CLAT Gurukul — By Ready For Exam

Daily RC & CR Sheet — Answers, Skills & Examiner Notes — 1 November 2026

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

ANSWER KEY — 1 NOVEMBER 2026

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

READING COMPREHENSION

Q1 B Main idea MED

The passage moves in four steps. It first presents the ledger as a private habit whose 'columns nobody had ever asked to see', then records Pillai's dismissal: 'a diary that no one will read'. The flood then removes every other record of land use, and the ledger alone shows 'Bhola's mother, with seedlings' crossing each June. Finally the clerk, who 'expected to be bored', cannot meet the ferryman's eye and takes off his shoes. Option B captures all four steps: a habit dismissed, its value in a crisis, and the change in the sceptic. A turns a story about one man into a general charge against officialdom, which the text never makes. C makes Pillai a rescuer, though he merely reads what Haridas wrote. D concerns knowledge of the river, which plays no part in the resolution.

> **Examiner's note — the trap:** Option A attracts students who notice the district office's single-figure form, but the narrator never accuses the system; the focus stays on Haridas and the ledger.

Q2 D Inference HARD

The shoes appear twice. In the second paragraph Pillai 'wore his shoes on the boat as though the river might be contagious', which tells us the shoes expressed distaste for the river and those who live by it. In the last line, after he 'could not meet the ferryman's eye', he removes them. Reversing an earlier gesture of disdain is the narrator's quiet way of recording a change of attitude, and the narrator states none of it directly. Option D therefore reads the gesture correctly. A credits Pillai with an administrative intention for which the text offers no evidence. B imports fear of the river, although the flood is described without any such effect on him. C invents an instruction from Haridas; the old man says nothing to Pillai except his single sentence about remembering who was aboard.

> **Examiner's note — the trap:** Option B is tempting because the flood has just been described, but nothing in the text shows fear; the shoes are a callback to the clerk's earlier contempt.

Q3 A Tone / attitude MED

The narrator never praises Haridas outright. Instead the portrait is built by restraint: he records names 'where he knew them', and 'woman with goat' where he did not; he 'turned a page and said nothing'; and his one line of speech is deliberately modest, 'It was only so I would remember who was aboard'. The effect is to let the facts earn the reader's respect, which is what 'quietly respectful, conveyed through understatement' means. Option B would require the narrator to find Haridas comic, but nothing in the language invites a smile at him. C treats his silence as a fault, whereas the narrator presents it as hard-earned wisdom: explanation 'tends to sound like complaint'. D fastens on the moving river, but this is a detail of setting, and the narrator expresses no regret for a lost world.

> **Examiner's note — the trap:** Option D appeals because the river has moved half a mile, yet the narrator treats that as fact, not as a loss to be mourned.

Q4 C Vocabulary in context EASY

The sentence says that explanation, offered to people who have not yet needed it, 'tends to sound like complaint'. The point is about how speech is heard: an unprompted defence of one's work sounds as though the speaker is aggrieved, or is whining. The word is therefore used in its everyday sense of an expression of dissatisfaction, a grievance voiced. Option C fits that sense and the surrounding logic, in which Haridas stays silent precisely so as not to seem discontented. A gives the legal sense of an accusation lodged with an authority, but Haridas is not lodging anything with anyone. B gives the medical sense of an ailment, which has no connection with the tone of someone's speech. D again moves into a courtroom meaning that the passage does not support.

> **Examiner's note — the trap:** Option A attracts students who know the legal usage of 'complaint', but the sentence concerns how speech sounds, not any proceeding before an authority.

Q5 B Structure / purpose ELITE

To judge a paragraph's purpose, ask what problem the surrounding text sets up and what the paragraph does about it. The second paragraph ends with Pillai's challenge that Haridas keeps 'a diary that no one will read'. The third paragraph answers it: when 'there was no record of who had farmed which plot', the ledger turns out to be the only evidence of who crossed to which bank and when. The flood is thus the occasion, not the subject. Option B states this function exactly. A treats the flood as an antagonist, but the river is never

given intention; it is 'unhurried' even afterwards. C seizes on the pulped land papers, yet they are mentioned only to show why the ledger matters; no blame is laid. D invents a rivalry; the survey officer merely receives the ledger.

> **Examiner's note — the trap:** Option C is the strongest trap because of the pulped papers, but that detail is a means of showing the ledger's uniqueness, not a criticism of administration.

