CLAT Gurukul — By Ready For Exam

Daily Practice Sheet — Answers, Skills & Examiner Notes — 1 November 2026

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

ANSWER KEY — 1 NOVEMBER 2026

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

LEGAL REASONING

Q1 A — Discovery proviso to Section 23(2) [MED]

Section 23(2) bars a confession made in police custody unless it is made in the immediate presence of a Magistrate. Ramesh spoke only to the Inspector, so his admission of the killing is shut out. The proviso, however, rescues so much of the information received from an accused in custody as relates distinctly to the fact thereby discovered. The fact discovered here is the rod lying in the well behind his house, and the words connecting him with that placing of the rod are the portion that may be proved, even though they incriminate him. The admission that he killed Dinesh does not relate distinctly to the rod's discovery; it is the confessional remainder and stays excluded. Recovery does not validate the whole statement, and the bar is not absolute because the proviso carves out an exception. Hence option A.

> **Examiner's note — the trap:** The trap is the first option other than the correct one: students feel that a confirmed recovery proves the whole statement reliable, but the proviso admits only the distinctly related part.

Q2 B — Section 26(a) dying declaration [HARD]

Section 26(a) makes relevant a statement by a person, since dead, as to the cause of his death or any circumstance of the transaction resulting in his death, where the cause of death comes into question. Meena's words identify the assailant and the motive, which are circumstances of the transaction that ended in her death from the infected wound. The cause of her death is in question in Prakash's trial for murder, so the condition of the section is met. The passage states expressly that the maker need not have expected to die, which disposes of the belief-in-impending-death argument borrowed from older English law. Nothing in the provision requires a Magistrate's record or a given interval between statement and death; those are matters of weight, not relevance. A statement to a conductor is therefore relevant. The correct answer is B.

> **Examiner's note — the trap:** The most attractive wrong option is the first distractor, the old English requirement of settled hopeless expectation of death, which Section 26(a) does not impose.

Q3 C — Section 63 certificate requirement [HARD]

Section 63 treats an electronic record as a document admissible without production of the original, but only if the conditions of the section are met, and the central condition is a certificate in the Schedule form signed by two persons: the person in charge of the computer or communication device and an expert. The complainant's certificate supplies only the first signature. Because the statutory requirement is cumulative, a certificate lacking the expert's signature does not satisfy the section, and the printout cannot be received on that footing. The owner's position as best person to speak of the phone does not substitute for the expert's role. Relevance of content is a separate test from the mode of proof. The last option fails because the whole purpose of Section 63 is to dispense with the original. The correct answer is C.

> **Examiner's note — the trap:** The trap is the first option, which treats ownership of the device as enough; the section demands a second, expert signature in addition to the owner's.

Q4 D — Burden under Section 109 [HARD]

Section 109 places on a person the burden of proving a fact especially within his knowledge, but the passage adds that it does not relieve the prosecution of proving the foundational facts of its own case. Here the prosecution proves homicidal death and nothing that points to Lalit. His refusal to disclose his whereabouts is a fact within his knowledge, but the burden under Section 109 begins to operate only once the foundation is laid; otherwise the provision would convert silence into proof and reverse the presumption of innocence. Silence may later become an additional circumstance completing a chain, yet it cannot create the chain. The civil-only argument is wrong since the section applies generally, and motive alone does not supply the missing foundation. Hence a conviction on silence alone is unsafe, which is option D.

NAME: _____ ROLL NO: _____ BATCH: _____

Examiner's note — the trap: The trap is the first distractor: students read Section 109 as a free-standing burden shift and forget that the prosecution must first prove foundational facts.

Q5 A Section 23(1) versus 23(2) ELITE

Section 23 has two distinct limbs. Section 23(1) bars proof of any confession made to a police officer against the accused, with no reference to custody; the bar attaches to the audience, not the circumstances. Arun's remark to Inspector Rao is therefore shut out although he was free to walk away. Section 23(2) bars confessions made by a person in police custody unless made in the immediate presence of a Magistrate. Bhim was in custody, but he confessed in the Magistrate's immediate presence, which is the very exception the sub-section preserves, so his confession is open to proof against him. Candidates who merge the two limbs into a single custody test reach the wrong pairing. No corroboration condition exists in either limb. The correct answer is therefore A.

