

NATIONAL LAW SCHOOL UNIVERSITY, DELHI ENTRANCE TEST

**ANALYSIS AND LIKELY CUT-OFF**

**The Examination**

If one goes only by the standard of the questions, then it was not very difficult to score well. However, the pattern (if there was anything at all) put paid to the hopes of many, since the absence of any particular sectional breakup made it almost impossible for many to manage their time.

The questions were all jumbled up, so it was very difficult to point out exactly how many questions were there pertaining to each subject.

A rough estimate of the overall structure of the paper is provided in the table below:

Serial No	Topic	No. of questions	Standard	Focus Area
1	English	18	Easy	Vocabulary and grammar
2	Analytical Reasoning	21	Moderate-difficult	Puzzle-based questions; assertions and reasons; pick the odd one out
3	Critical Reasoning	33	Easy-Moderate	Assertions and Reasons, Strengthen & weaken arguments; inference and conclusion
4	General Knowledge	38	Easy to Moderate	Static GK
5	Legal Aptitude	40	Moderate	Legal Knowledge (Mostly static; Constitution, Indian Polity, legal affairs and events)

## Subject-wise analysis

### I. GENERAL KNOWLEDGE

It was a mixed bag, covering everything from History (Mughal period- who was the first to introduce 'sidja', the British rule and freedom struggle- Simon Commission, the political parties represented in the Constituent Assembly, Wood's Dispatch, drain of wealth theory, etc), Geography (latitude and longitude, seas), Economics and business related terms (Golden handshake, maximum number of partners in a partnership firm-this was a repeat of Q. No 26 of last year's paper, taxation, VDIS, gilt-edged securities) and Science (well, there were 7 questions, but they were not out of the world- you could have answered them if your Class X basics were reasonably clear, and you added a dash of common sense!)

Current affairs did not find too much of a mention- there were the regular ones about awards, books and authors (there was something about Gunnar Myrdal's magnum opus 'Asian Drama'). However, the ghost of the Emergency in 1975 came to 'haunt'

Overall, the section was not too difficult, especially if the candidate had been able to gauge the likely trend from the 2008 paper.

### II. LOGICAL REASONING

Critical Reasoning had everything thrown in- from assertion- reasons, inference-conclusions, strengthening and weakening arguments, but was not very difficult.

The tough part was Analytical Reasoning, because it was very lengthy, all types of topics were dealt with, and also because there were a couple of questions which most candidates felt were erroneous (nobody has been able to come up with the proper question and all the given options- so the jury is still out on that!)

Some candidates have said that there were a number of assertion & reasoning questions covering topics on legal knowledge (it was a departure from last year), and there were a lot of questions on picking the odd-one out (on the lines of the old NALSAR papers).

This called into question your time-management strategies, especially in the face of adversity, and those who had problems, now need to work doubly hard in this area.

### **III. LEGAL APTITUDE**

*Legal Reasoning:* There were very few questions, and most of them were on torts and contracts. There was one question on criminal law, about abduction. ALL the questions were absolute sitters, and in fact, some of them resembled very closely the questions we have provided in our modules and mock tests.

*Legal Knowledge:* Again, not very difficult. The focus was on the Constitution – no confidence motion, right to property, etc (the importance of which we had been harping on continuously from Day 1!!!) and the Emergency of 1975 (the questions about the Shah Commission and ‘internal disturbance’ and the 39<sup>th</sup> Amendment). There was also a question on landmark judgements (the case where it was held that non-payment of minimum wages amounted to infringement of Fundamental Rights) and other policy-related matters (in which was ‘Project Tiger’ launched) as well as some on legal terms (what is the meaning of misdemeanour, slander)

Overall, it was pretty easy, and there was absolutely NOTHING which was totally unexpected or outside the syllabus and what we had taught.

### **IV. ENGLISH**

Lots of questions in vocabulary, which were pretty easy. The reading comprehension was not so easy (it was about ‘philosophical anarchy’ and some candidates faced difficulties in figuring out the meaning of certain portions of the passage).

### **LIKELY CUT-OFF**

Taking everything into account, it can be safely said that the likely cut-off should not go below 90, and above 110.

### **LESSONS TO LEARN**

This was one paper in which a candidate was made to face the worst, and once he/she has done that, figuring out the next strategy is pretty easy.

The lesson is- DO NOT LET A SUDDEN CHANGE IN THE PAPER PATTERN THROW ALL YOUR PLAND AND PREPARATION INTO A TIZZY!!

Just keep working on your time management strategies, and the rest would be fine!

All the Very Best!!!

The LST Team