CLAT Gurukul — By Ready For Exam

Daily Practice Sheet — Answers, Skills & Examiner Notes — 7 November 2026

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

ANSWER KEY — 7 NOVEMBER 2026

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

LEGAL REASONING

Q1 C — Res gestae: statement during the transaction — MED

Section 4 makes relevant any fact that, though not itself in issue, is so connected with a fact in issue as to form part of the same transaction. The passage adds the test for statements: a statement qualifies if it was made during the transaction, or so immediately after it that there was no opportunity to concoct. Kiran's scream was uttered while the stabbing was taking place, so it is part of the very transaction in issue, the killing, and the shopkeeper who heard it can depose to it. Nothing in the passage requires the words to be written or signed; that idea is invented. Section 6's Explanation concerns when a statement counts as 'conduct', which is a different head of relevancy, and does not exclude a statement that is relevant under section 4. Section 8 is about things said or done by conspirators in reference to a common intention; Kiran was the victim, not a conspirator, so section 8 has no application. The correct ground is therefore section 4.

> **Examiner's note — the trap:** The trap is option B: it imports the section 6 Explanation on 'conduct' into a question that turns on section 4, a separate head under which a contemporaneous statement is relevant in its own right.

Q2 A — Res gestae: interval allowing reflection — HARD

The passage states that a statement is part of the transaction only if made during it or so immediately after it that there was no opportunity to concoct, and that a narrative given after an interval that allowed reflection is not part of the transaction. Rafiq spoke three hours after the assault, after treatment and rest, and gave a detailed account of who attacked him and why. That is a considered narrative of a past event, not a spontaneous part of the event itself, which is the very kind of statement the Supreme Court declined to treat as res gestae in Gentela Vijayavardhan Rao. The words 'at different times and places' in section 4 extend to connected facts that are themselves part of one transaction; they do not convert a later narrative into part of the transaction. Nor is any category of statement automatically included, and the identity of the listener, nurse or magistrate, is not the test; the test is the absence of an opportunity to reflect.

> **Examiner's note — the trap:** Option B is attractive because it quotes the statute's 'different times and places' clause, but that clause describes connected facts within one transaction and cannot rescue a reflective narrative given hours later.

Q3 D — Motive, preparation and subsequent conduct — MED

Section 6 makes relevant any fact that shows or constitutes a motive or preparation for a fact in issue, and also the previous or subsequent conduct of a party if that conduct influences or is influenced by a fact in issue. The fact in issue is whether Leela poisoned her husband. Her expectation of inheriting his flat shows a motive, so it is relevant even though inheritance is otherwise a civil matter. Buying arsenic two days before the death is preparation for the act alleged. Burning his letters the day after the death is subsequent conduct, and conduct of this kind, destroying papers immediately after the event, is the sort that may be influenced by the fact in issue, so it is relevant too. The section expressly includes 'subsequent' conduct, so the timing of the burning does not exclude it. Relevance does not mean that any one of these facts proves guilt; it means each may be placed before the court and weighed. All three are relevant.

> **Examiner's note — the trap:** Option B tempts students who think only pre-offence facts matter, but section 6 expressly covers 'previous or subsequent conduct', so destroying letters after the death is squarely within it.

Q4 B — Explanation to section 6: statements as conduct — HARD

Section 6 makes the conduct of a party relevant, but its Explanation says that 'conduct' does not include statements unless those statements accompany and explain acts other than statements. Statement (ii) was shouted while Sunil was running from the burning shed; it accompanied a physical act, his flight, and explained it, showing the spirit in which he was leaving the fire. It therefore falls within 'conduct'. Statement (i) was a bare denial made a week later at home; it accompanied no act at all, so it is a mere statement and is excluded from 'conduct' by the Explanation. Option A ignores the Explanation altogether. Option D overstates it: the Explanation does

NAME: _____ ROLL NO: _____ BATCH: _____

not exclude every statement, only statements that do not accompany and explain acts. Option C inverts the rule by preferring a considered denial; the calmness of a statement has nothing to do with whether it is conduct. Only (ii) is conduct under section 6.

> **Examiner's note — the trap:** Option D is the trap for students who remember only the first half of the Explanation; the exception for statements that accompany and explain acts is what makes (ii) conduct.

