CLAT Gurukul — By Ready For Exam

Daily Practice Sheet — Answers, Skills & Examiner Notes — 4 November 2026

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

ANSWER KEY — 4 NOVEMBER 2026

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

LEGAL REASONING

Q1 C — Signatory's duty not to defeat object and purpose [MED]

The passage treats signature and ratification differently. A state becomes bound by a treaty only when it consents to be bound, usually by ratification, so Veloria is not yet a full party and is not answerable for every term. But the passage adds a limited duty: a state that has signed subject to ratification must, until it makes clear that it does not intend to become a party, refrain from acts that would defeat the object and purpose of the treaty. Both conditions are met. Veloria has signed, it has not ratified, and it has never said it will stay out. The dredging would destroy a listed reef, which is the very thing the treaty exists to protect, so it defeats the object and purpose. Veloria must therefore refrain, and option C is correct. Total freedom before ratification ignores the limited duty, full bindingness from signature overstates it, and sovereignty does not displace a duty a state has accepted.

> **Examiner's note — the trap:** The attractive wrong option says signature creates no duty at all; it forgets that the passage imposes a narrow duty of restraint on a signatory who has not withdrawn.

Q2 A — Custom and the persistent objector [HARD]

The passage first defines custom as settled practice plus opinio juris, and the facts supply both: coastal states have escorted vessels for decades in the belief that the law requires it. The passage then gives the one escape: a state that has persistently objected to the emerging custom from the outset is not bound by it. Tarnia protested at the beginning and kept protesting, so it qualifies and is not bound. Orsa did the opposite. It followed the practice for twenty years, which is itself evidence of acceptance, and objected only once the rule had hardened. A late objection is not an objection from the outset, so Orsa remains bound. Custom does not depend on treaty signature, which disposes of the claim that neither is bound, and the idea that any state may opt out at any time would make custom meaningless. Option A is correct.

> **Examiner's note — the trap:** The attractive wrong option is the last one, which lets every state opt out whenever it wishes; it ignores the passage's requirement that the objection be made from the outset.

Q3 D — Attribution of conduct to a state [HARD]

The passage lays down two attribution rules. First, the conduct of a state's organs is attributed to it even if they exceed their authority or disobey instructions. The constable in act (i) is a police organ, and his breach of standing orders does not detach his conduct from the state. Second, the conduct of private persons is attributed only if they act on the state's instructions or under its direction or control. In act (ii) a minister handed the crowd a list of addresses and told it what to do, so the crowd acted on state instructions and its conduct is attributed. In act (iii) the crowd acted on its own after a rumour and officials took no part, so nothing links it to the state. The attributable acts are (i) and (ii), and option D is correct. Territorial presence alone never attributes private conduct to a state.

> **Examiner's note — the trap:** The attractive wrong option is the one confining attribution to act (ii): it assumes that disobeying orders takes an official outside the state, which the passage expressly rejects.

Q4 B — Immunity: character, not purpose, of the transaction [HARD]

The passage draws the line between sovereign acts (jure imperii) and ordinary commercial transactions (jure gestionis), and gives the test: the character of the transaction decides, not the purpose for which its fruits are meant. Zandria's argument rests entirely on purpose, namely that the boots are for soldiers. But the transaction itself is a sale of goods for a price, exactly what any private buyer might make with the same firm. Its character is commercial, and the military use to which the boots will be put cannot convert it into a sovereign act. Zandria therefore has no immunity from the suit, and option B is correct. The claim that a state can never be sued contradicts the passage's own distinction. The suggestion that immunity is lost merely by failing to pay a debt is wrong too, since the loss of immunity flows from the commercial character of the contract and not from the default.

NAME: _____ ROLL NO: _____ BATCH: _____

Examiner's note — the trap: The attractive wrong option is the one granting immunity because the boots were for the army; it tests purpose, which the passage says is irrelevant.

Q5 A Jus cogens overrides consent and objection ELITE

Two doctrines in the passage appear to point in opposite directions, and the question is which prevails. The persistent-objector rule frees a state from an emerging custom that it has opposed from the outset, and Brenn fits it perfectly. The passage, however, qualifies the rule in the same breath: no state may contract out of a peremptory norm, and a treaty in conflict with such a norm is void. The prohibition of slavery is peremptory on the facts, so the objector's exemption simply does not apply to it, and consent by both states cannot rescue the treaty either, since the voidness follows from the conflict itself. Aldora's argument therefore fails on both limbs. Splitting the treaty into a valid half for Brenn and a void half for Aldora has no support in the passage, and nothing makes the voidness depend on a later court declaration. Option A is correct.

