally unresolved: 'Her mother, watching from the doorway, made a sound that was not quite a word.' The phrase 'not quite a word' indicates that language fails the mother at this moment — her response exceeds what articulation can hold. The passage does not resolve whether this sound is grief, acceptance, protest, or love — and that refusal of resolution is the point. The author's purpose is to honour the mother's emotional complexity rather than flatten her into an antagonist whose opposition has 'collapsed' (Option A's reading imposes a resolution the text denies). Option C speculates about future narrative action not in the text. Option D attempts ironic closure, but the passage's tone is not ironic toward the mother. Option B is the only answer that reads the ambiguity as the artistic intention — the mother's incoherence as genuine emotional overflow, not narrative convenience.

> **Examiner's note — the trap:** Option A is the most attractive wrong answer for students who read the scene as Sitaram's symbolic 'victory' over tradition, with the mother's sound as a surrender. The passage resists this binary: the elder's gesture is an atonement, not a triumphant judgment, and the mother is rendered in full emotional complexity rather than as a defeated representative of tradition.

CRITICAL REASONING

Q11 C Identify the conclusion MED

The passage builds from an initial premise (social media should theoretically reduce polarisation) to the contradiction (empirical evidence shows polarisation has accelerated), then to the mechanism (engagement-maximising algorithms progressively radicalise users), then to the structural amplifier (outrage spreads faster than information), and finally to the concept of algorithmically imposed 'epistemic bubbles'. The concluding sentence of the passage states the normative upshot: the platform 'shapes the electorate's informational environment with no democratic mandate or accountability'. Option C correctly identifies the main conclusion: social media deepens polarisation through algorithmic engineering that creates filtered informational environments without users' informed consent. Option A misidentifies the mechanism as deliberate avoidance by users (the passage explicitly argues the opposite — bubbles are 'algorithmically imposed', not 'self-constructed'). Option B identifies a real element of the argument but frames it tentatively ('correlation is significant but causation unestablished'), which is the critics' position, not the author's. Option D is a policy recommendation not argued for in the passage.

> **Examiner's note — the trap:** Option A is the key distractor because it restates the assumption the passage is explicitly arguing against: that users choose their informational environment. The passage makes a major point of distinguishing deliberate avoidance (autonomy) from algorithmic curation (manipulation). Students who read quickly may select A without noticing that the passage refutes it.

Q12 D Identify unstated assumption HARD

The argument claims that engagement-maximising algorithms produce polarisation by systematically radicalising users through progressive content escalation. This causal chain depends on the assumption that the algorithm is the driver of users' ideological drift rather than the reverse — that users seek out more extreme content independently, and the algorithm merely reflects their autonomous choices. If users who become more politically activated for reasons unrelated to the platform then seek out more extreme content, the algorithm is responding to pre-existing demand rather than manufacturing new demand. The argument's causal arrow (algorithm → radicalisation) depends on ruling out this alternative (pre-existing radicalisation → algorithmic response). Option D identifies this assumption precisely. Option A (companies are fully aware and commercially motivated) is related but not critical — the argument holds even if the effect is unintended. Option B (survey reliability) is a methodological assumption but not the most critical causal one. Option C (harm versus legitimacy) is a normative premise but not the argument's structural vulnerability.

> **Examiner's note — the trap:** Option A is a strong distractor because it concerns the platform's intent, which the passage implicitly assumes. However, the argument does not require platforms to be knowingly complicit — it would hold even if the polarising effect were an unintended by-product. The more fundamental assumption is the causal direction between algorithm and user behaviour, which Option D identifies.

Q13 A Weaken the argument HARD

The argument's central causal claim is that engagement-maximising algorithms radicalise users by serving progressively more extreme content. Option B directly attacks this claim by presenting evidence that algorithmic exposure correlates with attitude moderation rather than extremism — because encountering more content exposes users to internal contradictions within their own ideological camp. If this is true, the algorithm produces a corrective effect rather than a radicalising one, substantially undermining the argument's core mechanism. Option A (voluntary diversity features without engagement impact) is true but does not weaken the causal claim — it describes a failed remedy, not a counter-mechanism. Option C (polarisation in low-social-media countries) suggests structural causes but does not disprove that algorithms also contribute — multiple causes can co-exist. Option D (heavy social media users also consume traditional media) might suggest that traditional media is the primary driver but does not address the algorithmic mechanism the argument specifically targets. Option B is the strongest weakener.

