CLAT Gurukul — By Ready For Exam

Daily Practice Sheet — Answers, Skills & Examiner Notes — 2 November 2026

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

ANSWER KEY — 2 NOVEMBER 2026

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

LEGAL REASONING

Q1 B — Section 2(68) membership ceiling [HARD]

Section 2(68) permits a private company at most two hundred members, but the count leaves out two groups: members currently in the company's employment, and those who became members while employed and stayed on after leaving. Here that gives 25 plus 12, that is 37 members, who are ignored. Subtracting 37 from 238 leaves 201, and 201 is one more than the permitted two hundred. The 201 persons with no employment link plainly count. Excluding the employee-linked members does not rescue the company, because the exclusion removes only 37 from the total and the residue still exceeds the ceiling. The restriction on transfer and the bar on public invitation are satisfied but are separate conditions, and all three must hold together. Hence the company has breached the statutory limit, and option B is correct.

> **Examiner's note — the trap:** The attractive wrong option is A: it recognises that employees are excluded and then assumes without arithmetic that the residue is under the ceiling, when 238 less 37 is 201, one above two hundred.

Q2 D — Board meeting gap under Section 173 [MED]

Section 173 imposes two cumulative requirements: at least four Board meetings in a year, and not more than 120 days between any two consecutive meetings. The company satisfies the first, for it held four. The second must be tested interval by interval. From 12 January to 30 May is 19 days left in January, 28 in February, 31 in March, 30 in April and 30 in May, a total of 138 days. That exceeds 120 days, so the company has defaulted on the gap requirement even though the number of meetings is adequate. The later intervals, 95 days and then 104 days, are within the limit, but one breach is enough. The statute contains no quarterly requirement, and the gap is measured between consecutive meetings, not between the first and the last. Option D is therefore correct.

> **Examiner's note — the trap:** The trap is option A, which treats the count of four meetings as the whole of Section 173 and ignores the separate 120-day ceiling on the gap between consecutive meetings.

Q3 A — Two independent AGM time limits (Section 96) [HARD]

Section 96 lays down two separate limits for annual general meetings. The first fixes the outer date by reference to the financial year: the meeting must be held within six months of the close of that year. The second fixes the interval: not more than fifteen months between two meetings. A company must satisfy both. For the year ended 31 March 2025, six months expire on 30 September 2025, and a meeting on 20 December 2025 falls nearly three months late. The gap from 29 September 2024 to 20 December 2025 is about fourteen months and twenty-one days, so the fifteen-month limit is met, but that does not cure the breach of the first limit. The six months run from the close of the financial year, not from the earlier meeting. Option A is correct.

> **Examiner's note — the trap:** The attractive wrong option is B, which treats the fifteen-month gap as the sole test; students overlook that the six-month limit from the year-end is an independent requirement.

Q4 C — Short-notice consent: AGM versus other meetings [ELITE]

Section 101 fixes twenty-one clear days as the normal notice but allows shorter notice with consent, and the consent threshold differs by kind of meeting. For an annual general meeting the proviso requires the consent of every member entitled to vote. For any other general meeting, a majority in number of the members entitled to vote, holding at least ninety-five per cent of the voting capital, is enough. In meeting I, one member who holds 2 per cent has not consented, so the unanimity needed for an annual general meeting is missing and the notice is defective. In meeting II, 96 per cent consent from a majority in number clears the lower bar, so ten days' notice is valid. Option C alone applies the two different thresholds correctly. The twenty-one-day rule is therefore not absolute for either meeting.

> **Examiner's note — the trap:** The trap is option A: it applies the ninety-five per cent test to both meetings, forgetting that the passage demands unanimity for an annual general meeting.

NAME: _____ ROLL NO: _____ BATCH: _____

Q5 B Resident director test under Section 149 HARD

Section 149 requires every company to have at least one director who has stayed in India for not less than 182 days in the previous calendar year. The test is personal to a director: the days of different directors are not pooled, so the combined figure of 340 days is irrelevant. Dhruv stayed 150 days, Esha 100 and Farid 90, and each figure is below 182. No director qualifies as a resident director. The company's three directors do meet the minimum number required of a public company, so the number requirement is not in issue; the default lies in the residence requirement alone. The Act does not ask for a stay of the whole year, nor does it merely compare directors with one another, and 150 days does not become sufficient by being the highest. Option B is correct.

