



UPSC & STATE PCS CURRENT AFFAIRS · UJIYARI.COM

DAILY QUIZ — SOLVED

Daily Quiz — April 13, 2026

13 April 2026



CURATED & WRITTEN BY

Bharat Choudhary

UPSC Educator & Content Creator

[linkedin.com/in/epicbharat](https://www.linkedin.com/in/epicbharat)

ALSO FROM THE CREATOR

BharatNotes

Free UPSC notes, MCQs, PYQ analysis. **100% Free.**

bharatnotes.com →

ADVERTISE

Advertise with Ujiyari

Reach thousands of UPSC aspirants daily.

epicbharat@gmail.com

DAILY QUIZ — SOLVED ANSWER KEY

Daily Quiz — April 13, 2026

13 April 2026 · 14 Questions · Answers & Explanations Included

Question 1

of 14

[Source →](#)

The Rowlatt Act (Anarchical and Revolutionary Crimes Act), 1919 — which sparked the protests that brought civilians to Jallianwala Bagh — primarily empowered British authorities to:

- A Impose collective fines on villages harbouring anti-colonial activists
- B Detain individuals suspected of revolutionary activity without trial or bail ✓
- C Court-martial Indian soldiers who refused orders in internal security operations
- D Suspend civil courts and transfer all sedition cases to military tribunals

ANSWER & ANALYSIS

 **EXPLANATION**

FACT: The Rowlatt Act allowed indefinite detention without trial, bail, or legal representation — colonial counter-insurgency disguised as criminal law. **ANALYSIS:** Its passage despite unanimous opposition from all Indian members of the Imperial Legislative Council was the immediate trigger for Gandhi's hartal; the Jallianwala Bagh crowd gathered on Baisakhi to protest the arrest of local leaders under this Act.

 **CONCEPT NOTE**

The Rowlatt Act was based on the Sedition Committee report (1918) chaired by Justice Sidney Rowlatt, which reviewed the threat from Ghadar revolutionaries and Bengal terrorism. It extended wartime Defence of India Act provisions — specifically preventive detention — into peacetime without judicial oversight.

All Indian members voted against; the British official bloc passed it. Gandhi called it "the Black Act." Brigadier-General Dyer issued a proclamation banning public gatherings in Amritsar; the April 13 crowd — gathered for Baisakhi and protesting arrests of Satya Pal and Saifuddin Kitchlew — was unaware or unable to comply.

The massacre and the Hunter Commission's lenient verdict together radicalized India's constitutional moderates, accelerating the shift toward complete independence as the political goal.

Q1  **CONCEPT KIT**
 **CROSS-PAPER**

GS1 — Modern Indian History; GS2 — colonial legislation and civil liberties.

 **MAINS KEYWORDS**

Rowlatt Act, preventive detention, colonial law, Jallianwala Bagh, Hunter Commission.

 **COMMON MISTAKE**

Confusing the Rowlatt Act with IPC Section 124A (Sedition) — Rowlatt was a separate emergency statute allowing detention without any trial, not a substantive criminal offence.

 **EXAM TIP**

Hunter Commission (1919-20) investigated the massacre — Indian members dissented sharply; British members called it an "error of judgment." PYQ GS1 2016 asked about causes of Non-Cooperation Movement.

 **INTERVIEW**

Should Britain issue a formal state apology for Jallianwala Bagh, and what legal consequences would follow under the ILC Articles on State Responsibility?

 [Read Full Article →](#)

Question 2

of 14

[Source →](#)

India's bilateral Free Trade Agreements — including the India-UK FTA signed in July 2025 — grant tariff preferences below the WTO's standard Most Favoured Nation (MFN) rates to a specific partner. This departure from the MFN obligation is permissible under WTO rules because of:

- A GATT Article XVIII — which allows developing countries to protect infant industries
- B GATT Article XX — which provides general exceptions for public morality and national security
- C **GATT Article XXIV — which permits customs unions and free trade areas covering substantially all trade ✓**
- D The WTO Enabling Clause (1979) — which authorises preferential treatment for developing countries

ANSWER & ANALYSIS

 **EXPLANATION**

FACT: GATT Article XXIV is the legal basis for all bilateral FTAs between WTO members — it allows them to grant each other preferential tariffs below MFN rates, provided the agreement covers "substantially all trade" and does not raise barriers against third countries. **ANALYSIS:** This is the constitutional backbone of every FTA globally. Without Article XXIV, the India-UK deal — or RCEP, CPTPP, or any FTA — would violate the WTO's foundational non-discrimination principle.

 **CONCEPT NOTE**

The WTO's MFN obligation (GATT Article I) requires a member to grant any trade advantage given to one country to all WTO members equally. Article XXIV carves out an exception: FTAs and customs unions are permitted if they liberalise "substantially all trade" in goods (no agreed definition, but generally interpreted as >90% of trade) and are notified to the WTO. The Enabling Clause (1979 Decision) is a separate carve-out specifically for preferential treatment among developing countries — this is the legal basis for GSP schemes and GSTP, not bilateral FTAs between a developed and developing economy.

