BLOGS

Legal Reasoning Questions for CLAT 2025

Khushi Malviya · 28 May 2024

Preparing for CLAT? Attempt these Legal Reasoning Questions for CLAT 2025 and test your preparation today!

QUESTIONS

Q.1 Principle: A person is said to be of sound mind for the purpose of making a contract if, at the time when he makes it, he is capable of understanding it and of forming a rational judgment as to its effect upon his interests.

Facts: Anvi, a very good painter, is also a patient in a mental hospital, who, at times, is of sound mind. During one of these intervals, she entered into a contract with Mina to paint a picture of her for a specified amount of money. She, however, asked Mina to pay her the entire amount in advance. One month later, on the day of delivery of the painting, Anvi refused to perform the contract saying that she suffers from insanity. Can Mina force performance?

(A) Yes, because Anvi was of sound mind when she entered into the contract.
(B) No, because Anvi had been of unsound mind even while the contract was signed which is proved by the fact that she was admitted in an asylum.
(C) Yes, because a good painter can paint irrespective of his/her mental stability.
(D) No, because it was silly on Mina’s part to enter into a contract with a mental patient admitted in an asylum.

Q.2 Principle: When one person signifies to another his willingness to do or abstain from doing anything, with a view to obtaining the assent of that person to such an act or abstinence, he is said to have made a proposal.

Fact: “Ram telegraphed to Shyam, writing: “Will you sell me your Bentley CAR? Telegram the lowest cash price.” Shyam replied by telegram: “Lowest price for CAR is Rs. 20 lakh.” Ram immediately sent his consent through telegram stating: “I agree to buy the CAR for Rs. 20 lakh asked by you.” Shyam refused to sell the car.

(A) He cannot refuse to sell the car because the contract has already been made.
(B) He can refuse to sell the car because it was only invitation to offer and not the real offer
(C) It was not a valid offer because willingness to enter into a contract was absent
(D) None of these

Q.3 **Principle:** Ignorance of Fact is excused but ignorance of law is no excuse.

Fact: A was a passenger from Pakistan to Bangladesh in a Pakistani Plane. When the plane landed at the Airport of Delhi it was found on searching that A carried 40 kg of Gold Bricks on his person and that he had not declared it in the 'Manifest for Transit'. The Government of India had issued a notification modifying its earlier exemption, making it mandatory now that the gold must be declared in the "Manifest" of the aircraft.

(A) A cannot be prosecuted because he had actually no knowledge about the new notification issued two days ago.
(B) A cannot be prosecuted because ignorance of fact is excusable
(C) A can be prosecuted because ignorance of law is not excusable
(D) A's liability would depend on the discretion of the court

Q.4 Principle: Any direct physical interference with goods in somebody's possession without lawful justification is called trespass of goods.

Facts: A purchased a scooter from a person who had no title to it and sent it to a garage for repair. B believing that the scooter was his removed it from the garage under a wrong belief.

(A) B cannot be held responsible for trespass of goods as he was under a wrong belief.
(B) B can be held responsible for trespass of goods
(C) B has not committed any wrong.
(D) None of the above.

Q.5 Principle:A person is liable for the tort of negligence if he breaches a legal duty of care he owes to the plaintiff, and the plaintiff suffered a damage resulting from this breach.

Facts: V had a health condition in her intestines which required her to go through a surgery that involved cutting her stomach open as per the advice of her doctor, Dr C. Though the surgery went fine, after a few days, she started suffering from an infection which was a result of her stomach being cut open for the surgery. Reasonable measures to avoid any such infection had been taken by the doctors who operated her. She visited

another doctor, Dr K, after the infection, and he told her that even a laser surgery could have cured her without any risk of infection. V sued Dr C. Decide.

(A) Dr C will win because he had followed an accepted and established medical procedure taking reasonable precautions during the surgery.
(B) Dr C will win because the only operation was his responsibility and the operation was successful.
(C) Dr C will lose unless he is able to prove that the practice he chose was better than the other practice in this case.
(D) Dr C will lose because being a doctor, he owes a greater duty of care and it was his responsibility to ensure that his patients do not have to deal with such consequences.