Q6 D Main idea MED

The author's argument has a clear shape. The first two paragraphs make the case for committees: 'the floor is the least revealing place' to watch lawmaking, and committees offer competence and freedom from 'the party whip'. The third paragraph exposes the weakness: referral 'is a discretion exercised by the presiding officers' and recommendations are 'merely advisory'. The last paragraph rejects the view that committees are 'decorative' and proposes that referral become 'the default'. Option D combines the value of committees, the dependence on discretion, and the remedy. A wrongly says the author wants reports made binding; he calls only for default referral. B adopts the 'decorative' view that the author expressly rejects, and the passage says committees are not televised as a virtue, not a flaw. C proposes a takeover of all lawmaking, which is never suggested.

> **Examiner's note — the trap:** Option B lures students who stop after the third paragraph; the final paragraph begins by rejecting precisely that conclusion.

Q7 A Inference HARD

The fourth paragraph supplies the evidence: accepted amendments 'have often been technical ones that the minister's own officials privately welcomed', so committees 'work best as a channel for expertise the executive already half wants'. The inference is that influence follows alignment: an amendment succeeds when it is technical and the executive's own side wants it. Option A states this. B relies on floor debate, but the passage says reports are 'rarely debated', so debate cannot be the mechanism of acceptance. C turns on unanimity and publicity, neither of which the author links to acceptance. D describes what the author says committees cannot do, since in the absence of a referral rule they cannot 'constrain a government determined to legislate in haste', and the third paragraph says ignoring reports 'seldom exacts a political price'.

> **Examiner's note — the trap:** Option D appeals to students who think accountability is the author's theme, but the passage says the opposite: ignoring reports seldom costs the government anything.

Q8 C Tone MED

The author praises committees ('competence', 'temperament') and also criticises them ('Recommendations, moreover, are merely advisory'), then concludes with a concrete proposal: referral as 'the default, with the burden on the government'. That mixture of appreciation, diagnosis and recommendation is analytical and reformist. Option C says exactly this. A fits only the third paragraph and ignores the author's statement that 'it would nonetheless be a mistake to conclude that committees are decorative'. B ignores the whole discussion of weaknesses, which includes the lack of mandatory referral and the advisory status of reports. D ignores the final sentence, which is plainly a recommendation. A tone question requires a description that survives every paragraph, and only C does so.

> **Examiner's note — the trap:** Option A tempts students who remember the third paragraph's criticisms, but the author explicitly refuses the 'decorative' verdict.

Q9 B Vocabulary in context MED

The sentence reads: 'the committee system has rested less on rules than on convention'. The contrast with 'rules' is the clue. The author goes on to say that referral 'is not mandatory; it is a discretion', so what holds the system together is accepted practice that no rule enforces. That is the constitutional sense of convention, an established practice observed without legal compulsion. Option B gives this sense. A offers the meeting sense of the word (a convention of delegates), which does not contrast with rules. C offers the treaty sense, but a binding, enforceable agreement is the opposite of what the author describes, since nothing compels referral. D uses the adjective 'conventional' in the sense of unoriginal, which has nothing to do with legislative procedure.

> **Examiner's note — the trap:** Option C attracts students who recall 'conventions' between states, but the sentence sets convention against rules, and an enforceable agreement would be a rule.

Q10 A Structure / purpose ELITE

The paragraph opens with 'It would nonetheless be a mistake', which signals a qualification of the third paragraph's grim picture of discretion and advisory reports. It then concedes a limit ('What they cannot do…') and ends with a prescription: 'not… making committees louder but… making referral the default, with the burden on the government to justify any departure'. Option A captures all of these moves. B reverses the author's view; the opening claim is the foundation of the whole argument and is never refuted. C proposes bigger powers to summon witnesses, but the author says the problem is referral, not witnesses. D misdescribes the argument as new; the word 'decorative' is the author's anticipation of an objection that the third paragraph had already invited.

> **Examiner's note — the trap:** Option D is attractive because 'decorative' appears here, but the objection is raised only to be set aside, and the paragraph's real work is its closing remedy.

CRITICAL REASONING

Q11 C Conclusion HARD

The conclusion is signalled by 'We do not conclude that offsetting is worthless… But it should be understood as a supplement to the prevention of harm and never as a substitute for it, because a wrong that can be bought off ceases to be experienced as a wrong.' Option

C restates that sentence. A makes the stronger claim that paying is 'never' permissible, which the author denies by granting that where emissions cannot be avoided, 'funding removal elsewhere is better than doing nothing'. B misreads the Haifa example; the fines increased lateness, so they were evidence of failure, not of effective deterrence. D states a claim the author makes in the first two paragraphs as a step towards the conclusion, but he does not say the principle fails everywhere outside debts; it is a premise, not the final point.

> **Examiner's note — the trap:** Option D is the sophisticated trap: it states something the author argues, but as a step in the reasoning and with a universality the text does not claim.

