

Answers and Explanation:

Prime AP Mock 05 2025

English Language

1. Option (A) is incorrect as it contradicts the theme of the passage itself. It is not the religious liberty, but the religious imposition that is a threat. Option (C) is also incorrect and is not mentioned anywhere in the passage. Option (D) although seems correct, goes awry in the latter half of the sentence. The mention of 'hampering of societal existence' is not the author's contention Option (B) is the only correct answer as it is clearly stated in those lines that religion gains power when it mingles with politics and thus affects the freedom of performing religion according to one's choice.

2. C Option (A) is incomplete and cannot be deduced. What stance? Option (B) although seems correct, its vague. The expression that the church cannot go against the laws is incorrect. The preaching of the Church to through the law is forbidden. Option (D) is incorrect since it's out of context and is not relevant to the question stem. Option (C) is the only correct option. Option (C) is closer to the text and the religious preaching should not be forced, it may or may not be followed. It should not come in the way of the law of the land, "But the First Amendment is not a license for religious entities to impose their dogma on society through the law."

3. C Option (A) is incorrect and doesn't exist in the passage. Option (B) is more an opinion in the latter half (It's the way it should be.), which is open to debate. Option (C) is true. The passage talks about Justice Scalia's comments on enforcement of religious preaching. "the professed doctrines of religious belief superior to the law of the land" would mean allowing "every citizen to become a law unto him". Option (D) is contradicted by the passage. It only says that the preaching of the Church has the freedom to object to some acts as sinful, but will not get a legal stamp.

4. B The meaning of the expression 'built on air' means any unrealistic that is weak as it had no grounds or solid backing. It is very close to the idiom, 'building castles in the air'. Option (A) is contrary to the meaning of the idiom. Options (C) and (D) are incorrect meanings of the expression, 'built on air'.

5. B Historians found Carmichael's use of Sartre's terminology interesting because public intellectuals such as Carmichael and their language of expression of their ideas through distinctive terminology impacted social and cultural changes, especially as reference points in debates. Option (B) sums up the reason. Option (A) is vague. Counter racism is not mentioned anywhere in the passage. Option (C) is partially correct but only as a fact. It explains the terminology and not why the terminology interested the historians. Since option (B) is correct, option (D) is ruled out.

6. C Option (A) is incorrect because of the word adapted. Adapted means adjusted, which is wrong. Option (B) is vague and incorrect since we do not know the time frame. Option (D) contradicts the passage itself; hence, wrong. Option (C) is the only correct answer which can be found in the given passage. "In 1966, the American Civil Rights Movement fragmented. Before this year, civil rights activists were united, in public at least, in their support of a policy of peaceful integration of white and black people."

7. A Option (B) is far-fetched. It does not talk about any particular form of divide and rule. Option (C) is incorrect, since it's out of the context. Option (D) is also incorrect because its vague an answer and beyond the scope of the given context. Option (A) is directly related to the passage; hence, is the correct answer. "Paternalism was an ideology which aimed to reduce social anxiety by keeping different social groups segregated, allotting them distinct and separate roles."

8. B Expository writing style is the description and explanation of a particular idea. The passage describes the fragmentation of the civil rights movement based on the change, with a special mention of Carmichael. Then the passage from thereon describes the reason behind the adoption of a different ideology by Carmichael and the reason for the shift. Option (B) is the correct option. Option (A) is ruled out as Persuasive style of writing is a non-fiction writing that develops an argument, usually in the favour of the author views. It is used to convince to a particular logic or philosophy. Option (C) is ruled out as Narrative style is defined by a main character in a setting who engages with an issue. It also introduces side characters and the tone, voice, sentence structure moves towards anecdotes and so forth. Option (D) is ruled out as Analytical style is the ability to identify and then dissecting the subject based on parameters and after which the author offers an argument based on his interpretation.

9. B is correct as per the fourth paragraph of the given passage as the whole paragraph talks about the fact that it important that the message inscribed on the pillars must be first adopted by his sons, grandsons and, after those, my posterity, otherwise it might be forgotten and cannot become a way of life. So, he changed his words of the fourth edict (in the fifth edict) where he speaks of his ethical project progressing 'until the end of the world'. Hence, the answer is option B. Option A is contrary as he knew that unless his immediate successors do not continue the legacy, his words will fade. Option C is ruled out as it finds no support in the passage. Option D is beyond the scope and nowhere near the interpretation that the author gives.

10. C strengthens the argument mentioned in the question. The sentence says that Ashoka's influence is still there though the Mauryan empire sustained for lesser period of time. Statement in option C which says that Ashoka's influence can be seen in India itself as India adopted the Ashoka wheel on the National flag of India. This strengthens the idea of his influence mentioned in the question. Hence, the answer is option C. Option A is merely a description of what the animals symbolise and does not answer the question stem. Option B is irrelevant, as it again does not answer the question stem. Option D is partially true; only the former part of the sentence. The latter part of the sentence is beyond the scope.

