

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!