ANSWER KEY — 15 NOVEMBER 2026

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

LEGAL REASONING

Q1 **B** ***Art 200: withholding assent must be followed by return of the Bill*** MED

Article 200 lists withholding assent as one of the Governor's three courses, but the passage explains how both 2025 rulings read that course. The two-judge Bench in State of Tamil Nadu v Governor of Tamil Nadu held that a Governor who withholds assent must follow the first proviso and return the Bill, and cannot simply keep it pending. The Constitution Bench, answering the Presidential Reference in November 2025, accepted that withholding assent must be accompanied by return of the Bill to the House. The Governor of State X recorded that he withholds assent but sent no message and kept the Bill in his office, so he did not follow the course the Court requires. Option A reads the bare words of Article 200 and ignores how both rulings read them. Option C relies on a time limit; the Constitution Bench held that courts cannot impose time limits, and in any case the defect here is the failure to return, not delay. Option D wrongly treats the outcome of reconsideration as a reason to skip it. Option B is correct.

> **Examiner's note — the trap:** Option A is the trap: withholding assent does appear in Article 200, but the passage says both rulings require the Bill to be returned when assent is withheld.

Q2 **D** ***First proviso to Art 200: no withholding after re-passage*** HARD

The first proviso to Article 200 allows the Governor to return a Bill that is not a Money Bill with a message asking the House to reconsider it. It then states the consequence: if the House passes the Bill again, with or without amendments, and presents it to the Governor, he shall not withhold assent from it. Here the House reconsidered the Bill and passed it again with two amendments of its own. The words 'with or without amendments' cover exactly this situation, so the Governor's fresh declaration that he withholds assent is not open to him. Option A treats the amendments as creating a new Bill, but the proviso expressly includes re-passage with amendments. Option B reverses the text by confining the bar to Bills passed without amendment. Option C borrows the six-month period from Article 201, which governs Bills returned on the President's direction, and attaches it to Article 200, which contains no such period. Option D applies the proviso exactly as worded and is the answer.

> **Examiner's note — the trap:** Option A is the trap: it sounds reasonable that an amended Bill is a new Bill, but the proviso says the bar applies whether the House passes it again with or without amendments.

Q3 **A** ***Art 201: President not bound to assent after reconsideration*** HARD

Article 201 governs a Bill reserved for the President. He may assent or withhold assent, and where the Bill is not a Money Bill he may direct the Governor to return it for reconsideration. The House must reconsider it within six months, and if it is passed again it is presented once more for the President's consideration. The passage adds, pointedly, that nothing in Article 201 obliges the President to assent at that stage. The House here acted within four months and passed the Bill again, so the procedure was followed, but the result is only that the Bill goes back to the President for his consideration; he remains free to decide. Option B transfers to the President the bar in the first proviso to Article 200, which binds only the Governor. Option C confuses compliance with the six-month period with a duty to assent. Option D invents a rule that a reserved Bill lapses after three months; the passage contains no such rule, and the Constitution Bench rejected court-made time limits. Option A is correct.

> **Examiner's note — the trap:** Option B is the trap: the bar on withholding assent after re-passage belongs to the Governor under Article 200 and is not repeated for the President in Article 201.

Q4 **C** ***Presidential Reference 2025: no deemed assent, limited mandamus*** ELITE

The passage sets out what the Constitution Bench decided on the Presidential Reference in November 2025. Courts cannot impose time limits that the Constitution does not prescribe, there is no concept of 'deemed assent', and Article 142 cannot be used to substitute the Court's decision for that of the Governor or the President. The opinion nevertheless leaves one remedy: where the Governor's inaction is prolonged, unexplained and indefinite, a court may issue a limited direction asking him to decide within a reasonable time, without commenting on the merits. Twenty-six months of silence with no reason given is prolonged, unexplained and indefinite inaction, so that limited direction is available. Option A relies on the April 2025 time limits and on deemed assent, both of which the Constitution Bench rejected. Option B asks the Court to do what the opinion forbids, namely to use Article 142 to grant assent itself. Option D overstates the position, because the opinion expressly permits limited judicial scrutiny of indefinite inaction. Option C is correct.

NAME: _____ ROLL NO: _____ BATCH: _____

Examiner's note — the trap: Option A is the trap: it follows the April 2025 two-judge ruling, but the later Constitution Bench opinion held that there is no deemed assent and no court-imposed time limit.