> **Examiner's note — the trap:** The attractive wrong option is A, which adds the directors' days together; the statute tests one director at a time, so no aggregation is permitted.

Q6 C Consumer and commercial purpose MED

The definition excludes anyone who obtains goods for resale or for a commercial purpose, but it carves out an exception: goods bought and used exclusively by the buyer for earning his livelihood through self-employment do not count as bought for a commercial purpose. Mohan buys one auto-rickshaw and drives it himself, which is the very case the explanation protects, so he remains a consumer. Naresh buys three vehicles and lets them out for rent. He is not using the goods himself to earn his livelihood by self-employment; he is running a business that generates rent, so the purpose is commercial and he falls outside the definition. Paying consideration is necessary but not sufficient, and the exclusion is not limited to resale. A larger purchase does not make a person a consumer. Option C is correct.

> **Examiner's note — the trap:** The attractive wrong option is A, which treats payment of consideration as enough; it ignores that a buyer for a commercial purpose, like Naresh, is excluded.

Q7 A Pecuniary jurisdiction by consideration paid HARD

Under the Rules summarised in the passage, the pecuniary jurisdiction of a consumer forum is determined by the consideration paid for the goods or services, and the value of the compensation claimed does not decide the forum. Priya paid Rs 60 lakh. That sum exceeds fifty lakh rupees, which is the ceiling for a District Commission, and it does not exceed two crore rupees, which is the ceiling for the State Commission. Her complaint therefore lies before the State Commission. The claim of Rs 3 crore is irrelevant to the choice, and so is the sum of the consideration and the claim, which is a combination the rule does not contemplate. Nor does the single-unit character of the flat make it a District Commission matter. The correct forum is the State Commission, option A.

> **Examiner's note — the trap:** The trap is option B: students compare the Rs 3 crore claim with the two-crore ceiling, although the passage makes the consideration paid, not the compensation claimed, the test.

Q8 D Limitation and condonation under Section 69 HARD

Section 69 prescribes two years from the date on which the cause of action arises. Seema's cause of action arose on 10 January 2023, when the refrigerator failed and the seller refused repair, so the period expired on 10 January 2025. Her complaint of 3 March 2025 is late. The passage, however, preserves a discretion: a late complaint may be admitted if the Commission records in writing its reasons for condoning the delay. Condonation is therefore possible but it is not automatic, and the Commission must give written reasons. The period does not run from the discovery of loss in court. The Commission is not compelled to dismiss at once, nor to admit without reasons. Since Seema has given no explanation, she must persuade the Commission to condone the delay. Option D states the legal position correctly.

> **Examiner's note — the trap:** The attractive wrong option is A, which treats the two-year period as an absolute bar; the passage expressly allows condonation with reasons recorded in writing.

Q9 B Appeal period and mandatory deposit (Section 41) ELITE

Section 41 imposes two conditions on an appellant from a District Commission: the appeal must be filed within forty-five days of the order, and an appellant who must pay money under the order must first deposit fifty per cent of that amount. The order is dated 12 June and the appeal was filed on 20 July, which is 38 days later, so the time condition is met. Fifty per cent of Rs 8 lakh is Rs 4 lakh, but the company deposited only Rs 3 lakh. The deposit is therefore short by Rs 1 lakh, and the passage says that no such appellant is heard unless the full fifty per cent is deposited. The appeal cannot be entertained as filed, though the company may cure the shortfall. The rule applies to any appellant who must pay, including a company. Option B is correct.

> **Examiner's note — the trap:** The trap is option A: the appeal is on time, which tempts students to treat any deposit as enough, but the passage requires the full fifty per cent.

Q10 A Endorser liability under Section 21 MED

Section 21 allows the authority to penalise a person who endorses a misleading advertisement, and the passage states the first-contravention limits: a penalty of up to ten lakh rupees and a bar from endorsing for up to one year. The only escape is to show that he exercised due diligence to verify the claims made in the advertisement. The actor made no enquiry at all, so the defence is not available to him, and the first-contravention limits apply. The higher figures of fifty lakh rupees and three years are reserved for a subsequent contravention, which this is not. The liability is not confined to the manufacturer, since the provision specifically reaches endorsers. And the power includes the bar as well as the penalty. Option A is correct.

