BLOGS

Practice Questions on Legal Reasoning for CLAT UG 2026

Ruchika Mohapatra · 04 Aug 2025

Practice Legal Reasoning questions for CLAT UG 2026 and test your preparation today!

QUESTIONS

1. Scenario: John, a car owner, mails an offer on January 1st to sell his car to Andrew for ₹5 lakh. Andrew receives the offer on January 3rd and posts an acceptance letter on the same day (January 3rd). Unbeknownst to Andrew, John had mailed a revocation of the offer on January 2nd, which Andrew receives on January 4th. John's car sale price increases on January 5th, and he refuses to sell.

Which of the following is correct?

a. No contract was formed because John revoked the offer before Andrew learned of it.
b. A contract was formed on January 3rd, the date Andrew mailed his acceptance.
c. A contract was formed on January 4th, the date Andrew received the revocation.
d. A contract was formed on January 5th, the date John refused to sell.

Answer: b. A contract was formed on January 3rd, the date Andrew mailed his acceptance.

Explanation: Under the principles of offer and acceptance, acceptance is effective when it is properly communicated. In this scenario, Andrew's acceptance became effective the moment he posted it on January 3rd. At that moment a binding contract was formed. John's revocation, which Andrew only received on January 4th, came too late to prevent the contract, because Andrew had already accepted the offer when he mailed his letter. Therefore, answer (b) is correct.

2. Scenario: Bina saves Natasha's child from drowning in a river. Grateful, Natasha later promises to pay Bina ₹50,000 for the rescue after the event. Bina sues Natasha to enforce this promise of ₹50,000.

Which principle applies to determine the validity of this contract?

a. The agreement is void due to lack of consideration (past consideration).

b. The agreement is void because it is a gratuitous promise.

c. The agreement is valid because gratitude is sufficient consideration.

d. The agreement is valid as a binding contract for an act already performed.

Answer: a. The agreement is void due to lack of consideration (past consideration).

Explanation: In contract law, consideration must move from the promisee at the time of contract, not before. Bina's act of saving the child occurred *before* Natasha's promise, so it is "past consideration." Under the Indian Contract Act, past consideration is generally not valid consideration. Natasha's promise was made after Bina had already performed the rescue, and thus Bina cannot claim that was consideration for the promise. Therefore, there is no valid consideration, making the contract void.

3. Scenario: A 16-year-old student, Ravi, enters into a contract to purchase a smartphone on monthly installments from a retailer. After receiving the phone, Ravi refuses to make any further payments and demands the return of all payments made. The retailer sues Ravi for breach of contract.

Which of the following is the correct legal position?

a. The contract is void and unenforceable because Ravi is a minor.

b. The contract is voidable at the option of the retailer.

c. The contract is voidable at the option of the minor (Ravi).

d. The contract is valid and enforceable because it is for a necessity (smartphone).

Answer: a. The contract is void and unenforceable because Ravi is a minor.

Explanation: Under Indian Contract Act Section 11, a person must be of sound mind and majority (18 years or older) to contract. A contract entered into by a minor is void ab initio (void from the beginning), meaning it is not enforceable against either party. Ravi, being 16, is a minor. Therefore, he cannot be held liable under the contract, and the retailer cannot enforce it.

4. Scenario: Anirudh and Vijay agree on January 1st that Vijay will sell his car to Anirudh for ₹2 lakh. Both parties believe the car is a 2015 model. On January 3rd, they sign a formal sale agreement. On January 10th, Anirudh learns that the car was actually scrapped in 2014 and does not exist. Vijay pleads that he never intended to misrepresent, it was a mutual mistake of fact about the car's existence. Anirudh sues to rescind the contract.

What is the likely legal outcome?

a. The contract is valid and enforceable; Vijay must still sell the car once available.
b. The contract is void ab initio due to mutual mistake about the existence of the subject matter.
c. Anirudh must pay only a fair price because the contract is voidable only at Vijay's option.
d. The contract is voidable at Anirudh's option because he was mistaken.

Answer: b. The contract is void ab initio due to mutual mistake about the existence of the subject matter.

Explanation: The facts show a mutual mistake of fact: both parties believed in good faith that the car existed and was a 2015 model, but it did not exist at all. In contract law, if both parties make a fundamental mistake about an essential fact or the very existence of the subject matter, the contract is void ab initio. No real agreement could be reached when the subject itself was nonexistent.

5. Scenario: Greenfield Constructions entered into a contract on January 1st to build an outdoor amphitheater by June 30th. On March 15th, the government banned outdoor gatherings due to an unforeseen health crisis, making it impossible to open the amphitheater. Greenfield stops work on June 30th without completing the project. The client sues for breach of contract.

Which principle will most likely apply?

a. Greenfield is liable for breach because the contract terms did not provide for government bans.
b. The contract is discharged by frustration, as an unforeseen supervening event made performance impossible.
c. Greenfield may perform later; the contract is merely suspended until the ban lifts.
d. The contract is void ab initio due to lack of a clear end date.

