BLOGS

Logical Reasoning Questions for CLAT UG 2026- Part II

Ruchika Mohapatra · 05 Aug 2025

Preparing for CLAT UG 2026? Logical Reasoning is a crucial section that tests your ability to analyze, evaluate, and draw conclusions from given arguments. In this post, we provide Logical Reasoning questions tailored to the CLAT pattern, with detailed explanations to help you improve accuracy and speed.

PASSAGE

The debate over whether laws derive their legitimacy from morality or from the mere fact of their enactment continues to divide legal theorists. Natural law theorists argue that an unjust law is not a law at all, asserting that laws must align with moral principles to be valid. In contrast, legal positivists maintain that the validity of a law is independent of its moral content and depends solely on its source, typically a recognized authority such as the state. According to positivists, even an immoral law—if properly enacted—is legally binding.

Critics of positivism argue that such a view detaches the law from justice, permitting the enforcement of oppressive or discriminatory statutes under the guise of legality. They assert that obedience to law must be conditional upon its alignment with ethical standards. However, positivists respond that blending law with morality introduces subjectivity and undermines legal certainty, potentially allowing individual interpretations of justice to override democratically enacted statutes.

This tension becomes particularly acute in transitional societies emerging from authoritarian rule, where legal systems may be riddled with laws that, while technically valid, are morally indefensible. The question that arises is whether to uphold such laws in the interest of continuity or to invalidate them based on higher moral reasoning. The resolution often involves difficult trade-offs between stability, legitimacy, and justice.

1. Which of the following best represents the core disagreement between natural law theorists and legal positivists?

A. Whether laws should be written or customary

B. Whether immoral laws can possess legal validity

C. Whether courts should make or interpret laws

D. Whether laws should reflect majority opinion

Correct Answer: B

Explanation: The core tension lies in whether a law's legitimacy depends on its moral content (natural law) or its source (positivism).

2. If a court refuses to enforce a statute on the grounds that it is morally unacceptable, which legal philosophy is the court most closely following?

A. Legal realism

B. Legal positivism

C. Natural law theory

D. Economic analysis of law

Correct Answer: C

Explanation: Refusing enforcement based on morality aligns with natural law theory, which ties legal validity to moral standards.

3. Which assumption underlies the positivist argument for separating law and morality?

A. All laws are based on religious principles.

B. Laws cannot be enforced without public consensus.

C. Legal certainty is preferable to subjective interpretations of justice.

D. Morality is the exclusive domain of legislatures.

Correct Answer: C

Explanation: Positivists fear that mixing morality into law would undermine legal certainty and consistency.

4. Suppose a post-authoritarian society retains certain laws enacted under the former regime. According to the natural law view, why might this be problematic?

A. The laws were not democratically passed.

B. These laws may lack moral legitimacy and thus should not be obeyed.

C. The legal language may be outdated.

D. They were not recognized by international organizations.

Correct Answer: B

Explanation: Natural law theory emphasizes moral legitimacy, so retaining morally indefensible laws is seen as problematic.

5. Which of the following best expresses the positivist concern with grounding legality in moral standards?

A. It requires laws to be approved by religious authorities.

B. It creates a risk of moral relativism undermining legal authority.

C. It grants too much power to the judiciary.

D. It assumes all laws are ethically perfect.

Correct Answer: B

Explanation: Positivists argue that relying on subjective moral views risks inconsistency and undermines the predictability of law.

6. If a newly elected legislature invalidates a discriminatory law from a prior regime solely on moral grounds, how would a strict legal positivist likely view this action?

A. As illegitimate unless based on existing procedural rules

B. As necessary for justice

C. As a natural application of law in context

D. As a violation of separation of powers

Correct Answer: A

Explanation: Positivists view legality as procedural; invalidating laws solely on moral grounds would not align with their framework.

7. Which of the following, if true, would most weaken the natural law theory's claim that immoral laws are not valid laws?

A. People tend to obey even immoral laws due to fear of punishment.

B. Legal systems function effectively even when some laws are unjust.

C. Most societies distinguish between legal and moral responsibilities.

D. Courts often interpret laws in light of evolving societal values.

Correct Answer: B

Explanation: This challenges the idea that morality is essential for legal function, undermining the natural law theory's central claim.

8. What implication does the passage suggest for transitional societies dealing with legally valid but morally unjust laws?

A. They should ignore those laws to preserve public peace.

B. They must abolish all prior laws regardless of content.

C. They face a trade-off between legal continuity and moral justice.

D. They should adopt international law wholesale.

Correct Answer: C

Explanation: The passage states transitional societies must balance stability with the need to correct moral wrongs.

9. Which of the following scenarios most clearly illustrates the tension described in the passage?

A. A country passes a law banning monopolies.

B. A legislature updates outdated tax codes.

C. A post-conflict nation debates repealing laws that criminalized political dissent.

D. A court increases penalties for theft.

Correct Answer: C

Explanation: This reflects the tension between legal continuity and the moral unacceptability of previous laws.

10. Based on the passage, how might a legal system best reconcile the goals of legitimacy and justice in a post-authoritarian context?

A. By implementing strict positivist legal frameworks

B. By enforcing all existing laws until repealed

C. By involving both moral review and legal processes in reforming laws

D. By adopting a purely religious legal system

Correct Answer: C

Explanation: The passage suggests that legitimacy and justice may require both continuity and moral reasoning, aligning with a balanced reform approach.

Logical Reasoning Questions for CLAT UG 2026- PART I