

ANSWER KEY – 7 MAY 2026

Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q5	Q6	Q7	Q8	Q9	Q10
B	B	B	C	A	B	C	C	B	B
Q11	Q12	Q13	Q14	Q15	Q16	Q17	Q18	Q19	Q20
B	A	A	A	A	B	A	A	B	A
Q21	Q22	Q23	Q24	Q25	Q26	Q27	Q28	Q29	Q30
B	B	B	B	C	D	B	D	A	C
Q31	Q32	Q33							
B	A	C							

RC PASSAGES

Q1 B

The phrase 'transmutes climate risk into debt distress' appears in the second paragraph, in the context of borrowing on commercial terms to finance adaptation. The author is making the point that when a vulnerable country borrows to deal with climate impacts (rather than receiving grants), the underlying climate vulnerability is converted into a different problem — the inability to service the resulting debt. Option (B) captures exactly this transformation: a country's exposure to physical climate risk becomes its exposure to financial distress. Option (A) is too generic and misses the directionality. Option (C) is wrong because the passage contrasts commercial borrowing with concessional aid, not equates them. Option (D) inverts the meaning — the passage criticises the practice of reclassifying loans as climate finance, but that is a separate point made in paragraph one about accounting practices. The vocabulary-in-context clue is 'transmutes', a near-synonym for 'transforms', which signals a change-of-form between two distinct conditions.

Q2 B

Paragraph one explicitly states that when nominal totals approached USD 100 billion, 'accounting practices inflated them: development loans on near-commercial terms were counted at face value rather than at the modest grant-equivalent that genuinely transferred resources.' This is a direct textual basis for option (B). Option (A) is contradicted by the passage, which says the pledge was missed. Option (C) makes a specific claim about China and Gulf states that the passage does not make — the passage notes only that the Loss and Damage fund signalled 'partial expansion of contributors', without specifying refusals. Option (D) is unsupported; the passage does not compare ease of financing adaptation versus mitigation at all. The inference question rewards careful textual anchoring — option (B) is the only one with a direct textual basis.

Q3 B

The central argument of the passage is that climate finance has fallen short — both in quantity (the USD 100 billion target was missed) and in honesty of accounting (loans counted at face value rather than grant-equivalent) — and that the underlying disagreement about whether climate finance is owed (historical accountability) or offered (contemporary generosity) remains unresolved. Option (B) captures both the quantity-and-accounting critique and the unresolved framing question. Option (A) is wrong because the passage explicitly says the Loss and Damage fund only 'partially' expanded contributors and that the 'deeper question remains unresolved'. Option (C) misrepresents the policy recommendation — the passage does not advocate debt restructuring. Option (D) inverts the equity argument; the passage in fact emphasises developed-nation responsibility and only acknowledges emerging-economy contributions as a partial response. Always test main-idea options against the LAST paragraph, where authors typically restate their central claim.

Q4 C

Paragraph three opens with 'Defenders of the existing arrangement argue...' and then surveys two counter-arguments: (i) that climate finance is hard to distinguish from development assistance, and (ii) that emerging economies should contribute. The author then partially accepts this in paragraph four ('The response is partly accepted: the 2022 COP27 agreement on a Loss and Damage fund signalled a partial expansion of contributors') before returning to the central concern about the unresolved framing question. This three-step rhetorical move — present counter, partially acknowledge, return to thesis — is the structure option (C) describes. Option (A) misreads the paragraph as a policy recommendation. Option (B) inverts the tone — the author does not REJECT the equity case but defends it. Option (D) extrapolates incorrectly; the passage attributes only specific positions to emerging economies and does not generalise. Identifying authorial purpose by paragraph requires close attention to discourse markers ('defenders argue', 'the response is partly accepted').

