ANSWER KEY — 23 NOVEMBER 2026

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

LEGAL REASONING

Q1 A *Who is an accomplice* MED

The passage defines an accomplice as a person who has taken part in the commission of the very offence charged, as a principal or an abettor, and expressly excludes a person 'who merely saw the offence being committed' or 'learnt of it afterwards and kept silent'. Hemant only watched the men break open the ATM and then stayed quiet out of fear; he took no part in the offence. He is therefore an ordinary eyewitness, and his testimony is weighed like any other witness's, so option A is correct. Option B wrongly treats silence as participation; the presumption that an accomplice is unworthy of credit unless corroborated applies only to accomplices, and Hemant is not one. Option C is wrong twice over: Hemant concealed nothing in the sense of joining the crime, and the passage says that even a true accomplice is a competent witness. Option D invents a requirement that another accomplice confirm his word, and the passage in fact says one accomplice cannot corroborate another. The first step in any accomplice question is to decide whether the witness participated at all.

> **Examiner's note — the trap:** Option B tempts because Hemant's week-long silence feels blameworthy, but the passage expressly says that keeping silent after seeing an offence does not make a person an accomplice.

Q2 B *Uncorroborated accomplice testimony* HARD

Kunal drove the getaway car, so he took part in the robbery and is an accomplice. The passage states the statutory rule, formerly section 133 of the Indian Evidence Act, 1872 and retained in the Bharatiya Sakshya Adhiniyam, 2023: an accomplice is a competent witness, and 'a conviction is not illegal merely because it proceeds upon the uncorroborated testimony of an accomplice'. The need for corroboration is only a rule of prudence built on a presumption the court 'may' draw; a judge who consciously warns herself of the danger and finds the accomplice wholly reliable does not break the law by convicting. Rehan's argument that the conviction is illegal therefore fails, and option B is correct. Option A states the rule of prudence as if it were a rule of law, which the passage contradicts. Option C wrongly says an abettor cannot testify; the passage makes every accomplice, principal or abettor, a competent witness. Option D reaches the right result for an invented reason, since nothing in the passage limits the rule of prudence to pardoned accomplices.

> **Examiner's note — the trap:** Option A tempts because judges ordinarily insist on corroboration, but that is prudence, not law; the statute says such a conviction is not illegal.

Q3 C *Corroboration must connect the accused* HARD

The passage lays down that corroboration 'must connect the accused with the crime; evidence that merely confirms that the crime happened, or how it happened, does not corroborate the accomplice against the accused'. The independent evidence here proves only that the rear padlock was cut and that ten bales were missing. That confirms the theft and its method, both of which are true whoever the thieves were, but nothing in it points to Deepak, and the facts say nothing else links him. It therefore does not corroborate Leela against Deepak, and option C is correct. Option A counts confirmed particulars without asking whether they touch the accused; the particular must confirm the accused's participation. Option B relies on the first condition, independence, but corroboration must satisfy all three conditions, and independence alone is not enough. Option D reaches the right conclusion on a false ground, because the passage says corroboration need not prove every detail of the accomplice's story. The correct option must give both the right result and the passage's reason for it.

> **Examiner's note — the trap:** Option A tempts because two details of Leela's story are proved true, but they confirm only that the theft happened, not that Deepak took part in it.

Q4 D *One accomplice cannot corroborate another* ELITE

Gopal and Manav both admit helping Sood smuggle gold, so each is an accomplice. The passage ends with the rule that 'because every accomplice shares the same taint, the testimony of one accomplice is not treated as corroboration of another'. However closely their separate accounts agree, the only evidence against Sood is the word of two tainted witnesses, so the case is uncorroborated, and option D gives the correct result with the correct reason. Option A treats agreement between two accomplices as mutual confirmation, which is exactly what the rule forbids. Option B misreads the independence condition: corroboration must be independent of the accomplice class, not merely come from a different person who shares the same taint. Option C is the subtle trap. It correctly calls the case uncorroborated but then says a conviction would be illegal; the passage states that a conviction is not illegal merely because it rests on uncorroborated accomplice testimony. Lack of corroboration engages the rule of prudence; it does not make a conviction unlawful.

