

ENGLISH LANGUAGE & LOGICAL REASONING**1. B**

Explanation: The author repeatedly emphasises that India's suspension is a *strategic and security-driven* response to terrorism, not a legal or retaliatory water cut.

2. B

Explanation: The vivid imagery ("blood stains the snow") contrasts real terror attacks with the "abstractions" of legal processes.

3. B

Explanation: If Pakistan is not responsible for the attack, the basis of India's suspension (terrorism emanating from Pakistan) is undermined.

4. C

Explanation: The article acknowledges procedural validity but criticises tribunals for being context-blind ("law cannot be blind to context").

5. B

Explanation: These global examples support the idea that power without legitimacy leads to long-term instability.

6. B

Explanation: The author's argument rests on the idea that terrorism has eroded the trust needed to maintain the older insulated framework..

7. C

Explanation: The contrast between slow legal processes and immediate terror threats supports the author's view of legal inadequacy.

8. C

Explanation- Unilateral withdrawal contradicts the advocated balance of firmness and responsibility.

9. C

Explanation: The author repeatedly connects treaty implementation with trust, and how terror erodes it.

10. B

Explanation - The author suggests India can use its upstream advantages legally and transparently to create pressure.

Legal Reasoning

11. (b) Refer to the lines, “Since there were conflicting views in the Supreme Court – in *Prakash v. Phulwati (Phulwati) and Mangammal v. T.B. Raju & Ors.* (Mangammal), the court said the daughter could claim her share only if her father was alive on September 9, 2005, while in *Danamma v. Amar* (Danamma), the court said the fact of her birth was enough to vest her with rights regardless of whether her father was alive or not – the matter was referred to a larger bench that is the author of the latest judgment (*Vineeta Sharma v. Rakesh Sharma*).”

12. (d) The passage clearly mentions that coparcenary right is a right recognised from the time the daughter is born just as if she were a son. This status therefore operates from the time she is born. Therefore, only Statement III forms a part of the judgment of the Supreme Court in *Vineeta Sharma*. I and II are explicitly false, as per the passage.

13. (b) The decisions of the Supreme Court in *Phulwati* and *Mangammal* merely state that the daughter could claim her share only if her father was alive on September 9, 2005. Sunita’s father died in 2017, hence he was alive on the date of the amendment. Therefore, she can claim coparcenary rights even as per *Phulwati* and *Mangammal*.

14. (a) Refer to the lines, “while in *Danamma v. Amar* (Danamma), the court said the fact of her birth was enough to vest her with rights regardless of whether her father was alive or not – the matter was referred to a larger bench that is the author of the latest judgment (*Vineeta Sharma v. Rakesh Sharma*).”

15. (b) Refer to the lines, “*The prospective statute operates from the date of its enactment conferring new rights. The retrospective statute operates backward and takes away or impairs vested rights acquired under existing laws. A retroactive statute is one that does not operate retrospectively. It operates in futuro. However, its operation is based upon the character or status that arose earlier.*”

16. (d) Referring to the passage it mentions that, when an unauthorized person uses a trademark that is 'identical' or 'deceptively similar' to a registered trademark, it is known as infringement. Therefore, Kevtol will be held liable for infringing the 65year old trademark of Kettol.

17. (d) Referring to the passage, when an unauthorized person uses a trademark that is 'identical' or 'deceptively similar' to a registered trademark, it is known as infringement. Here, Uhao India has a potential to confuse people with Uhao and therefore it will amount to infringement.

18. (c) We do not know whether the trademark was registered or not thus it cannot be concluded whether there was a case of infringement or other remedies shall apply. All the other options are out of scope.

19. (c) Logos of a company form an intrinsic part of their goodwill and brand loyalty. Hence even though unregistered they can have severe impact and thus alternate remedies might be available. Thus, option (c) is right.

20. (b) This can either be a case of violation or infringement depending on whether the packaging is registered or unregistered as a trademark. Irrespective, copying packaging comprises goodwill and thus will open gates for possible breach.

General Knowledge

21 → A, Only Statement 1 is correct. UNFF is universal but NOT treaty-based and does NOT report annually to UNGA. (Given in topic context, NOT in passage.)

22 → B, GFFFN helps countries with finance access and national strategies, not carbon pricing.

23 → D, All three appear as elements of GFGs under UNSPF.

24 → B, UNFF operates on voluntary, consensus-based processes.

25 → B, Secretariat is within **UNDESA**.

26 → A, UNSPF aligns with SDG 15 and includes six GFGs but is NOT binding.

27 → B, FAO conducts FRA, with UNFF providing input.

28 → D, All three are widely recognized forest governance challenges.

29 → D, Forest goals link to SDGs 13, 15, and 17.

30 → B, South America continues highest net forest loss (Amazon-driven).

31. A (1 and 3 only)

Given in passage: Assembly + Technical Bureau.

Not given: Secretariat with DG, sanctions → not mentioned.

32. A (1 and 2 only)

GAEA mandates transparency + risk-classification.

Sanctions → *not mentioned*.

33. A (1, 2 and 4 only)

Global Trade Integration is NOT a pillar.

34. B (1, 3 and 4 only)

IASG covers data flows, cybersecurity, anonymity.

Neuromorphic computing is outside IASG.

35. B (1, 2 and 3 only)

Environmental norms criticism → *not mentioned*.

36. A (1, 3 and 4 only)

Executive Council has 15 members → passage contradicts option 2.

37. D (All three correct)

All three facts appear in the passage.

38. B — UNESCO

UNESCO's Recommendation on AI Ethics (2021).

39. A — 1, 2 and 4 only, Frontier models exceed capability + large models + systemic risks.

40. B — United States, US launched AI Safety Institute (2023–24).

Quantitative Technique

Passage-I

Explanation

Total rent = $5500 \times 24 = 132000$

Total expenses on utility = $3400 \times 24 = 81600$

Total tuition fee = $250000 \times 4 = 1000000$

Total exp on study = $132000 + 81600 + 1000000 = 1213600$

Loan by bank = 80% of $1213600 = 970880$

Expanses bear by her = 20% of $1213600 = 242720$

41-C

42-A

43-C

44-A

45-C



Passage - II

Explanation (166 - 170)

46. D, $3\% = 15.75$

$1\% = 15.75/3 = 5.25$

100% (total) = $5.25 \times 100 = 525$ million.

47. D, Below 26 years = $30 + 17.75 = 47.75\%$

$5600 \times 47.75\% = 2674$

48. D

49. D. $5.12\% = 20.48$

$1\% = 4$

Difference (3.5%) = $4 \times 3.5 = 14$ million

50. C. Below 36 years = $30 + 17.75 + 17.25 =$

65%

$65\% = 400$

$5.12\% = ?$

$? = 31.50$ million