Examiner's note — the trap: The trap is the second distractor, which makes custody the only test; Section 23(1) bars a confession to a police officer even when the maker is free.

Q6 B Copyright Act Section 17 hierarchy ELITE

Section 17 begins with the author as the default first owner and then lists exceptions. Two are in play. The commissioning rule makes the person at whose instance a photograph is made for valuable consideration its first owner, in the absence of a contrary agreement. The employer rule makes the employer first owner of a work made under a contract of service, but, as the passage states, only where the commissioning rule and the newspaper-proprietor rule do not apply. Ananya paid for the photographs and no agreement displaced the rule, so the commissioning rule applies and the employer rule is excluded. Studio Lumen's claim as Tarun's employer therefore fails, and the claim of Tarun as author fails because the default yields to the exception. The rules are hierarchical, not cumulative, so there is no joint ownership. The correct answer is B.

Examiner's note — the trap: The trap is the first distractor, Studio Lumen as employer, which ignores that the employer rule is subordinate to the commissioning rule.

Q7 C Copyright Act Section 19 default rules HARD

Section 19 supplies default terms for gaps in an assignment. Silence on period yields a deemed five years, and silence on territory yields India. It also contains a separate lapse rule: unless the assignment says otherwise, an assignment lapses if the assignee does not exercise the assigned rights within one year. Rohit's deed said nothing on period, territory or exercise, so the five-year and India defaults would apply, but the lapse rule operates alongside them and is displaced only by a contrary provision in the deed. Pagehouse left the book unpublished for eighteen months, beyond the one-year mark, so the assignment is deemed to have lapsed. Rohit was therefore free to assign the rights afresh. The five-year default does not protect an assignee who does not exercise the rights. The correct answer is C.

Examiner's note — the trap: The trap is the first distractor, which treats the deemed five-year period as a guaranteed minimum; the one-year lapse rule cuts it short.

Q8 D Trade Marks Act Section 9(1) proviso HARD

Section 9(1) refuses registration to a mark devoid of distinctive character or consisting exclusively of indications describing the kind or quality of goods. SUPER-CRISP is plainly of that descriptive type for chips. The proviso is the only route to registration: the mark must have acquired a distinctive character through use before the date of application. The wording fixes the cut-off at the date of application, not the date of hearing or decision. Crispo applied on 1 March 2018, when advertising was modest, and the consumer association developed only in 2020 and 2021. At the relevant date the mark had no acquired distinctiveness, so the proviso cannot be invoked. The statement that descriptive marks can never be registered is wrong, because the proviso allows registration where acquired distinctiveness pre-dates the application. Advertising does not make a descriptive mark inherently distinctive. The correct answer is D.

Examiner's note — the trap: The trap is the first distractor: later acquired distinctiveness feels deserving, but the proviso looks only to the position before the date of application.

Q9 A Patents Act Section 3(d) MED

Section 3(d) denies patentability to a new form of a known substance unless it shows enhanced known efficacy. Zenith's crystalline salt is a new form of a known antibiotic. The tests show the same therapeutic effect, so the efficacy of the known substance has not been enhanced; better shelf stability concerns storage, not the therapeutic efficacy the provision examines. Novelty of form alone cannot rescue the application, since the provision exists to stop minor modifications of known substances from extending monopolies. The final option also misstates Section 53, which counts the term from the date of filing and not from the date of grant, and in any event no grant arises because of the Section 3(d) bar. The application is therefore liable to be refused, which is option A.

Examiner's note — the trap: The trap is the second distractor, which equates shelf stability with enhanced efficacy; the provision looks to the known efficacy of the substance, not its storage life.

Q10 B Patents Act Sections 25(2) and 53 MED

Two separate periods are tested. Under Section 25(2), a post-grant opposition must be filed within one year from the date of publication of the grant. The grant was published on 12 October 2015, so the period ended on 12 October 2016. Vedant filed on 20 November 2016, more than a month late, so the opposition is out of time. Under Section 53, the term of a patent is twenty years from the date of filing, not from grant or publication. Filing took place on 3 June 2012, so the patent runs to June 2032. A candidate who counts the term from

publication of the grant arrives at October 2035, and one who counts the opposition window from filing or grant of the patent rather than publication may call it in time. Only one combination is right: out of time, with the term ending in June 2032, which is option B.

> **Examiner's note — the trap:** The trap is the second distractor, which gets the opposition right but counts the twenty years from publication of the grant instead of from filing.