Q5 C Stretch: section 8 timing and the end of the conspiracy ELITE

Section 8 makes relevant, against each conspirator, anything said, done or written by any one of them in reference to the common intention, after the time when that intention was first entertained by any one of them. The starting point is the moment the intention was first entertained by anyone, not the moment a particular accused joined. Amar and Bala formed the intention in January, so Amar's February letter about the guard rota, written in reference to the plan, is relevant against Chetan even though Chetan joined only in March. Bala's account to the police in May stands differently. By then all three had been arrested and the common intention had come to an end; the account is a narrative of a past plan, not something said in reference to a live common intention. Mirza Akbar holds that section 8 does not reach such post-arrest statements. So the letter is relevant against Chetan and Bala's account is not.

> **Examiner's note — the trap:** Option D reverses the timing rule: section 8 runs from when the intention was first entertained by any one conspirator, so a letter written before Chetan joined still counts, while a post-arrest narrative does not.

Q6 B Definition of online money game: skill is irrelevant MED

The passage defines an online money game as an online game, irrespective of whether it is based on skill, chance or both, played by paying fees, depositing money or other stakes in the expectation of winning, where winning brings monetary enrichment in return. FantasyXI's users pay a Rs 49 entry fee, play in the expectation of winning, and winners share a cash prize pool, so every element is present. FantasyXI's argument that winning depends on knowledge is answered by the words 'irrespective of whether it is based on skill, chance or both': the Act deliberately removes the older skill-versus-chance distinction for games played for money. The contests cannot be online social games, because those involve no wagering of money or other stakes, and the entry fee here buys a chance at cash. Nor are they e-sports merely because they are competitive and organised; the passage does not treat every organised contest as e-sports, and the cash stake is what places FantasyXI in the money-game category.

> **Examiner's note — the trap:** Option A carries the pre-2025 intuition that games of skill are lawful; the Act's definition expressly applies whether the game rests on skill, chance or both.

Q7 D Subscription fee versus stake HARD

The Act separates a fee that buys access from a stake placed in the expectation of winning. An online social game, the passage says, involves no wagering of money or other stakes, but may be offered for a subscription fee or a one-time access fee. GambitPro's Rs 199 is a monthly subscription; it is paid whether a user wins or loses and it does not buy a chance at a return. The monthly winners get a profile badge, not money or any redeemable reward, so winning brings no monetary or other enrichment in return for a stake. The definition of an online money game requires both elements, a stake and enrichment from winning, and neither is present. GambitPro is therefore an online social game, a category the Act recognises and promotes. Option B wrongly treats every fee as a stake, which the passage contradicts, and option C invents a rule that every competitive paid game must be e-sports.

> **Examiner's note — the trap:** Option A is the trap: it notices money and competition but misses that a subscription is an access fee, not a stake, and that a badge is no enrichment.

Q8 A Who is liable: offer, advertise, facilitate HARD

The Act creates three sets of prohibitions. It forbids offering an online money game, or aiding, abetting or inducing its offering; it forbids making or causing to be made an advertisement that promotes or induces anyone to play such a game; and it forbids banks, financial institutions and any other person to facilitate or authorise a payment for such a game. A poker app on which Arjun deposits money to win more is an online money game, so its operator offers one. PayQuick knowingly processed the deposit, which is facilitating a payment. The cricketer appeared in a paid advertisement promoting the app, which falls within the advertising prohibition. Arjun's position differs. The passage says expressly that mere playing is not an offence and that users are treated as the people the law protects. His deposit is part of playing; reading it as 'aiding the offering' would defeat that express choice. Three persons are liable: the operator, PayQuick and the cricketer.

> **Examiner's note — the trap:** Option C stretches 'aid or abet' to catch the player himself, but the passage states plainly that mere playing is not an offence and that users are protected, not punished.

