

**ENGLISH LANGUAGE & LOGICAL REASONING****1. (Correct Answer: A)**

**Explanation:** The passage stresses that the US message focused on defence burden-sharing and China's military challenge, whereas France emphasised "strategic autonomy" and reduced dependence on both China and the US. This contrast directly showcases divergent strategic expectations.

**2. (Correct Answer: C)**

**Explanation:** The passage explicitly states that South Korea's political oscillation "mirrors wider regional trends" of balancing between China and the US — reflecting the broader dilemma of strategic balancing.

**3. (Correct Answer: B)**

**Explanation:** The phrase demonstrates that the US message emphasized military issues over economic ones.

**4. (Correct Answer: D)**

**Explanation:** The author urges India to maintain flexibility, avoid rigid blocs, and strengthen diversified partnerships—reflecting pragmatic caution.

**5. (Correct Answer: A)**

**Explanation:** Macron argues for reducing dependence on both China and the US, implying engagement without constraint.

**6. (Correct Answer: C)****7. (Correct Answer: D)****8. (Correct Answer: A)****9. (Correct Answer: B)****10. (Correct Answer: B)**

For 1-to-1 Mentorship with **Anurag Choubey Sir**

 Call Now: **+91 7033005444**

 **CLAT Gurukul** | Personalized Guidance for Every Aspirant

**Legal Reasoning**

- 11. (b)** The passage clearly tells us that in the case of tort of trespass, direct physical interference may be committed intentionally, negligently or even by an honest mistake. Therefore, even though Meha was under a mistaken belief, she can still be held liable for trespass to goods. This will not amount to conversion as there is not enough information in the question which determines that Meha “dealt” with the goods in a manner that deprived another of its immediate use or possession.
- 12. (b)** The fact that the independent contractors had no knowledge of the underground cables and neither were they made aware of the same points to the fact that they were not at fault. Since they were not aware of the underground cables, the damage caused to them would be inevitable.
- 13. (b)** This is a clear case of conversion as Atkins dealt with Richard’s goods in a manner that deprived him of its use and possession. All the other options are out of context. Hence, option (b) is right.
- 14. (a)** As has been stated in the passage, for the purposes of establishing conversion, it is no defence that he honestly believed that he has a right to deal with the goods or he had no knowledge of the owner’s right in them. If we are to take the defence of bona fide, it also needs to be shown that Felix carried out some reasonable steps to keep the goods in custody till he found the true owner. None of this is ascertainable from the facts of the case.
- 15. (b)** As the lease obtained by Pramesh expired on 20-3-2019, which was extended by a day by the court to 21-3-2019, any use by Pramesh beyond that date would not be lawful. Which means that he would have no right to use or possession of the property/goods in question and therefore, conversion cannot occur.
- 16. (c)** There was no wilful intention, as Karthik took the pen accidentally. All the other options are out of context. Therefore, option (c) is the most appropriate answer.
- 17. (d)** The exception of demand and refuse is applicable only to goods in a lien. This is conversion as by keeping the goods Karthik interfered with rights of both Prajjwal and Shantanu. Thus, option (d) is right.
- 18. (a)** A conversion is an act, or complex series of acts, of wilful interference, without lawful justification, with any chattel in a manner inconsistent with the right of another, whereby that other is deprived of the use and possession of it. Prajjwal had the immediate right to possess them along with being the owner of it.
- 19. (b)** In this case, it becomes important to note that demand and refusal are not evidence of conversion where the party has the lien upon the chattel. It means that a mere demand of the chattel from the bailee and its refusal on the part of the bailer won’t amount to the act of conversion.
- 20. (b)** Even after receiving the money, Animesh’s refusal to return the horse amounts to conversion as it interferes unlawfully with Suneel’s rights. All the other options are out of context. Hence, option (b) is right.

**General Knowledge**

21. Answer: B

22. Answer: C

23. Answer: A

24. Answer: D

25. Answer: B

26. Answer: C

27. Answer: A

28. Answer: D

29. Answer: B

30. Answer: C

31. Answer: C

32. Answer: D

33. Answer: B

34. Answer: A

35. Answer: D

36. Answer: C

37. Answer: B

38. Answer: A

39. Answer: C

40. Answer: B



For 1-to-1 Mentorship with **Anurag Choubey Sir**

 Call Now: +91 **7033005444**

 **CLAT Gurukul** | Personalized Guidance for Every Aspirant

## Quantitative Technique

### Passage-I

#### Explanation

A : B : C 25000 x 12 : 20000 x 12 + 5000 x 8 : 40000 x 8

Ratio of profit = 300000 : 280000 :

32000 = 15:14:16

Total profit = Rs. 44000

A's salary = 44000 x 10 % = 4400

Remaining profit = 44000 - 4400 = 39600

41. (B) B' share in profit =  $39600 \times \frac{14}{45}$  = Rs. 12320

42. (D) A' s share of profit =  $15 \times \frac{100}{45}$  = 33.33%

43. (C) 4400 +  $39600 \times \frac{15}{45}$  , 17600

44. (A) 15:16

45. (A) Less investment = 40000 - 25000 = 15000

% less =  $15000 \times \frac{100}{40000}$  = 37.5%

### Passage-II

#### Explanation :

Month	POCO	BlackBerry	Total
April	600	360	960
May	480	320	800
June	500	700	1200
July	240	400	640
<b>Total</b>	<b>1820</b>	<b>1780</b>	

46. (C) Total number of Blackberry phones sold in all months =  $600 + 480 + 500 + 240$  = 1820

47. (A) Required ratio = 360 : 480 = 3 : 4

48. (C) Required percentage =  $(500/400) \times 100$  = 125%

49. (D) Required percentage change =  $((320 - 240) / 320) \times 100$  = 25%

50. (C) Required difference = 1820 - 1780 = 40

For 1-to-1 Mentorship with **Anurag Choubey Sir**

 Call Now: +91 **7033005444**

 **CLAT Gurukul** | Personalized Guidance for Every Aspirant