Examiner's note — the trap: Option C tempts because it starts correctly, but it turns the rule of prudence into a rule of law; uncorroborated accomplice evidence does not make a conviction illegal.

Q5 **B** ***Independent corroboration of participation*** **ELITE**

Test each item against the three conditions. The neighbour is independent of Farid, and her evidence that Om carried a bundle into his locked shed, where the stolen idol was later found, connects Om himself with the stolen property, a material particular of his participation. It need not prove every step of the theft. Farid's wife, by contrast, testifies only to 'what he told her'; the passage says corroboration must come from an independent source, 'not from the accomplice himself or from what he told others'. Her testimony is Farid's own story repeated, so it adds nothing. Only the neighbour's testimony corroborates Farid against Om, and option B is correct. Option A wrongly counts the wife's evidence. Option C picks precisely the evidence that fails the independence condition; how soon Farid spoke to her does not change the fact that the source is Farid. Option D applies a requirement the passage rejects, since corroboration need not prove every detail of the accomplice's account, provided it confirms the accused's participation.

Examiner's note — the trap: Option A tempts because the wife's account matches Farid's, but it is Farid's own statement repeated, which the passage excludes as corroboration.

Q6 **D** ***Three-year bar under s 84*** **EASY**

Section 84 of the Patents Act, 1970, as set out in the passage, allows an application for a compulsory licence only 'at any time after the expiry of three years from the date of the grant of a patent'. Aqua Ltd's patent was granted on 1 March 2024, so the earliest date on which an ordinary application could be made is after 1 March 2027. Purewell applied on 1 June 2026, only about two years and three months after the grant, and the facts rule out any government notification that could open the separate emergency route. The application is therefore premature, and option D is correct. Option A names a real ground, unaffordable pricing, but a good ground cannot cure an application made before the time bar has run. Option B measures time from filing and examination, whereas the passage counts the three years from the date of grant. Option C is wrong because the passage allows 'any person interested' to apply; the Central Government's role arises only on the separate emergency route.

Examiner's note — the trap: Option A tempts because affordability is a valid ground, as Natco v Bayer shows, but the three-year clock from grant must run out before any ground can be argued.

Q7 **A** ***Existing licensee may apply*** **HARD**

The passage says in terms that 'an application may be made even by a person who already holds a licence under the same patent'. Medix holds a voluntary licence limited to two states and now seeks a compulsory licence for the whole country, four years after grant, on the ground that public demand is unmet, which is the first of the three grounds. Its existing licence does not bar the application, so the patentee's objection fails and option A is correct. Option B treats the voluntary licence contract as a waiver of statutory rights, but the passage gives an existing licensee the right to apply. Option C invents a definition of 'person interested' that excludes those who have dealt with the patentee; the passage contains no such limit. Option D reaches the right result, that the objection fails, for a wrong reason: the passage requires the Controller to weigh several factors, so passing the three-year mark makes an application possible, not a licence automatic. Only option A gives the result together with the passage's own reason.

Examiner's note — the trap: Option D tempts because it also says the objection fails, but it wrongly makes the licence automatic after three years, ignoring the factors the Controller must weigh.

Q8 **D** ***Factors the Controller weighs*** **HARD**

Zenlab applies five years after grant, so the time bar is satisfied, and non-working in India is one of the three grounds. The passage then lists what the Controller 'takes into account' in deciding the application: the nature of the invention, the time elapsed since grant, the applicant's ability to work the invention to the public advantage, and 'whether the applicant made efforts to obtain a licence from the patentee on reasonable terms and those efforts failed within a reasonable period'. Zenlab never asked the patentee for a licence, so this factor tells against it, and the Controller must weigh it in deciding whether to grant a licence. Option D is correct. Option A wrongly makes a ground self-sufficient; establishing a ground opens the inquiry but does not end it. Option B confines the efforts factor to the affordability ground, a limit the passage does not contain, since the factors apply to every application. Option C confuses the ordinary route with the separate emergency route; any person interested may allege non-working.