Examiner's note — the trap: The attractive wrong option is B: the endorser feels a step removed from the false claim, but the provision makes endorsers answerable unless they prove due diligence.

LOGICAL REASONING

Q11 D Parallel flaw: affirming the consequent HARD

Argument I says that every survivor had piles: survival implies piles. It then notes that the Sarayu bridge has piles and concludes that it survived. This reverses the conditional, since having piles is necessary for survival but not sufficient for it, and many bridges on piles may still have failed. The flaw is affirming the consequent. Option D has the same skeleton: every cross-examined witness was sworn, so being sworn is only a necessary condition, yet the conclusion treats it as sufficient. Option A is valid, because denying the necessary condition does deny the outcome. Option B is also flawed but in a different way, since it denies the antecedent of an if-then statement. Option C is a valid modus ponens. Only option D matches both pattern and flaw, so D is correct.

Examiner's note — the trap: The attractive wrong option is B, because it is also invalid; but it denies the antecedent, a different fallacy from the reversed necessary condition in Argument I.

Q12 C Parallel valid pattern: contrapositive of an exclusion MED

Argument II rests on an exclusion: paying the deposit excludes refusal of possession. It then notes that the refusal has occurred and concludes that the deposit was not paid. This is valid, for if the two cannot coexist and one is present, the other must be absent. Option C reproduces this exactly: disqualification excludes sitting the final round, Pooja sits the final round, so she has not been disqualified. Option A reverses a conditional, a different pattern and an invalid one. Option B starts from the same exclusion but argues from the absence of the first to the presence of the second, which is invalid because a person who is not disqualified need not sit the round. Option D draws a conclusion from a statement about some members of a class. Only option C is valid and parallel.

Examiner's note — the trap: The attractive wrong option is B, since it uses the same opening exclusion; but it argues from absence to presence, which does not follow.

Q13 A Parallel flaw: unrepresentative sample generalised HARD

The reporter's argument moves from a small and possibly unrepresentative sample, five judges, to a claim about the whole population of High Court judges in the country. The flaw is hasty generalisation: nothing shows that the five are typical, and three of five is far too small a base for a claim about most judges nationwide. Option A makes the same move, taking four of six tea stalls near one university and generalising to most tea stalls in the country. The sample is small, local and unrepresentative. Option B reverses a conditional and so commits a different fallacy. Option C also reverses a conditional, treating a shared property as proof of kind. Option D is an appeal to authority. Only option A reproduces the sampling flaw, so A is correct.

Examiner's note — the trap: The attractive wrong option is B: it feels parallel because it is about tea stalls and universities, but it commits a reversed-conditional fallacy, not a sampling flaw.

Q14 B Parallel flaw with 'unless': affirming the consequent ELITE

The words 'unless a petition has an affidavit, it will not be entertained' state a necessary condition: an affidavit is required for entertainment. The argument then observes that the petition was not entertained and concludes that it lacked an affidavit. But non-entertainment may have other causes, such as lack of jurisdiction, so the inference runs backwards from the consequence to the condition. That is the fallacy of affirming the consequent. Option B follows the same route: not admitted, so did not score the cut-off. Options A and C both begin from the same conditional but reason validly, A by moving from admission to the necessary cut-off and C by denying the necessary condition to deny admission. Option D is a plain modus ponens. Only option B repeats the flaw, and so B is correct.

Examiner's note — the trap: The attractive wrong option is A, because it uses the same 'unless' sentence; but it moves from the outcome present to the condition present, which is valid, the opposite direction.

Q15 B Role of a statement: position rejected MED

[S2] begins with 'It is therefore tempting to conclude', and the next sentence says flatly, 'That conclusion is unwarranted.' The author thus states a view in order to reject it. The argument's own conclusion comes at the end: the pioneering cities' evidence tells us little about a nationwide ban. [S1] is the evidence the tempting conclusion draws on, and [S3] is a reason offered against it. Option A fails because [S2] is not what the author is arguing for; the author is arguing against it. Option C fails because the author does not rely on [S2] as a premise, and the author treats it as an unsound inference from [S1]. Option D fails because nothing in the passage claims that the bans failed in the cities, where consumption in fact fell by a third. The correct description is therefore option B.