Q12 D Assumption HARD

The incentive argument runs: in Haifa a fine turned a wrong into a fee and lateness rose; 'There is little reason to suppose that a company... would reason differently from a parent'. That inference from parents to firms is valid only if firms would indeed treat a purchasable offset as parents treated the fine. Option D states this bridge, and denying it destroys the second argument. A is far too strong; the author accepts that offsets can remove carbon. B says outcomes are 'irrelevant', but the author only denies that they are the sole consideration, which is a weaker claim. C makes consent a universal condition, whereas the author says only that the window case had consent in its favour. Neither the author's conclusion nor the Haifa inference needs a universal rule about consent.

> **Examiner's note — the trap:** Option C appeals because consent is discussed, but the passage uses consent as a feature of one example, not as a general condition the argument needs.

Q13 B Weaken HARD

The author's second argument claims that offsets reduce firms' reasons to examine their own conduct. Evidence that firms buying offsets actually cut their own emissions and audit themselves more than comparable firms directly contradicts that incentive claim, and so weakens the argument most seriously. Option B does this. A is not a weakener at all; distance between harm and repair is the author's first complaint, so it supports his case. C shows that offsets may not work, which, if anything, adds to the worry about them rather than answering it. D attacks the generality of the Haifa study, and so offers some weakening of the analogy, but it does not show that firms behave differently, and is therefore far less damaging than direct counter-evidence about firms themselves.

> **Examiner's note — the trap:** Option D is the attractive wrong answer: it criticises the study's sample, yet leaves untouched the question of how actual firms behave.

Q14 A Strengthen ELITE

The author claims that 'A firm that can purchase absolution has less reason to examine its own conduct.' Evidence that offset-buying firms are less inclined to commission independent reviews of their production methods is a direct observation of that predicted behaviour in real firms, and so strengthens the claim most. Option A supplies it. B points the other way; if offsets become a large cost, firms have more reason to cut their own emissions, and so the claim about weakened incentives is made less plausible. C concerns consumer preference, which explains why firms might buy offsets but says nothing about whether buying them reduces self-examination. D is about the effectiveness of offsets, a different worry from the one the author raises in this paragraph.

> **Examiner's note — the trap:** Option B may attract students who feel that higher costs matter, but a rising price gives firms a motive to reduce their emissions, which cuts against the author.

Q15 D Parallel reasoning HARD

The author's pattern is this: a principle (a cancelled harm leaves no wrong) works in the window case because of two features, consent and same-kind repair; those features are missing in the offset case; so the principle cannot be carried over. Option D has the same structure: the honour system works in a village match because players value the game and cannot profit from lying; those features are absent in a professional league; so the system cannot be carried over. A argues that a result obtained in one group can be applied to another, which is the opposite of the author's caution. B argues for extension without regard to differences. C also argues for extension from one case to a different one. Only D reasons that a difference in enabling conditions blocks extension.

> **Examiner's note — the trap:** Option A appeals because it mentions two groups and a difference between them, but it concludes that the result transfers, whereas the author concludes that it does not.

Q16 A Conclusion HARD

The author's closing line is the point of the whole argument: 'the published percentages should be read as evidence of what schools have learned about the rules of the ranking, not of what their pupils have learned.' The earlier paragraphs supply support for it: the fall in Class X enrolment, the rise in students held back, and the research on retention. Option A states the conclusion. B says the tables should be abolished, but the author proposes a 'fairer measure' and not abolition, and nothing suggests that parents cannot compare schools. C states a point that is part of the support (retention raises dropout) and turns it into a demand for a ban, which the author never makes. D is the officials' view, which the whole argument is meant to resist.

> **Examiner's note — the trap:** Option C attracts students who take the strongest-sounding premise, retention and dropout, as the conclusion; but it supports the argument and is not its end point.

Q17 C Assumption HARD

The author reasons from two figures: the Class X examinees fell to 'roughly nine-tenths' of the previous Class IX cohort, and more students were 'declared not ready for promotion'. From these he infers that 'part of the improvement was achieved by deciding who would be permitted to sit'. That inference fails if the drop in numbers has another source, such as families moving away or students

switching to a different board. So the argument needs the assumption that nothing else explains most of the fall. Option C states it. A is too strong; the author says only that retention 'raises the likelihood' of dropping out. B is contradicted by the author's own phrase 'part of the improvement', which allows that teaching may have improved too. D says nothing about the link between retention and the figures.

> **Examiner's note — the trap:** Option B appeals to students who read the argument as all-or-nothing, but 'part of the improvement' concedes that teaching may have improved as well.