> **Examiner's note — the trap:** Option C is the most attractive distractor because it offers an alternative explanation for polarisation — the classical social-scientific move of showing that the correlation is spurious. However, it does not rule out the algorithmic mechanism; it only

shows that polarisation has other causes. Option B, by showing a reversed correlation specifically between algorithm exposure and attitude, directly attacks the causal mechanism the argument relies on.

Q14 B Strengthen the argument ELITE

The argument claims that recommendation algorithms deliberately optimise for engagement and that this optimisation systematically produces radicalisation. To strengthen this, we need evidence that corroborates the algorithm's role — ideally internal evidence from the platform itself confirming the causal mechanism. Option B provides exactly this: leaked internal research showing that the platform knowingly amplifies 'borderline' content because it generates the highest engagement, and that this choice is internal to the platform's own analytical framework rather than an emergent by-product. This corroborates both the algorithmic mechanism and the claim that the platform is a deliberate actor in shaping the informational environment. Option A (mind-changing users) actually weakens by suggesting exposure produces attitude updating. Option C (disclosure produces engagement drop) is suggestive but addresses a remedy rather than corroborating the original mechanism. Option D (pre-digital partisan newspapers comparable) undermines the novelty of the algorithmic claim, weakening rather than strengthening it.

Examiner's note — the trap: Option D is the most seductive distractor for students who misread 'strengthen' as 'make the problem seem important'. Option D actually weakens by showing the algorithmic effect is not qualitatively new. The correct approach to 'strengthen' is to supply evidence that corroborates the specific causal mechanism claimed — which Option B does by providing internal platform confirmation.

Q15 C Identify a flaw in reasoning HARD

The argument draws a moral distinction between a user who self-selects out of opposing viewpoints (autonomy) and a user whose feed is curated without knowledge (manipulation), using this distinction to conclude that platforms are unaccountable political actors. The flaw identified in Option C is that the platform's curation may be understood as reflecting aggregated user behaviour — users click on extreme content, engagement data reflects those clicks, and the algorithm surfaces what users collectively demonstrate they want. On this view, the curation is not an 'external imposition' but an emergent aggregate of user choices, which blurs the autonomy/manipulation distinction the argument relies on. Option A (editorial curation comparison) is relevant and addresses a different angle, but it is a challenge to the novelty of the argument rather than a flaw in the specific autonomy/manipulation distinction. Option B (exposure doesn't change beliefs) addresses a different premise, not this specific distinction. Option D (conflates editorial and algorithmic curation) is a different objection. Option C is the direct flaw in the distinction the passage draws.

Examiner's note — the trap: Option A is the most dangerous distractor because the editorial/algorithmic comparison is a real and sophisticated objection in communications scholarship. Students with broader reading may prefer it. The question, however, asks about the specific distinction between self-selection and algorithmic imposition, and Option C addresses that distinction most precisely by showing the binary may be false.

Q16 D Identify the conclusion MED

The passage's final paragraph contains the explicit conclusion: 'the Mental Healthcare Act, 2017, whatever its normative merit, is an under-funded mandate that cannot deliver on its statutory promises. In the absence of a substantial and sustained reallocation of public health resources ... the Act is not a health policy. It is a statement of aspiration with the force of law but not the resources of governance.' This is a clear concluding statement flowing from the evidence presented: the psychiatrist gap, the un-constituted Review Boards, the sub-one-percent budget allocation. Option C captures this conclusion precisely. Option A is a policy recommendation (repeal and replace) not made in the passage. Option B is a generalisation about Indian political culture that is one supporting claim in the passage but not its primary conclusion — the conclusion is specific to the 2017 Act. Option D introduces stigma as a cause, which the passage does not argue.

Examiner's note — the trap: Option B is the strongest distractor because the passage does include a paragraph arguing that this gap is 'not incidental' and reflects a 'structural feature of Indian social legislation'. Students may elevate this supporting claim to the conclusion. The final paragraph's explicit evaluative statement about the Act specifically is the definitive marker of the main conclusion.

Q17 A Identify unstated assumption MED

The passage argues that the implementation gap is 'not incidental' — it is a structural feature of political design, not a contingent failure. This claim depends on the assumption that the legislature's pattern of ambitious legislation without fiscal follow-through is a deliberate strategic choice (generating political capital without fiscal cost) rather than the result of capacity constraints, federal fiscal dynamics, or competing budget priorities that may be beyond any individual legislator's control or intent. If the gap results from genuine resource constraints or federal complexity rather than deliberate calculation, the 'not incidental' characterisation loses its force. Option B states this assumption clearly: that the pattern is 'a deliberate strategic choice' rather than 'a consequence of capacity constraints, fiscal federalism, or competing budgetary priorities'. Option A (legislators were aware) is related but narrower — awareness is a component but not the core structural assumption. Options C and D address empirical sub-assumptions that are real but less central to the 'not incidental' characterisation.