Examiner's note — the trap: Option A tempts because non-working is a listed ground, but a ground only opens the inquiry; the Controller must still weigh the applicant's failure to seek a voluntary licence.

Q9 **B** ***Emergency route and survival of the patent*** **ELITE**

Two separate rules answer the patentee's two arguments. First, the passage says that where the Central Government, by notification, declares a national emergency in respect of a patent, compulsory licences 'may be granted at any time after the grant, without waiting three years'. The notification of August 2026 brings Biovax's application within this route, so argument (i), that the application is premature, fails. Second, the passage states that 'a compulsory licence does not end the patent: the patentee keeps it and receives royalty', as in Natco v Bayer, where the Controller fixed a royalty payable to Bayer. Argument (ii) also fails. Neither argument succeeds, and option B is correct. Option A is wrong on both counts. Option C applies the ordinary three-year rule while ignoring the emergency route that the notification opens. Option D wrongly treats an emergency licence as ending the patent; nothing in the passage distinguishes emergency licences from ordinary ones on this point, and the general rule is that the patent survives.

Examiner's note — the trap: Option C tempts because the three-year wait is the headline rule of section 84, but the notified-emergency route expressly allows a licence at any time after grant.

LOGICAL REASONING

Q10 **D** ***Must be true (chain of conditions)*** **MED**

Two statements combine. Every sari sold through the cooperative store in 2024 carried the GI label, and the passage says the label may be attached only to a sari woven on a handloom, by a registered weaver, inside one of the eleven notified villages, with inspectors verifying that in 2024 no label was used on any other sari. So every sari the store sold in 2024 must have been a handloom sari from a notified village, and option D must be true. Option A compares quantities the passage never gives; we know only that 'some' traders' saris carried the label. Option B is not supported: the wage per sari stayed fixed, and nothing says how many saris the cooperative bought, so total earnings could have risen, fallen or stayed level. Option C reverses the conditional: all store saris were labelled handloom saris, but that does not mean all handloom saris went to the store, and indeed private traders also sold labelled saris. A must-be-true answer follows from the statements with no added assumption.

Examiner's note — the trap: Option C tempts because it sounds like the same chain, but it reverses the direction; private traders also sold labelled handloom saris, so not all of them went through the store.

Q11 **B** ***Most strongly supported (revenue = quantity x price)*** **HARD**

Revenue from sales equals the number of saris sold multiplied by the average price. The passage states that between 2021 and 2024 the number of saris sold through the cooperative store rose, and the average price at which the store sold them rose by 30 per cent. When both the quantity and the average price rise, their product must rise, so the store's revenue from sari sales was higher in 2024 than in 2021. Option B is not merely supported but follows directly, which makes it the strongest choice. Option A asserts a cause; the passage reports the GI tag and the price rise side by side but never links them, and other causes such as rising silk costs are possible. Option C compares trader prices with store prices, but the passage gives no trader prices at all. Option D makes a claim about what traders paid weavers, which the passage never mentions; it tells us only the cooperative's fixed wage. Strong support comes from arithmetic on the stated facts, not from a plausible story.

Examiner's note — the trap: Option A tempts because the tag and the price rise sit close together in the passage, but correlation in the text is not a stated cause.

Q12 **A** ***Cannot be true (direct contradiction)*** **HARD**

A cannot-be-true answer must contradict the statements. The passage says plainly that 'no powerloom sari sold in the town' in 2024 carried the label, and that inspectors verified the label was used only on handloom saris woven by registered weavers in the notified villages. Option A describes a labelled powerloom sari sold in the town by a private trader in 2024, which directly contradicts both statements, so it cannot be true. Option B is possible: private traders sold some labelled saris, but they may also have sold unlabelled saris woven by unregistered weavers. Option C is possible: an average price that rose by 30 per cent still allows some individual saris to sell below the old average, since an average hides spread. Option D is possible: the passage says the cooperative bought only from registered weavers, not that every registered weaver sold to it; some may have sold only to private traders. The other three options are merely unstated, while A is ruled out.