Q9 C Stretch: other stakes and non-cash enrichment ELITE

The definition is wider than cash. A user may play by paying fees, depositing money or 'other stakes', and winning must entail 'monetary and other enrichment' in return for the money or other stakes. On RummyRaja, coins are bought with money and then staked on each game, so they are other stakes paid for with money. Coins won are converted into shopping vouchers, which have money's worth; that is enrichment in return for the stake. RummyRaja's first defence, that it never pays cash, fails because the definition expressly reaches stakes and enrichment other than cash. Its second defence, that rummy is a game of skill, fails because the definition applies irrespective of whether the game rests on skill, chance or both. The game is not a social game either: a social game involves no wagering of money or other stakes, whereas staking purchased coins is wagering. RummyRaja therefore offers an online money game.

Examiner's note — the trap: Option A is the trap: it reads 'monetary' alone and forgets 'other stakes' and 'other enrichment', the very words that catch coin-and-voucher schemes.

LOGICAL REASONING

Q10 A Matching a valid contrapositive (modus tollens) MED

Argument I has the form: every A is B; this individual is not B; so this individual is not A. Appearing before the tribunal (A) requires enrolment (B); Neha lacks B, so she cannot be A. This is valid, because if every A is B, anything that is not B cannot be A. Option A has exactly this form: every train halting at Itarsi (A) takes water there (B); the Gondwana Express took no water (not B); so it did not halt (not A). Option B affirms the consequent: from B it infers A, which is invalid because trains might take water without halting under the rule. Option C denies the antecedent: from not A it infers not B, which is also invalid. Option D starts from 'some trains', a weaker premise that cannot support any conclusion about a train that took no water, because the trains that halt without taking water may include the Gondwana Express. Only option A reproduces Argument I's valid structure.

Examiner's note — the trap: Option C looks parallel because it uses the same three terms, but it runs the inference from 'did not halt' to 'took no water', which denies the antecedent and is invalid.

Q11 C Spotting affirming the consequent HARD

Argument II says that whenever the server crashes (P), the cause list is late (Q); the list was late (Q); so the server crashed (P). This affirms the consequent: Q can occur for other reasons, a sick clerk or a late order, so Q does not establish P. Option C has the same form: whenever the umpire falls ill (P), the match is delayed (Q); the match was delayed (Q); so the umpire fell ill (P). Rain or a late team could equally cause the delay, which is the same gap. Option A denies the antecedent, a different error: from not P it infers not Q. Option B is a valid modus tollens, from not Q to not P. Option D is a valid modus ponens, from P to Q. So only option C commits the same error as Argument II. The question asks for the same flaw, not merely any flaw, which is why option A, though also invalid, must be rejected.

Examiner's note — the trap: Option A is the trap: it is also invalid, but it denies the antecedent rather than affirming the consequent, so its error is not the same as Argument II's.

Q12 B Chaining 'most' statements HARD

Argument III chains two 'most' statements: most committee members are senior advocates, and most senior advocates oppose the dress code, so most committee members oppose it. The inference fails because the committee members who are senior advocates may all fall within the minority of senior advocates who do not oppose the code. 'Most' in each premise does not guarantee overlap. Option B repeats this exactly with residents, teachers and bus commuters: the residents who are teachers may be among the teachers who do not take the bus. Option A chains two 'all' statements, which is valid. Option C has a 'most' premise followed by an 'every' premise; since every teacher commutes by bus and most residents are teachers, most residents do commute by bus, so it is valid. Option D likewise is valid, because if no teacher uses the bus and most residents are teachers, most residents do not use the bus. Only option B shares the flaw.

Examiner's note — the trap: Option C is tempting because it begins with the same 'most' premise, but replacing the second 'most' with 'every' makes the conclusion follow, so the flaw disappears.

Q13 D Stretch: disjunctive syllogism versus affirming a disjunct ELITE

Argument IV is a disjunctive syllogism: either P or Q; not Q; therefore P. Since at least one of the two alternatives holds and one has been ruled out, the other must hold; the argument is valid. Option D has the identical form: either the meter is faulty (P) or the tenant used more power (Q); the meter is not faulty (not P); so the tenant used more power (Q). The order of the disjuncts does not matter. Option A affirms a disjunct: from 'the witness lied' it concludes that the camera did not err. That is invalid with an ordinary 'or', which allows both alternatives to be true. Option B affirms the consequent of a conditional, a different and invalid form. Option C is valid, but its form is different: it moves from a conjunction, both things are true, to a disjunction. The question asks for the same valid pattern, so only option D qualifies.

