BLOGS

Practice Questions from English for CLAT UG

Adtiya Aryan · 25 Nov 2025

Passage 1:

In the corridors of democracy, the judiciary stands as the unyielding sentinel against the whims of executive overreach and legislative impulsiveness. Yet in recent years, an insidious shadow has crept over this institution, eroding public trust in its independence. This phenomenon is not merely a perceptual glitch but a tangible crisis fueled by political interference, opaque appointment processes, and the relentless glare of media sensationalism.

Consider the appointment of judges. In many jurisdictions, the executive has disproportionate influence over judicial selections, turning what should be a merit-based exercise into a system of patronage. This politicization does not occur in isolation. It reverberates through the judiciary's decision-making, where rulings increasingly appear to align with shifting political interests rather than the principles of justice.

The consequences extend far beyond the courtroom. When citizens begin to perceive the judiciary as an extension of the ruling elite, they disengage from the legal process and cultivate a culture of cynicism and vigilantism. Historical examples illustrate this pattern. The Watergate scandal in the United States exposed how executive pressure on judges can undermine constitutional safeguards and lead to a drop in public confidence. In emerging democracies, similar trends appear, such as judges facing impeachment threats for unpopular verdicts or transfers to remote benches as subtle punishment. These actions, often presented as routine administration, signal to the public that justice is selective rather than impartial.

The role of the media in this erosion is equally significant. The twenty four hour news cycle, constantly searching for controversy, magnifies isolated instances of judicial misconduct into sweeping allegations against the entire system. A single allegation of bribery, even if unproven, can quickly evolve into narratives of systemic corruption and overshadow the diligent work of upright judges. This exaggeration distorts reality and pressures judges to issue overly cautious rulings to avoid public criticism. The result is a chilling effect on judicial courage, where bold interpretations of law are replaced with timid adherence to precedent, slowing the evolution of

legal thought.

Rebuilding trust requires multifaceted reforms. First, creating independent appointment commissions made up of legal experts and civil society representatives could make the selection of judges more merit based. Second, increasing transparency in judicial processes through live streaming hearings and making judgments more accessible could reduce misconceptions and encourage informed public engagement. Third, strengthening whistleblower protections for judicial insiders could allow corruption to be exposed without fear. Yet these measures do not fully address the deeper issue. Societies must view the judiciary not as an adversary but as a partner in governance. Until political actors stop treating courts as battlegrounds and citizens adopt more nuanced dialogue instead of outrage, the erosion of trust will continue.

In this delicate balance, the independence of the judiciary is democracy's early warning signal. Its decline reflects not only institutional weakness but also the fraying of the social fabric. As Alexis de Tocqueville observed, "The judiciary is the most invisible and yet the most effective guardian of liberty." Ignoring it is dangerous, for when trust dissolves, the rule of law dissolves with it.

Questions:

1. What is the primary purpose of the passage?

- a) To advocate for immediate impeachment of politically influenced judges.
- b) To analyze the causes and consequences of declining public trust in the judiciary, proposing remedial steps.
- c) To critique media's role in judicial appointments exclusively.
- d) To compare historical judicial scandals across democracies without suggesting reforms.

2. The author's attitude towards the media's influence on the judiciary can best be described as:

- a) Laudatory, as it ensures accountability through constant vigilance.
- b) Indifferent, viewing it as an inevitable aspect of modern democracy.
- c) Critical, portraying it as a catalyst for distortion and judicial timidity.
- d) Optimistic, believing it ultimately strengthens public engagement.

3. In the context of the passage, the phrase "pusillanimous adherence to precedent" most nearly means:

- a) Courageous innovation in legal interpretation.
- b) Timid and overly cautious sticking to established rulings.
- c) Rigorous application of historical case law.
- d) Collaborative revision of outdated judicial norms.

4. Which of the following, if true, would most weaken the author's argument regarding the chilling effect on judicial courage?

- a) Recent studies show that media scrutiny has led to a 20% increase in landmark progressive judgments.
- b) Judges in non-transparent systems report higher job satisfaction than those under public gaze.
- c) Political interference has decreased in jurisdictions with independent appointment commissions.
- d) Public trust metrics have stabilized despite ongoing media coverage of judicial errors.

5. The passage implies that the "social compact" mentioned in the penultimate paragraph primarily involves:

- a) Politicians and judges collaborating on legislative drafts.
- b) Citizens and the state mutually recognizing the judiciary's role beyond confrontation.
- c) Media outlets and courts establishing joint ethical guidelines.
- d) Legal scholars dictating public perceptions of judicial integrity.