Q5 A

Option (A) directly attacks the author's central empirical claim that climate finance is inadequate. The passage relies on the OECD's reported figures and argues those numbers are inflated by face-value accounting of loans. If, however, an INDEPENDENT audit shows the OECD figures actually UNDERCOUNT climate finance by one-third, then the true volume of resources transferred is materially higher than the author assumes, and the inadequacy claim is significantly weakened. Option (B) STRENGTHENS the author by reinforcing the inadequacy argument. Option (C) is consistent with the author's claim about debt distress and supports rather than weakens. Option (D) is irrelevant to the climate-finance-quantity argument — it speaks to the productivity of adaptation spending, which is a separate matter. The 'most weakens' question requires identifying which option attacks the author's central premise, not merely which option is unfavourable in tone.

Q6 B

The verb 'externalises' in the fourth paragraph appears in the phrase 'externalises a cost' and is contrasted with 'internalises the gains'. The structural contrast — gains internalised, costs pushed outside — is the textbook definition of an externality in economics: a cost or benefit that affects parties not involved in the transaction. Option (B) captures exactly this displacement of cost. Option (A) confuses externalising costs with corporate secrecy, which is a different concept. Option (C) refers to operational outsourcing, which is unrelated. Option (D) is the opposite of externalising — disclosing through filings is in fact an internalising mechanism. The vocabulary-in-context cue is the explicit textual contrast with 'internalises', which fixes the meaning unambiguously.

Q7 C

Paragraph three explicitly observes that prestige drama runs to 'ten one-hour instalments' (very long) while short-form video collapses to 'fifteen-second loops' (very short), and explicitly states that 'both designs serve the same goal of session extension'. This is a direct textual basis for option (C). Option (A) is absurd — Simon's 1971 framework predates modern algorithms by decades; he did not design Netflix's recommendation system. Option (B) is contradicted by paragraph two, which states platforms compete against 'every other claimant — work, family, sleep' (i.e., non-platform activities). Option (D) is the OPPOSITE of what critics in paragraph four allege; the passage links short-form video to fragmented attention and worry about reading capacity. Inference questions are best answered by mapping each option to a specific sentence in the text — only option (C) has direct textual support.

Q8 C

The passage's central argument is that streaming-era content design and recommendation systems are organised around the goal of capturing scarce viewer attention (the 'attention economy' diagnosis), and that this generates externalities — costs not internalised by the platforms — whose social allocation remains contested. Option (C) captures both the descriptive thesis (design oriented around attention capture) and the unresolved normative question (externalities, distribution). Option (A) is too narrow — it only states one possible policy response, which the author flags as one of three contested alternatives. Option (B) inverts the passage's stance; the author USES Simon's framework, not abandons it. Option (D) is also too narrow — regulation is one of three possible responses ('user discipline, platform self-restraint, or regulatory intervention') and the author endorses none. Main-idea answers should reflect the WHOLE passage, including its concluding 'unresolved' framing.

Q9 B

The 2017 Netflix memorandum naming sleep as the company's chief competitor is cited to demonstrate that streaming platforms understand attention to be SUBSTITUTABLE across activities — not just across competing platforms. This goes to the heart of Simon's framework as updated for streaming: the relevant competition is for hours of waking attention, including hours that would otherwise have been spent sleeping, working, or with family. Option (B) captures this purpose precisely. Option (A) reads the citation as moralising about Netflix, but the author neither praises nor condemns the company in the second paragraph. Option (C) overinterprets the citation — the passage does not assert sleep deprivation is a 'most pressing public health concern'. Option (D) misses the point entirely; the disclosure ethics of internal corporate documents are not at issue. Authorial-purpose questions are best answered by identifying what work the example does in the surrounding argument.