Examiner's note — the trap: Option C is the trap for students who look only for a valid argument; it is valid, but it infers a disjunction from a conjunction instead of eliminating one alternative.

Q14 A Bold-face roles: accepted finding and intermediate claim HARD

The economist 'disputes the inference, though not the figure'. So the first boldface, the forty per cent fall since the cameras were installed, is a finding she accepts as accurate; what she disputes is what it shows. The second boldface, that the figure cannot by itself tell us how much of the fall the cameras produced, is a claim she draws about that finding, supported by the coincidence with the widening and barriers and by the steepest fall being on camera-free bends. It is not her final conclusion; that comes in the third boldface, the recommendation about which highways should get cameras first. Option B is wrong because she accepts the figure's accuracy. Option C wrongly makes the second boldface her main conclusion. Option D misdescribes both: she does not rely on the forty per cent figure for her proposal, and she never abandons the second claim. Option A captures the structure exactly.

Examiner's note — the trap: Option B is the trap: it treats a dispute about significance as a dispute about accuracy, which the passage rules out with the words 'though not the figure'.

Q15 D Identifying the main conclusion MED

The third boldface opens with 'therefore', signalling that it is drawn from what came before, and nothing in the passage is offered in support of anything beyond it. It recommends that cameras go first to highways like the flat stretch and that their effect be measured before wider spread. Her earlier claim that the forty per cent figure cannot isolate the cameras' effect explains why she does not endorse the officials' blanket plan, and the flat-stretch result explains why she still favours cameras on suitable roads. Both lead to this recommendation, which is therefore her main conclusion. It is not an objection she answers, option A, because she endorses it. It is not the officials' recommendation, option B; theirs was cameras on every highway. It does not support the second boldface, option C; the support runs the other way, from the second boldface towards the third.

> **Examiner's note — the trap:** Option C reverses the direction of support; the word 'therefore' marks the third boldface as what the other claims support, not a premise for them.

Q16 B Method: alternative cause HARD

The officials reason from a before-and-after fall in deaths to the conclusion that cameras caused it. The economist does not challenge the numbers; she points out that the highway was widened and fitted with crash barriers in the same year as the cameras, and that the fall was steepest on the barrier-fitted bends, which have no cameras. Her method is to identify a concurrent change that offers an alternative explanation for much of the fall, so that the figure cannot be credited to cameras alone. Option A is wrong because she accepts the figure. Option C is wrong because she expressly 'does not oppose cameras' and cites a fall on the flat stretch that she attributes to them. Option D is wrong because she says nothing about the officials' motives; her objection is purely about the inference. This alternative-cause method is the standard way of attacking a causal claim built on a correlation in time.

> **Examiner's note — the trap:** Option C tempts readers who see her as an opponent of cameras, but she says plainly that she does not oppose them and relies on evidence that they work on the flat stretch.

Q17 A Stretch: function of a controlled comparison ELITE

The flat stretch is the part of the same highway on which no barriers were built. A fall of a fifth there after cameras arrived cannot be explained by the barriers, so it isolates the cameras' contribution more cleanly; the economist calls it 'the cleaner test'. It does two things in her argument: it shows that her objection to the officials' inference is not hostility to cameras, and it supplies the evidence for her positive proposal that cameras be extended first to similar highways. Option B is wrong because a fall of a fifth does not repeat the forty per cent figure; the difference is precisely why the larger figure overstates the cameras' effect. Option C overreaches: the flat stretch shows a fall without barriers, but proves nothing about whether barriers work elsewhere. Option D is wrong because she recommends a staged extension, not cameras on every highway at once.

> **Examiner's note — the trap:** Option C is the trap: a fall where no barriers exist says nothing about barriers being useless; if anything, the steeper fall on the barrier bends suggests barriers matter.