Q5 **A** *Second proviso to Art 200: compulsory reservation* MED

The second proviso to Article 200 deals with one kind of Bill: a Bill which, in the Governor's opinion, would, if it became law, so derogate from the powers of the High Court as to endanger the position that the Constitution designs for that Court. For such a Bill the proviso does not leave a choice; it obliges the Governor to reserve the Bill for the consideration of the President. The facts state that the Bill takes away the High Court's power to hear appeals in land-revenue cases and that the Governor holds exactly that opinion, so he must reserve it. Option B wrongly makes withholding and return the required course, when the proviso requires reservation. Option C invents a condition that reservation may come only after reconsideration; nothing in the passage supports it. Option D also imposes a first round of reconsideration that the second proviso does not require, and treats reservation as optional when it is compulsory. Option A states the rule correctly and is the answer.

Examiner's note — the trap: Option D is the trap: returning the Bill first sounds cautious, but once the Governor holds the stated opinion the second proviso requires reservation for the President.

Q6 **C** *S 2(d) Designs Act: mechanical device excluded* MED

Section 2(d) of the Designs Act, 2000 defines a design as only the features of shape, configuration, pattern, ornament or composition of lines or colours that, in the finished article, appeal to and are judged solely by the eye. It expressly excludes any mode or principle of construction and anything that is in substance a mere mechanical device. Rekha's ratchet is hidden inside the tap, cannot be seen and does not change how the tap looks; its value lies entirely in how the tap works. It is therefore a mechanical device outside the definition, and the question of novelty never arises. Option A focuses on novelty, but novelty matters only for something that is a design in the first place. Option B reads section 2(d) as if application by an industrial process were enough, ignoring the requirement that the features be judged solely by the eye. Option D goes too far: a functional article such as a tap can carry a registered design for its visible shape; what is excluded is a functional feature, not a functional article. Option C is correct.

Examiner's note — the trap: Option D is the trap: the Act excludes mechanical features, not useful articles, so a tap with a new visible shape could still be registered.

Q7 **B** *S 22(3) Designs Act: cancellation grounds as defence* HARD

Under section 4, a design cannot be registered if it was disclosed to the public anywhere in India or in any other country, by publication in tangible form, by use or in any other way, before the filing date. Lumen filed in January 2025, but in 2024 it had already sold the shade in Dubai and displayed it on its online shop. That is prior disclosure to the public, so the registration was open to cancellation. The passage then supplies the procedural link: in a piracy suit, the defendant may plead as a defence any ground on which registration could be cancelled under section 19, such as prior publication. Glowco may therefore defeat the suit by proving the earlier disclosure. Option A wrongly treats registration as beyond challenge in a piracy suit. Option C confines novelty to India, whereas section 4 covers disclosure in any other country. Option D invents an exemption for the proprietor's own disclosure; the section speaks of disclosure to the public by any means, without regard to who made it. Option B is correct.

Examiner's note — the trap: Option D is the trap: it feels unfair to hold a designer's own sales against him, but section 4 bars any prior public disclosure, including the applicant's own.

Q8 **D** *S 22(2) Designs Act: Rs 25,000 per contravention, Rs 50,000 cap* ELITE

Piracy under section 22 means applying the registered design, without consent and for sale, to an article in a class in which the design is registered. Rajat's three uses on bottles are in the registered class, so each is a contravention. His use on drinking glasses is in a class where the design is not registered, so it is not piracy at all. For every contravention the proprietor may recover up to Rs 25,000 as a contract debt, which would give 3 x Rs 25,000 = Rs 75,000. But the passage adds a ceiling: the total recoverable in this way in respect of any one design cannot exceed Rs 50,000. Nayan therefore recovers at most Rs 50,000. Option A counts the glasses, which fall outside the registered class, and ignores the cap. Option B counts correctly but stops before applying the cap. Option C treats the Rs 25,000 figure as a single overall limit, when it is a limit per contravention. If Nayan wants more, the passage's alternative is a suit for damages and an injunction. Option D is correct.

Examiner's note — the trap: Option B is the trap: three contraventions at Rs 25,000 each is the right first step, but the fifty-thousand-rupee cap for one design then applies.