11. D is correct as per the second and third sentence of the first paragraph of the given passage. This sentence in the passage says that the roof protects the pillars from wind and rain so it might be thought as a way for durability of the inscriptions on the pillars. Hence, the answer is option D. Options A, B and C do not find a mention in the passage and, therefore, are incorrect.

12. C is correct as per the first and second sentence of the third paragraph of the given passage which says that the message was inscribed across the empire onto freestanding boulders etc. Hence, the answer is option C. Option A is a false notion and does not address the question stem. Option B is incorrect as the message was inscribed in many languages, but not as a translation. Option D is ruled out as it is contrary to what has been mentioned in the passage. Refer to the line, 'Ashoka's ethical message was refined and rendered in a number of Indian vernaculars, as well as Greek and Aramaic.'

13. C Both B and D are correct as per the first sentence of the fourth paragraph in the passage. Hence, the answer is option C. Refer to the lines, "This Inscription on Ethics has been written in stone so that it might endure long and that my descendants might act in conformity with it,' Ashoka says at the end of the fifth edict.' Option A does not find a mention in the passage and was not the intention of the emperor, as well.

14. C This is an inferential question that also tests one's interpretation of the statement. Such statements invite varied interpretation, but the one that is the closest to the essence can be taken the answer. Usually, adages on ethics come from personal or relative experiences. Option C) is correct as the inscription talks about how hard it is to do good and even beginning to do good is hard. This message might be an experience from his own life. Option A is ruled out as it a wrong interpretation of the statement. Option B is far-fetched as 'not always' cannot be the possible interpretation. Option D is illogical. How do we figure out his personality through the statement: That he was a calm man? It is absurd.

15. D is correct as per the last sentence of the first paragraph of the given passage which talks about China's increasing presence in Nepal is one of the reasons for present flare up (means 'a sudden outburst of something, especially violence or hostility') as mentioned in the passage i.e. "The present flare up is a result of a combination of factors: India's strategic concerns; China's steady inroads into Nepal; and deteriorating India-China relations". Also, the first sentence of the last paragraph also reiterates the role of China in the issue. Hence, the answer is option D. Option A is ruled out as one cannot assume that the disputed area between India and Nepal is strategically important for only India and not Nepal, especially when Nepal too has increased border patrolling. Option B is too far-fetched to be true. Option C does not find a mention in the passage.

16. B is correct as per the second and third sentence of the last paragraph of the given passage which talks about hardening the international boundary with India by increasing the security posts along the border and increasing the security along the border sends a message that Nepal is serious about the demarcated international boundary between the two countries. Hence, the answer is option B. Option A is contrary to what has been mentioned in the passage. Option C is ruled out as the action is more a strategy than a protest, especially when Nepal wants to give a clear message to India. Option D is not a step but a justification on the part of Nepal's foreign minister.

17. C is correct as per the third paragraph of the given passage which explicitly mention the reason behind the dispute and how both the countries took action to justify their sides. Hence, the answer is option C. Option A is part of the last paragraph. Option B is the primary purpose of the passage, but a reference point. Option D is wrong as there is one reason which is that India inaugurated the Darchula-Lipulekh pass link road, cutting across the disputed Kalapani area, which is used by Indian pilgrims travelling to Kailash Mansarovar.

18. C is correct as per the second and fourth sentence of the second paragraph of the given passage which says that if the source of the river is confirmed then the dispute can be settled in the favour of the country which is correct about the origin of the river. Hence, the answer is option C. Option A is contrary to the passage. Option B is ruled out as it will not lessen (alleviate), but increase the concern. Option D is a probability that is not substantiated by any information in the passage.

19. A is correct as per the first sentence of the second paragraph of the given passage. Refer to the lines, 'The India-Nepal border was originally delineated by the 1816 Sugauli Treaty, which established the river Kali (Sharda, Mahakali) as the boundary, with territory east of the river going to Nepal.' Option B and C tries to present the same idea but do not actually convey it. In option B the word 'borders' (which is the actual word for an area separating two countries) is replaced by 'threshold' which is incorrect. Option D the sentence is framed incorrectly as the treaty is not between India, Nepal and China. Hence, the answer is option A.

20. D The fourth sentence of the second paragraph says, 'This process, known as bioremediation, uses living organisms like plants, fungi and microbes to break down pollutants, including crude oil.' Hence, D is the correct answer. Option A is incorrect as Bioremediation has nothing to do with revitalizing the water bodies. Option B is incorrect as the mention is of eliminating oil pollutants and not plastic pollution. Option C is ruled out as Bioremediation is not the process of contaminating the soil, rather decontaminating the soil.

21. A The last sentence of the second paragraph says, "The course Rodriguez attends is called "Guardians of the Soil", which is an introduction to permaculture- based bioremediation for low-income communities, founded by local resident and independent researcher, Lexie Gropper." Hence, A is the correct answer. Option B is incorrect as Galo Rodriguez was the farmer who found oil on his farm. Options C and D find no mention in the passage.