Q10 B

The passage is analytical — it lays out the mechanism (attention as scarce resource, design choices as instrumental, externalities as a side-effect) — and measured: it presents the diagnosis as 'no longer contested' but flags the normative question of how to address externalities as 'remaining contested'. It neither calls for regulation (ruling out polemical) nor suggests the framework is fictional (ruling out sceptical). Option (B) accurately captures both attributes. Option (A) overstates by labelling the passage 'polemical' and projects a regulatory recommendation the author does not make. Option (C) misreads tone — the passage is forward-looking analytical, not nostalgic; pre-streaming culture is not even mentioned. Option (D) inverts the passage, which treats the attention economy as an empirically observable phenomenon, not a fictional construct. Tone questions reward attention to discourse markers ('what is no longer contested', 'remains contested') that signal the author's analytical posture.

CR PASSAGES

Q11 B

The conclusion of the critics' argument is stated explicitly in the final paragraph: 'FAME-II should sunset on schedule and the saved fiscal space should be redirected to capital-side interventions in the EV ecosystem.' Option (B) faithfully restates this position. Option (A) is a separate empirical claim, not the conclusion. Option (C) is too broad — the argument is specific to FAME-II, not all transport subsidies. Option (D) misrepresents the argument; nowhere do the critics make a claim about two-wheelers being 'inferior' as a class. Identifying the conclusion of an argumentative passage is best done by looking for explicit signposts in the final paragraph ('the argument concludes', 'should sunset', etc.). The question tests basic argument identification, which is foundational to all subsequent CR questions on the same passage.

Q12 A

Paragraph two of the passage explicitly identifies the unstated premise: the critics' argument relies on the further premise that 'no other factor has been preventing the price-signal from translating into purchase decisions, and that adoption is therefore best understood as price-elastic in this market.' Option (A) captures this assumption precisely. If adoption were NOT price-elastic — if other factors like charging-infrastructure availability or range anxiety dominated — then the failure of the subsidy to lift penetration would not be evidence that the subsidy itself is ineffective; it would be evidence that the subsidy is operating in an environment where other constraints dominate. Option (B) is too strong and is not necessary to the argument. Option (C) addresses the political economy of policy implementation, not the economic logic. Option (D) is irrelevant to the price-elasticity premise. Identifying assumptions requires asking: 'what must the author take for granted, even if not stated, for the conclusion to follow from the premises?'

Q13 A

Option (A) directly attacks the unstated assumption identified in Q12 — that EV adoption is price-elastic. If most non-buyers cite range anxiety as the principal reason for non-purchase, then price subsidies cannot meaningfully shift their decision because price is not the binding constraint. The poor adoption rate then becomes evidence not of subsidy ineffectiveness, but of a non-price barrier the subsidy cannot address. Option (B) is consistent with the critics' framing and does not weaken. Option (C) is irrelevant — the comparison is to other countries, not to subsidy effectiveness. Option (D) attacks specific manufacturers' compliance, not the substantive subsidy-adoption causal claim. The strongest weakener of an argument that depends on an unstated assumption is one that disconfirms that assumption directly. The 'principal reason cited by non-buyers' phrasing is the textual hinge that fixes (A) as the strongest weakener.

Q14 A

Option (A) directly STRENGTHENS the critics' fiscal-redirection claim. The critics argue that capital-side interventions (charging infrastructure, grid upgrades, battery manufacturing) offer better long-run value than per-unit consumption subsidies. If an independent econometric study finds that one rupee of infrastructure spending yields three to four times more long-run adoption than one rupee of subsidy, that is direct empirical support for the redirection claim. Option (B) is irrelevant — manufacturer lobbying tells us about political pressure, not policy efficacy. Option (C) is also irrelevant; the existence of state subsidies is orthogonal to whether the central scheme should sunset. Option (D) speaks to a long-run technology trend that does not bear on the relative efficacy of subsidies versus infrastructure investment. The 'most strengthens' question rewards identification of the option that provides direct empirical support to the SPECIFIC claim under examination — here the 'fiscal opportunity cost' claim of paragraph three.