QUANTITATIVE TECHNIQUES

Q18 B Annual profit from a toll caselet MED

Daily toll revenue = 8,000 x 100 + 2,000 x 155 + 2,200 x 350 + 2,000 x 560 = 8,00,000 + 3,10,000 + 7,70,000 + 11,20,000 = Rs 30,00,000, that is Rs 30 lakh a day. Annual revenue = 30 lakh x 365 = Rs 10,950 lakh = Rs 109.5 crore. The concession fee is 10 per cent of revenue, Rs 10.95 crore. Simple interest on the Rs 300 crore loan at 10 per cent is Rs 30 crore a year. Operation and maintenance cost Rs 28 crore. Annual profit = 109.5 - 10.95 - 28 - 30 = Rs 40.55 crore. Rs 51.50 crore omits the concession fee; Rs 70.55 crore omits the interest; Rs 46.35 crore wrongly charges the 10 per cent fee on profit (51.50 x 0.9) instead of on revenue. Only Rs 40.55 crore deducts all three charges as the passage defines them. Note also that the Rs 500 crore construction cost is not deducted; the definition of profit does not include it.

> **Examiner's note — the trap:** Rs 46.35 crore is the trap: it takes 10 per cent of the profit instead of 10 per cent of toll revenue, the base the passage specifies for the concession fee.

Q19 D Compensating a revenue loss through one price HARD

Car, jeep and van revenue is 8,000 x 100 = Rs 8,00,000 a day. A 15 per cent fall in those trips is 1,200 trips, a loss of 1,200 x 100 = Rs 1,20,000 a day. Other traffic is unchanged, so the whole loss must be made up from multi-axle vehicles, whose present revenue is 2,000 x 560 = Rs 11,20,000 a day. Required rise in the multi-axle toll = 1,20,000 / 11,20,000 x 100 = 10.71 per cent, about 10.7 per cent. Check: new multi-axle toll = 560 x 1.10714 = Rs 620 per trip; 2,000 x 620 = Rs 12,40,000, which is Rs 1,20,000 more than before, exactly offsetting the loss. The 15 per cent option simply copies the fall in car trips; 4.0 per cent expresses the loss as a share of total revenue rather than of multi-axle revenue; 15.6 per cent divides the loss by bus and two-axle truck revenue of Rs 7,70,000, the wrong class.

> **Examiner's note — the trap:** 4.0 per cent is the trap: it is the loss as a share of total revenue, but the rise must be measured against multi-axle revenue alone, the only stream being increased.

Q20 A Compound versus simple interest HARD

Under the present terms the company pays simple interest of 10 per cent of Rs 300 crore, Rs 30 crore, every year, so over three years it pays 3 x 30 = Rs 90 crore of interest. Under the alternative, interest compounds annually and is paid in one sum after three years. Amount = 300 x (1.1)^3 = 300 x 1.331 = Rs 399.3 crore, so the interest is 399.3 - 300 = Rs 99.3 crore. The extra interest is 99.3 - 90 = Rs 9.3 crore. A quick check uses the standard result for three years: CI - SI = P x r^2 x (3 + r) = 300 x 0.01 x 3.1 = Rs 9.3 crore. Rs 9.00 crore charges 10 per cent on the accumulated simple interest only, Rs 3 crore in year two and Rs 6 crore in year three, missing the interest on year two's interest; Rs 30 crore is one year's interest; Rs 99.30 crore is the whole compound interest, not the difference.

Examiner's note — the trap: Rs 9.00 crore is the trap: it charges interest on the simple interest already due but forgets that in year three interest is also charged on year two's Rs 3 crore of interest on interest.

Q21 C Percentage change in profit after a fee change HARD

At present the concession fee is 10 per cent of Rs 109.5 crore, Rs 10.95 crore, and annual profit is Rs 40.55 crore. With a fixed fee of Rs 14 crore, profit = 109.5 - 14 - 28 - 30 = Rs 37.5 crore. Profit therefore falls by 40.55 - 37.5 = Rs 3.05 crore. As a percentage of the present profit, the fall is 3.05 / 40.55 x 100 = 7.52 per cent, about 7.5 per cent. The distractors each use a wrong base or direction. 3.05 / 37.5 = 8.13 per cent uses the new profit as the base; stating it as a fall of 8.1 per cent uses the wrong base, and stating it as a rise of 8.1 per cent also gets the direction wrong, because the fixed fee of Rs 14 crore is larger than the present fee of Rs 10.95 crore. 3.05 / 109.5 = 2.8 per cent measures the fall against revenue rather than against profit.