Examiner's note — the trap: The attractive wrong option applies the persistent-objector rule to a peremptory norm; the passage says no state may contract out of such a norm, so the objector's exemption never arises.

Q6 B Contributory negligence: apportionment MED

The passage says that contributory negligence does not bar the claim; it reduces the damages in proportion to the claimant's share of fault. Rohan's total loss is Rs 9,00,000 and his share of fault is 30 per cent. The reduction is 30 per cent of Rs 9,00,000, which is Rs 2,70,000, and what remains is Rs 9,00,000 minus Rs 2,70,000, that is Rs 6,30,000. Equivalently, the truck side bears 70 per cent of the loss, and 70 per cent of Rs 9,00,000 is Rs 6,30,000. The full sum is wrong because it ignores the claimant's own share of fault. Recovering nothing is wrong because the passage expressly says contributory negligence is not a complete bar; only volenti bars the claim wholly. The figure of Rs 2,70,000 is the amount deducted, not the amount recovered. Option B is therefore correct.

Examiner's note — the trap: The attractive wrong option is Rs 2,70,000, which is the deduction itself; a hurried reader picks the 30 per cent figure instead of the 70 per cent that remains payable.

Q7 D Remoteness: unforeseeable kind of damage HARD

The passage makes liability depend on three things: a duty and breach, factual causation by the but-for test, and damage of a kind the defendant ought reasonably to have foreseen. The passage adds that the defendant is not liable for unforeseeable damage even if the breach directly caused it. The risk created by a leaking oil drum is that people and vehicles will slip, and perhaps that the oil will pollute. A fire started by an extremely rare reaction with an illegally dumped compound is a different kind of damage that no reasonable person would foresee. The but-for test is satisfied, since without the spill there would have been no fire, but that is only one requirement and it is not sufficient. The claim therefore fails for remoteness, and option D is correct. The idea that liability extends to every direct consequence is exactly what the passage rejects. The duty is not limited to road users merely because the likely harm is to them.

Examiner's note — the trap: The attractive wrong option relies on the but-for test alone; the trap is to treat factual causation as enough when the passage also demands foreseeability of the kind of damage.

Q8 C Vicarious liability: course of employment HARD

The passage makes an employer vicariously liable for a tort committed in the course of employment, and it expressly includes a wrongful way of doing what the employee was authorised to do. In act (i) Anil was doing his authorised job, delivering parcels, but did it in a forbidden and careless manner by overtaking on a blind curve. That is a wrongful mode of an authorised act, so the firm is liable despite the written instruction. In act (ii) Anil was on a private pleasure trip after his round, which is wholly outside the employment, so the passage gives no liability. In act (iii) Bela is an independent contractor, and the passage excludes liability for her torts. Only act (i) is covered, and option C is correct. Breach of an instruction does not by itself take an act outside employment; it is the character of the act that matters.

Examiner's note — the trap: The attractive wrong option is the one denying liability for all three: it treats a breach of instructions as ending the employment, which the passage's 'wrongful way of doing' language rules out.

Q9 A Rescuer: volenti rejected, contributory negligence available HARD

The passage separates two defences. Volenti bars a claim wholly, but only when the claimant freely agreed, with full knowledge, to bear the risk; mere knowledge of danger is not enough, and a rescuer who responds to a danger created by the defendant's wrong is not treated as volenti. Hari's careless storage created the danger, and Meena entered to save the watchman, so volenti fails. Contributory negligence is a different matter. It does not bar the claim but reduces damages in proportion to the claimant's share of fault. Meena had a wet cloth and time to cover her face, and a reasonable rescuer would have avoided part of the burns, so a reduction is open to the court. Meena therefore recovers, but possibly not in full, and option A is correct. A rescuer's own carelessness is not exempt from apportionment, and contributory negligence never defeats the whole claim.

Examiner's note — the trap: The attractive wrong option bars the claim by volenti because she knew the danger; the passage says knowledge is not enough and a rescuer is not volenti.