Q9 **A** *S 15(2) Copyright Act: unregistered design reproduced over 50 times* HARD

Priya's pattern is capable of registration as a design but was never registered, so the passage sends her to section 15(2) of the Copyright Act, 1957. Copyright in such a design ceases as soon as any article to which it has been applied has been reproduced more than fifty times by an industrial process, either by the owner or, with his licence, by any other person. Her licensee mill printed 3,000 sheets, far more than fifty, so her copyright in the design has ended and the rival's copying gives her no claim under the Copyright Act. Option B treats the pattern as an ordinary artistic work, but section 15(2) specifically governs designs capable of registration and overrides that general protection once the fifty-copy threshold is crossed. Option C overstates the rule: copyright can exist in such a pattern until the threshold is passed. Option D ignores the words 'with his licence, by any other person', which count reproduction by a licensee. Option A is correct.

Examiner's note — the trap: Option D is the trap: reproduction by a licensee counts exactly as reproduction by the owner for the fifty-copy rule in section 15(2).

LOGICAL REASONING

Q10 **D** ***Necessary assumption: the new intermediary*** HARD

The secretary reasons that because there will be no traders and no shops in the chain, the 40 per cent margin they now take will reach the weavers. That step quietly treats the online marketplace as if it were not an intermediary at all. A marketplace is itself a seller's agent and normally charges for its service. Apply the negation test to option D: suppose the marketplace does keep a share of each sale comparable to the 40 per cent that traders and shops now keep. Then the weaver would still receive about Rs 3,000 a sari, and the conclusion that she will earn at least Rs 4,000 collapses. So D is an assumption the argument needs. Option A, about the age of buyers, has no bearing on what a weaver earns per sari. Option B concerns how quickly the saris are listed, which does not affect earnings on each sari actually sold. Option C compares growth rates of online and shop sales, which the conclusion does not depend on. Option D is correct.

Examiner's note — the trap: Option C is the trap: it sounds supportive of selling online, but the conclusion is about earnings per sari, not about how fast online sales grow.

Q11 **B** ***Negation test: price assumption*** HARD

The secretary's figures depend on the online price. Rs 3,000 is 60 per cent of a shop price of Rs 5,000, and the target of at least Rs 4,000 is reached only if the saved 40 per cent margin, Rs 2,000, is available to be passed on. That calculation assumes buyers online pay about what shop buyers pay. Negate option B: suppose online buyers pay far less, say Rs 3,500 a sari. Then even with no intermediaries at all, a weaver cannot earn Rs 4,000 from that sari, and the conclusion fails. No other option has that effect. Option A, about weavers in other districts, might affect competition in the long run, but its negation does not by itself defeat a claim about each sari's earnings. Option C concerns traders, who are being bypassed anyway; their withdrawal is part of the plan. Option D concerns designs, and changing them would not necessarily reduce the earnings from each sari sold. Option B is correct.

Examiner's note — the trap: Option C is the trap: losing the traders sounds harmful, but the plan already removes them from the chain, so its negation does not touch the per-sari conclusion.

Q12 **C** ***Assumption EXCEPT: scope of the conclusion*** ELITE

The key to this question is the exact scope of the conclusion: every member's income from each sari she sells will rise by at least a third. It is a claim about earnings per sari, not about total income or sales volume. Options A, B and D each describe something that would eat into the Rs 2,000 margin the secretary expects to pass to the weaver on every sari: shipping costs (A), the cooperative keeping the receipts (B) and the cost of returns (D). If any of them were false, a weaver could earn less than Rs 4,000 a sari, so each is assumed. Option C is different. Even if online buyers bought fewer saris a month than the traders now buy, each sari that is sold could still earn the weaver Rs 4,000. Total income might fall, but the conclusion would remain true as stated. The argument therefore does not need option C. Option C is the exception and the answer.

Examiner's note — the trap: Option C is the trap in reverse: sales volume feels essential to higher income, but the conclusion is limited to income from each sari sold.

Q13 **A** ***Sufficient assumption: closing the gap*** MED

A sufficient assumption must, together with the passage, guarantee the conclusion that a weaver earns at least Rs 4,000 from each sari. Option A does this. If each sari sells for Rs 5,000, all selling costs together come to no more than Rs 1,000, and the rest goes to the weaver, she receives at least Rs 5,000 - Rs 1,000 = Rs 4,000, which is a rise of at least Rs 1,000 on Rs 3,000, or one-third. Option B fixes the price and the marketplace fee at Rs 500, but says nothing about shipping or other costs, or about whether the cooperative passes the money on, so the weaver might still receive less. Option C caps costs but leaves the price open; if saris sold for Rs 4,500, the weaver would receive only Rs 3,500. Selling more saris does not help a per-sari claim. Option D fixes a minimum price and the pass-through but leaves costs uncapped. Only option A closes every gap, so it is correct.