Q.6 Principle: A person is liable for the tort of negligence if he breaches a legal duty of care he owes to the plaintiff, and the plaintiff suffered a damage resulting from this breach.

Facts: Deepak started to drive his Celerio on the highway after gulping down two bottles of Beer. Ishaan was driving his WagonR with the headlights turned off. They collided resulting in an injury on Ishaan's head. Deepak, who was highly intoxicated, had only a narrow chance to avoid the collision, but because of the high levels of alcohol in his blood, he was unable to do so. Ishaan sued Deepak for negligence. Will he succeed?

(A) Yes, because Deepak should be taught a lesson.
(B) Yes, because Deepak breached the duty of care that he owes to the other people commuting on the highway.
(C) No, because Ishaan provided Deepak with only a narrow window of time to avoid the collision.
(D) No, because Ishaan's headlights were turned off.

Q.7 Principle: The intentional use of force against another person without lawful justification constitutes the tort of battery.

Facts: During the Freshers' Party of a Law College, Suchi pulled Auro's glass while he was drinking wine. Auro started crying because his glass had been snatched away and decided to sue Suchi for battery. Will Aurobind succeed in his claim?

(A) No, because Auro could easily have helped himself by taking another glass.
(B) Yes, because Suchi had used force against Aurobind without lawful justification.
(C) No, because law does not take note of trifles.

(D) Yes, because Suchi had infringed upon Auro's right to the drink wine.

Q.8 Principle: Interference with someone's possession or enjoyment of movable property constitutes the tort of trespass of goods.

Facts: Rishi, a thief by profession, was sitting in his house with some stolen books by Aristotle. Suddenly, his neighbour, Anu, entered and tried to snatch away those books from him saying that they belong to her. As it turns out, she was right. Still, Rishi sues Anu for trespass to goods. Will he succeed?

(A) Yes, because the books were in Rishi's possession, and trespass is a tort against possession and not against ownership.
(B) Yes, because she shouldn't snatch things just like that and instead should have filed a complaint
(C) No, because she was the rightful owner of the books.
(D) No, because the books do not belong to Rishi, and no matter who they belong to, Rishi cannot sue.

Q.9 Principle: The mere fact that a man is injured by another's act gives in itself no cause of action even though the injury caused is intentional, so long as the other party is exercising a legal right.

Facts: Vishu dug a pit on his property using which they obtained water. This affected Van's well which had been dug up some 16 years ago and was situated at a distance of two miles from that place where these people had intercepted water. This caused a lot of problems and inconvenience to Van and he sued Vishu. Decide.

(A) Vishu will win the case because he can do anything over his property that he likes and his act should not be connected to a well one mile away.
(B) Vishu will win the case because there is the absence of a legal injury and he is acting well within his legal rights.
(C) Van will win the case because Vishu's act caused him damage.
(D) Van will win the case because the underground water is not the sole property of Vishu.

Q.10 Principle: No man can enforce a right which he has voluntarily waived or abandoned.

Facts: Ruba invited Sakhi to her house for tea. They became good friends very soon. In the evening while they were watching a sitcom, Sakhi said that she did not like Bengali people. Ruba

had a Bengali boyfriend and so she felt very bad. She asked Sakhi to get out of her house and later, she brought an action for trespass against Sakhi. Decide.

(A) Ruba will not succeed because she herself waived off her right to sue Sakhi for trespass by inviting her to her house.
(B) Ruba will not succeed because the law does not take care of trifles.
(C) Ruba will succeed because Sakhi was making a bad comment about her boyfriend. She should not make such comments because she is in Ruba's house.
(D) Ruba will succeed because she never waived off her right to throw Sakhi out of her house when she makes such a comment.

ANSWERS

1- A

2- B

3- C

4- B

5- A

6- B

7- B

8- A

9- B

10- A

For more Legal Reasoning Questions for CLAT 2025, click here!