Q10 C Vicarious liability with remoteness and apportionment ELITE

Three rules from the passage must be applied in order. First, Gati Movers is vicariously liable because Sunil committed the tort in the course of his employment. Second, the employer is liable only for damage of a kind that was reasonably foreseeable, so the Rs 2,50,000 for the instruments, lost through an unforeseeable gas reaction, is irrecoverable even though the reversing caused the sparks. The

recoverable loss is Rs 5,00,000 plus Rs 3,50,000, which is Rs 8,50,000. Third, contributory negligence reduces damages in proportion to the claimant's share of fault, here 20 per cent. Twenty per cent of Rs 8,50,000 is Rs 1,70,000, and Rs 8,50,000 minus Rs 1,70,000 is Rs 6,80,000. Applying the reduction to the full Rs 11,00,000 would ignore remoteness, and skipping the reduction would ignore her fault. Rs 1,70,000 is only the deduction. Option C is correct.

> **Examiner's note — the trap:** The attractive wrong option applies the 20 per cent reduction to the full Rs 11,00,000; it forgets that the unforeseeable fire loss must be removed first.

LOGICAL REASONING

Q11 D Assumption: excluding an alternative cause MED

The chairperson reasons from a rise in collection to a cause: the app made members more willing to sell to the Federation. Such a causal argument needs the assumption that the obvious rival causes are not doing the work. If milk output per animal had risen because of better fodder or rain, collection would have gone up with or without the app, and the app would deserve no credit. The number of households stayed the same, so the rise must come from more milk per household, and the argument therefore needs the rise to be due to willingness to sell and not to a general rise in output. Negate the correct option and the argument collapses, which is the test of a necessary assumption. The other options are not required: the app can work without the farmers having sold only to traders before, without comparison to other cooperatives, and without being easier than paper registers. Option D is correct.

> **Examiner's note — the trap:** The attractive wrong option is the one about ease of use compared with paper registers; it sounds supportive but the argument can stand even if the app is no easier to use.

Q12 B Assumption: representativeness of the extension HARD

The chairperson predicts that extending the app to 60 villages will raise collection there by a similar proportion. A prediction of this kind carries a result from one group to another, so it needs the assumption that the second group is relevantly like the first. If the 60 villages sell little to traders, or have different markets, payment habits or milk supply, a rise of 14 per cent in the first group says nothing about them. The correct option states exactly this link, and its negation, that the villages differ in relevant ways, would undermine the prediction. The other options are not necessary. The prediction concerns the proportion of the rise, so the number of households in the 60 villages is irrelevant. Lower costs of collection are a separate benefit, not a condition for higher collection. Dissatisfaction is not needed either, since the app can raise collection among contented farmers too. Option B is correct.

> **Examiner's note — the trap:** The attractive wrong option claims that farmers in the 60 villages are dissatisfied; this would help the prediction, but helping an argument is not the same as being needed by it.

Q13 A Assumption: the loyalty claim HARD

The statement compares two things a farmer might gain: faster payment from the Federation and a slightly higher price from a trader. To conclude that loyalty will survive the price rise, the chairperson must assume that the benefit of quick payment is worth at least as much to the farmer as the extra price. If farmers valued the small price gain more than the speed, they would move to traders and the loyalty claim would fail. That is the correct option, and its negation destroys the claim. The option about preferring a cooperative regardless of price is far stronger than needed and even contradicts the argument's reliance on payment speed. The option about the size of future price rises is not required, because the claim is already limited to small rises. The absence of complaints is irrelevant to what farmers value. Option A is correct.

> **Examiner's note — the trap:** The attractive wrong option says traders will raise prices only slightly; it repeats the statement's own limit and so is not an extra assumption the argument needs.

Q14 C Assumption: what is NOT required ELITE

Apply the negation test to each option: an assumption is something whose falsity would damage the argument. If the Federation had not in fact paid within 48 hours, the app could not have made members more willing to sell, so the first of the other options is needed. If traders in the 60 villages already paid within 48 hours, the app would offer no advantage there, so the second is needed. If speed of payment did not influence where farmers sell, the whole chain from app to loyalty would break, so the third is needed. The remaining option, that the Federation's price is higher than the traders', is not needed at all. The argument rests on speed of payment, and the chairperson even allows that traders may raise their prices, which suggests that price is not the Federation's strength. The argument survives if the prices are equal or the Federation is lower. Option C is correct as the one that is not an assumption.