Examiner's note — the trap: The attractive wrong option is A, which mistakes a conclusion for the author's conclusion; the word 'tempting' signals that the author will reject it.

Q16 D Method of argument: disanalogy HARD

The author accepts [S1], that bag consumption fell by a third in the cities that banned bags, and does not question the survey. The author's point is that the cities were special: they already had waste-segregation systems and reusing residents. A nationwide ban would apply also to places with neither, and there consumers might shift to thicker pouches. The method is therefore to argue that the observed outcome in one group of cases cannot safely be projected on to a different group because the groups differ in relevant respects, in other words an argument from disanalogy. Option A is wrong because the author does not deny that the bans reduced

consumption. Option B is wrong because the survey is accepted. Option C is wrong because no cities are shown to have failed. Option D is correct.

> **Examiner's note — the trap:** The attractive wrong option is A: the passage mentions causes, but it never denies that the bans were responsible for the fall in the cities where they were imposed.

Q17 C Roles of two statements: opposed claim and rebutting fact HARD

The argument has this structure. [X] reports a fact, the 40 per cent rise since the benches were created. [Y] states what the critics infer from it, that the benches caused the rise. The word 'However' then introduces [Z], a fact that cuts against [Y]: the backlog began to swell two years before any additional bench existed, so the benches cannot be the whole explanation, and the closing sentence draws the author's conclusion that they cannot be blamed. [Y] is therefore the position under attack, and [Z] is evidence against it. Option A reverses the roles, since the author's conclusion is the last sentence, not [Y]. Option B makes the author accept [Y], which the word 'critics' and the rest of the passage contradict. Option D wrongly makes [Z] a claim by critics. Option C is correct.

> **Examiner's note — the trap:** The attractive wrong option is A: it assumes that the first-stated claim, [Y], is what the author defends, though the author introduces it as the critics' view and then rebuts it.

Q18 A Roles: alternative explanation and its limit ELITE

The argument first reports the analysts' inference and then says through [M] that it is open to doubt. [N] explains why: more returns may follow simply from the extension of mandatory filing, which is a rival explanation that does not involve better compliance. If the argument stopped there it would reject the analysts outright. But [O] adds a limiting fact, that mandatory filing is only a year old whereas the rise has lasted a decade. That restricts what [N] can explain, which is why [P], the conclusion, says only that the rule cannot wholly explain the rise and some improvement is likely. [N] is therefore a rival explanation raised against the inference, and [O] limits its reach. Option B makes [N] the conclusion, but [P] is the conclusion. Option C and option D misdescribe [N] as support for the analysts. Option A is correct.

> **Examiner's note — the trap:** The attractive wrong option is B: because [M] and [N] sit together, students take [N] as the conclusion, but the conclusion the argument finally reaches is [P], a more qualified one.

QUANTITATIVE TECHNIQUES

Q19 A Successive percentage change MED

Apply the changes one after another on the preceding year. For Q, 2023 ridership is 16 x 1.50 = 24 lakh and 2024 ridership is 24 x 1.25 = 30 lakh, so the net change on the 2022 base is (30 - 16) / 16 = 87.5 per cent. For T, 24 x 1.25 = 30 and 30 x 1.10 = 33, a net rise of 9 / 24 = 37.5 per cent. For R, 40 x 0.90 = 36 and 36 x 1.20 = 43.2, a rise of 3.2 / 40 = 8 per cent. For P, 20 x 1.25 x 0.80 = 20, a net change of zero. For S, 30 x 1.20 x 0.75 = 27, a fall of 10 per cent. The highest is therefore Q at 87.5 per cent. Simply adding 50 and 25 gives 75 per cent, which ignores compounding; that is the error behind the nearest wrong option. Option A is correct.

> **Examiner's note — the trap:** The attractive wrong option is B, which adds the two percentages to get 75; successive changes compound, so the correct net figure is 87.5.