Examiner's note — the trap: Option C tempts because prices rose sharply on average, but an average can rise while some individual saris sell below the earlier average.

Q13 **D** ***Inference EXCEPT (sold versus bought)*** **ELITE**

Options A, B and C each follow from the statements. A follows because the label may be used only on saris woven by registered weavers, and inspectors verified that no label went on any other sari. B follows because every sari the store sold carried the label, and the label can be attached only to handloom saris. C follows because the cooperative paid 'the same fixed wage' per sari throughout 2021 to 2024. Option D does not follow. The passage says the number of saris the store sold rose, but the wage is paid on saris the cooperative bought. Sales and purchases can differ, for instance if the store sold off stock bought in earlier years, so the passage does not tell us that purchases, and hence total wages paid, rose. D is the only statement that cannot be properly inferred. Students who read 'sold more' as 'bought more' will treat D as inferable and then wrongly hunt for a flaw in A, B or C.

Examiner's note — the trap: Option D looks safe because a busier store usually buys more, but the passage counts saris sold while wages are paid on saris bought; the two figures need not move together.

Q14 **C** ***Resolve the paradox (outside supply)*** **HARD**

The puzzle is that local landings fall by about seventy per cent while household demand holds steady, yet city prices dip slightly. A resolution must show that total supply reaching the city markets does not fall, or even rises, during the ban. Option C does exactly that: if a neighbouring state's ban falls in other months, its trawlers are free to fish during Varunadri's ban and ship large, cheap catches into Varunadri's markets. The local shortfall is then more than made up from outside, and prices can fall even though local landings collapse. Option A concerns the months after the ban ends, not prices during it. Option B deepens the puzzle: if the only local catch during the ban is of high-priced species, average prices should rise, not fall. Option D explains how fishermen cope with lost income but says nothing about the supply or demand of fish in city markets. The correct choice is the only one that reconciles both facts rather than explaining just one of them.

Examiner's note — the trap: Option A tempts because it shows the ban working, but a bigger catch after the ban cannot lower prices during it.

Q15 **D** *Paradox EXCEPT (non-helper)* HARD

Each helper must either add supply to the city markets during the ban or remove demand from them. Option A adds supply: frozen fish bought cheaply in the pre-ban glut is released during the ban. Option B removes demand: the passage says household demand in the state does not fall, but inland traders are outside buyers, and their withdrawal lowers total demand in the city markets. Option C adds supply: farmed fish from inland ponds is not affected by a ban on sea fishing and arrives mainly in the monsoon. Option D does none of these. If boats from other states are also barred from Varunadri's waters during the ban, supply from those waters falls even further, which, if anything, makes lower prices harder to explain. D therefore does not help to explain the lower prices, and it is the answer. In EXCEPT questions, test each option against the two levers, supply and demand, and pick the one that moves neither in the helpful direction.

> **Examiner's note — the trap:** Option B tempts because the passage says demand does not fall, but that sentence covers households, while inland traders are a separate source of demand.

Q16 **A** *Deepen the paradox* MED

To deepen a paradox, a fact must close off the most natural explanation. The obvious way to square a seventy per cent fall in local landings with lower prices is that fish reaches the city markets from somewhere else, such as other states, cold stores or fish farms. Option A rules out every such source: if no fish reaches the city markets during the ban except from the state's own harbours, then supply truly falls sharply while demand stays steady, and a fall in price becomes even harder to explain. A is correct. Option B is about vegetables; a fall in vegetable prices might make a weak case for substitution, but if anything it would help explain cheaper fish, not deepen the puzzle. Option C slightly increases local supply during the ban, which marginally helps to resolve the puzzle rather than deepening it. Option D reports a policy demand by unions, which has no bearing on fish supply, demand or prices during the ban.

> **Examiner's note — the trap:** Option C tempts because it mentions the ban period directly, but more small craft would add supply and so ease the puzzle, not deepen it.