Q18 B Weaken ELITE

The author claims that retention 'raises the likelihood of dropping out' and that those held back are mostly poorer, so the policy 'transfers the cost' to them. The claim would be seriously weakened by direct evidence from the state that poorer students who repeat Class IX complete school at the same rate as the others, because then the harm does not appear in the group at issue. Option B supplies it. A concerns how easily parents understand the tables, which is irrelevant to the cost borne by students. C states a baseline difference that existed before the policy; it explains why poorer students are at risk but does not show that retention is harmless, and may even strengthen the concern. D offers a speculative difference in conditions, much weaker than evidence about the state's own students.

> **Examiner's note — the trap:** Option D tempts students who look for a reason to doubt foreign research, yet it names no actual effect, while the correct option reports actual outcomes.

Q19 D Parallel reasoning ELITE

The passage's structure is: a published ratio is made the measure of success; the ratio can be improved by choosing who is counted; the improvement is therefore weak evidence of real quality; a measure that counts everyone would be fairer. Option D reproduces each step with surgeons: survival rate as the measure, declining high-risk patients as the way of altering the denominator, rising rates as weak evidence of skill, and counting all referrals as the fairer measure. A infers skill from higher sales without examining how the measure was achieved. B infers failure of deterrence from higher revenue, a different flaw altogether. C moves from a correlation between publication and applications to a policy demand, with no discussion of manipulation of the measure.

> **Examiner's note — the trap:** Option A appeals because incentives alter behaviour, but it lacks the central move of the passage: that the measure can be improved by changing who is counted.

Q20 C Strengthen HARD

The claim is that exclusion contributed to the rise. If the schools that held back the most students gained the most, then the size of the gain tracks the size of the exclusion, which is the pattern the claim predicts; this adds a dose-response link to the author's cohort figures. Option C supplies it. A points the other way: gains in schools with no retention suggest that something other than exclusion produced the rise. B offers an alternative explanation, better teaching, and so weakens rather than strengthens. D is about growth in the school-age population; this may change the numbers but says nothing about whether schools used retention to improve their ratios, and so leaves the claim where it was.

> **Examiner's note — the trap:** Option D may attract students who see enrolment figures and assume relevance, but a rising intake neither raises nor lowers the evidence that schools were selecting who sat the examination.

RAPID FIRE — ANSWERS

1. Plural of 'phenomenon'? — **phenomena**

2. Meaning of the maxim 'ubi jus ibi remedium'? — **Where there is a right, there is a remedy**

3. Antonym of 'candid'? — **guarded; evasive**

4. Which Article of the Constitution guarantees equality before law? — **Article 14**

5. One word for 'a person who lives in a foreign country by choice'? — **expatriate**

6. Meaning of 'mens rea'? — **guilty mind**

7. Correct word: 'The committee (adopted/adapted) the resolution unanimously.' — **adopted**

8. Synonym of 'obdurate'? — **stubborn; unyielding**

9. Which Article abolishes untouchability? — **Article 17**

10. Meaning of 'bona fide'? — **in good faith**

11. Spot the error: 'Each of the boys have finished.' — **'have' should be 'has'**

12. Meaning of 'ultra vires'? — **beyond one's legal powers**

13. Who presides over the Rajya Sabha? — **The Vice-President of India**

14. Synonym of 'ephemeral'? — **short-lived; transient**

15. Idiom 'to burn the midnight oil' means? — **to work late into the night**

16. Which writ means 'you may have the body'? — **Habeas corpus**

17. Antonym of 'benevolent'? — **malevolent**

18. Article 21 protects which right? — **Life and personal liberty**

19. Meaning of 'sub judice'? — **under judicial consideration**

20. Fill in: 'Neither the teacher nor the students ___ present.' (was/were) — **were**

21. How many Fundamental Duties are listed in Article 51A? — **Eleven**

22. One word for 'a speech delivered without preparation'? — **extempore**

23. Meaning of 'obiter dictum'? — **a remark made in passing by a judge, not binding**

24. Synonym of 'meticulous'? — **extremely careful; painstaking**

25. Who appoints the Chief Justice of India? — **The President of India**

26. Idiom 'a red herring' means? — **a misleading clue**

27. Meaning of 'res judicata'? — **a matter already adjudicated**

28. Correct spelling: 'accomodation' or 'accommodation'? — **accommodation**

29. Which Part of the Constitution contains the Directive Principles? — **Part IV**

30. Antonym of 'verbose'? — **concise; terse**

31. Meaning of 'locus standi'? — **right to bring a case before a court**

32. Meaning of 'quid pro quo'? — **something given in return for something else**