Passage 2:

In the digital agora of the 21st century, personal data has ascended from a mere byproduct of human interaction to the lifeblood of a burgeoning economic empire known as surveillance capitalism. Coined by scholar Shoshana Zuboff, this paradigm describes how tech behemoths harvest our behavioral residues such as clicks, swipes, and scrolls to predict, commodify, and manipulate preferences, often without consent or recompense. The paradox lies in the fact that while this ecosystem promises empowerment through personalized services, it simultaneously

erodes the very privacy it claims to protect. It ultimately creates a society where autonomy becomes illusory and vigilance becomes the price of existence.

At its core, surveillance capitalism thrives on asymmetry. Users, entranced by the appeal of free platforms, unintentionally cede granular insights into their inner lives. Location pings reveal nocturnal wanderings, search histories betray unspoken anxieties, and social graphs map personal relationships once confined to private conversations. These data troves, aggregated into predictive algorithms, fuel not just advertising but behavioral modification. Nudges can sway elections, tailor propaganda, or even orchestrate consumer addictions. The Cambridge Analytica scandal exemplified this danger when harvested Facebook data was used to micro-target voters, demonstrating how privacy breaches can cascade into democratic subversion.

Legal frameworks lag far behind this technological torrent. The General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR) in Europe represents a significant step forward by mandating consent, data minimization, and imposing hefty fines of up to 4% of global turnover for violations. Yet enforcement remains weak. Tech giants, supported by strong lobbying networks, circumvent these rules through jurisdictional arbitrage, routing data through countries with lenient regulations. In contrast, jurisdictions like India grapple with emerging laws such as the Personal Data Protection Bill, which, while ambitious, suffers from vague definitions of “sensitive data” and insufficient redress mechanisms. This regulatory stagnation creates a global patchwork where privacy becomes a privilege enjoyed primarily by the digitally aware or the geopolitically fortunate.

The societal consequences are profound. The erosion of privacy creates a panopticon-like existence where self-censorship replaces free expression. Many hesitate to voice dissent when every utterance might be archived for algorithmic evaluation. Psychologists note rising paranoia, with “data fatigue” leading individuals to withdraw from online spaces and deepening digital divides. Ethically, the phenomenon forces us to confront fundamental questions about personhood. If our choices are predicted or preempted by opaque AI systems, we must ask whether we remain the architects of our own destinies or if we have become mere nodes in a vast computational grid.

Countering this challenge requires a reimagining of privacy paradigms. Beyond regulation, society may benefit from “data cooperatives,” which are user-owned entities that aggregate and monetize data collectively while redistributing profits to members. Technological tools such as

homomorphic encryption can enable computation on encrypted data while preserving confidentiality. On a cultural level, reclaiming certain analog interactions may help temper the relentless flow of data. Ultimately, this paradox can be resolved not through withdrawal from digital life but through assertive action. Privacy must be upheld as a right rather than a relic, and society must rewrite the social contract for an age in which data functions both as a sword and as a shield.

Questions:

6. The main idea of the passage is to:

- a) Celebrate the economic innovations driven by surveillance capitalism.
- b) Examine the tensions between data-driven personalization and privacy loss, advocating for systemic changes.
- c) Detail the technical mechanisms of predictive algorithms without ethical commentary.
- d) Compare GDPR's success metrics across European nations.

7. The word "inadvertently" in the second paragraph is closest in meaning to:

- a) Deliberately.
- b) Unintentionally.
- c) Reluctantly.
- d) Strategically.

8. According to the passage, which of the following best exemplifies the "asymmetry" in surveillance capitalism?

- a) Users benefiting equally from targeted ads as companies from data sales.
- b) Platforms offering opt-out features that are prominently displayed.
- c) Individuals surrendering detailed personal insights for minimal or no direct gain.
- d) Governments mandating uniform data-sharing protocols worldwide.

9. If the proposed "data cooperatives" were widely adopted, it would most likely:

- a) Eliminate all forms of behavioral targeting in advertising.

- b) Strengthen the author's argument by empowering users to control and profit from their data.
- c) Undermine GDPR's enforcement by creating competing regulatory bodies.
- d) Increase self-censorship due to collective data pooling risks.

10. The author's tone towards existing legal frameworks like GDPR is one of:

- a) Unqualified praise for their comprehensive scope.
- b) Qualified approval, acknowledging progress but highlighting implementation flaws.
- c) Dismissive scorn, viewing them as futile against tech influence.
- d) Neutral analysis, avoiding any evaluative language.

Passage 3:

Gender justice, long envisioned as a monolithic quest for parity, reveals itself upon closer scrutiny as a multifaceted odyssey that demands intersectional lenses to illuminate the shadows cast by race, class, and caste. In legal spheres, affirmative action such as quotas in legislatures, boardrooms, and bar associations has been the clarion call, ostensibly leveling the patriarchal playing field. Yet, this blunt instrument often falters, privileging elite women while marginalizing those at the nexus of multiple oppressions. The Indian Parliament's 33 percent reservation for women in local bodies, for instance, has empowered rural panchayat leaders but exposed fissures. Upper caste women dominate nominations, sidelining Dalit and Adivasi counterparts whose voices remain muffled by entrenched hierarchies.