22. A The fifth sentence of the second paragraph says, "There are several ways this could happen, but most of the hard work to break down crude oil happens below ground, where microorganisms are concentrated around the roots of plants and mineralise, or decompose, the crude components, making it easier for plants to take up."The rest of the options do not find a mention in the passage.

23. A The third sentence of the last paragraph says, "In 1993, thousands of community members filed a lawsuit against the company, saying it did not perform any adequate clean up and its drilling installations continued to contaminate the area, and demanded they pay for remediation.". Option B is incorrect as it is not mentioned in the passage. Options C and D do not find support in the passage.

24. B Both options B and D are similar in meaning to the word 'pungent', except option B is a better choice as the passage uses pungent with respect to gasoline that has a distinct smell. A distinct smell means one can identify the oil; therefore, it has to be strong enough. 'Stimulating' is a positive meaning of the word 'pungent', which does not go with the theme. Putrid in option A is incorrect as it is a smell of decomposing or a decaying flesh; rotten. If the farmer was able to identify the oil as Gasoline, it means that the oil was in its more or less same state. Option C is contrary to the meaning.

CURRENT AFFAIRS INCLUDING GK

- 25.C
- 26.B
- 27.C
- 28.C
- 29.A
- 30.B
- 31.C
- 32.D
- 33.B
- 34.A
- 35.B
- 36.C
- 37.B
- 38.B
- 39.C
- 40.A
- 41.C
- 42.D
- 43.C
- 44.A
- 45.A
- 46.C
- 47.B
- 48.B
- 49.A
- 50 A
- 51.C
- 52.D

LEGAL REASONING

53. The correct answer is A since the passage states that three conditions must be met in order for someone to be held strictly liable: the presence of a dangerous material, an unnatural use of land, and the escape of the substance. Since all three conditions are met in the specific situation, Q will be held accountable. Because he was negligent in keeping the keys in the keyhole, option B is incorrect. C is not the right answer because the question refers to Q's obligation, not that of the housekeeper. D is not the correct answer since, despite being accurate; it only discusses one criterion while option A addresses every requirement.

54. The right answer is B because, according to the passage, the hazardous chemical must also escape from the defendant's premises to another is and cause ultra-hazardous harm to the victim. Because no harm was done, XYZ cannot be held accountable under strict liability. For the same

reason, D is not the correct answer. Because the question asks about accountability under strict liability rather than negligence, option A is incorrect. C is not the correct answer because it provides an imprecise rationale as it is fact-based reasoning.

55. The right answer is C because, according to the passage, it takes more than just the presence of a 'hazardous substance' to establish the defendant's guilt. The phrase 'escape' refers to leaving the defendant's property or an area under his control. It is difficult to hold the firm accountable because there was never any substance escape in the first place. For the same reason option A is incorrect. Because B does not offer a convincing justification, it is not the right answer. D is not the right answer because the company can only be held accountable when the dangerous substance escapes the factory and not in any other circumstance.

56. The right answer is B because, according to the passage, mere evidence of a hazardous substance is insufficient to prove that the defendant is liable. The substance must also escape from the defendant's premises and cause extreme harm to the victim. The term 'escape' refers to fleeing from the defendant's place of control. T shall not be held accountable because the snakes did not escape in the given situation and instead the child entered the room. For the same reason, A is not the correct answer. C is not the correct answer because the intent is irrelevant in strict liability. D is not the correct answer because only one requirement was met.

57. The right answer is C because, according to the passage, an injunction is a writ of prohibition issued by an equity court at the request of a party complainant, directed at a party defendant in the action, prohibiting the latter from performing a particular act. Injunction is the appropriate course of action since in the case at hand, the court forbade N from allowing his branches to invade M's land. For the same reason, the answers A and B are incorrect. D is not the right answer because it offers an illogical justification.

58. The correct answer is D because, according to the passage, a plaintiff in a lawsuit to prevent a breach of an obligation that already exists in his favour may be awarded a permanent injunction. Similarly, option A is incorrect. Because it uses additional knowledge that is not mentioned anywhere in the passage, option B is incorrect. The passage does not mention such a remedy, so choosing C as the answer would violate the passage's instructions to conform to its contents.

59. luded in mens rea is not mentioned in the passage. Option D is not correct as the student's liability iThe right answer is C because, according to the passage, an injunction is a prohibitive writ issued by an equity court upon the petition of a party complainant, forbidding a party defendant in the action from continuing a certain act that is unfair and harmful to the plaintiff. Since the father only expressed his wish and made no official record of it, option A is incorrect. For the same reason, option D is also incorrect. Since there is no mention of a family court in the passage, option C is incorrect.