Examiner's note — the trap: Fall by about 8.1 per cent is the trap: it divides the Rs 3.05 crore drop by the new profit of Rs 37.5 crore, whereas a percentage change is measured on the original figure.

Q22 B Stretch: required price rise with a traffic response ELITE

Target profit = 25 per cent of Rs 200 crore equity = Rs 50 crore. Profit = 0.9R - 28 - 30, where R is annual toll revenue, because the 10 per cent fee comes off revenue. So 0.9R - 58 = 50, giving R = 108 / 0.9 = Rs 120 crore. If car, jeep and van trips fall by 5 per cent, they fall by 400 trips, and at present tolls daily revenue becomes 30,00,000 - 400 x 100 = Rs 29,60,000; annual = 29.6 lakh x 365 = Rs 108.04 crore. Every toll rises by the same factor k, so 108.04k = 120, k = 1.1107, a rise of about 11.1 per cent. Without the fall in car trips the rise would be 120 / 109.5 - 1 = 9.6 per cent, which is the first distractor. 15.4 per cent wrongly applies the 5 per cent fall to all traffic, and 23.3 per cent is the percentage rise in profit needed (50 / 40.55 - 1), not in tolls.

Examiner's note — the trap: 9.6 per cent is the trap: it is correct only if traffic does not respond, but the question builds in a 5 per cent fall in car trips that must be offset as well.

Q23 D Comparing percentage increases MED

Percentage increase in votes polled = (2024 votes - 2019 votes) / 2019 votes x 100. Amargarh: (1,161 - 1,040) / 1,040 = 121 / 1,040 = 11.63 per cent. Belapur: (897 - 900) / 900 = -0.33 per cent, a small fall. Chandpur: (1,300 - 1,080) / 1,080 = 220 / 1,080 = 20.37 per cent. Devgarh: (1,080 - 980) / 980 = 100 / 980 = 10.20 per cent. Eklavya Nagar: (728 - 580) / 580 = 148 / 580 = 25.52 per cent. The largest percentage increase is therefore in Eklavya Nagar, about 25.5 per cent. Chandpur has the largest absolute increase, 220 thousand votes against Eklavya Nagar's 148 thousand, but it starts from a much larger base of 1,080 thousand, so its percentage rise is smaller. A percentage comparison must always divide each change by its own starting figure; ranking by the size of the raw change gives the wrong answer here.

Examiner's note — the trap: Chandpur is the trap: it has the biggest absolute rise, 220 thousand votes, but on a base nearly twice Eklavya Nagar's its percentage increase is lower.

Q24 A Percentage change versus percentage points HARD

Combined electors: 2019 = 1,600 + 1,250 + 1,800 + 1,400 + 1,000 = 7,050 thousand; 2024 = 1,720 + 1,300 + 2,000 + 1,500 + 1,120 = 7,640 thousand. Combined votes: 2019 = 1,040 + 900 + 1,080 + 980 + 580 = 4,580 thousand; 2024 = 1,161 + 897 + 1,300 + 1,080 + 728 = 5,166 thousand. Turnout 2019 = 4,580 / 7,050 = 64.96 per cent; turnout 2024 = 5,166 / 7,640 = 67.62 per cent. The change is 67.62 - 64.96 = 2.65 percentage points. As a percentage change, 2.65 / 64.96 x 100 = 4.08 per cent, about 4.1 per cent. The second option swaps the two measures. 12.8 per cent is the rise in votes polled (5,166 / 4,580 - 1), and 8.4 per cent is the rise in electors (7,640 / 7,050 - 1); neither is a change in turnout, which is the ratio of the two. The passage defines both measures, so the answer must state the percentage change correctly.

Examiner's note — the trap: The second option is the trap: it swaps percentage points and percentage change, the exact distinction the passage defines before the questions.

