BLOGS

Sectional Test on Legal Reasoning for CLAT UG

Adtiya Aryan · 16 Jul 2025

This Legal Reasoning sectional test for CLAT UG is designed to help aspirants strengthen their understanding of core legal principles through moderately challenging questions. Each question presents a realistic legal scenario followed by carefully framed options to test your reasoning and application skills.

Use this test to build both clarity and confidence in one of the most critical sections of the CLAT exam.

Q1. Principle: An agreement without consideration is void unless it is in writing and registered or made out of natural love and affection between close relations.
Facts: Ramesh, out of affection for his nephew, gives him a written and registered document promising to pay ₹1,00,000. Later, Ramesh refuses to pay.
Is the agreement valid?
A. Yes, because it is in writing and registered.
B. No, because it is a gift and not a contract.
C. No, because consideration is always essential.
D. Yes, because they are close friends.

Q2. Principle: Whoever does any act so rashly or negligently as to endanger human life or the personal safety of others shall be guilty of an offence.
Facts: A doctor, in a hurry, administers the wrong medicine to a patient, which results in complications.
Is the doctor liable?
A. No, because it was a mistake.
B. Yes, because it was a rash and negligent act.
C. No, because doctors are exempt from liability.
D. Yes, because it was intentional.

Q3. Principle: Every person has a right to defend themselves against unlawful force, but the force used in defence must be proportionate.

Facts: Rina is attacked with a stick. She retaliates by stabbing the attacker with a knife, causing death.

Is Rina liable?

A. No, she was exercising self-defence.

B. Yes, because her response was disproportionate.

C. No, because she had a right to protect herself.

D. Yes, because she had a knife.

Q4. Principle: A minor is not competent to contract, and any agreement with a minor is void ab initio (from the beginning).

Facts: A 17-year-old boy enters into an agreement to purchase a bike and pays an advance. Later, he cancels the contract and asks for a refund.

Is the agreement valid?

A. Yes, because he paid money.

B. No, because minors can't enter contracts.

C. Yes, if the guardian approves.

D. Yes, because it's beneficial to him.

Q5. Principle: No person shall be prosecuted and punished for the same offence more than once.

Facts: Ravi was tried and acquitted for theft. Later, new evidence emerges, and the police try to reopen the case.

Can Ravi be prosecuted again?

A. No, it violates double jeopardy.

B. Yes, if new evidence is found.

C. Yes, if the court allows.

D. No, unless he confesses.

Q6. Principle: Whoever intentionally uses force against another person without lawful justification commits the offence of battery.

Facts: A teacher slapped a student for not doing homework. The school rules don't allow corporal punishment.

Is the teacher liable?

A. No, because teachers can discipline students.

B. Yes, because there was no lawful justification.

C. No, because the student was at fault.

D. Yes, because homework is not serious enough.

Q7. Principle: Consent obtained by coercion is not valid in law.

Facts: Ajay threatens to harm Rakesh's family unless Rakesh signs a loan guarantee. Out of fear, Rakesh signs it.

Is the consent valid?

A. Yes, because he signed voluntarily.

B. No, because consent was obtained through coercion.

C. Yes, because he didn't inform police.

D. No, because it's a family matter.

Q8. Principle: Whoever causes pollution to the environment is liable to compensate for the damage under the 'polluter pays' principle.

Facts: A chemical factory pollutes a nearby lake, affecting local farmers and fishermen.

Who is liable to compensate?

A. The government

B. The factory

C. The farmers

D. No one, unless proven guilty

Q9. Principle: The master is liable for the wrongful acts of his servant committed in the course of employment.

Facts: A delivery driver employed by a company hits a pedestrian while taking an unauthorized detour.

Is the company liable?

A. No, because the driver acted on his own.

B. Yes, because he was still in employment.

C. No, because detour was not authorized.

D. Yes, because the pedestrian was injured.

Q10. Principle: Freedom of speech and expression is subject to reasonable restrictions in the interest of public order and morality.

Facts: A person makes a provocative speech that leads to violence.

Can the state restrict his speech?

A. No, freedom of speech is absolute.

B. Yes, if it disturbs public order.

C. No, unless he intended violence.

D. Yes, because morality is subjective.

Answer Key with Detailed Explanations

Q. No.	Answer	Explanation
1	A	As per Sec. 25 of Indian Contract Act, agreements made out of love and affection between close relations, and if written and registered, are valid.
2	B	The doctor acted negligently, risking the patient's safety. Such rashness makes him liable under the principle.
3	B	The use of a knife in response to a stick was disproportionate. Self-defence must be reasonable and proportionate.
4	B	A minor's agreement is void ab initio as per Section 11 of the Indian Contract Act. No enforceable contract exists.
5	A	Article 20(2) of the Constitution protects against double jeopardy. Ravi cannot be tried again for the same offence.
6	B	There was no lawful justification for physical punishment, making it an unlawful battery.
7	B	Coercion invalidates consent under Section 15 of the Indian Contract Act. Ajay's threat renders the contract voidable.
8	B	Under the 'polluter pays' principle from environmental law, the factory is liable for damage caused by pollution.
9	B	Even though the driver took a detour, he was still acting in the course of employment. Hence, the employer is vicariously liable.
10	B	Article 19(2) allows reasonable restrictions on speech for public order. Provocative speech inciting violence can be curtailed.