60. The right answer is C because, according to the passage, temporary injunctions are granted for a set amount of time or until the court issues subsequent orders on the subject matter. Because W simply asked Q to stop playing music at night in this case, the court may provide a temporary injunction while his case is heard. A is also not the correct option for the same reason. B is not the correct answer since Q does not have the absolute right to do anything on his land, even if it violates the rights of others. D is not the correct answer because it suggests is not asked for in the question.

61. Option D is the correct answer because requisites of private defence are an imminent threat, proportionate harm to the plaintiff, and harm to personal body or property or someone else's property or body. In the given case there was imminent harm to X as he was threatened by gun and he harmed the other party proportionately. There was harm to his body, which further eliminates option C. Option A is incorrect because though his action was proportionate harm. Still, it is essential that other requisites also get satisfied which are correctly captured by option D. Option B is incorrect because though there was an imminent threat. Still, it is essential that all other requisites get satisfied, and here only one prerequisite is mentioned which is satisfied.

62. Option D is correct because the requisites which needed to be satisfied in this case are that the setting mantrap is only allowed in dwelling house but in the given case mantrap was set up at a commercial place, which further eliminates option C. Option A is incorrect because though he set up mantrap to protect his property but he didn't follow essentials of setting requisites which are it should be set in a dwelling house and that too between sunset and sunrise. Option B is incorrect because though it is wrong to set up mantrap anytime other than after sunset and before sunrise and thus he cannot exercise the private defence.

63. Option C is correct because requisites of private defence are an imminent threat, proportionate harm, injury to private body or property, or injury to someone else's body or property. Here in the given case, there was no imminent threat to D he was told that he had a time of 2 days. Option A is incorrect because it is not sufficient to just have a threat but it is also essential to have an imminent threat. Option B is incorrect because the facts mentioned in the passage don't mention anything in relation to the fact given in option, it is incorrect as it is a fact-based answer. Option D is incorrect because it is clarified that option C is correct.

64. Option A is correct because it is essential to have imminent harm and in case of imminent harm, private defence can be used and thus option D is incorrect. Option B is incorrect because person can exercise private defence also in case of harm to someone else's property or body. Option C is incorrect because some of the ingredients are indeed satisfied.

65. Option C is correct. As per the passage, Mens rea and actus Reus were inherently connected in common law doctrine. Liability necessitated a guilty mind as well as a wrong act. Since the facts are silent on the mens rea i.e., guilty intention on part of Zorawar, hence liability cannot be ascertained. Moreover, he sold tickets to Rajat, thinking of him as a major. Hence, option C is correct. Option B is not correct as it neither can be inferred from the passage nor the facts that under "state law" only crimes committed with criminal intent are actionable. Option D is not correct as it is true that he was aware, but he had no intention of violating the law, he mistook Rajat as an adult and then sold him a ticket. Hence, not correct. Option A is not correct as the facts do not provide anything which implies that Rajat had acted intentionally or fraudulently. Hence, not correct.

66. Option B is correct. As per the passage, Mens rea and actus Reus were inherently connected in common law doctrine. Liability necessitated a guilty mind as well as a wrong act. Here, Mayur had no mens rea to leak the paper, he would have been made liable in case he knowingly left the paper set onto his desk, thus, not A but option B is correct. Option C is not correct on similar grounds because whether negligence will be incls of no relevance with respect to the facts given.

67. Option C is correct. Since the act is done with a dishonest intention of making Abhishek loose. Hence, he will be held liable and option C is correct and not option B. Option A is correct but the essential of "intent" is mentioned in option C. Thus, it is considered over option A. Option D is not correct as irrespective of Abhishek's act, the factual question is focus on Rajat's act. Thus, option D is not correct.

68. Option C is correct. The passage in its last second para states that Liability necessitated a guilty mind as well as a wrong act. Thus, both statements A and D are correct and do not present an anomaly with the passage context as the offence is determined by the existence of both mens rea and an actus Reus. Option B is correct as in *Fowler v. Padget (1798)*, the Court held that Actus Reus and mens rea are both required for the commission of a crime. Lord Kenyon stated, "Actus non facit reum nisi mens sit rea is a tenet of natural justice and our law." Option C is not correct as the passage is silent on the information as on to whom the burden of proof shall lie. Thus, option C is incorrect and thus our correct answer.

69. The correct answer is option C. Shantanu has divorced Falguni and had no pre-existing marriage at the time of marrying Nisha. Thus, he is not married to both at the same time, rather he married Nisha only after Falguni was no longer his wife. Thus, option A is incorrect. Option B is incorrect because there is no such stipulation that a divorced person cannot remarry under HMA. Option D is not untrue but it is incorrect because the question is concerned with bigamy as can be seen in the question stem.

70. The correct answer is option B. Shantanu cannot marry Nisha without finalizing a divorce with Falguni as it is illegal to have two living wives at the same time. Thus, the marriage between Shantanu and Nisha is invalid. Option A is incorrect because Falguni is alive at the time of Shantanu marrying Nisha. Option D is incorrect because of the qualifier 'Yes'. Option C is incorrect because Falguni's consent or approval of the second marriage does not matter as it will not make an invalid marriage valid under HMA.