Examiner's note — the trap: Option B is the trap: a 10 per cent fee looks small enough, but without a cap on shipping and other costs the Rs 4,000 figure is not guaranteed.

Q14 **C** ***Flaw: self-selection mistaken for cause*** HARD

The office compares restaurants that displayed a sticker with those that did not and concludes that displaying a rating makes a restaurant cleaner. But the passage states that display was voluntary and each restaurant decided for itself whether to put up its rating. A restaurant with a high rating has every reason to display it; one with a poor rating has every reason to hide it. The displaying group was therefore likely to be the cleaner group from the start, and the gap in complaints may reflect who chose to display, not any effect of displaying. Option C names this self-selection flaw. Option A misreads the argument; the report measures food-poisoning complaints but never claims they are the only kind. Option B demands a figure that is not needed, because the comparison is a ratio of averages. Option D attacks the source's motives, which is not a flaw in the reasoning itself and would itself be a flawed criticism. Option C is correct.

Examiner's note — the trap: Option D is the trap: questioning the office's motives feels like a criticism, but it attacks the source rather than the reasoning, which is itself a fallacy.

Q15 **A** ***Parallel flaw: self-selected group generalised by compulsion*** ELITE

The office's argument has two linked steps. It takes a group that selected itself (restaurants that chose to display), treats that group's better results as caused by the chosen activity, and then predicts that forcing everyone to do the activity will bring everyone to the group's level. Option A repeats this structure exactly: pupils who chose optional revision classes scored higher, so making the classes compulsory will lift every pupil to that level, ignoring that the keener or stronger pupils may be the ones who chose to attend. Option B commits a different error, reversing a conditional statement. Option C wrongly applies a majority trait to one individual. Option D is the most tempting distractor because it is also a causal flaw, reasoning from sequence in time to cause, but it involves no self-selected group and no forecast that compulsion will spread a group's results to everyone. Only option A matches both steps of the office's reasoning, so it is correct.

> **Examiner's note — the trap:** Option D is the trap: it is a causal flaw too, but a post hoc one, with no self-selected group and no claim that compulsion will lift everyone to a group's level.

Q16 **D** *Flaw: single counter-example against an average* HARD

The report's claim is about averages: restaurants that displayed stickers received, on average, one complaint for every five received by those that did not. The association answers with one case, a restaurant with a top-grade sticker that was found with rats in its kitchen, and concludes that stickers have nothing to do with cleanliness. One exception cannot refute a claim about an average across many restaurants; an average can hold even when individual cases go the other way. Option D identifies this flaw. Option A describes an attack on motives, but the association attacks no one's motives; it offers a counter-example. Option B assumes a link between rats and complaints that the association never relies on. Option C attributes to the association a claim about restaurants without stickers, which its reply does not mention. The association's reasoning is weak for a reason that has nothing to do with the office's own flaw, so a student must read the reply on its own terms. Option D is correct.

> **Examiner's note — the trap:** Option A is the trap: the reply is hostile to the office, but its error is generalising from one case, not attacking anyone's motives.

Q17 **B** *Flaw: false dilemma* MED

The councillor says that either display is made compulsory or the city must accept that its restaurants will go on poisoning their customers. This presents only two choices as if they exhausted the possibilities. In fact a city could reduce food poisoning in many other ways, such as more frequent inspections, stricter penalties for violations, training for kitchen staff, or a combination of these, with or without compulsory stickers. Reasoning that hides such alternatives is a false dilemma, and option B describes it. Option A describes the association's reply, which generalised from one restaurant, not the councillor's statement. Option C refers to a policy borrowed from another city, which the passage never mentions. Option D describes an attack on officials' past conduct; the councillor attacks no one and in fact supports the proposal. The question tests whether a student can separate the flaws of three different speakers in one passage and match each description to the right one. Option B is correct.

> **Examiner's note — the trap:** Option A is the trap: it is a real flaw from the same passage, but it belongs to the owners' association's reply, not to the councillor.

