BLOGS

Practice Legal Reasoning Questions for CLAT 2026

Ruchika Mohapatra · 06 Dec 2024

CLAT 2026 is exactly a year away. Start practicing now with these 20 important Legal Reasoning Questions on CLAT based on the latest pattern.

Principle 1:

"A contract is voidable if consent to it was obtained by coercion."

Facts: A forces B to sign a contract by threatening to damage B's property. B later seeks to cancel the contract.

Q1. Is B entitled to cancel the contract?

a) Yes, because B's consent was obtained by coercion.
b) No, because B signed the contract willingly.
c) Yes, because the contract is void.
d) No, because threatening property does not amount to coercion.

Answer: a) Yes, because B's consent was obtained by coercion.

Explanation: Coercion includes threatening a person or their property to obtain consent, making the contract voidable at the option of the coerced party.

Principle 2:

"Whoever intentionally causes harm to another person without lawful justification commits a tort."

Facts: X throws a stone at Y's window, breaking it, because Y insulted X.

Q2. Can Y sue X for damages?

a) Yes, because X intentionally caused harm.

b) No, because Y insulted X first.

c) No, because breaking a window is not a tort.

d) Yes, but only if X apologizes.

Answer: a) Yes, because X intentionally caused harm.

Explanation: Intentional harm to another's property without justification constitutes a tort.

Principle 3:

"A minor cannot enter into a valid contract."

Facts: A 16-year-old boy borrows ₹10,000 from a shopkeeper to buy a smartphone and refuses to repay.

Q3. Can the shopkeeper enforce the contract?

a) Yes, because the boy bought a smartphone.

b) No, because the contract is void as one party is a minor.

c) Yes, because the shopkeeper lent money in good faith.

d) No, because minors are never liable for any transactions.

Answer: b) No, because the contract is void as one party is a minor.

Explanation: Minors lack the legal capacity to contract, making such agreements void.

Principle 4:

"Every person has a right to defend themselves if there is an imminent threat to their life or property."

Q4. Assertion: Self-defense can justify causing harm to an attacker.

Reason: Self-defense is a legal right recognized by law.

a) Both assertion and reason are correct, and the reason explains the assertion.

b) Both assertion and reason are correct, but the reason does not explain the assertion.

c) Assertion is true, but the reason is false.

d) Both assertion and reason are false.

Answer: a) Both assertion and reason are correct, and the reason explains the assertion.

Explanation: Self-defense allows a person to harm an attacker to protect life or property, as recognized by law.

Principle 5:

"Negligence is the breach of a duty of care resulting in damage to another party."

Q5. Assertion: A doctor failing to diagnose a serious illness can be held liable for negligence.
Reason: A doctor owes a duty of care to their patients.

a) Both assertion and reason are correct, and the reason explains the assertion.
b) Both assertion and reason are correct, but the reason does not explain the assertion.
c) Assertion is true, but the reason is false.
d) Both assertion and reason are false.

Answer: a) Both assertion and reason are correct, and the reason explains the assertion.
Explanation: Doctors owe a duty of care to patients, and failure to perform their duty diligently constitutes negligence.

Principle 6:

"A promise made without consideration is not enforceable by law."
Facts: P promises to give ₹5,000 to Q out of love and affection. Later, P refuses to pay.

Q6. Can Q enforce the promise?

a) Yes, because P made a promise.
b) No, because the promise lacked consideration.
c) Yes, because love and affection are valid considerations.
d) No, because P never signed an agreement.

Answer: b) No, because the promise lacked consideration.
Explanation: A valid contract requires consideration. A promise without consideration is unenforceable.

Principle 7:

"Freedom of speech and expression is guaranteed, but it is subject to reasonable restrictions such

as public order and morality."

Facts: Z writes an article criticizing government policies and posts it online. It leads to violent protests.

Q7. Can Z's article be restricted?

a) Yes, because it caused public disorder.
b) No, because Z has freedom of speech.
c) No, because Z did not incite violence directly.
d) Yes, because criticism of the government is not allowed.

Answer: a) Yes, because it caused public disorder.
Explanation: Freedom of speech can be restricted if it affects public order, even if it does not incite violence directly.

Q8. Legal Principle: "An agreement to commit a crime is void and unenforceable."
Facts: A hires B to steal confidential information. B completes the task, but A refuses to pay. Can B claim the money?

1. a) Yes, because B fulfilled the agreement. b) No, because the agreement was void. c) Yes, because A benefitted from the theft. d) No, because B is equally at fault.

Answer: b) No, because the agreement was void.
Explanation: Agreements to commit crimes are void and unenforceable under the law.

Q9. Principle: "A person who causes harm due to their negligence is liable to compensate the affected party."

Facts: A leaves a water tap running in his garden, causing the water to overflow onto B's property. B's car gets damaged as a result. Is A liable?

1. a) Yes, because A was negligent in controlling the water. b) No, because it was an accident. c) No, because B should have protected his car. d) Yes, because A intentionally caused the damage. Answer: a) Yes, because A was negligent in controlling the water. Explanation: A's negligence caused the harm, making him liable for damages.

Q10. Principle: "The right to equality before the law does not prohibit classification, provided it is reasonable and not arbitrary."

Facts: A government scheme reserves 20% of public jobs for economically weaker sections (EWS). It is challenged as discriminatory.

a) The scheme is valid if the classification is reasonable.
b) The scheme is invalid because all citizens should have equal opportunities.
c) The scheme is valid because EWS need support.
d) The scheme is invalid because it is arbitrary.