71. The correct answer is option C. A marriage will not be valid if consent is given by threat or coercion. Here, Vivek's father threatened to drink poison if he did not get married. Hence, there is no free consent. Thus, option A is incorrect. Option B is incorrect because the provisions of HMA are applicable to "any person" who gets married under the HMA. The example of the girl's father in the passage is only illustrative in nature. Thus, consent of Vivek is also necessary for a valid marriage. Option D is incorrect because there is no information given in the facts about Vivek's wife so we cannot assume consent or absence thereof, on her part.

72. The correct answer is option A. For a valid marriage, the person shall be not suffering from any insanity or mental disorder "at the time of the marriage." Lalu got married during period of sanity and not insanity, thus marriage is valid and option C is incorrect. Option B is incorrect since question is concerned with insanity so option A is a better answer since the moot point is capacity to give consent and not consent itself. Option D is incorrect because Lalu could exercise independent, rational thinking during period of sanity.

73. The correct answer will be option C. As per the passage, Contracts governing marriages between persons residing in India are considered to be against public policy and so, not valid. Prenuptial agreements or marriage contracts are not enforceable in any court in India. Option A is not valid as it provides a piece of suggestive information as the reason i.e., the Hindu law forces an obligation upon the spouse to live with her better half any place he chooses to remain, and moreover, it is not mentioned in the passage as well. Option B is not correct as the passage is silent on defining what constitutes legal consideration. Hence, both options B and D are eliminated.

74. Option C is the correct answer as Contracts governing marriages between persons residing in India are considered to be against public policy and so, not valid. Even if it is required by law to give maintenance to the wife in the event of a divorce the agreement itself holds no value in the eyes of law and is unenforceable. Thus, not option B but option C is the correct answer. Option D is not the correct answer as the factual question asks for the validity of the agreement and not the terms of the agreement. Moreover, India does not recognize marriage contracts. Thus, making options A and D incorrect.

75. Option D is correct. The facts clearly state that there exists a pre-marriage understanding that decides where the spouses will live and that such conditions need to be strictly adhered to and that the wife shall be given gold jewelry, hence, it is invalid and option D is the correct answer. Option A is therefore negated as it contradicts the correct statement. Option B is not correct as the arrangement limits a spouse's permanent residence in Bombay. Option C is not correct as already discussed above such arrangements are against public policy and not valid.

76. Option A is the correct answer. As per the passage, the court, while granting divorce and/or deciding maintenance or division of properties, may consider such a contract to guide its decision, but it is not bound by the terms of the contract. Hence, option C is not correct as it is no obligation on part of the court to give recognition to such clause of the contract or contract in general. Option B is not correct as it is upon the discretion of the court to whether to consider such clause of an agreement. Option D is negated on similar grounds.

77. Option C is correct as the passage clearly mentions that producing a conversation tape recorded by the husband without the consent of the wife cannot be received in evidence. Option d is incorrect as it is clearly mentioned in the facts that it happened without her knowledge. Option a is incorrect as it does not concern itself with the aspect of the violation of right to privacy of Anita and simply concerns itself with the violation of the right to privacy of Ashok. Option b is incorrect as such a proposition is not mentioned in the passage and thus, it would be too far-fetched to answer the question based on an unfounded proposition. Further, only call recordings made without the other spouse's consent cannot be produced before the court.

78. Option D is the correct option as the passage is silent on a situation wherein a private conversation between husband and wife is produced by the police to the magistrate and it is also silent on the fact that whether WhatsApp conversation will be covered or not under the ambit of telephonic conversation. Thus, by implication options C and B are incorrect. Option a is factually correct but does not answer the question properly and thus, is rendered incorrect because whether WhatsApp conversation will be included in the telephonic conversation or not is not given in the passage.

79. Option A is the correct answer because the passage clearly mentions that producing a recording of a telephonic conversation would amount to a clear violation of the right to privacy and paragraph 2 states that "To permit a spouse to record conversations with an unsuspecting partner and to produce the same in a court of law, to be made the basis of deciding a petition under Section 13 of the Act, would indeed not be feasible" and thus, in this question the ultimate test lies on whether or not Rishi had consented to the recording being produced before the court. Option B is incorrect as there is no absolute ban on producing of call recordings as evidence and the passage clearly mentions in paragraph 2 that conversation tapes recorded by the husband without the wife's consent cannot be received in evidence and be made use of against her, as the same goes against her fundamental right to privacy. Further, only knowledge is not sufficient for a recording to be produced before the Court and it is important that the spouses have consented to the same.