LOGICAL REASONING

Q11 C Exception needs consent and permitting rules HARD

Apply the three conditions and then the exception. The readings are original to Dev and unpublished, so they are not common knowledge. Isha knows that Dev collected them, so the knowledge condition is met. A thesis is submitted for a degree, which is credit. The three conditions of misattribution are therefore satisfied. The only escape is the exception, which has two cumulative limbs: the originator has consented to going unnamed, and the rules of the submission expressly permit unnamed collaboration. Dev's consent satisfies the first limb, but the thesis rules require every collaborator to be named, so the second limb fails and the exception does not apply. Intention to deceive is not a condition of the principle, and prior publication is not required either, since original means originating with another and not common knowledge. Isha is therefore liable, which is option C.

> **Examiner's note — the trap:** The trap is the first distractor: Dev's consent feels decisive, but the exception demands that the submission's rules also permit unnamed collaboration.

Q12 D Constructive knowledge limb HARD

Test each condition in turn. The scheme is original to Leena and, being published only last month and cited by nobody, it cannot be treated as common knowledge in the field. Condition (ii) is satisfied by either actual knowledge or constructive knowledge: a researcher ought reasonably to know of the origin from the material available to him. The volume carrying Leena's name is on Karan's shelf, so he ought reasonably to know the source, and his honest belief does not displace that standard. Condition (iii) names promotion expressly as credit, so the third distractor misreads the definition. Nothing in the principle gives a supervisor ownership of a student's contribution; it asks only who originated it. All three conditions are met and no exception is pleaded, so Karan is liable, which is option D.

> **Examiner's note — the trap:** The trap is the first distractor, honest belief; the principle uses an objective ought-to-know standard, so sincerity alone does not defeat the knowledge condition.

Q13 A Timing of correction ELITE

The conditions of misattribution are met: Omkar's method is original and unpublished, so it is not common knowledge. Mira knows its source because she has read his paper, and a funding proposal is submitted for credit. Omkar has not consented, so the exception for unnamed collaboration is unavailable. The question is only whether the correction saves her. The principle protects a researcher who files a written correction before the evaluation of the work begins, and it says in terms that a correction filed after evaluation has begun does not cancel liability. The test is the start of evaluation, not its completion and not a number of days since submission. The panel opened the file at 10 a.m. and read the first section, so evaluation had begun before the 4 p.m. correction. Liability stands, and it is not a matter of time apportionment. The correct answer is A.

> **Examiner's note — the trap:** The trap is the second distractor, which measures evaluation by completion; the rule asks only whether evaluation had begun before the correction.

Q14 B Credit condition MED

The principle lists three conditions that must all be met, and the failure of any one defeats liability. Take them in order. The mnemonic system is the topper's own and is not widely known, so condition (i) may well be met. Priya presents it as her own while knowing, or at least ought to know, where it came from, so condition (ii) is arguably met. Condition (iii) requires the work to be submitted for credit, and the passage defines credit as marks, a degree, funding or promotion. Circulating notes among friends involves none of these, so the third condition fails and the principle does not impose liability. The conduct may be ethically poor, but the question asks for application of this specific principle, which confines misattribution to work submitted for credit. Hence the correct answer is B.

> **Examiner's note — the trap:** The trap is the first distractor, which stops after originality; the conditions are cumulative, and the absence of credit ends the inquiry.

Q15 D Elimination from conditions EASY

Test each option against the conditions. Contempt must come at least two days after Bail, so the earliest day for Contempt is Wednesday; it cannot be on Monday. Divorce must be heard the day after Easement, so Easement must come first and Divorce cannot be earlier than Tuesday. Forgery must be heard after Arbitration, so Forgery cannot be earlier than Tuesday either. Easement has no condition that forces another matter before it. If Easement is on Monday, Divorce falls on Tuesday and Arbitration, which cannot be on a day adjacent to Easement or on the same day, may be heard on Wednesday or later, with Forgery after it and Bail and Contempt fitting around. One complete valid schedule is Easement, Divorce, Bail, Arbitration, Contempt, Forgery, which shows that Monday is attainable only for Easement among the options. The correct answer is D.

> **Examiner's note — the trap:** The attractive wrong option is Forgery or Contempt for those who read the conditions loosely, but each of them has a matter that must precede it.