QUANTITATIVE TECHNIQUES

Q18 **B** *Dividing a total in a given ratio* EASY

The total capacity of 24,000 MW is divided among coal, solar, wind and hydro in the ratio 9 : 5 : 4 : 2. The ratio has 9 + 5 + 4 + 2 = 20 parts in all, so one part is 24,000 / 20 = 1,200 MW. Solar has 5 parts, so solar capacity at the start of 2026 was 5 x 1,200 = 6,000 MW. As a check, coal was 9 x 1,200 = 10,800 MW, wind 4 x 1,200 = 4,800 MW and hydro 2 x 1,200 = 2,400 MW, and 10,800 + 6,000 + 4,800 + 2,400 = 24,000 MW, which matches the total. The question asks about the start of the year, so the 3,000 MW of solar added during the year is not included. Option A, 4,800 MW, is the wind figure. Option C, 7,200 MW, counts one part too many, 6 x 1,200. Option D, 10,800 MW, is the coal figure, 9 x 1,200. Option B is correct.

> **Examiner's note — the trap:** Option A is the trap: 4,800 MW is a genuine figure from the same calculation, but it belongs to wind, which has 4 parts, not solar, which has 5.

Q19 **C** *Ratio after additions and retirements* MED

First find each source's capacity at the start. One part is 24,000 / 20 = 1,200 MW, so coal was 9 x 1,200 = 10,800 MW, solar 6,000 MW, wind 4,800 MW and hydro 2,400 MW. Now apply the changes in the table. Coal: 10,800 - 1,800 = 9,000 MW. Solar: 6,000 + 3,000 = 9,000 MW. Wind: 4,800 + 1,200 = 6,000 MW. Hydro stays at 2,400 MW. The combined capacity of solar, wind and hydro is 9,000 + 6,000 + 2,400 = 17,400 MW. The required ratio is 9,000 : 17,400. Dividing both terms by their highest common factor, 600, gives 15 : 29. Option A, 9 : 11, is the ratio of coal to the rest at the start of the year, before any change. Option B, 3 : 5, compares coal with solar and wind only, leaving out hydro (9,000 : 15,000). Option D, 15 : 44, compares coal with the whole grid of 26,400 MW rather than with the other three sources. Option C is correct.

> **Examiner's note — the trap:** Option A is the trap: 9 : 11 is the right comparison at the start of 2026, but the question asks for the ratio after the year's changes.

Q20 **A** *Partnership: capital x time* HARD

Profit is shared in proportion to capital multiplied by time. Kiran: Rs 48 crore for 12 months = 48 x 12 = 576. Lata joined four months after the start, so her Rs 36 crore was invested for 8 months: 36 x 8 = 288. Mohan had Rs 60 crore for the first 6 months and, after withdrawing Rs 20 crore, Rs 40 crore for the last 6 months: 60 x 6 + 40 x 6 = 360 + 240 = 600. The ratio is 576 : 288 : 600, which

simplifies (dividing by 24) to 24 : 12 : 25, with 61 parts in all. Mohan's share is 12.2 x 25 / 61 = Rs 5.00 crore. Check: Kiran gets 12.2 x 24 / 61 = Rs 4.80 crore and Lata 12.2 x 12 / 61 = Rs 2.40 crore, and 4.80 + 2.40 + 5.00 = 12.20. Option B ignores time and uses the capitals 48 : 36 : 60 alone. Option C allows for Lata's late entry but ignores Mohan's withdrawal, using 60 x 12 = 720. Option D is Kiran's share. Option A is correct.

> **Examiner's note — the trap:** Option C is the trap: it handles Lata's late entry correctly but forgets that Mohan withdrew Rs 20 crore after six months.

Q21 **D** *Mixture ratio by alligation* HARD

The blend must contain 28% ash, made from imported coal at 10% ash and domestic coal at 40% ash. By alligation, imported : domestic = (40 - 28) : (28 - 10) = 12 : 18 = 2 : 3. To check with algebra, let the blend use x tonnes of imported coal for every y tonnes of domestic coal: 0.10x + 0.40y = 0.28(x + y), so 0.12y = 0.18x and x : y = 2 : 3. The plant wants to use all 9,000 tonnes of domestic coal, so imported coal = 9,000 x 2 / 3 = 6,000 tonnes. The blend then weighs 15,000 tonnes, and its ash is 600 + 3,600 = 4,200 tonnes, which is 28% of 15,000, as required. Option A, 13,500 tonnes, inverts the ratio and uses 3 : 2. Option B, 15,000 tonnes, is the weight of the whole blend rather than the imported coal alone. Option C, 5,400 tonnes, takes 60% of 9,000 without a proper ratio. Option D is correct.