80. Option B is the correct option as paragraph 1 clearly states that "recording of telephonic conversations of the wife without her knowledge amounts to infringement of her privacy". Here, even though the recording was produced before the Court with Nagma's consent, it cannot be denied that the call was recorded without her consent which actually amounts to a violation of her

right to privacy. Option A is incorrect because only knowledge is not sufficient for a recording to be produced before the Court and it is important that the spouses have consented to the

recording of the same as well. Here, even though Nagma had the knowledge that the recording was going to be produced, it does not answer the instant question. Option C merely states the facts without answering the question and thus, is incorrect. Further, even if Nagma had consented to the recording being produced, that doesn't negate the fact that her right to privacy was in fact violated when the call was recorded without her consent. Option D is incorrect because even though Rakesh produced the recording after taking Nagma's consent, her consent was not taken before recording the conversation which, as per the passage, amounts to an infringement of her right to privacy.

81. Option C is the correct answer because the process of terminating a pregnancy when a woman is more than 12 weeks pregnant is she should first take approval from 2 medical practitioners and when they approve termination then she may proceed with termination of her pregnancy under the MTP act, but in given case J was pregnant for 13 weeks and she only consulted a medical practitioner instead of consulting 2 medical practitioners, Option A and B are incorrect because there stated that she has followed the act and as clarified in explanation of Option C that she has not followed the act. Option D is incorrect because the reason is valid as it is mentioned in the passage that 'A woman's socioeconomic status may hamper a healthy pregnancy' this is a legally acceptable reason for terminating pregnancy.

82. Option B is correct because it is mentioned in the passage that 'A surgeon who has six months of experience in obstetrics and gynecology' such surgeons can only terminate pregnancy according to the MTP act but in the given case surgeon who treated K is only gynecologist and not obstetrics, hence surgeon will be held liable. Option D is incorrect because it stated in these options that the surgeon will not be held liable but it is clarified by option B's explanation that surgeon will be held liable, hence these options get eliminated. Option A is incorrect because it is not just enough that hospital has license. Option C is incorrect because the reason is legally acceptable.

83. Option D is correct because the requisites of termination of pregnancy by giving morning-after pills are pills must be given by doctor on prescription until the 7th week of pregnancy, but in the given case pills were not given on doctor's prescription instead they are given on chemist's prescription, hence U will be held liable for not satisfying requisites of MTP act that included, pills can be provided in amendment of 2002 and 2003. Options B and C get eliminated because they state that U will not be held liable but as stated in the explanation of option D that U will be held liable. Option A is incorrect because the 'good faith' exception can be used only when there was a necessity to save the life of the woman, as there was no express necessity of the same in the present case, he cannot be given the benefit of good faith.

84. Option B is correct because according to abortion laws in India, women above 18 years can get their pregnancy terminated by giving their written consent to the hospital and in the given case when D went for termination she was an adult. Thus, Options A and C get eliminated because they state that hospital took legally right action or the hospital will not be held liable. Option D is incorrect as a woman below the age of 18 years cannot get pregnancy aborted without the written consent of the guardian. Thus, stating that D has the right to take a decision at any age of her life would be wrong in the light of the passage.

Logical Reasoning

85. C Although the passage does digress in the last paragraph (suggesting a possible transition to another area of discussion), the passage is devoted mainly to a critical analysis of the restorationists' environmental philosophy, as exemplified by Turner and Jordan. A is too narrow. The author makes no claim to having formulated the organic model or that it is a "new philosophical model". B is too narrow and not well-supported. (D) distorts the author's purpose.

(C) supports well the primary purpose of this passage.

86. (D) because in the first paragraph, the author states that a preservationist need not have a dualist view, and therefore the argument of Turner and Jordan that the preservationists are also "unhealthy" dualists is an unfair claim. (D) is also supported later in the first paragraph, where the author criticizes Turner and Jordan for the "sharpness and relentlessness of their attack on preservationists." (A) confuses the information in the passage.

The author suggests that it is the restorationists such as Turner and Jordan (not the preservationists) who are not critical enough of those who have plundered the natural world.

(B) and (C) confuse the author's viewpoint with the viewpoint of others mentioned in the passage. It is the restorationists, not the author, who claim that the preservationists base their ideas on an unhealthy dualism and who suffer from the same mind-set as the industrial mainstream.

87. (C) (A) runs contrary to the passage and does not identify which issues are subject to debate and which are not. (B) is only partially supported in the latter portion of the statement; the former (to identify problem areas within a school of thought) does not form part of the first paragraph. (D) distorts the information in the passage. Although the author includes some "historical" background but apart from this single reference to past events, the paragraph speaks in terms of the present day.

88. (A). The author states that Turner's and Jordan's descriptions of restorationist activities "do not cohere well with the community participation model." On following this, it is reasonably inferable that restorationists' activities are more consistent with this other model than with the community participation model. (B) confuses the information in this portion of the passage. It is contrary to what has been said in the passage. (C) confuses the information in the passage-specifically, by bringing in irrelevant information. The author is not concerned at all in this portion of the passage with the preservationists. (D) is somewhat consistent with the information in the passage, but it does not respond to the question. The author does identify the organic model as one type of "holistic" model, but, the author states that it may be more serviceable than another holistic model.