Q17 **C** *Evaluate an explanation (most useful information)* ELITE

The trader's explanation is that cold-storage firms release frozen fish stocked before the ban, adding supply and keeping prices low. To evaluate a causal claim, ask for information that would come out differently depending on whether the claim is true. If frozen stocks in the state's cold stores fall sharply during the ban compared with other months, fish is indeed being released into the market then, which supports the trader; if stocks stay level, the claimed release is not happening and the explanation fails. Option C is therefore the most useful thing to know. Option A concerns a ten-year price trend against inflation, which says nothing about the dip during the ban. Option B, consumers' stated preference for fresh fish, tempts because it seems to cast doubt on frozen fish; but a stated preference does not show what people actually buy when frozen fish is cheaper, so it does not test the claim. Option D concerns the history of the ban's length, which is irrelevant to the source of supply.

> **Examiner's note — the trap:** Option B tempts because a preference for fresh fish seems to undercut the frozen-fish story, but stated preferences do not show actual purchases; only stock movement tests the claim.

QUANTITATIVE TECHNIQUES

Q18 **B** *Storage balance and percentage* MED

Use the storage equation given in the passage: storage on 30 September = storage on 1 June + inflow - turbine release - spill. For reservoir R this is 480 + 1,050 - 420 - 0 = 1,110 MCM. R's capacity is 1,200 MCM, so the percentage filled is 1,110 / 1,200 x 100 = 92.5 per cent, and option B is correct. A check on the figure: 1,200 x 0.925 = 1,110, which matches. Option A, 87.5 per cent, is R's inflow alone as a share of capacity (1,050 / 1,200), which ignores the opening storage and the release. Option C, 91.25 per cent, would need 1,095 MCM in store, which no correct step produces. Option D, 95 per cent, would require 1,140 MCM in store, which would mean subtracting only 390 MCM of release. The method is to build the closing balance step by step from the opening balance, adding inflow and taking away every outflow listed, and only then divide by capacity.

> **Examiner's note — the trap:** Option A tempts because 1,050 / 1,200 = 87.5 per cent uses a real figure from R's row, but it is the inflow alone, not the closing storage of 1,110 MCM.

Q19 **D** *Aggregate change with spill* HARD

Compute each closing balance with storage on 30 September = opening + inflow - release - spill. P: 270 + 820 - 300 - 0 = 790. Q: 210 + 450 - 180 - 0 = 480. R: 480 + 1,050 - 420 - 0 = 1,110. S: 90 + 560 - 160 - 40 = 450, which is exactly its capacity. Combined closing storage = 790 + 480 + 1,110 + 450 = 2,830 MCM. Combined opening storage = 270 + 210 + 480 + 90 = 1,050 MCM. The rise is 2,830 - 1,050 = 1,780 MCM, so option D is correct. A shortcut confirms it: total inflow 2,880 minus total release 1,060 minus total spill 40 gives 1,780. Option A, 1,820 MCM, is the trap: it is total inflow minus total release, forgetting the 40 MCM that S spilled. Option B, 1,740, subtracts the spill twice. Option C, 1,800, is a rounded guess with no basis in the table. Every outflow column must be used when building a balance, and the spill column is the one most often skipped.

> **Examiner's note — the trap:** Option A tempts because inflow minus release looks like the full story, but S lost 40 MCM by spilling, so the rise is 1,780, not 1,820.

Q20 **B** *Energy yield comparison* HARD

Energy yield is energy generated per MCM released through the turbines. R's yield is 378 / 420 = 0.9 MU per MCM. Q released 180 MCM; at R's yield, that water would have produced 180 x 0.9 = 162 MU. Q actually produced 99 MU, a yield of 99 / 180 = 0.55 MU per MCM. The additional energy would be 162 - 99 = 63 MU, so option B is correct. Check: the gap in yield is 0.9 - 0.55 = 0.35 MU per

MCM, and 0.35 x 180 = 63 MU, the same answer. Option A, 54 MU, is 0.3 x 180 and follows from misreading the yield gap as 0.3. Option C, 72 MU, comes from multiplying 180 by 0.4, a misread of the yield gap. Option D, 162 MU, is the whole output of Q's water at R's yield, not the extra over the 99 MU Q actually produced. The key is to use the release of Q with the yield of R, not R's release.