Q16 A Forced arrangement HARD

If Divorce is on Saturday, Easement must be on Friday. Arbitration cannot be on Thursday or Friday, since it may not be on the same day as Easement or on a consecutive day, and it must precede Forgery, so Forgery needs a later day than Arbitration. The remaining four days, Monday to Thursday, must hold Arbitration, Bail, Contempt and Forgery. Contempt needs a gap after Bail, and Arbitration must precede Forgery. Enumerating the possibilities gives exactly three schedules: Arbitration, Bail, Forgery, Contempt, Easement, Divorce; Bail, Arbitration, Contempt, Forgery, Easement, Divorce; and Bail, Arbitration, Forgery, Contempt, Easement, Divorce. In every one, Arbitration and Bail fill Monday and Tuesday in some order, which is the statement that Arbitration and Bail fill Monday and Tuesday. Forgery, Contempt and Bail's exact day vary across the schedules, so those statements are only possible, not necessary. The correct answer is A.

> **Examiner's note — the trap:** The trap is the option fixing Bail on Monday, which is true in two of the three schedules but false when Arbitration opens the week.

Q17 B Conditional enumeration HARD

With Bail on Wednesday, Contempt must be on Friday or Saturday, at least two days later. Divorce follows Easement directly. Consider where the Easement-Divorce pair can sit: Monday-Tuesday, Thursday-Friday or Friday-Saturday, since Wednesday is taken. Arbitration must be earlier than Forgery and may not be on or next to Easement's day. The valid schedules are Arbitration, Forgery, Bail, Easement, Divorce, Contempt; Easement, Divorce, Bail, Arbitration, Contempt, Forgery; and Easement, Divorce, Bail, Arbitration, Forgery, Contempt. In the first, Arbitration is heard on Monday; in the other two it is heard on Thursday. Tuesday fails because every placement of the Easement-Divorce pair then leaves Forgery on Monday or Contempt without a legal day, and Friday leaves no later day for Forgery. So Arbitration can be heard on Monday or Thursday only. The correct answer is B.

> **Examiner's note — the trap:** The trap is the third option, Monday, Tuesday or Thursday, which looks natural because Arbitration seems free early in the week.

Q18 C Counting valid arrangements ELITE

First count all valid schedules. Fix the Easement-Divorce pair, then place Bail and Contempt with a gap, Arbitration before Forgery, and Arbitration not adjacent to Easement. Systematic listing gives 15 valid schedules in total. Now pick those in which Contempt follows Divorce: Arbitration, Bail, Easement, Divorce, Contempt, Forgery; Arbitration, Bail, Easement, Divorce, Forgery, Contempt; Arbitration, Bail, Forgery, Easement, Divorce, Contempt; Arbitration, Forgery, Bail, Easement, Divorce, Contempt; Bail, Arbitration, Forgery, Easement, Divorce, Contempt; Easement, Divorce, Arbitration, Bail, Forgery, Contempt; Bail, Easement, Divorce, Arbitration, Contempt, Forgery; Bail, Easement, Divorce, Arbitration, Forgery, Contempt; Easement, Divorce, Bail, Arbitration, Contempt, Forgery; Easement, Divorce, Bail, Arbitration, Forgery, Contempt; and Bail, Easement, Divorce, Contempt, Arbitration, Forgery. That makes 11. The remaining four have Contempt before Divorce. The correct answer is C.

> **Examiner's note — the trap:** The trap is 15, the total count, which students give after finding all valid schedules without applying the extra Contempt-after-Divorce filter.

QUANTITATIVE TECHNIQUES

Q19 C Percentage change MED

Percentage growth = (capacity 2025 minus capacity 2021) divided by capacity 2021, multiplied by 100. For P: (18 - 12)/12 = 50%. For Q: (26 - 20)/20 = 30%. For R: (21 - 15)/15 = 40%. For S: (14 - 8)/8 = 75%. For T: (30 - 25)/25 = 20%. State S therefore shows the highest percentage growth at 75%. Notice that the absolute increase is 6 GW for each of P, Q, R and S and 5 GW for T, so a reader who compares absolute additions cannot separate the states and may pick the state with the largest bar, such as Q or T. Because the question asks for percentage growth, the smaller base of S, only 8 GW in 2021, makes the same 6 GW addition count for the most. The correct answer is S, 75%, which is option C.