89. (D). The author finds some point of similarity among all other models mentioned. Therefore, by elimination, (D) is the best response. Refer to the lines, 'Dissatisfaction with dualism has for some time figured prominently in the unhappiness of environmentalists with a mainstream industrial society...' (A) and (B) are not viable. The author points out several similarities between the organic model (aholistic model) and the domination model. (C) is not a viable response, since the author points out in the paragraph that the community participation and organic models both picture nature as a system of interconnected parts.

90. C is the correct answer because the author tries to put forth through the passage to remove the VVIP convoy system and enable a more intelligent security system that will benefit the public. Option A is not correct as it is not about only India but for any country. It will provide a hurdle and inconvenience to the ordinary person and pose a threat to them. Option B is not correct, as it is not the message that the author wants to pass on. Option D is not valid as only the President cannot be held liable for the death of Vandana Mishra as the VVIP convoy system was not implemented by him.

91. B Statement I is contrary to the essence of the passage. Statement II is correct as it is the desirable course of action, as per the author. Refer to the lines, 'In New Zealand, when the PM's motorcade was caught over the speed limit, it was fined for dangerous driving.' Statement III is not the correct course of action for India, given the size of the population and a smooth working of the functionary. A course of action should be practical and feasible, keeping in mind the place and the factors involved. One country's asset can be other country's liability. Option B is the correct answer as Article 14 of the Indian Constitution states that the law holds every person to be the same before it, and no one acquires a higher position in the eyes of the law. So a

politician doesn't have any right to violate traffic rules, just like an ordinary man. Option A is incorrect as statement I is not the right course of action. Option C is incorrect as Statement III is incorrect and Option D is incorrect as both Statements I and III are wrong courses of action.

92. B is the correct answer as if any one of the political and administrative VVIP manifestations is not done away, the people of India will continue to suffer, and their rights for equality will be infringed. Option A is not correct as it is not relevant information in the passage, and, therefore, not the right assumption. Option C is not valid, as bringing more innovative security into action will not end the perils of democracy; therefore, not the correct assumption. Option D is not correct, as VVIP convoys should be away within a democracy such as India; otherwise, it will differentiate the citizens of India.

93. A A central flaw is that the argument mistakes condition sufficient for bringing about a result for a condition necessary for doing so. Option A is the correct answer as the author while putting forth the argument assumes the traffic situation in India and Western countries to be the same (a condition sufficient to bring about the changes. Assuming similar situations and overlooking other factors in reaching an outcome). Option B is the incorrect answer as it is not irrelevant because all the countries mentioned in the passage are Europeans. Option C is not the correct one, as this is the truth under all circumstances and is not a central flaw. Option D is not valid as the situations, and the treatment for the public servants in India and the Western countries are not the same. Also, this is the conclusion one can draw, but cannot be said to be the central flaw.

94. C The argument above talks of the conduct of the political leader whereby they do not take advantage of their position, but are true representatives of their people. The main argument is to be weakened. To weaken the argument is to present a counter argument that completely invalidates the reasoning. Option C weakens the argument completely. If the leaders, who are the representatives of the people and have important works of national interest are under threats, they cannot be exposed in the public. Hence, they need protection, for which they have to maintain distance and cannot be seen in public transports. Option B may appear close by way of their indifference and people may vent out their anger is to assume that all leaders are indifferent, which is an extreme case. Option (a) and D strengthen the argument. In option A, if people are in awe (marvel), they do not want their leaders to conduct themselves as commoners, but would like to know them from afar and they are fine with the distance. Option D is actually the inference of the main argument.

95. D Options (A) can't be supported as though the passage mentions that the building and logistics are difficult to get and different for the elder-care and the child-care and mixing them up in a shared site makes it a lot more difficult, he doesn't say that this makes it a bad idea for the society. Option (B) can be supported as the author says that this concept is actually a pretty popular one and also lots of students have showed interest in joining these organizations. Option (C) can be supported as the author says that there are many impediments to the concept of shared sites, but more awareness can negate those. Thus, this option too is correct. Thus, the answer is option (D).

96. C Option (A) can't be inferred from the paragraph as the author says that people are not that in to investing in these sorts of spaces. Also, tax-free has not been mentioned anywhere. Option (B) can't be inferred as it has not been mentioned. The paragraph says that it rises interests among the workers and employees of the shared sites, but whether the elders prefer to live in these centres has not been made clear. Option (C) can be inferred from the paragraph as the author says that in US, people must be made aware of its benefits. Option (D) cannot be inferred as it is in contradiction to the information in the passage. The sites do not increase costs; rather are cost efficient. Also, isolating the health care workers form critical care is not mentioned anywhere in the passage. Thus, the answer is option (C).