> **Examiner's note — the trap:** Option C tempts if the yield gap is misread as 0.4; R's yield is 378/420 = 0.9 and Q's is 99/180 = 0.55, a gap of 0.35, giving 63 MU.

Q21 **A** *Usable storage and weighted energy* **ELITE**

First find each reservoir's closing storage: P 790, Q 480, R 1,110, S 450 MCM. Dead storage is 20 per cent of capacity: P 180, Q 120, R 240, S 90 MCM. Usable water is closing storage minus dead storage: P 610, Q 360, R 870, S 360 MCM. Each reservoir's energy yield: P 240/300 = 0.8, Q 99/180 = 0.55, R 378/420 = 0.9, S 112/160 = 0.7 MU per MCM. Energy available: P 610 x 0.8 = 488, Q 360 x 0.55 = 198, R 870 x 0.9 = 783, S 360 x 0.7 = 252. Total = 488 + 198 + 783 + 252 = 1,721 MU, so option A is correct. Option B, 2,210 MU, is the main trap: it applies each yield to the whole closing storage, ignoring the dead storage that cannot be released. Option C, 1,768 MU, takes dead storage as 20 per cent of closing storage instead of capacity (0.8 x 2,210). Option D, 2,044.7 MU, takes it as 20 per cent of the 1 June storage. Water from different reservoirs cannot be pooled at one yield; each reservoir's usable water must be converted at its own rate and the results added.

> **Examiner's note — the trap:** Option B tempts because it uses every yield correctly, but it releases the 20 per cent dead storage too, which the question forbids.

Q22 **B** *Spill converted at energy yield* **HARD**

S's energy yield is its energy divided by its turbine release: 112 / 160 = 0.7 MU per MCM. S spilled 40 MCM. Had that water gone through the turbines, it would have generated 40 x 0.7 = 28 MU more. S's total generation would then have been 112 + 28 = 140 MU, so option B is correct. A check: total release would have been 160 + 40 = 200 MCM, and 200 x 0.7 = 140 MU, the same answer. Note also that S's closing storage would be unchanged at 450 MCM, since the water leaves the reservoir either way, through the turbines or over the spillway; the question changes only the route. Option A, 132 MU, adds only 20 MU, as if the yield were 0.5. Option C, 144 MU, uses P's yield of 0.8, adding 32 MU. Option D, 152 MU, adds the full 40 as if one MCM gave one MU. The question specifies S's own yield, so P's or a notional one-to-one rate cannot be used.

> **Examiner's note — the trap:** Option C tempts if P's yield of 0.8 is used, but the question asks for S's own yield, 112/160 = 0.7, giving 28 MU more and 140 MU in all.

Q23 **C** *Central angle from share* **MED**

The passage says a component's central angle equals its share of 360 degrees. In 2024-25 pensions take 24 per cent of committed expenditure, so the angle is 24 / 100 x 360 = 0.24 x 360 = 86.4 degrees, and option C is correct. A quick check: each percentage point of a pie is 3.6 degrees, and 24 x 3.6 = 86.4. Option A, 79.2 degrees, is 22 x 3.6, the pensions angle for 2023-24; it is what you get by reading the wrong column. Option B, 90 degrees, is a quarter of the pie, which is the angle for interest payments at 25 per cent, not for pensions. Option D, 129.6 degrees, is 36 x 3.6, the angle for salaries in 2024-25, and comes from reading the wrong row. In pie-chart questions, first confirm the year and the component being asked about, then convert with the fixed rate of 3.6 degrees per percentage point. Rupee totals are not needed at all for an angle, because the angle depends only on the share.

> **Examiner's note — the trap:** Option A tempts because 22 per cent sits in the same row; it is the 2023-24 share, while the question asks about the 2024-25 pie.