Answer: b. The contract is discharged by frustration, as an unforeseen supervening event made performance impossible.

Explanation: The government's ban on outdoor gatherings is a supervening event outside the control of either party that makes it impossible to complete the amphitheater usefully. Under the doctrine of frustration (Section 56 of the Indian Contract Act), a contract is discharged when an unforeseen event occurs after formation, through no fault of either party, making performance impossible or illegal.

6. Scenario: Arjun intentionally fires a shot at Raman aiming to kill him but instead severely injures his leg. Surprisingly, while recovering in the hospital, Raman develops complications (unrelated to the injury) and dies several weeks later. Arjun argues that he did not intend to kill Raman.

Under the Indian Penal Code (IPC), what is Arjun most likely guilty of?

a. Murder (under IPC Section 300).
b. Culpable homicide not amounting to murder (IPC Section 299).
c. Attempt to murder (IPC Section 307).
d. No offence, because he did not intend to kill.

Answer: b. Culpable homicide not amounting to murder (IPC Section 299).

Explanation: Arjun's intent was to kill Raman (he fired aiming at Raman) but the actual direct injury was to the leg, not immediately fatal. However, his action resulted in Raman's death due to complications. Under IPC, the distinction between murder (Sec. 300) and culpable homicide (Sec. 299) depends on intent and knowledge. Arjun had the intention to kill (which points to murder), but since death was not the direct or only result of his action and happened by an unforeseen development, this situation fits "culpable homicide not amounting to murder."

7. Scenario: X and Y agree that X will pay Y ₹1 lakh to cause the death of Z. Y arranges the plan but does not carry it out. X is arrested before any attempt is made on Z's life.

What offence has X committed under the IPC?

a. Murder.
b. Culpable homicide not amounting to murder.
c. Attempt to murder.
d. Criminal conspiracy.

Answer: d. Criminal conspiracy.

Explanation: X and Y made an agreement to kill Z, which is a concerted plan to commit murder. Under the IPC, the formation of an agreement among two or more persons to do an illegal act amounts to criminal conspiracy (IPC Section 120A). Even if the act of murder was never executed or even attempted, the conspiracy itself is punishable (IPC Section 120B).

8. Scenario: A man, B, is verbally threatened by C, who points a loaded gun at him in a dark alley. Fearing for his life and believing C is about to shoot, B reacts by pulling out a hidden knife and fatally stabs C. It turns out C's gun was unloaded and he never intended to shoot.

Is B criminally liable for C's death?

a. Yes, B committed murder, as C posed no real threat.
b. No, B is justified by private defense, because a reasonable person would have believed C intended to kill.
c. Yes, B's act exceeds the scope of self-defense and is manslaughter at best.
d. No, B cannot be liable because the attacker's weapon was not functional.

Answer: b. No, B is justified by private defense, because a reasonable person would have believed C intended to kill.

Explanation: Under Indian law, a person has the right to private defense of the body when faced with an imminent threat of death or grievous hurt. In this scenario, C's actions (brandishing a gun and threatening) would reasonably make B believe he faced a deadly threat. B used force (stabbing) to save himself. Even though the gun was unloaded (unknown to B), a reasonable person in B's position would be justified in believing their life was in danger. Thus, B's act was in private defense of his life.

9. Scenario: Paula visited a friend's party where her drink was secretly spiked without her knowledge. Under this involuntary intoxication, Paula later committed theft, taking valuables from another guest. She claims she had no intent or knowledge due to the intoxication.

How would Paula's intoxication likely affect her criminal liability?

a. Paula is guilty of theft, because intoxication is no excuse for crimes of general intent.
b. Paula may have a defense if she can show her intoxication was involuntary and she lacked mens rea.
c. Paula is automatically guilty of an aggravated offence because of intoxication.
d. Paula is guilty of a lesser offence due to diminished capacity.

Answer: b. Paula may have a defense if she can show her intoxication was involuntary and she lacked mens rea.

Explanation: Under IPC Sections 85-86, involuntary intoxication (without one's knowledge) that prevents the formation of intent (mens rea) can be a defense. Because Paula was unknowingly

spiked, she could not form the intent to steal. If a court finds her intoxication was truly involuntary and she lacked intent, she cannot be held liable as for a normal theft.

10. Scenario: Roy and Soy agree to rob a bank together late at night. They discuss the plan but are apprehended by police before taking any action.

Under the IPC, of what offence(s) can Roy and Soy be convicted?

a. Attempt to robbery (under the relevant sections on attempt).
b. Abetment of robbery.
c. Criminal conspiracy to commit robbery.
d. No offence, since they never attempted or abetted any act.

Answer: c. Criminal conspiracy to commit robbery.

Explanation: Roy and Soy have agreed to commit the illegal act of robbery; this agreement itself constitutes criminal conspiracy (IPC Section 120A). Even though they did not perform any overt act (they were caught before attempting anything), the conspiracy is complete upon the agreement.

Read More: Legal Reasoning Questions for CLAT