This oversight stems from a reductive feminism that universalizes womanhood, ignoring how intersecting identities amplify subjugation. Kimberlé Crenshaw's intersectionality framework, seminal in critical race theory, posits that discrimination compounds. Black women in the United States, for example, face wage gaps 40 percent wider than white women, compounded by racial bias in hiring algorithms. Legal systems, steeped in binary gender norms, exacerbate this. Custody battles favor mothers presumptively, yet transgender parents navigate barriers that are bureaucratically complex and overwhelming, with their parental rights contested under archaic definitions of family. In criminal justice as well, the paradox persists. While laws such as India's POCSO Act shield girl children, they inadvertently stigmatize queer youth by framing non heteronormative expressions as predatory.

The quest for equity therefore necessitates a paradigm shift from additive quotas to holistic reforms. Judicial training modules must integrate intersectional curricula, sensitizing benches to biases that skew sentencing, such as women of color receiving harsher penalties for identical offenses. Legislative drafting should embed safeguards, including sub quotas within quotas, ensuring proportional representation for multiply marginalized groups. Moreover, restorative justice models that emphasize dialogue over punishment could humanize gender based violence trials, where survivors' narratives often clash with adversarial forensics.

Critics decry such nuances as diluting the gender agenda, arguing that fragmentation weakens collective bargaining. This narrow view ignores empirical gains. Sweden's intersectional policies have narrowed not only gender but ethnic pay disparities by 15 percent over a decade. Globally, the United Nations Sustainable Development Goal 5 urges this inclusivity, recognizing that true justice is indivisible and that gains for one subgroup ripple outward.

Reimagining gender justice is therefore an imperative of equity, not equality alone. It calls upon lawmakers, jurists, and activists to dismantle silos and forge a jurisprudence in which every identity's grievance finds resonance. As Audre Lorde warned, "The master's tools will never dismantle the master's house." Quotas may renovate rooms, but intersectionality rebuilds the foundation.

Questions

11. The passage primarily argues for:

- a) Abolishing all gender quotas in favor of merit-based selections.
- b) Expanding affirmative action to incorporate intersectional considerations for more inclusive justice.
- c) Focusing exclusively on transgender rights within existing legal frameworks.
- d) Comparing wage gaps across countries without proposing solutions.

12. In the passage, "Kafkaesque barriers" refers to obstacles that are:

- a) Bureaucratically absurd and nightmarishly complex.
- b) Financially prohibitive for low-income litigants.
- c) Politically motivated to suppress minority voices.
- d) Technologically advanced, like AI-driven court scheduling.

13. Which of the following statements from the passage, if false, would most undermine the author's critique of quotas?

- a) Upper caste women often dominate nominations in India's panchayat reservations.
- b) Intersectionality has led to wider wage gaps for Black women in the United States.
- c) Sweden's policies reduced ethnic pay disparities alongside gender ones.
- d) POCSO Act protections inadvertently affect queer youth positively.

14. The author's reference to Audre Lorde's quote serves to:

- a) Support the idea that quotas alone are insufficient for systemic change.
- b) Critique restorative justice as an ineffective tool.
- c) Argue against international frameworks such as SDG 5.
- d) Emphasize the need for binary gender norms in law.

15. The tone of the passage towards "reductive feminism" is:

- a) Endorsing, as it simplifies advocacy efforts.
- b) Reproachful, for overlooking compounded discriminations.
- c) Ambivalent, weighing its benefits against drawbacks.
- d) Detached, presenting it as a historical curiosity.

ANSWER KEY:

1. b) To analyze the causes and consequences of declining public trust in the judiciary, proposing remedial steps.
2. c) Critical, portraying it as a catalyst for distortion and judicial timidity.
3. b) Timid and overly cautious sticking to established rulings.
4. a) Recent studies show that media scrutiny has led to a 20% increase in landmark progressive judgments.
5. b) Citizens and the state mutually recognizing the judiciary's role beyond confrontation.
6. b) Examine the tensions between data-driven personalization and privacy loss, advocating for systemic changes.
7. b) Unintentionally.

8. c) Individuals surrendering detailed personal insights for minimal or no direct gain.
9. b) Strengthen the author’s argument by empowering users to control and profit from their data.
10. b) Qualified approval, acknowledging progress but highlighting implementation flaws.
11. b) Expanding affirmative action to incorporate intersectional considerations for more inclusive justice.
12. a) Bureaucratically absurd and nightmarishly complex.
13. a) Upper-caste women often dominate nominations in India’s panchayat reservations. (If this were false, the argument that quotas benefit elites over marginalized women would weaken.)
14. a) Support the idea that quotas alone are insufficient for systemic change.
15. b) Reproachful, for overlooking compounded discriminations.