Q15 A

Option (A) identifies a substantive flaw in the distributional argument. The critics argue that current EV subsidy beneficiaries are already wealthier than the median household. But the relevant question is not who benefits from the EXISTING subsidy; it is what the distribution would look like UNDER THE COUNTERFACTUAL of subsidy withdrawal. If subsidy withdrawal pushes EV purchases even further up the income distribution (because only the very wealthy can afford EVs without subsidy support), the redistributive case for ending the subsidy is undermined. Option (B) misstates the relevance of median income; income comparisons are routinely used in distributional analysis. Option (C) addresses comparative benchmarking, not the internal logic of the distributional argument. Option (D) is factually peripheral — both households and firms purchase EVs, but this does not invalidate the distributional reasoning. Flaw-identification questions reward the option that exposes a hidden ASSUMPTION the argument relies on without examining.

Q16 B

The conclusion of the commentary is stated explicitly in the final paragraph: 'For these reasons — cognitive, economic, administrative and social — the commentary concludes that nationwide bilingual mandate at primary level is the right next step in Indian education policy.' Option (B) restates this position faithfully and at the right level of generality. Option (A) is too narrow — regulation of private schools is not the conclusion. Option (C) is methodological commentary, not the conclusion of the policy argument. Option (D) is a different policy proposal not advanced by the author. Always confirm the conclusion by reading the final paragraph and asking: 'what is the author asking the reader to accept or do?' Here the answer is the bilingual mandate proposal — option (B).

Q17 A

Paragraph two of the passage explicitly identifies the unstated assumption: that 'splitting instruction does not erode either benefit relative to single-language delivery'. The argument treats the two outcomes (cognitive grounding from mother-tongue instruction, labour-market access from English instruction) as 'additively combinable'. If splitting instruction in fact eroded one benefit (say, by reducing the depth of mother-tongue learning) without producing a sufficient compensatory gain in the other, the argument's conclusion would not follow. Option (A) captures this precisely. Option (B) is too strong — the argument does not need to assert universal superiority of mother-tongue instruction. Option (C) addresses a separate empirical claim about private schools. Option (D) is unrelated to the curriculum-design argument. Identifying assumptions is rewarded by asking what the author must take for granted for the move from premises to conclusion to be valid.

Q18 A

Option (A) directly attacks the assumption identified in Q17 by providing rigorous evidence that splitting instruction erodes one benefit (foundational literacy is LOWER under bilingual instruction than mother-tongue-only) without compensating gain (no English-fluency advantage by age fourteen). If both halves of the trade-off are negative, the additive-combinability assumption fails and the argument's conclusion does not follow. Option (B) is irrelevant — private-school behaviour is not the issue. Option (C) reveals a feasibility concern but does not directly attack the cognitive/labour-market trade-off claim. Option (D) actually somewhat strengthens by validating the labour-market premise. The 'most weakens' question favours the option that disconfirms a load-bearing premise of the argument with rigorous empirical evidence — here a 'large multi-state randomised study'.

Q19 B

Option (B) identifies a generalisation flaw — the author cites pilots that used 'specially trained teachers recruited from teachers' colleges with bilingual certification' and infers that nationwide scaling would produce comparable results, without addressing whether such teachers are available at scale. This is a classic problem of inferring at-scale results from special-condition pilots. The pilot used a critical input (specially trained bilingual-certified teachers) that may not be representative of the at-scale teacher pool, and the author overlooks this distinction. Option (A) is too narrow and not necessarily a flaw. Option (C) attributes a claim to the author that is not made — the author does not reduce educational outcomes to reading-comprehension scores alone. Option (D) makes a linguistic-representativeness point that is plausible but secondary to the special-conditions issue. Flaw-identification rewards spotting the gap between what the data can support and what the conclusion claims.