> **Examiner's note — the trap:** Option A is the trap: alligation gives 2 : 3 for imported to domestic, and reversing the ratio produces 13,500 tonnes.

Q22 **C** *Stretch: share target when the total also grows* ELITE

After the year's changes, solar is 9,000 MW and the whole grid is 9,000 + 9,000 + 6,000 + 2,400 = 26,400 MW. Let x MW of solar be added. Then both the solar figure and the total rise by x, and the condition is 9,000 + x = 0.40 x (26,400 + x). Expanding, 9,000 + x = 10,560 + 0.4x, so 0.6x = 1,560 and x = 2,600 MW. Check: solar becomes 11,600 MW and the total 29,000 MW, and 11,600 / 29,000 = 0.40, or 40%. Option A, 1,560 MW, is the gap between 40% of the present total (10,560 MW) and present solar; it forgets that the added solar also enlarges the total. Option B, 600 MW, measures the gap against 40% of the old 24,000 MW total. Option D, 10,560 MW, is 40% of the present total, the solar capacity needed if the total stayed fixed, not the amount to add. Option C is correct.

> **Examiner's note — the trap:** Option A is the trap: 1,560 MW looks right until you notice that adding solar raises the total too, so the share falls short of 40%.

Q23 **D** *Simple average* MED

The average is the sum of the scores divided by the number of shooters. The five scores are 584, 577, 579, 571 and 589. Adding them in steps: 584 + 577 = 1,161; 1,161 + 579 = 1,740; 1,740 + 571 = 2,311; 2,311 + 589 = 2,900. The team average is therefore 2,900 / 5 = 580.0. A quick check uses deviations from an assumed mean of 580: the deviations are +4, -3, -1, -9 and +9, which add up to 0, so the average is exactly 580. Option A, 579, is Charu's score, which is the median of the five and is easy to mistake for the mean. Option B, 581.6, is the team average after the replacement described in the next question. Option C, 578.4, comes from an arithmetic slip that drops 8 points from the total (2,892 / 5). The question involves no weighting and no exclusions, so the plain mean is the answer. Option D is correct.

> **Examiner's note — the trap:** Option A is the trap: 579 is the middle score, the median, which is not the same as the mean of 580.

Q24 **B** *Replacement changes the average* HARD

The team has five members, so a rise of 1.6 points in the average means the team's total rises by 5 x 1.6 = 8 points. Only one score changes when Devansh is replaced, so Farhan must have scored 8 points more than Devansh: 571 + 8 = 579. Check: the old total was 2,900; the new total is 2,900 - 571 + 579 = 2,908; and 2,908 / 5 = 581.6, which is 1.6 more than the old average of 580. Option A, 572.6, adds the 1.6-point rise directly to Devansh's score, as if a change in the average equalled the change in one member's score; it forgets that the rise is shared across five members. Option C, 581.6, is the new average itself, not Farhan's score. Option D, 577, adds 6 points instead of 8, which would raise the average by only 1.2. The principle is that a change in one member's score changes the average by that amount divided by the number of members. Option B is correct.

> **Examiner's note — the trap:** Option A is the trap: adding 1.6 to Devansh's score treats the average's rise as one person's rise, when the total must rise by 5 x 1.6 = 8.

Q25 **A** *Weighted average across stages* HARD

The two groups of shots are of different sizes, so a weighted average is needed. The total for the first 10 shots is 10 x 10.25 = 102.5 points. The total for the next 14 shots is 14 x 10.40 = 145.6 points. Over all 24 shots the total is 102.5 + 145.6 = 248.1 points, and the average is 248.1 / 24 = 10.3375, which is 10.34 to two decimal places. The result is closer to 10.40 than to 10.25, as it should be, because more shots were fired in the second stage. Option B, 10.33, is the simple average of the two stage averages, (10.25 + 10.40) / 2 = 10.325, rounded up; it gives the 10-shot stage the same weight as the 14-shot stage. Option C, 10.38, overweights the second stage. Option D, 10.30, is a round figure that matches neither calculation. Option A is correct.

> **Examiner's note — the trap:** Option B is the trap: averaging the two averages ignores that the second stage had 14 shots against 10 in the first.