> **Examiner's note — the trap:** The trap is State Q or T, the states with the biggest bars, chosen by students who compare absolute capacity instead of growth relative to the 2021 base.

Q20 A Ratio from percentages HARD

Solar capacity in 2025 equals the 2025 capacity multiplied by the solar share. For State R: 21 GW x 60% = 12.6 GW. For State T: 30 GW x 20% = 6 GW. The required ratio is 12.6 : 6, which on multiplying both terms by 10 and dividing by 6 becomes 126 : 60 = 21 : 10. The common errors are to use the total capacities, giving 21 : 30 = 7 : 10, or to use only the percentages, giving 60 : 20 = 3 : 1. The 12 : 5 option comes from mixing the solar share of R with the total capacity of T, and 63 : 20 and 9 : 4 come from slips with the percentage shares of other states. Only 12.6 : 6 is correct and it simplifies to 21 : 10. The correct answer is option A.

> **Examiner's note — the trap:** The trap is 12 : 5, a tidy-looking ratio reached by mixing the solar share of R with the total capacity of T; the question needs solar capacity in both states.

Q21 D Conditional aggregation MED

First identify the states whose solar share is below 50%: these are Q at 40% and T at 20%. P is exactly 50% and so is excluded, because the condition is strictly less than 50%. Non-solar share equals 100% minus the solar share. For Q: non-solar share is 60%, so the non-solar capacity is 26 x 0.60 = 15.6 GW. For T: non-solar share is 80%, so the non-solar capacity is 30 x 0.80 = 24 GW. The combined figure is 15.6 + 24 = 39.6 GW. If P were wrongly included, its non-solar capacity of 18 x 0.5 = 9 GW would raise the total to 48.6 GW, which is the most tempting wrong answer. The figure 31.2 is double Q's non-solar capacity, and 41.5 matches none of the states. The correct answer is 39.6, option D.

Examiner's note — the trap: The trap is 48.6, obtained by including State P, whose solar share is exactly 50% and therefore fails the strict less-than condition.

Q22 B Component percentage change ELITE

State S had 8 GW in 2021, of which 50% was solar, so solar was 4 GW and non-solar was 8 - 4 = 4 GW. In 2025 S had 14 GW with a 75% solar share, so solar was 14 x 0.75 = 10.5 GW and non-solar was 14 - 10.5 = 3.5 GW. The change in non-solar capacity is 3.5 - 4 = -0.5 GW. As a percentage of the 2021 base this is (-0.5/4) x 100 = -12.5%, a decrease of 12.5%. The headline 75% is the growth of total capacity, and 162.5% is the growth of solar capacity, from 4 GW to 10.5 GW, which is (10.5 - 4)/4 x 100. Both are real figures for S but answer different questions. A decrease of 25% results from misreading the fall of 0.5 GW against a base of 2 GW. The correct answer is a decrease of 12.5%, option B.

Examiner's note — the trap: The trap is an increase of 162.5%, the solar growth of S, or 75%, its total growth; the question concerns only the non-solar component, which actually fell.

Q23 A Percentages and product MED

Rice occupies 30% of 240 acres, which is 72 acres. Production is 72 x 24 = 1,728 quintals. The post-harvest loss is 10%, so the quantity sold is 1,728 x 0.90 = 1,555.2 quintals. At Rs 2,200 per quintal the revenue is 1,555.2 x 2,200 = Rs 34,21,440. The figure Rs 38,01,600 is the revenue if no produce were lost, being 1,728 x 2,200, and is the usual trap for readers who skip the loss clause. Rs 14,05,440 is the profit from rice, which equals revenue minus the cost of 72 x 28,000 = Rs 20,16,000, but the question asks for revenue, not profit. The remaining option results from applying the loss twice over. Since only the produce remaining after loss is sold, the correct revenue is Rs 34,21,440, which is option A.

Examiner's note — the trap: The trap is Rs 38,01,600, the revenue with no loss, chosen by students who ignore that only the produce remaining after loss is sold.