> **Examiner's note — the trap:** The attractive wrong option is the price comparison, which sounds like a natural support for loyalty; but the chairperson relies on speed of payment, not on a higher price.

Q15 A Flaw: selection effect behind a causal claim MED

The official infers a cause, that tracking makes drivers punctual, from a difference between two groups: 9 per cent late trips for tracked buses against 22 per cent for the rest. But the passage tells us that the tracked buses were chosen from the three best-run depots. Buses from the best-run depots would probably have been more punctual even without tracking, because of better maintenance, supervision and routes. The difference in lateness may therefore reflect where the devices were fitted and not what the devices did. That is the flaw in the correct option: the argument overlooks a pre-existing difference between the groups. Comparing percentages of trips is perfectly valid, so the objection about percentages and counts fails. Drivers' resentment and the acceptability of 9 per cent are side issues that do not touch the inference from the figures to the cause. Option A is correct.

Examiner's note — the trap: The attractive wrong option is the one about 9 per cent being acceptable; it criticises a standard the official never set, while the real gap is the choice of the best depots.

Q16 D Flaw: unsupported extension to all cases HARD

The first half of the sentence, that punctuality is needed everywhere, is a goal. The second half, that every bus should be fitted with tracking, is a means. The official slides from one to the other without showing that tracking will achieve the goal in all depots. The evidence comes only from the best-run depots, where lateness may have been low for other reasons. In depots where buses run late because of congestion, poor roads or breakdowns, a GPS device would only record the delay and not remove it. The argument thus assumes that the effect, if any, will carry over to all conditions. That is the flaw in the correct option. The claim that a sample can never support a wider conclusion is false, since fair samples can. The official does not rely on drivers' opinions, and the passage speaks of the record of trips, not of each trip. Option D is correct.

Examiner's note — the trap: The attractive wrong option says a sample never supports a wider conclusion; the real fault is not sampling in general but the absence of any showing that the effect carries over to different depots.

Q17 B Flaw: self-validating defence of evidence HARD

When people doubt the figures, the proper reply is to show that the review's method or data are sound. The official instead says that the review is reliable because he commissioned it and would not have commissioned an unreliable one. That reasoning is circular and personal: it takes the official's confidence in his own judgement as proof of the review's accuracy. Who ordered a review has no bearing on whether its findings are right, and the sentence adds no evidence at all. This is the flaw described by the correct option. The official does not attack the doubters' motives; he simply ignores their doubts, so the first of the other options does not describe him. He cites no witness, so the second fails. And he never assumes that the doubters are right, so the third is wrong too. The reply is a bare assertion that rests on the official's own authority. Option B is correct.

Examiner's note — the trap: The attractive wrong option is the attack on motives, which is a familiar fallacy; but the official never mentions the doubters' motives, he merely vouches for himself.

Q18 C Parallel flaw ELITE

The official's reasoning has three faults: a causal conclusion drawn from groups that were not comparable at the start (the best depots were tracked), an extension of the remedy to every case, and a defence of the evidence by his own part in commissioning it. The correct option reproduces all three. Drip systems were fitted only on the most fertile farms, so the higher yield may reflect fertility; the secretary then extends the remedy to every farm; and she defends her survey because she designed it. The home-delivery argument shares only the extension, and it adds a small-sample flaw absent from the passage. The hospital argument reproduces only the circular defence of the audit and has no faulty comparison or extension. The bridge argument attacks the critics, which the official did not do. A parallel-flaw question rewards matching every flaw, not just one. Option C is correct.

Examiner's note — the trap: The attractive wrong option is the hospital audit, which copies the official's final sentence neatly but misses the unequal groups and the extension to all cases.

QUANTITATIVE TECHNIQUES

Q19 B Division in a ratio, two stages MED

First find each team's points: T1 has 3 x 8 + 2 = 26, T2 has 3 x 6 + 5 = 23, T3 has 3 x 7 + 1 = 22, and T4 has 3 x 5 + 4 = 19. The total is 90 points. The prize pool of Rs 9,00,000 is therefore worth Rs 10,000 per point, and T3, with 22 points, receives Rs 2,20,000. T3 then divides this in the ratio 7 : 4, which makes 11 parts. One part is Rs 2,20,000 divided by 11, that is Rs 20,000. The support staff has 4 parts, which is Rs 80,000, and the players have 7 parts, which is Rs 1,40,000. The figure Rs 1,40,000 belongs to the players, the figure Rs 88,000 comes from wrongly taking 4 out of 10 parts, and Rs 1,10,000 is simply half of T3's prize. The correct amount is Rs 80,000, option B.