Q20 C Percentage change of a combined quantity HARD

First find the 2024 ridership of each system. For Q, 16 x 1.50 x 1.25 = 30 lakh. For T, 24 x 1.25 x 1.10 = 33 lakh. The combined 2024 figure is 30 + 33 = 63 lakh. The combined 2022 figure is 16 + 24 = 40 lakh. The increase is 63 - 40 = 23 lakh, and the percentage increase on the 2022 base is 23 / 40 x 100 = 57.5 per cent. A percentage change of a combined quantity cannot be found by averaging the two individual percentages. The individual net changes are 87.5 per cent for Q and 37.5 per cent for T, and their simple average is 62.5 per cent. That average gives equal weight to the two systems, although Q carried a smaller base than T. The weighted calculation above gives 57.5 per cent, which is option C.

> **Examiner's note — the trap:** The attractive wrong option is A: it averages the two percentage changes, 87.5 and 37.5, which wrongly gives equal weight to systems with different bases.

Q21 D Chained percentage change EASY

System S carried 30 lakh passengers a day in 2022. In 2023 it rose by 20 per cent to 30 x 1.20 = 36 lakh. In 2024 it fell by 25 per cent to 36 x 0.75 = 27 lakh. In 2025 it rose by 20 per cent over 2024 to 27 x 1.20 = 32.4 lakh. Compared with the 2022 figure of 30 lakh, the difference is 32.4 - 30 = 2.4 lakh, and the percentage change on the 2022 base is 2.4 / 30 x 100 = 8 per cent. A shortcut using multipliers gives the same result: 1.20 x 0.75 x 1.20 = 1.08, that is a net rise of 8 per cent. Subtracting percentages, for example 20 - 10, or ignoring the intermediate year, leads to the wrong options of 10 or 12 per cent. The 20 per cent in the question refers to 2024 and not to 2022. Option D, 8 per cent higher, is correct.

> **Examiner's note — the trap:** The attractive wrong option is A: students offset the 20 per cent rise with the 10 per cent net fall of the earlier years, instead of multiplying the three factors.

Q22 B Multi-step percentage change with a derived base ELITE

The mean 2022 ridership of the five systems is (20 + 16 + 40 + 30 + 24) / 5 = 130 / 5 = 26 lakh, which is the 2022 ridership of U. In 2023 it rose by 50 per cent to 26 x 1.5 = 39 lakh. In 2024 it fell by 20 per cent to 39 x 0.8 = 31.2 lakh. The 2024 ridership of P is 20 x 1.25 x 0.80 = 20 lakh. The excess of U over P is 31.2 - 20 = 11.2 lakh, and the question takes P's figure as the base, so the percentage is 11.2 / 20 x 100 =

56 per cent. If the excess were measured on U's own figure the result would be 11.2 / 31.2, about 36 per cent, which is not offered. The question also invites a slip in the mean by using the wrong total. Taking the base as P, the answer is 56 per cent, option B.

> **Examiner's note — the trap:** The attractive wrong option is C: students approximate the net change from the +50 and -20 percentages as +30 and then misapply it, instead of computing the actual 31.2 lakh.

Q23 C Marked price, discount and profit MED

The cost per unit is Rs 5, and a profit of 20 per cent on cost means the selling price after discount is 5 x 1.20 = Rs 6. The discount of 20 per cent is allowed on the listed tariff, so the selling price is 80 per cent of the listed tariff. Let the listed tariff be L. Then 0.80 L = 6, which gives L = 6 / 0.80 = Rs 7.50. A check confirms the result: a discount of 20 per cent on 7.50 is Rs 1.50, leaving Rs 6, and Rs 6 against a cost of Rs 5 is a profit of 20 per cent. The common error is to add the profit and the discount, 20 + 20 = 40 per cent, to the cost, which gives Rs 7 and ignores that the discount is taken on the listed tariff and not on the cost. Option C, Rs 7.50, is correct.

> **Examiner's note — the trap:** The attractive wrong option is A: adding 20 per cent profit and 20 per cent discount on cost gives Rs 7, but the discount is on the listed tariff, not on the cost.