97. C Option (A) presents a fact that has not been mentioned by the author. It is actually difficult to build places which is suitable for both the children and elders and that is why these centres are low in number.

Option (B) again is a hypnotized point mentioned. The author says that the investors have shied

away from investing in such centres and is exactly the opposite of the option. Option (C) is relevant as the answer as it accurately addresses the benefits of the intergenerational share sites. Refer to the lines, 'Shared sites benefit and build the health-care workforce as well' and "The program has not only sparked student interest in health-related careers but also helped them develop a range of useful life skills.'

Option (D) poses the challenges of the shared sites, instead of the advantages.

Thus, option (C) is the answer.

98. Option (A) provides a valid problem. The centres such as these are reliant on good social behavior from the elders as well as the children. If there is a roadblock from either side, it can be a genuine problem in popularising the centres.

Likewise, option (B) presents a similar problem, but does not completely undermine the author's argument, as 'some' is a figure that is vague; in fact, it can represent a number that does not really pose a problem at all in the larger context. Thus, it does not completely undermine, making it not a valid answer.

Only Option (C) is immaterial to the discussion posed by the author. It has got no relevance whatsoever to what we are talking about. Option (D) strengthens the author's argument as it is in sync with the passage.

Therefore, the correct Option is (A).

99. A Premises are the facts or evidence that support or lead to the conclusion. Therefore, the above statement forms premise of the passage which leads to the conclusion. Hence, option (A) is the correct answer. Conclusions are the wrap-ups of an argument, the expression 'research shows' is not a conclusion. The above statement demands an extension of the main argument; hence, cannot be the conclusion. An assumption is the basis of an argument. The expression 'the research shows' rules out an assumption. An assumption would be:

Researches lead to certain conclusion. Option (D) is ruled out that a simple statement can be a premise, assumption or a conclusion. At the least, it will be a fact or a point of view.

100. A The correct answer is A. The author has mentioned that policymakers need to look beyond the populism steps, thereby implying that the policymakers should refrain from appealing to the ordinary people. Hence, this can be inferred. Option B is clearly incorrect since the Ujjwala scheme does not cater to the demands of the middle class. Option C is also incorrect since the author does not present any piece of evidence regarding this claim. In fact, the author has said that India's goal for 2030 is unlikely to be achieved, making this statement incorrect. Since option A is the answer, option D is ruled out.

101. D The author says that he is not surprised by the findings of 'The Network' since the carbon footprint of India's coal-processing industry remains severe. By saying that he is not surprised, he means that he agrees with the findings as if almost expected the numbers to be true. Therefore, the correct answer is D. Option A is contrary, as bewildered means surprised, as if unexpected. Option B may seem correct, but the author is not unconcerned by the findings. This is because the author presents some suggestions to improve the current situation. Option C is ruled out because had it been the case, the author would not have cited 'The Network's findings.

102. The correct answer is (D). All of the above can be considered as a logical course of action, according to the author. I: The author is concerned about the high LNG prices for the middle class. Therefore, the author would want the government to take measures to keep those prices under control. II: The author has clearly mentioned in the last sentence of the first paragraph that a move away from coal as a whole is necessary. III: This one would also be a welcome

decision since the author wants the policymakers to avoid making populist decisions. All of the following are the course of action that are concurrent with the author's line of thought.

103. The correct answer is A. This question is easy. As stated in the explanation of a previous question, the author has mentioned in the last sentence of the first paragraph that a move away from coal as a whole is necessary. But option A draws an incorrect inference. Refer to the lines, 'To meet the 2030 emissions goal committed at the Paris Pact, India would need to reduce coal

capacity in and around its C40 cities by about 22 per cent.' Option B, C and D can be inferred to be the supporting ideas of the passage. Option B comes from the first part of the second paragraph. Policies are made on some unfounded assumptions and therefore this option makes sense. Option C is a supporting idea as well, coming from this part of the passage: 'Yet, going by the current coal plans, it is expected to increase by 20 per cent instead. To bridge this gap, which is unlikely, policymakers need to look beyond populist steps.' Option D: 'In spite of much-lauded efforts in clean energy, the carbon footprint of India's coal-processing industry remains stark.'

104. A The author has made an argument for shifting away from coal and moving towards cleaner energy. This piece of evidence gives an incentive towards making a change to cleaner and greener energy sources. Hence, this option supports the author's arguments.

Therefore, the correct option is A. Option B is incorrect as it does not negate but strengthens the author's contention. Option C is not true as it does support the author's argument as a 100 percent cleaner and greener energy translates into a clean environment which means robust health yielding more productivity. Option D is not an assumption as it is a furtherance to author's argument.

QUANTITATIVE TECHNIQUES

SET-1

- 105- C
- 106- A
- 107- B
- 108- C
- 109- B

SET-2

- 110- B
- 111- C
- 112- A
- 113- B
- 114- A

SET-3

- 115- A
- 116- D
- 117- B
- 118- A
- 119- C

- 120-D