Q25 C Shortfall against a constant rate HARD

Belapur's 2019 turnout was 900 / 1,250 = 72 per cent. Its 2024 turnout was 897 / 1,300 = 69 per cent. Had turnout stayed at 72 per cent in 2024, votes polled would have been 72 per cent of the 2024 electorate: 0.72 x 1,300 = 936 thousand. Actual votes were 897 thousand, so the shortfall is 936 - 897 = 39 thousand, that is 39,000 votes. Equivalently, the three-point fall in turnout applied to the 2024 electorate gives 0.03 x 1,300 thousand = 39,000. The 37,500 option applies the three-point fall to the 2019 electorate of 1,250 thousand, the wrong year. The 3,000 option is merely the fall in actual votes from 900 to 897 thousand, which ignores that the electorate grew. The 27,000 option applies three per cent to the 2019 votes polled, which is not the base on which turnout is calculated.

Examiner's note — the trap: 37,500 is the trap: the three-point fall is right, but the counterfactual concerns 2024, so it must be applied to the 2024 electorate of 1,300 thousand.

Q26 B Stretch: successive growth rates and a ratio ELITE

From 2019 to 2024 Eklavya Nagar's electorate grew from 1,000 to 1,120 thousand, a rise of 12 per cent; its votes polled grew from 580 to 728 thousand, a rise of 148 / 580 = 25.52 per cent. For 2029: electorate = 1,120 x 1.12 = 1,254.4 thousand. Votes grow by half of 25.52 per cent, that is 12.76 per cent: 728 x 1.1276 = 820.9 thousand. Turnout 2029 = 820.9 / 1,254.4 = 65.44 per cent, about 65.4 per cent, slightly above the 2024 turnout of 728 / 1,120 = 65.0 per cent. The rise is small because votes grow only 0.76 point faster than the electorate. 72.8 per cent applies the full 25.5 per cent growth to votes; 65.0 per cent assumes the two growth rates are equal, which they are not;

63.9 per cent halves the absolute rise of 148 thousand votes instead of the percentage rise. Only 65.4 per cent follows the stated assumptions.

> **Examiner's note — the trap:** 65.0 per cent is the trap: halving 25.5 per cent gives 12.76 per cent, which is close to but still above the electorate's 12 per cent growth, so turnout edges up rather than standing still.

RAPID FIRE — ANSWERS

1. Which Act replaced the Indian Evidence Act, 1872? — **The Bharatiya Sakshya Adhiniyam, 2023**

2. Under BSA s.3, of which facts may evidence be given? — **Only facts in issue and facts declared relevant**

3. Which BSA section contains the rule of res gestae? — **Section 4: facts forming part of the same transaction**

4. Can facts at different times and places form part of the same transaction? — **Yes, s.4 expressly covers them**

5. When is a statement part of the res gestae? — **When made during the transaction or so soon after that there was no chance to concoct**

6. Is a narrative given after time for reflection res gestae? — **No, it is not part of the transaction**

7. Which 1996 Supreme Court case refused res gestae to later recorded statements? — **Gentela Vijayavardhan Rao v. State of Andhra Pradesh**

8. Which BSA section makes motive and preparation relevant? — **Section 6**

9. Is subsequent conduct of a party relevant under s.6? — **Yes, if it influences or is influenced by a fact in issue**

10. When does a statement count as 'conduct' under s.6? — **Only when it accompanies and explains an act other than a statement**

11. Is a bare denial made a week later 'conduct'? — **No, it accompanies no act**

12. Which BSA section deals with things said or done by conspirators? — **Section 8**

13. From when do a conspirator's acts become relevant under s.8? — **From when the common intention was first entertained by any one of them**

14. Is a letter written before an accused joined the conspiracy relevant against him? — **Yes, if written in reference to the common intention after it was formed**

15. Which Privy Council case excluded post-arrest statements under the conspiracy rule? — **Mirza Akbar v. King-Emperor (1940)**

16. For what two purposes is s.8 evidence relevant? — **To prove the conspiracy and to show that a person was party to it**

17. In the Leela case, what did buying arsenic show? — **Preparation**

18. In the Leela case, what did the expected inheritance show? — **Motive**

19. When was the Promotion and Regulation of Online Gaming Act enacted? — **August 2025**

20. Into how many groups does the 2025 Act sort online games? — **Three: e-sports, online social games and online money games**

21. Which category of online game does the 2025 Act prohibit? — **Online money games**