Q24 D Compound interest versus simple interest HARD

The rate is 20 per cent per annum compounded half-yearly, so the rate for each half-year is 10 per cent and there are two half-years in the year. The amount is 5 crore x (1.10)^2 = 5 x 1.21 = Rs 6.05 crore, so the compound interest is 6.05 - 5 = Rs 1.05 crore. The simple interest for one year on Rs 5 crore at 20 per cent is Rs 1 crore. The difference is 1.05 - 1.00 = Rs 0.05 crore, which is Rs 5 lakh. The excess arises only from interest earned on the first half-year's interest: 10 per cent of Rs 50 lakh, which is Rs 5 lakh. Taking the annual compounding formula by mistake, with a single period at 20 per cent, would make the compound and simple interest equal for one year and give a difference of nil. The correct difference is Rs 5 lakh, which is option D.

> **Examiner's note — the trap:** The attractive wrong option is B: students double the half-yearly interest on the first half, or misread the rate, and reach Rs 10 lakh instead of Rs 5 lakh.

Q25 A Equal instalments under compound interest HARD

Let each instalment be x crore. The present value of the first instalment, paid after one year, is x / 1.10, and that of the second, paid after two years, is x / (1.10)^2 = x / 1.21. Together they must equal the loan of Rs 4.2 crore. So x (1/1.10 + 1/1.21) = 4.2. Now 1/1.10 + 1/1.21 = 1.10/1.21 + 1/1.21 = 2.10/1.21, so x = 4.2 x 1.21 / 2.10 = 2 x 1.21 = 2.42. A check follows: the first year's interest is 0.42, the balance becomes 4.62, and paying 2.42 leaves 2.20; interest of 0.22 makes it 2.42, which clears the loan with the second instalment. Dividing 4.2 by two, giving 2.10, ignores interest, and adding simple interest gives other wrong figures. The correct instalment is 2.42, option A.

> **Examiner's note — the trap:** The attractive wrong option is B: Rs 2.31 comes from adding one year's simple interest of 10 per cent to half the loan, which ignores that interest accrues on the reducing balance.

Q26 B Mixed profit and loss on parts of a stock ELITE

The cost per unit is Rs 2.50, so the cost of 50 lakh units is Rs 125 lakh. An overall profit of 10 per cent makes the total revenue Rs 137.5 lakh. The first part is 60 per cent of 50, that is 30 lakh units, sold at a profit of 25 per cent, so at 2.50 x 1.25 = Rs 3.125 per unit, giving revenue of 30 x 3.125 = Rs 93.75 lakh. The remaining revenue is 137.5 - 93.75 = Rs 43.75 lakh from the other 20 lakh units, which is Rs 2.1875 per unit. Against a cost of Rs 2.50, the loss per unit is 0.3125, and 0.3125 / 2.50 x 100 = 12.5 per cent. A shortcut using weights: 0.6 x 25 + 0.4 x (-x) = 10 gives 15 - 0.4x = 10, so x = 12.5. Averaging the 25 and 10 per cent would give 17.5 and go wrong. The loss is 12.5 per cent, option B.

> **Examiner's note — the trap:** The attractive wrong option is C: students set the loss equal to the gap between the 25 per cent and the overall 10 per cent, 15 per cent, ignoring the 60:40 weights.

RAPID FIRE — ANSWERS

1. Maximum members in a private company, excluding employee-members? — **200 (Section 2(68))**

2. Minimum number of members in a public company? — **Seven (Section 3)**

3. Maximum gap between two consecutive Board meetings? — **120 days (Section 173)**

4. Within how long of the financial year-end must an AGM be held? — **Six months (Section 96)**

5. Normal notice period for a general meeting? — **Twenty-one clear days (Section 101)**

6. Consumer Commission with jurisdiction up to Rs 50 lakh consideration? — **District Commission**

7. Limitation period for a consumer complaint under Section 69? — **Two years from the cause of action**

8. Share of the amount ordered an appellant must deposit under Section 41? — **Fifty per cent**

9. Fallacy: 'All A are B; x is B; so x is A'? — **Affirming the consequent**

10. Fallacy: general claim drawn from a small, unrepresentative sample? — **Hasty generalisation**

11. Compound interest at 20% p.a., half-yearly, equals what rate per half-year? — **10%**

12. Net effect of a 25% rise followed by a 20% fall? — **No change (1.25 x 0.8 = 1)**