BLOGS

Legal Reasoning Questions for CLAT UG-Part III

Ruchika Mohapatra · 14 Aug 2025

PASSAGE

The Fair Trade and Consumer Protection Act prohibits any advertisement that is “false, misleading, or likely to mislead consumers” about the quality, quantity, or benefits of a product. Under the Act, a claim is considered misleading if it cannot be substantiated with credible evidence at the time it is made. The law allows fines, compensation to affected consumers, and orders to withdraw such advertisements.

A popular beverage company launches a campaign for its new energy drink, claiming it “boosts immunity by 200% within a week.” Health authorities demand evidence for the claim, but the company provides only general studies on certain vitamins, without testing the product itself. Several consumers file complaints, saying they bought the drink for its immunity benefits and saw no results. The company argues that the claim was “figurative marketing” and that consumers should understand it as exaggeration.

The Supreme Court has held that while advertisements may use persuasive language, they cannot make factual claims that are untrue or unsupported by evidence. It has also stated that companies are responsible for ensuring the accuracy of their claims at the time of publication, regardless of their intention.

QUESTIONS

1. Which fact most strongly supports the case against the company?

A. The company is a market leader.
B. The product was never tested to prove the specific claim.
C. Some consumers enjoyed the taste of the drink.
D. The vitamins in the drink are found in other beverages.

Answer: B
Explanation: Lack of product-specific evidence makes the factual claim misleading under the Act.

2. If the company had included a small disclaimer saying "results may vary," would that automatically protect it from liability?

A. Yes, because disclaimers always remove liability.

B. No, because disclaimers cannot override false factual claims.

C. Yes, if consumers read it carefully.

D. No, because the company is state-owned.

Answer: B

Explanation: Disclaimers cannot excuse unsubstantiated factual claims.

3. Which principle guides the Court's reasoning in such cases?

A. Caveat emptor ("buyer beware")

B. Accountability for factual claims

C. Freedom of commercial speech without limits

D. Absolute immunity for advertisements

Answer: B

Explanation: The Court emphasizes that factual claims must be accurate and provable.

4. Which scenario would likely NOT violate the Act?

A. A phone ad claiming "crystal-clear calls" without evidence.

B. A soap ad claiming it makes skin "feel as soft as a cloud" (metaphor).

C. A cereal ad claiming "prevents colds completely" without proof.

D. A car ad claiming "fastest in the country" without speed test results.

Answer: B

Explanation: Metaphorical language that is obviously subjective is not treated as a factual claim.

5. If the law were amended to require proof only after a complaint is filed, what would be the likely effect?

A. Stronger consumer protection.

B. Weaker enforcement, as false claims could circulate longer.

C. No change in company responsibilities.

D. Complete removal of liability.

Answer: B

Explanation: Delaying proof requirements would make it easier for misleading ads to influence consumers before being challenged.

PASSAGE

The Equal Opportunity in Employment Act prohibits workplace rules that directly or indirectly discriminate against employees based on religion, gender, or ethnicity, unless the rule is objectively necessary for the job. The Act allows employers to set dress codes for safety, hygiene, or uniformity, provided they are reasonable and proportionate to the work requirements.

A private security company requires all guards to wear a standard cap as part of the uniform. An employee belonging to a religious community that mandates wearing a specific head covering requests to wear it instead of the company cap. The employer refuses, stating that uniformity is essential to the company's brand image. The employee claims this violates their right to equal opportunity and religious freedom.

The Supreme Court has previously ruled that employers must justify restrictions that interfere with personal or religious expression by showing a genuine and significant workplace need. Cosmetic or brand-image reasons alone are generally not sufficient to override fundamental rights.

QUESTIONS

1. Which fact most supports the employee's claim?

A. The employee has been with the company for five years.
B. The company's rule is based mainly on brand image.
C. The cap is part of a global uniform standard.
D. The job involves guarding a secure facility.

Answer: B

Explanation: Brand image alone is not generally a strong enough reason to restrict religious expression.

2. If the cap were required for safety (e.g., protection gear), what would be the likely outcome?

A. The rule could be upheld as objectively necessary.

B. The employee would automatically win the case.

C. The court would ban all dress codes.

D. The company would still violate the Act.

Answer: A

Explanation: Safety requirements can justify proportional restrictions.

3. What principle guides the Court's assessment of such disputes?

A. Employer's right to profit maximization

B. Reasonable accommodation of individual rights

C. Strict separation of personal beliefs and work

D. Absolute enforcement of company rules

Answer: B

Explanation: Employers must adjust rules where possible to respect rights without harming legitimate needs.

4. Which scenario would most clearly violate the Act?

A. Requiring gloves for hygiene in a food factory.

B. Banning all religious symbols for "aesthetic consistency."

C. Requiring steel-toed boots on a construction site.

D. Mandating ID badges for security purposes.

Answer: B

Explanation: An across-the-board ban for purely aesthetic reasons is discriminatory.

5. If the company allowed religious head coverings in a matching color to the uniform, how would this affect the legal analysis?

A. It would likely satisfy the requirement of reasonable accommodation.

B. It would have no effect on the case.

C. It would still be illegal under the Act.

D. It would remove the need for any dress code.

Answer: A

Explanation: Matching colors maintains uniformity while respecting religious rights.