Examiner's note — the trap: The attractive wrong option is Rs 1,40,000, which is the players' share; the ratio 7 : 4 lists the players first, so the staff share is the smaller figure.

Q20 D Ratio of quantities and revenue HARD

The ratio 6 : 4 : 3 has 13 parts, and the revenue per part is 6 x 150 + 4 x 250 + 3 x 400 = 900 + 1,000 + 1,200 = Rs 3,100 for each set of 13 tickets. Since the total is Rs 6,20,000, there are 200 such sets, so the stands sold 1,200, 800 and 600 tickets respectively. Revenue from the Rs 150 stand is Rs 1,80,000 and from the Rs 250 stand is Rs 2,00,000, together Rs 3,80,000. The Rs 400 stand at first earned 600 x 400 = Rs 2,40,000. To equal Rs 3,80,000 it must sell 3,80,000 divided by 400, which is 950 tickets. The extra tickets are 950 minus 600, that is 350. Check: 350 x 400 = Rs 1,40,000, and Rs 2,40,000 plus Rs 1,40,000 is Rs 3,80,000. The answer is 350, option D.

Examiner's note — the trap: The attractive wrong option is 400 extra tickets; it comes from forgetting that the Rs 400 stand already holds 600 tickets and wrongly equating the new total with the target revenue.

Q21 A Man-days with unequal efficiency HARD

The job needs 15 x 12 = 180 worker-days. After 4 days, 15 x 4 = 60 worker-days have been done, leaving 120 worker-days to be done in the remaining 8 days. To finish on time we need 120 divided by 8, that is 15 original-worker equivalents every day. After the departure, only 10 original workers remain, so a shortfall of 5 original-worker equivalents must be made good. Each new worker supplies only 5/6 of an original worker, so the number to be hired is 5 divided by 5/6, which is 6. Check: 10 + 6 x 5/6 = 15 equivalents, and 15 x 8 = 120

worker-days. Hiring only 5 workers would be right only if the new hires were as efficient as the old ones, which ignores the stated 5/6 rate. Hiring 7 or 4 gives 15.83 or 13.33 equivalents, and neither finishes exactly on time. The answer is 6, option A.

> **Examiner's note — the trap:** The attractive wrong option is 5 new workers, which simply replaces the 5 who left and ignores that the new workers are less efficient.

Q22 C Alligation and mixtures ELITE

In X the syrup is 2/5 of the volume, and in Y it is 1/5; the target drink has 1/4 syrup. By alligation, the quantities of X and Y are in the ratio (1/4 - 1/5) : (2/5 - 1/4) = 1/20 : 3/20 = 1 : 3. So 4 litres of X needs 12 litres of Y. Check by direct calculation: 4 litres of X holds 1.6 litres of syrup and 2.4 litres of water, and 12 litres of Y holds 2.4 litres of syrup and 9.6 litres of water. The final drink has 4 litres of syrup and 12 litres of water, a ratio of 1 : 3 as required, with a total volume of 16 litres. The figure 9.6 litres counts only the water from Y. The figure 14.4 litres wrongly adds the water of X twice. The figure 16 litres is the total volume of the drink, not its water content. The answer is 12 litres, option C.

> **Examiner's note — the trap:** The attractive wrong option is 9.6 litres, which counts only the water that came from Y and leaves out the 2.4 litres already in X.

Q23 D Weighted average MED

The overall average must be weighted by team size, because the teams are not equal. The salary totals, in thousands, are: Development 12 x 60 = 720; Design 8 x 50 = 400; Sales 10 x 40 = 400; Support 15 x 28 = 420; Data 5 x 90 = 450. The sum is 720 + 400 + 400 + 420 + 450 = 2,390 thousand, that is Rs 23,90,000 for 50 employees. The average is 2,390 divided by 50, which is 47.8 thousand, or Rs 47,800. The figure Rs 53,600 is the simple mean of the five team averages, (60 + 50 + 40 + 28 + 90) divided by 5, which ignores the fact that large low-paid teams pull the true average down. The other two figures arise from arithmetic slips in the totals. The correct answer is Rs 47,800, option D.