Answer: a) The scheme is valid if the classification is reasonable.
Explanation: Reservation for EWS is permissible if the classification is reasonable and serves a legitimate purpose.

Principle 1:
"A person who intentionally makes a false representation to another to cause harm is guilty of fraud."
Facts: X sells a second-hand car to Y, falsely claiming it has no mechanical issues. Later, Y discovers the car has significant engine problems.

Q11. Can X be held liable for fraud?

a) Yes, because X intentionally made a false representation.
b) No, because Y could have checked the car before buying.
c) Yes, because every second-hand car sale involves fraud.
d) No, because X did not explicitly harm Y.

Answer: a) Yes, because X intentionally made a false representation.
Explanation: Fraud involves intentional misrepresentation to induce another party to act, which is evident in this case.

Principle 2:
"An offer is accepted when the acceptance is communicated to the offeror."
Facts: A sends an offer to B to buy a property. B writes an acceptance letter and posts it, but it never reaches A.

Q12. Has the contract been formed?

a) Yes, because B accepted the offer.

b) No, because A never received the acceptance.

c) Yes, because the letter was posted.

d) No, because property deals require verbal agreements.

Answer: b) No, because A never received the acceptance.

Explanation: Acceptance must be communicated to the offeror for the contract to be valid.

Q13. Principle: “The occupier of a property owes a duty of care to visitors and must ensure their safety.”

Facts: A owns a café. One of the chairs collapses due to a loose screw, injuring a customer. Is A liable?

a) Yes, because A failed to maintain the property.

b) No, because accidents happen.

c) Yes, because the customer was paying for services.

d) No, because the customer should have checked the chair.

Answer: a) Yes, because A failed to maintain the property.

Explanation: As an occupier, A has a duty of care to ensure the safety of visitors, and failing to maintain the chair breaches this duty.

Q14. Principle: “A person is liable for trespass if they intentionally enter another’s property without permission.”

Facts: X enters Y’s garden, thinking it is a public park. Y sues X for trespass. Is X liable?

a) Yes, because X entered without permission.

b) No, because X thought it was a public park.

c) Yes, because ignorance of property ownership is no defense.

d) No, because no harm was caused.

Answer: a) Yes, because X entered without permission.

Explanation: Trespass involves entering property without consent, and X’s mistake does not absolve liability.

Principle 3:

"A gift given voluntarily without any expectation of return is valid under the law."

Q15. Assertion: A gift must be given voluntarily to be legally valid.
Reason: The person giving the gift must expect something in return.

a) Both assertion and reason are correct, and the reason explains the assertion.
b) Both assertion and reason are correct, but the reason does not explain the assertion.
c) Assertion is true, but the reason is false.
d) Both assertion and reason are false.

Answer: c) Assertion is true, but the reason is false.
Explanation: A gift must be given voluntarily, but expecting something in return invalidates it as a gift.

Q16. Principle: "Ignorance of the law is no excuse for breaking it."
Assertion: A person cannot defend themselves by claiming they were unaware of the law.
Reason: Knowledge of the law is presumed for all citizens.

a) Both assertion and reason are correct, and the reason explains the assertion.
b) Both assertion and reason are correct, but the reason does not explain the assertion.
c) Assertion is true, but the reason is false.
d) Both assertion and reason are false.

Answer: a) Both assertion and reason are correct, and the reason explains the assertion.
Explanation: The principle holds that ignorance is no defense because the law presumes everyone knows the law.

Principle 4:

"The right to life includes the right to a clean and healthy environment."
Facts: A factory releases untreated chemicals into a nearby river, polluting the water. Residents sue for violation of their right to life.

Q17. Can the residents succeed?

a) Yes, because pollution affects the right to a healthy environment.

b) No, because the factory operates legally.

c) No, because the right to life does not include environmental concerns.

d) Yes, but only if the pollution causes direct harm to residents.

Answer: a) Yes, because pollution affects the right to a healthy environment.

Explanation: The right to life encompasses the right to live in a healthy environment, and the factory's pollution violates this right.

Q18. Principle: "No person shall be discriminated against on the grounds of religion, race, caste, sex, or place of birth."

Facts: A temple prohibits women from entering its inner sanctum. This rule is challenged in court.

Q18. Is the rule valid?

a) Yes, because religious institutions have autonomy.

b) No, because it discriminates on the basis of gender.

c) Yes, because the temple follows traditional practices.

d) No, because gender equality is absolute.

Answer: b) No, because it discriminates on the basis of gender.

Explanation: Gender-based discrimination violates the principle of equality under the law, and religious practices cannot override constitutional rights.

Q19. Principle: "A person is not criminally liable for acts done under duress."

Facts: Y is threatened with death unless he helps X rob a bank. Y complies but later confesses. Is Y liable?

a) Yes, because he participated in the crime.

b) No, because he acted under duress.

c) Yes, because confessing does not absolve guilt.

d) No, because he did not benefit from the crime.

Answer: b) No, because he acted under duress.

Explanation: The principle excuses liability when a person acts under the threat of imminent

harm.

Principle: “Defamation is the publication of a false statement that harms another’s reputation.”
Facts: Z publishes an article alleging X committed fraud. Later, it is proven false. X sues for defamation.

Q20. Can X succeed in the suit?

a) Yes, because the statement was false and harmed X’s reputation.
b) No, because freedom of the press protects Z.
c) Yes, but only if Z intended to harm X.
d) No, because opinions are not defamatory.

Answer: a) Yes, because the statement was false and harmed X’s reputation.
Explanation: Defamation involves false statements harming reputation, and Z’s publication satisfies these criteria.

Take a Mock for CLAT 2026 here!