Q24 **A** *Percentage change in absolute amount* **HARD**

Shares cannot be compared directly across years when the totals differ, so convert to rupees first. Subsidies in 2023-24: 13 per cent of Rs 60,000 crore = Rs 7,800 crore. Subsidies in 2024-25: 15 per cent of Rs 72,000 crore = Rs 10,800 crore. The increase is 10,800 - 7,800 = Rs 3,000 crore, and the percentage rise is 3,000 / 7,800 x 100 = 38.46 per cent, about 38.5 per cent. Option A is correct. Check: 7,800 x 1.3846 is about 10,800. Option B, about 15.38 per cent, is the trap: it is the rise in the share, from 13 to 15, as a percentage of 13, which ignores the 20 per cent growth in the total. Option C, 20 per cent, is the growth of the total itself, (72,000 - 60,000) / 60,000. Option D, 40 per cent, is a rounded guess. A useful cross-check: growth in the amount = (1 + growth in share) x (1 + growth in total) - 1 = (15/13) x 1.2 - 1 = 0.3846, which matches.

> **Examiner's note — the trap:** Option B tempts because it is the change in the pie share, but the pie itself grew by 20 per cent, so the rupee rise is far larger.

Q25 **A** *Projected share after unequal growth* **ELITE**

Interest payments in 2024-25 are 25 per cent of Rs 72,000 crore = Rs 18,000 crore. A 20 per cent rise takes them to 18,000 x 1.2 = Rs 21,600 crore in 2025-26. Total committed expenditure rises by 15 per cent, to 72,000 x 1.15 = Rs 82,800 crore. Interest's share of the 2025-26 pie = 21,600 / 82,800 x 100 = 26.09 per cent, about 26.1 per cent, so option A is correct. The ratio shortcut confirms it: new share = old share x (1.20 / 1.15) = 25 x 1.0435 = 26.09 per cent. Option B, 25 per cent, assumes the share is unchanged, which would be true only if interest grew at the same rate as the total. Option C, about 28.75 per cent, is 25 x 1.15, applying the total's growth to the share. Option D, 30 per cent, is 25 x 1.2, applying interest's growth to the share while forgetting that the whole pie also grows. A share changes only by the ratio of the component's growth factor to the total's growth factor.

> **Examiner's note — the trap:** Option D tempts because interest grows by 20 per cent, but the whole pie also grows by 15 per cent, so the share rises only by the factor 1.20 / 1.15.

Q26 **C** *Falling share, rising amount* HARD

Salaries' share of the pie fell from 40 per cent to 36 per cent, but the pie itself grew, so compute the amounts. Salaries in 2023-24: 40 per cent of Rs 60,000 crore = Rs 24,000 crore. Salaries in 2024-25: 36 per cent of Rs 72,000 crore = Rs 25,920 crore. The change is 25,920 - 24,000 = a rise of Rs 1,920 crore, so option C is correct. As a check, growth factor = (36 / 40) x (72,000 / 60,000) = 0.9 x 1.2 = 1.08, an 8 per cent rise, and 8 per cent of 24,000 is 1,920. Option A, a fall of Rs 2,400 crore, applies the four-point fall in share to the 2023-24 total (4 per cent of 60,000). Option B, a fall of Rs 2,880 crore, applies it to the 2024-25 total (4 per cent of 72,000). Option D gets the direction right but gives the rise in the whole pie, 72,000 - 60,000, not in salaries. A smaller slice of a bigger pie can still be a bigger amount.

> **Examiner's note — the trap:** Option A tempts because the share fell by four points, but those points are of a larger total; the rupee amount actually rose by Rs 1,920 crore.

