AILET

MCQs for CLAT PG 2026: PART I

Ruchika Mohapatra · 26 Aug 2025

Q1. In *Kesavananda Bharati v. State of Kerala (1973),* the majority held that:

a) Parliament has unlimited power to amend the Constitution

b) Fundamental Rights cannot be amended at all

c) Parliament can amend the Constitution but not alter its basic structure

d) The Supreme Court has no role in reviewing constitutional amendments

Answer: c) Parliament can amend the Constitution but not alter its basic structure

Explanation: The 13-judge bench ruled that constitutional amendments are valid, but they cannot damage the "basic structure," which includes principles like rule of law, democracy, and judicial review.

Q2. The principle of *collective responsibility* of the Council of Ministers to the Lok Sabha is found in which Article?

a) Article 73

b) Article 74

c) Article 75(3)

d) Article 76

Answer: c) Article 75(3)

Explanation: Article 75(3) states that the Council of Ministers is collectively responsible to the Lok Sabha, making it a cornerstone of parliamentary democracy.

Q3. Which of the following is an example of *conditional legislation* rather than delegated legislation?

a) Framing of rules under the Motor Vehicles Act

b) Executive determining the date of enforcement of an Act

c) Regulations framed by SEBI under its statute

d) Guidelines issued by RBI for banking operations

Answer: b) Executive determining the date of enforcement of an Act

Explanation: Conditional legislation refers to situations where the legislature enacts the law but leaves its application (like date, area, or conditions) to the executive.

Q4. In *A.D.M. Jabalpur v. Shivkant Shukla (1976)*, the Supreme Court held that:

a) Fundamental Rights are non-suspendable

b) Habeas corpus is not maintainable during Emergency

c) The judiciary can review preventive detention orders in all circumstances

d) Article 21 remains enforceable even during Emergency

Answer: b) Habeas corpus is not maintainable during Emergency

Explanation: The Court infamously upheld suspension of Article 21 during Emergency. This judgment was later overruled, and Article 21 is now non-suspendable.

Q5. Which Article gives the Governor the power to promulgate ordinances at the state level?

a) Article 154

b) Article 163

c) Article 213

d) Article 356

Answer: c) Article 213

Explanation: Article 213 empowers the Governor to promulgate ordinances when the State Legislature is not in session, subject to later approval.

Q6. The doctrine of pleasure under Article 310 is subject to safeguards under:

a) Article 14

b) Article 19

c) Article 311

d) Article 368

Answer: c) Article 311

Explanation: Article 310 states that civil servants hold office during pleasure, but Article 311 requires inquiry and safeguards before dismissal or reduction in rank.

Q7. Which writ is issued to test the authority of a person holding a public office?

a) Habeas Corpus

b) Mandamus

c) Prohibition

d) Quo Warranto

Answer: d) Quo Warranto

Explanation: A writ of *quo warranto* challenges the legality of a person's claim to a public office, ensuring only qualified individuals occupy public posts.

Q8. Which part of the Constitution deals with relations between the Union and the States?

a) Part IX

b) Part XI

c) Part XII

d) Part XIV

Answer: b) Part XI

Explanation: Part XI (Articles 245–263) deals with legislative and administrative relations between Union and States.

Q9. In *Indira Nehru Gandhi v. Raj Narain (1975)*, which constitutional principle was added to the basic structure?

a) Judicial Review

b) Free and Fair Elections

c) Secularism

d) Federalism

Answer: b) Free and Fair Elections

Explanation: The Supreme Court struck down the 39th Amendment and held that free and fair elections are part of democracy and hence part of the basic structure.

Q10. Which case first applied the doctrine of "eclipse" to pre-constitutional laws inconsistent with Fundamental Rights?

a) Keshavan Madhava Menon v. State of Bombay

b) Shankari Prasad v. Union of India

c) Golaknath v. State of Punjab

d) Champakam Dorairajan v. State of Madras

Answer: a) Keshavan Madhava Menon v. State of Bombay

Explanation: The Court held that pre-constitutional laws inconsistent with Fundamental Rights are not void ab initio but remain eclipsed until amended or until restrictions are removed.