Q26 **C** *Stretch: combined average, then removal of one score* ELITE

First find the number of women. Let it be w. Total points are 12 x 578 + 583w, and this must equal 581 x (12 + w). So 6,936 + 583w = 6,972 + 581w, which gives 2w = 36 and w = 18. There were 12 + 18 = 30 shooters, and their total was 30 x 581 = 17,430 points. Check: 12 x 578 = 6,936 and 18 x 583 = 10,494, which add up to 17,430. Removing the cancelled score of 591 leaves 17,430 - 591 = 16,839 points for 29 shooters, so the new average is 16,839 / 29 = 580.655..., which is 580.66 to two decimal places. Option A, 580.57, assumes 12 women instead of solving for w. Option B, 582.53, is the new average of the women alone, (10,494 - 591) / 17. Option D, 580.68, follows from wrongly taking 20 women. Option C is correct.

> **Examiner's note — the trap:** Option B is the trap: 582.53 correctly removes 591 from the women's total but answers for the women only, not for all the remaining shooters.

RAPID FIRE — ANSWERS

1. Which Article governs the Governor's assent to State Bills? — **Article 200**

2. How many courses does Article 200 give the Governor? — **Three: assent, withhold assent, or reserve for the President**

3. Can a Governor return a Money Bill for reconsideration? — **No; the first proviso covers only Bills that are not Money Bills**

4. If the House re-passes a returned Bill, may the Governor withhold assent? — **No, whether it was re-passed with or without amendments**

5. Which Bills must the Governor reserve under the second proviso to Article 200? — **Bills that would endanger the High Court's constitutional position**

6. Which Article deals with Bills reserved for the President? — **Article 201**

7. Within what period must a House reconsider a Bill returned under Article 201? — **Six months**

8. Is the President bound to assent to a Bill re-passed under Article 201? — **No**

9. Which case of April 2025 concerned the Tamil Nadu Governor's delay over Bills? — **State of Tamil Nadu v Governor of Tamil Nadu**

10. How many Tamil Nadu Bills did the April 2025 ruling treat as assented? — **Ten**

11. Which Article did the April 2025 Bench use to treat the Bills as assented? — **Article 142**

12. Under which Article did the President make a Reference to the Supreme Court? — **Article 143**

13. When did the Constitution Bench give its opinion on the Reference? — **November 2025**

14. Did the November 2025 opinion accept 'deemed assent'? — **No**

15. May courts fix time limits for the Governor's decision on Bills? — **No, said the November 2025 opinion**

16. What relief remains for prolonged, unexplained inaction by a Governor? — **A limited direction to decide within a reasonable time**

17. Does that limited direction examine the merits of the Governor's decision? — **No**

18. Which Act governs industrial designs in India? — **The Designs Act, 2000**

19. Which section of the Designs Act defines 'design'? — **Section 2(d)**

20. A design's features must be judged by what? — **Solely by the eye**

21. Is a mere mechanical device a 'design'? — **No; it is excluded**

22. Is a mode or principle of construction registrable as a design? — **No**

23. Which section of the Designs Act bars registration of designs? — **Section 4**

24. Does disclosure abroad before filing bar registration of a design? — **Yes; disclosure in any country counts**

25. Can obscene matter be registered as a design? — **No**

26. How long does copyright in a registered design first last? — **Ten years from registration**

27. By how much can design copyright be extended? — **Once, by five years**

28. Which section of the Designs Act deals with piracy? — **Section 22**

29. Maximum sum per contravention recoverable as a contract debt for piracy? — **Rs 25,000**

30. Cap on the contract-debt sum for any one design? — **Rs 50,000**

31. Which section's cancellation grounds may be pleaded as a defence to piracy? — **Section 19**

32. Which Copyright Act provision governs unregistered registrable designs? — **Section 15(2)**

33. After how many industrial reproductions does that copyright cease? — **More than fifty**

34. Does reproduction by a licensee count under section 15(2)? — **Yes**

35. Shop price and weaver's earning per sari in the Bhagalpur argument? — **Rs 5,000 and Rs 3,000**

36. What share of a sari's shop price goes to traders and shops? — **40 per cent**

37. What per-sari earning does the secretary predict after selling online? — **At least Rs 4,000**

38. What intermediary does the secretary's argument overlook? — **The online marketplace itself**

39. Is the secretary's conclusion about total income or per-sari income? — **Per-sari income**

40. Was display of hygiene stickers voluntary or compulsory? — **Voluntary**

41. Complaint ratio, sticker restaurants to non-sticker restaurants? — **One for every five**

42. Name the flaw in the food safety office's reasoning. — **Self-selection mistaken for cause**