> **Examiner's note — the trap:** The attractive wrong option is Rs 53,600, the unweighted mean of team averages; it ignores that Support, the largest team, is also among the lowest paid.

Q24 B Average of a removed group HARD

The original Support average is Rs 28,000 for 15 employees, so the total is 15 x 28 = 420 thousand. The remaining ten earned an average of Rs 2,000 more, that is Rs 30,000, so their total is 10 x 30 = 300 thousand. The five who left therefore accounted for 420 minus 300, which is 120 thousand, and their average is 120 divided by 5, that is 24 thousand, or Rs 24,000. Check: five at 24 and ten at 30 give 120 + 300 = 420 thousand, and 420 divided by 15 is 28. The figure Rs 28,000 is the original team average, which would be the answer only if leavers and stayers earned alike, contradicting the higher average of the remaining. The figure Rs 30,000 is the average of those who stayed, and Rs 22,000 is a slip. The correct answer is Rs 24,000, option B.

> **Examiner's note — the trap:** The attractive wrong option is Rs 30,000, which is the stayers' average; the question asks about the leavers, who must earn less to raise the average.

Q25 C Overlapping averages HARD

Work with totals. The eight-month total is 8 x 3,500 = 28,000. The first five months total 5 x 3,200 = 16,000, and the last five months total 5 x 3,900 = 19,500. The first five months (1 to 5) and the last five months (4 to 8) overlap in months 4 and 5, so these two months are counted twice when the two totals are added. Hence 16,000 + 19,500 = 28,000 + (month 4 + month 5), which gives month 4 + month 5 = 35,500 minus 28,000, that is 7,500. With month 4 at 3,600, month 5 is 7,500 minus 3,600, that is 3,900. The figure 3,750 is the average of the two months, which equals the fifth month only if the fourth month were also 3,750. The figure 3,600 repeats the fourth month, and 4,100 is a slip. The answer is 3,900, option C.

> **Examiner's note — the trap:** The attractive wrong option is 3,750, the average of the two overlapping months; it is the correct pair-average but not the fifth month alone.

Q26 A Average with corrections and a new entrant ELITE

The table total was 2,390 thousand. The Development entry was too low by 90 - 60 = 30, so the total rises by 30. The Support entry was too high by 52 - 25 = 27, so the total falls by 27. The corrected total is 2,390 + 30 - 27 = 2,393 thousand. After the 51st employee joins, the average of 48 thousand gives a total of 51 x 48 = 2,448 thousand. Her salary is 2,448 minus 2,393, which is 55 thousand, that is Rs 55,000. If the audit were ignored, the answer would be 2,448 - 2,390 = 58, which is the Rs 58,000 distractor. If the signs of the corrections were reversed, the total would be 2,390 - 30 + 27 = 2,387 and the answer 61, which is Rs 61,000. The figure Rs 52,000 has no basis in the data. The answer is Rs 55,000, option A.

> **Examiner's note — the trap:** The attractive wrong option is Rs 58,000, which comes from ignoring the audit; the corrections shift the total by a net 3 thousand and so change the answer.

RAPID FIRE — ANSWERS

1. Which test of causation asks whether the damage would have occurred without the breach? — **The but-for test**

2. Meaning of volenti non fit injuria? — **To a willing person no injury is done; full knowledge and free consent bar the claim wholly**

3. What does contributory negligence do to a tort claim? — **It reduces damages in proportion to the claimant's share of fault; it does not bar the claim**

4. What is opinio juris? — **The belief that a state practice is legally obligatory, needed with settled practice to form custom**

5. Immunity of a foreign state: which acts are covered? — **Sovereign acts (jure imperii); not ordinary commercial acts (jure gestionis)**

6. Quick check for a necessary assumption in logic? — **Negate it; if the conclusion then collapses, it was a necessary assumption**

7. Name the flaw in 'A comes before B, so A caused B' or 'groups differ, so the treatment caused it'. — **Confusing correlation (or prior difference) with causation**

8. Divide N in the ratio a : b; what is the first share? — **N x a / (a + b)**

9. Overall average of groups of different sizes? — **Total of all values divided by total count (weighted by size), never the mean of the group averages**