BLOGS

# Legal Reasoning Questions for CLAT UG-Part IV

Ruchika Mohapatra · 15 Aug 2025

## PASSAGE

The Right to Information Act grants citizens access to government records, but exempts information that could endanger national security, diplomatic relations, or the safety of individuals. The Act requires authorities to provide reasons when denying a request and to consider partial disclosure where possible.

A journalist requests documents on a recent military procurement deal, suspecting irregularities in pricing. The Ministry refuses, citing national security concerns, but does not explain how disclosure would cause harm. The journalist argues that without specific reasons, the denial is arbitrary and undermines transparency.

The Supreme Court has held that exemptions to information access must be narrowly interpreted, and authorities must demonstrate a clear connection between disclosure and the harm claimed. Public interest in exposing wrongdoing can outweigh secrecy, unless disclosure poses a real and substantial risk to protected interests.

## QUESTIONS

**1. Which fact most supports the journalist's position?**

A. The Ministry refused without explaining the risk.
B. The procurement involved foreign suppliers.
C. The journalist works for a major newspaper.
D. The deal was worth a large sum.

**Answer:** A
**Explanation:** Lack of specific reasons weakens the claim of exemption.

**2. If the documents contained troop deployment details, what would be the likely outcome?**

A. Disclosure would be required.

B. Exemption for national security would apply.

C. The journalist would win the case.

D. Public interest would outweigh all other concerns.

**Answer:** B

**Explanation:** Troop deployment information poses a direct and substantial security risk.

**3. Which principle does the Court apply in balancing access and secrecy?**

A. Maximum disclosure, minimum exemption

B. Complete secrecy in security matters

C. Freedom of speech over all else

D. Equal treatment of all requests

**Answer:** A

**Explanation:** The Court favors disclosure unless harm is real and significant.

**4. Which scenario would most clearly justify withholding information?**

A. Documents reveal misuse of funds.

B. Papers detail covert intelligence operations.

C. Reports critique government policy.

D. Records show inflated project costs.

**Answer:** B

**Explanation:** Covert operations disclosure could endanger security.

**5. If the Ministry released parts of the document with sensitive sections removed, which legal requirement would it meet?**

A. Absolute secrecy

B. Partial disclosure

C. Full exemption

D. No compliance

**Answer:** B

**Explanation:** Partial disclosure balances transparency with protection.

## PASSAGE

The Patient Rights and Medical Ethics Code states that no medical procedure can be performed without the patient's informed consent, except in life-threatening emergencies where the patient is unconscious or unable to decide, and delay would risk death or serious harm. In such emergencies, doctors may proceed in the patient's best interest.

An unconscious accident victim is brought to a hospital requiring immediate surgery to stop internal bleeding. The doctors proceed without consent. After recovery, the patient sues, claiming their right to decide was violated. The hospital defends the action, citing the emergency exception.

The Supreme Court has held that informed consent is central to respecting patient autonomy but recognizes that emergencies create exceptions. In such cases, the intervention must be necessary, proportionate, and aimed at saving life or preventing serious harm.

## QUESTIONS

**1. Which fact most supports the hospital's defense?**

A. The patient arrived with family members.
B. Surgery was needed immediately to prevent death.
C. The doctors did not explain the risks before surgery.
D. The patient had a history of medical refusals.

**Answer:** B
**Explanation:** Life-threatening urgency justifies bypassing consent under the Code.

**2. If the surgery could have been safely delayed for two hours to obtain consent, what would be the likely legal outcome?**

A. The hospital would still be justified.
B. The patient's claim would be stronger.
C. Emergencies remove all consent requirements.
D. The case would be irrelevant.

**Answer:** B
**Explanation:** If delay is possible without risking life, consent must be sought.

**3. What principle underlies the emergency exception?**

A. Patient autonomy is absolute.

B. Preservation of life takes priority in urgent cases.

C. Doctors can act without limits in emergencies.

D. Consent can always be waived.

**Answer:** B

**Explanation:** Saving life or preventing serious harm can temporarily override consent.

**4. Which scenario would most clearly violate the Code?**

A. Performing CPR on an unconscious patient.

B. Conducting cosmetic surgery without consent.

C. Giving oxygen to a semi-conscious patient.

D. Treating a broken bone in a non-urgent setting.

**Answer:** B

**Explanation:** Cosmetic surgery is non-urgent and requires informed consent.

**5. If the law were amended to allow doctors to act without consent in all cases, what would be the primary concern?**

A. Increased medical innovation

B. Violation of patient autonomy and rights

C. Reduced healthcare costs

D. Faster hospital service

**Answer:** B

**Explanation:** Removing consent undermines individual autonomy and legal protections.

## PASSAGE

The Online Safety and Responsibility Act criminalizes online communication that is “threatening, harassing, or intentionally causes severe emotional distress” to an individual. The Act does not apply to fair criticism of public figures unless the criticism contains threats or harassment.

A social media user posts a series of messages targeting another individual with repeated insults about their appearance and personal life. The target reports feeling anxious and avoiding social

media altogether. The accused claims it was “just free speech” and that online interactions are often harsh.

The Supreme Court has ruled that freedom of expression does not protect speech intended to cause targeted harm, and that harassment is judged by its effect on a reasonable person, not only by the speaker’s intent.

## QUESTIONS

**1. Which fact most supports a conviction under the Act?**

A. The accused criticized a politician’s policies.
B. The accused repeatedly insulted the target’s personal life.
C. The accused used sarcasm in an online debate.
D. The accused discussed a controversial public issue.

**Answer:** B
**Explanation:** Targeted, repeated personal insults causing distress fit the Act’s definition of harassment.

**2. If the messages contained direct threats of physical harm, what would be the likely result?**

A. It would strengthen the case for prosecution.
B. It would make the speech legally protected.
C. It would have no effect.
D. It would exempt the accused from the Act.

**Answer:** A
**Explanation:** Threats are explicitly prohibited and make the case stronger.

**3. Which principle guides the Court’s approach?**

A. Speaker’s intent is the only factor.
B. The effect on a reasonable person matters.
C. All offensive speech is banned.
D. Only private communications can be punished.

**Answer:** B

**Explanation:** Harm is judged from the reasonable person's perspective.

**4. Which scenario would likely NOT be covered by the Act?**

A. Repeated personal harassment in private messages.

B. An academic article critiquing public policy.

C. A series of insulting posts directed at one person.

D. Publicly urging others to humiliate someone online.

**Answer:** B

**Explanation:** The Act targets harassment, not general policy critique.

**5. If the law were expanded to ban all "offensive" speech, what legal concern would arise?**

A. Overbreadth restricting legitimate expression.

B. Stronger enforcement of online safety.

C. More public order.

D. Increased internet usage.

**Answer:** A

**Explanation:** Banning all offensive speech risks violating free expression.