Q20 A

Option (A) directly UNDERMINES the social-fragmentation claim. The author argues that a bilingual mandate would narrow the gap between elite private schools and government schools by offering a 'common bilingual standard'. But if elite private schools respond by adopting trilingual or specialised programmes that distinguish them further from government schools, the policy mandate would WIDEN rather than narrow the gap — directly defeating the convergence-through-standardisation logic. This is a classic strategic-response-to-policy critique. Option (B) raises parental satisfaction with the existing curriculum, which is tangential. Option (C) raises a feasibility concern about teacher recruitment, which is a different objection. Option (D) is a generic statement about social mobility that does not directly address the schooling-gap argument. The strongest undermining option is the one that shows the policy would PRODUCE THE OPPOSITE of its intended convergence effect — here option (A).

SECTION C — RAPID-FIRE GK & CURRENT AFFAIRS

Q21 B

Article 279A was inserted into the Constitution by the 101st Amendment Act, 2016 to establish the Goods and Services Tax Council. The Council is a federal body chaired by the Union Finance Minister with the State Finance Ministers as members; it makes recommendations on GST rates, exemptions, threshold limits and dispute resolution. Article 270 deals with taxes levied and distributed between the Union and States. Article 280 establishes the Finance Commission. Article 246A grants concurrent power to Parliament and State legislatures to make laws on GST. Option (B) Article 279A — correct.

Q22 B

Mission Mausam, approved by the Union Cabinet in September 2024 with an outlay of approximately ₹2,000 crore, aims to make India a 'weather-ready and climate-smart' nation. It enhances capabilities in observational systems, supercomputing for forecast modelling, and atmospheric research, anchored at the Ministry of Earth Sciences (IMD, NCMRWF, IITM). It is unrelated to maritime defence, space exploration or cyber-security, each of which has its own dedicated programmes. Option (B) Weather forecasting and climate research — correct. Mission Mausam is a frequent CLAT current-affairs item for 2025-26.

Q23 B

Ephemeral means short-lived, transient, lasting only a brief time. Its opposite is enduring (lasting, persistent). Option (A) 'Transient' is a near-synonym, not antonym. Option (C) 'Fragile' refers to physical vulnerability, not duration. Option (D) 'Cursory' means hasty or superficial, related to thoroughness, not duration. The vocabulary cluster ephemeral / fleeting / transient / evanescent forms one antonymic pair with enduring / abiding / lasting / perennial. Option (B) Enduring — correct.

Q24 B

The idiom 'to throw in the towel' originates from boxing, where a corner-man would literally throw a towel into the ring to signal that the fighter could not continue, conceding the bout. Today the idiom means to give up, admit defeat, or stop trying after sustained effort. Option (A) takes the phrase literally; option (C) confuses it with surrender by flag-waving; option (D) misreads the idiom as wastefulness. Option (B) To admit defeat and stop trying — correct. Idiom-meaning Qs are standard CLAT English fare; rote memorisation of common idioms is rewarded.

Q25 C

Justice K. S. Puttaswamy v. Union of India (2017), commonly known as the Privacy judgment, was decided by a nine-judge bench of the Supreme Court that unanimously declared the right to privacy a fundamental right under Article 21 (right to life and personal liberty), with traces in Articles 14 and 19. The judgment overruled earlier rulings such as M. P. Sharma (1954) and Kharak Singh (1962) to the extent they denied privacy as a fundamental right. Kesavananda Bharati (1973) established the basic-structure doctrine; Maneka Gandhi (1978) expanded Article 21's procedural-fairness requirement; ADM Jabalpur (1976) infamously denied habeas corpus during Emergency. Option (C) Puttaswamy — correct.

Q26 D

On 9 February 2024, the Government of India announced posthumous Bharat Ratna awards for both Chaudhary Charan Singh (former Prime Minister and farmers' leader) and P. V. Narasimha Rao (former Prime Minister and architect of 1991 economic reforms). Both received the award the same year, alongside M. S. Swaminathan and others. Lal Bahadur Shastri received the Bharat Ratna in 1966 (posthumously, the first PM to do so), well before 2024. Option (D) Both B and C — correct. CLAT current-affairs Qs frequently test the year-and-recipient combination for top civilian honours.