RAPID FIRE — ANSWERS

1. Who is an accomplice? — **A person who took part in the very offence charged, as principal or abettor**

2. Is a mere eyewitness to a crime an accomplice? — **No**

3. Is a victim of the offence an accomplice? — **No**

4. Does keeping silent after learning of a crime make one an accomplice? — **No**

5. Which section of the Indian Evidence Act, 1872 made an accomplice a competent witness? — **Section 133**

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

7. Is a conviction on uncorroborated accomplice testimony illegal? — **No, not merely for that reason**

8. What may a court presume about an uncorroborated accomplice? — **That he is unworthy of credit**

9. In what must an accomplice be corroborated? — **In material particulars**

10. Is the need to corroborate an accomplice a rule of law or of prudence? — **A rule of prudence**

11. From what kind of source must corroboration come? — **An independent source**

12. Can an accomplice's own statements to others corroborate him? — **No**

13. Must corroboration connect the accused with the crime? — **Yes**

14. Does proof that the crime happened corroborate an accomplice against the accused? — **No**

15. Must corroboration prove every detail of the accomplice's story? — **No**

16. Can one accomplice corroborate another? — **No, both share the same taint**

17. Which Act contains section 84 on compulsory licences? — **The Patents Act, 1970**

18. For how long does an Indian patent last? — **Twenty years from the date of filing**

19. When may an ordinary compulsory-licence application be made? — **After three years from the date of grant**

20. To whom is a compulsory-licence application made? — **The Controller of Patents**

21. Who may apply for a compulsory licence? — **Any person interested**

22. Name the first ground for a compulsory licence under s 84. — **Reasonable requirements of the public not satisfied**

23. Name the pricing ground for a compulsory licence. — **Not available at a reasonably affordable price**

24. Name the territorial ground for a compulsory licence. — **The invention is not worked in India**

25. Can an existing licensee apply for a compulsory licence? — **Yes**

26. Which applicant conduct must the Controller weigh? — **Efforts to obtain a licence on reasonable terms**

27. Which case saw India's first compulsory licence? — **Natco Pharma v Bayer Corporation (2012)**

28. Which drug was licensed in Natco v Bayer? — **Sorafenib, a cancer drug**

29. Does a compulsory licence end the patent? — **No, the patentee keeps it and gets royalty**

30. What does the patentee receive under a compulsory licence? — **Royalty**

31. What removes the three-year wait for a compulsory licence? — **A government notification of emergency, urgency or public non-commercial use**

32. What does a GI label on Kanchavaram saris certify? — **Handloom, registered weaver, notified village**

33. How many notified villages are in the Kanchavaram cluster? — **Eleven**

34. Did any powerloom sari sold in the town carry the GI label? — **No**

35. By how much did the cooperative store's average sari price rise? — **30 per cent**

36. How did the cooperative pay registered weavers? — **A fixed wage per sari bought**

37. Revenue equals which two quantities multiplied? — **Number sold and average price**

38. How long is Varunadri's monsoon fishing ban? — **Sixty-one days**

39. Which boats are barred during the Varunadri ban? — **Mechanised fishing boats**

40. By how much do fresh-fish landings fall during the ban? — **About seventy per cent**

41. What happened to city fish prices during the ban? — **They were slightly lower than before it**

42. To resolve a price paradox, which two levers do you test? — **Supply and demand**

43. What is a reservoir's energy yield? — **Energy generated per MCM released through turbines**

44. What does MCM stand for? — **Million cubic metres**

45. Which reservoir spilled water during the monsoon? — **Reservoir S, 40 MCM**

46. What was reservoir R's energy yield? — **0.9 MU per MCM**

47. What is dead storage? — **Water that cannot be released from a reservoir**

48. How many degrees does one percentage point of a pie chart take? — **3.6 degrees**

49. What was the state's committed expenditure in 2024-25? — **Rs 72,000 crore**

50. Can a smaller share of a bigger pie be a larger amount? — **Yes, as with salaries here**

51. Can an abettor of the offence charged be an accomplice? — **Yes, as well as a principal offender**

52. Can an accomplice be a competent witness against the accused? — **Yes**

53. In which year was the Bharatiya Sakshya Adhiniyam enacted? — **2023**

54. Is corroboration of an accomplice required as a rule of law? — **No, only as a rule of prudence**

55. What must corroboration confirm in some material particular? — **The accused's participation in the crime**

56. Why can one accomplice not corroborate another? — **Both share the same taint**

57. Is a getaway driver in a robbery an accomplice? — **Yes, he takes part in the offence**

58. Who has the exclusive right to make, use and sell a patented invention? — **The patent holder**