Examiner's note — the trap: Option A is the closest distractor: if legislators were not aware, the 'deliberate' characterisation collapses. However, Option B is broader and more precise — even legislators who were aware might be acting within tight fiscal constraints that make the 'deliberate choice' framing unwarranted. The core assumption is about the nature of the political economy, not individual knowledge.

Q18 C Weaken the argument HARD

The argument concludes that the Act cannot deliver on its statutory promises because the required institutional infrastructure — trained professionals, functional Review Boards, adequate budget — is absent. To weaken this, we need evidence that either the infrastructure gap is being addressed or that the Act can deliver rights even without the presumed infrastructure. Option B directly

addresses the most critical deficiency: if the Union government has announced a five-year National Mental Health Mission with sufficient dedicated funding to reach WHO ratios and fully constitute all required Boards, the argument's premise that fiscal commitment is absent is falsified. Option A (state-level supplementary legislation) is relevant but partial — state action may not be sufficient to bridge the national gap. Option C (rights-based laws accelerate infrastructure in comparable economies) suggests that the Act may have indirect infrastructure-building effects but does not directly address the specific Indian gap. Option D (private sector expansion with insurance) applies primarily to urban populations and does not address the rural and district-level infrastructure the argument specifically examines.

> **Examiner's note — the trap:** Option A is a strong distractor because it is empirically plausible and addresses the institutional gap at the state level. The key limitation is that the argument's evidence is national-level, and state-level supplementary legislation, while helpful, does not establish that the national mandate is being met. Option B's announcement of a national mission with sufficient funding directly falsifies the fiscal premise.

Q19 B Strengthen the argument HARD

The argument's conclusion rests on showing that the institutional infrastructure the Act requires — budget allocation, trained professionals, Review Boards — has not materialised and shows no sign of materialising. Option B provides the most direct corroboration: that the budget allocation has remained below one percent across seven years since the Act came into force, despite a documented increase in the mental health disease burden. This directly corroborates the claim that the resource gap is not a transitional shortfall but a persistent structural feature, and that the disease burden is rising while investment stagnates. Option A (Review Boards produce measurable results where functional) actually supports the Act's efficacy when properly resourced, which is a concession to the Act's critics that the argument can accommodate but that doesn't directly strengthen the 'under-funded' central claim. Option C (expert recommendations set aside) strengthens the 'deliberate gap' narrative but is less direct than Option B's persistent budget data. Option D (research on advance directives improving outcomes) supports the Act's aspirational merit but not its implementation claim.

> **Examiner's note — the trap:** Option C is the most attractive distractor because it supports the passage's 'not incidental' characterisation directly by showing that recommendations for increased funding have been consistently ignored. However, Option B's direct budget data over seven years since commencement provides harder evidence of the persistent gap than anecdotal reference to recommendations being set aside.

Q20 D Evaluate a logical characterisation / identify reasoning structure ELITE

The phrase 'the force of law but not the resources of governance' encapsulates the argument's central disjunction: the Act has legal validity and statutory rights-creation, but lacks the operational infrastructure — budget, professionals, Boards — to make those rights meaningful in practice. Option B correctly identifies this as a valid inference from the evidence presented: the passage has established the psychiatric staffing gap (0.3 per 100,000 against WHO 3), the Review Board constitution gap (fewer than half constituted), the budget gap (below 1% consistently), and the legal gap (rights unenforceable without mechanisms). The characterisation is an accurate summary of these cumulative findings. Option A (false dichotomy) mischaracterises the argument — the author is not saying partial implementation is impossible, but that at current resource levels the Act cannot deliver on its statutory promises. Option C (category error) misrepresents how the author is using 'force' — the passage explicitly distinguishes legal force from governance resources as complementary requirements, not competing categories. Option D (overgeneralisation about urban populations) is potentially true but the passage's evidence is national in scope and the argument does not claim zero implementation everywhere.

> **Examiner's note — the trap:** Option A is the most philosophically sophisticated distractor: the 'false dichotomy' objection is a legitimate critique of 'all or nothing' policy arguments. Students with strong critical thinking skills may be attracted to it. The key is that the author does not claim the Act delivers zero benefit — the specific claim is that it 'cannot deliver on its statutory promises' as a whole, which the evidence supports without requiring an all-or-nothing framing.