Q27 B

Banu Mushtaq, the Kannada writer and lawyer, won the International Booker Prize 2025 for 'Heart Lamp', a collection of twelve stories written between 1990 and 2023, translated from Kannada to English by Deepa Bhashti. This made Banu Mushtaq the first Kannada-language author and the second Indian (after Geetanjali Shree, who won in 2022 for 'Tomb of Sand') to win the prize. The prize is awarded annually for a work translated into English and published in the UK or Ireland. Option (B) Banu Mushtaq — correct.

Q28 D

The current Dalai Lama, Tenzin Gyatso, is the head of the Gelug school (also known as Yellow Hat school) of Tibetan Buddhism. The Gelug school was founded by Je Tsongkhapa in the 14th century and emphasises monastic discipline and scholarly study. The other major schools — Nyingma, Sakya and Kagyu — each have their own respective heads (e.g., the Karmapa heads the Karma Kagyu lineage). The Dalai Lama's institutional role specifically belongs to the Gelug tradition, though he is widely regarded as the spiritual leader of all Tibetan Buddhists. Option (D) Gelug — correct.

Q29 A

Trenchant means vigorous, sharp, incisive — often used of speech or criticism that is forceful and cutting. 'Trenchant remarks' fits the criticism context: undiplomatic because too pointed. Option (B) Mellifluous (smooth-flowing, sweet-sounding) suggests pleasing speech, which would not be criticised as undiplomatic. Option (C) Insouciant (carefree, indifferent) does not fit a criticism for undiplomatic content. Option (D) Sycophantic (flattering, obsequious) is the opposite of criticism-worthy speech. Option (A) Trenchant — correct. The CLAT vocabulary section rewards close attention to connotation, not just denotation.

Q30 C

Article 360 of the Indian Constitution empowers the President of India to declare a financial emergency if she is satisfied that a situation has arisen whereby the financial stability or credit of India or any part of its territory is threatened. Article 352 deals with national emergency (war, external aggression, armed rebellion); Article 356 deals with State emergency (failure of constitutional machinery in a State); Article 365 deals with the consequences of a State's failure to comply with Union directions. A financial emergency under Article 360 has never been declared in India. Option (C) Article 360 — correct.

Q31 B

The High-Level Committee on Simultaneous Elections ('One Nation, One Election') was constituted on 2 September 2023 and chaired by former President of India Ram Nath Kovind. The committee submitted its report to the President on 14 March 2024, recommending a phased return to simultaneous elections to the Lok Sabha and State Legislative Assemblies, followed by local-body elections within 100 days. The report has since been the basis for The Constitution (One Hundred and Twenty-ninth Amendment) Bill, 2024 and a complementary Union Territories bill. Option (B) Ram Nath Kovind — correct.

Q32 A

Perfunctory means done as a formality, hastily, with little care or interest. Cursory shares this meaning — a quick, superficial treatment. Both words describe an action carried out without depth or attention. Option (B) Meticulous (extremely careful and precise) is the opposite. Option (C) Profound (deep, far-reaching) is the opposite in connotation. Option (D) Diligent (showing care and effort) is also opposite. Option (A) Cursory — correct. The pair 'perfunctory / cursory' is a frequent CLAT vocabulary item and worth memorising as a synonym pair.

Q33 C

Neeraj Chopra won the silver medal in men's javelin throw at the Paris Olympics 2024 with a best throw of 89.45 m, finishing behind Pakistan's Arshad Nadeem who set an Olympic record of 92.97 m to take gold. Chopra had won gold in javelin at Tokyo 2020. Kishore Kumar Jena (option A) finished sixth at Paris with 80.73 m. Manu Bhaker won bronze medals in shooting at Paris (10 m air pistol, 10 m mixed team), not javelin. Arshad Nadeem (option D) is the gold medallist, not the Indian silver. Option (C) Neeraj Chopra — correct.