Q24 C Weighted average profit HARD

Areas are wheat 120 acres, rice 72 acres and pulses 48 acres. Wheat: production 120 x 18 = 2,160 quintals, sold 2,160 x 0.95 = 2,052 quintals, revenue 2,052 x 2,400 = Rs 49,24,800; cost 120 x 20,000 = Rs 24,00,000; profit Rs 25,24,800. Rice: revenue Rs 34,21,440, cost Rs 20,16,000, profit Rs 14,05,440. Pulses: production 48 x 8 = 384 quintals with no loss, revenue 384 x 6,000 = Rs 23,04,000; cost 48 x 14,000 = Rs 6,72,000; profit Rs 16,32,000. Total profit = 25,24,800 + 14,05,440 + 16,32,000 = Rs 55,62,240. Divided by 240 acres, this gives Rs 23,176 per acre. The simple mean of the three per-acre profits, Rs 24,853, ignores the unequal areas, and Rs 44,376 is revenue per acre. The correct answer is Rs 23,176, option C.

Examiner's note — the trap: The trap is Rs 24,853, the unweighted average of the three crops' per-acre profits; the crops cover different areas and must be weighted by acreage.

Q25 B Share of total HARD

Pulses cover 48 acres, so production is 48 x 8 = 384 quintals, with no loss, and revenue is 384 x 6,000 = Rs 23,04,000. The cost of cultivation is 48 x 14,000 = Rs 6,72,000, so profit from pulses is Rs 16,32,000. The total profit of the cooperative, from wheat Rs 25,24,800, rice Rs 14,05,440 and pulses Rs 16,32,000, is Rs 55,62,240. The share is 16,32,000 / 55,62,240 x 100 = 29.34%, or 29.3% to one decimal place. The figure 20.0% is simply pulses' share of the land, 48 out of 240 acres. The figure 21.6% is pulses' share of total revenue, 23,04,000 against Rs 1,06,50,240, which ignores that pulses cost far less to grow per rupee earned. The figure 32.7% results from an arithmetic slip. The correct answer is 29.3%, option B.

Examiner's note — the trap: The trap is 21.6%, pulses' share of revenue; the question asks about profit, where pulses weigh more because their costs are low.

Q26 D Marginal gain optimisation ELITE

Profit per acre of rice is revenue 24 x 0.90 x 2,200 = Rs 47,520 minus cost Rs 28,000, giving Rs 19,520. Profit per acre of pulses is 8 x 6,000 = Rs 48,000 minus cost Rs 14,000, giving Rs 34,000. Shifting one acre from rice to pulses therefore adds 34,000 - 19,520 = Rs 14,480. Present profit is Rs 55,62,240 and the target is Rs 60,00,000, a shortfall of Rs 4,37,760. The number of acres needed is 4,37,760 / 14,480 = 30.23, so the shift must be a whole number not less than 31. Check: 30 acres add Rs 4,34,400, giving Rs 59,96,640, which falls just short, while 31 acres add Rs 4,48,880, giving Rs 60,11,120. The figure 34 would be needed if the land were taken from wheat, whose per-acre profit is Rs 21,040. Rice has 72 acres, so 31 is feasible. The correct answer is 31, option D.

Examiner's note — the trap: The trap is 30, from rounding 30.23 down; 30 acres leave profit at Rs 59,96,640, still short, so the answer must be rounded up to 31.

RAPID FIRE — ANSWERS

1. Which BSA section bars proof of a confession made to a police officer? — **Section 23(1)**

2. Which BSA section governs the admissibility of electronic records through a Schedule certificate? — **Section 63**

3. Which BSA section places the burden of proving a fact especially within a person's knowledge on that person? — **Section 109**

4. Which BSA clause makes a dying declaration relevant? — **Section 26(a)**

5. What is the normal term of copyright in a literary work under Section 22 of the Copyright Act, 1957? — **Author's lifetime plus 60 years**

6. Which section of the Copyright Act, 1957 lists acts that are not infringement, such as fair dealing? — **Section 52**

7. Which section of the Copyright Act protects the author's moral rights? — **Section 57**

8. How long is the term of a patent, and from when does it run (Patents Act, Section 53)? — **20 years from the date of filing**

9. Which section of the Patents Act excludes a computer programme per se from patentability? — **Section 3(k)**

10. Which section of the Trade Marks Act, 1999 lists the absolute grounds for refusal of registration? — **Section 9**

11. What is the period of a trade mark registration, and of each renewal, under Section 25 of the Trade Marks Act? — **Ten years**

12. Which section of the Trade Marks Act deals with relative grounds for refusal, including earlier marks? — **Section 11**