Article XX covers general exceptions (health, morality, environment, security) — not tariff preferences. The India-UK FTA, once implemented, will be notified to the WTO Committee on Regional Trade Agreements.

Q2  **CONCEPT KIT**

 CROSS-PAPER	GS2 — International Relations, WTO architecture; GS3 — trade policy, bilateral FTAs.
 MAINS KEYWORDS	GATT Article XXIV, MFN obligation, FTA, WTO notification, trade liberalisation.
 COMMON MISTAKE	Confusing the Enabling Clause (for developing-country GSP) with Article XXIV (for bilateral FTAs between any WTO members) — they are different legal instruments.
 EXAM TIP	UPSC Prelims 2018 asked about MFN status and WTO principles. Article XXIV is the standard answer whenever FTA legality under WTO is tested.
 INTERVIEW	WTO rules require FTAs to cover "substantially all trade" — but there is no agreed definition of this threshold. Should WTO set a precise percentage to prevent shallow deals?

 [Read Full Article →](#)

Question 3

of 14

[Source →](#)

The Mines and Minerals (Development and Regulation) Amendment Act, 2023 introduced a distinct chapter on "critical minerals" in India's mining law. The most significant governance change this amendment made was:

- A Allowing foreign companies to directly bid for critical mineral blocks without a joint venture requirement
- B Enabling the central government to auction critical mineral blocks directly, bypassing the usual state government auction route ✓
- C Granting KABIL statutory authority to compulsorily acquire critical mineral deposits from private landholders
- D Transferring regulation of all critical minerals from the Ministry of Mines to the Ministry of Defence

ANSWER & ANALYSIS

 **EXPLANATION**

FACT: The MMDR Amendment Act 2023 empowered the central government to conduct auctions for specified critical minerals directly — a significant departure from the normal federal arrangement where states conduct auctions for minerals in their territory. **ANALYSIS:** This reflects the strategic nature of critical minerals: unlike coal or iron ore, lithium and REEs are defence and energy-security inputs, and the Centre treats them as too important to leave entirely to state-level processes.

 **CONCEPT NOTE**

Under the Constitution, minerals are in the Concurrent List (Entry 54, Union List for regulation and development of mines). The MMDR Act 1957 originally gave states the dominant role in granting mineral concessions. The 2021 amendment opened up captive mines and introduced commercial mining auctions. The 2023 amendment went further by identifying a list of critical minerals — including lithium, cobalt, nickel, graphite, and rare earth elements — and enabling the Centre to auction these directly. India imports 80–90% of its critical mineral needs. KABIL (Khanij Bidesh India Ltd. — NALCO 40%, HCL 30%, MECL 30%) handles overseas acquisition. The 46 blocks auctioned in April 2026 represent the largest single-round auction under the new framework. India also joined the Minerals Security Partnership (MSP) as the only developing-country member.

Q3  **CONCEPT KIT**
 **CROSS-PAPER**

GS3 — mineral policy, federal governance; GS2 — centre-state relations.

 **MAINS KEYWORDS**

MMDR Act, critical minerals, central auction, federal mining rights, KABIL.

 **COMMON MISTAKE**

Assuming state governments still control critical mineral auctions — the 2023 amendment specifically removed this for the notified list of critical minerals.

 **EXAM TIP**

Under MMDR, minerals in Schedule I (atomic minerals) are centrally controlled; the 2023 amendment effectively creates a new category for strategic critical minerals with similar central control.

 **INTERVIEW**

Does central control over critical mineral auctions undermine cooperative federalism, or is it justified by national security imperatives?

 [Read Full Article →](#)

Question 4

of 14

[Source →](#)

Which of the following correctly describes the institutional character of NPCI (National Payments Corporation of India)?

- A A statutory body established directly under the Payment and Settlement Systems Act, 2007
- B A not-for-profit company under Section 8 of the Companies Act, promoted by RBI and Indian banks ✓
- C A government company under the Companies Act with RBI as majority shareholder
- D An autonomous authority under the Ministry of Finance, established by executive order in 2008

ANSWER & ANALYSIS
✓ EXPLANATION

FACT: NPCI is incorporated as a Section 8 (not-for-profit) company under the Companies Act, promoted by RBI and a consortium of 10 major Indian banks. It is NOT a statutory body — it operates as an authorised payment system operator under the Payment and Settlement Systems Act, 2007, but was not created by that statute.

ANALYSIS: This governance distinction matters: NPCI is privately governed by its member banks even though it operates critical national payment infrastructure — a recurring regulatory debate.

📌 CONCEPT NOTE

NPCI was incorporated in 2008 and became operational in 2009. Its umbrella products include UPI, IMPS, RuPay, NACH, FASTag, and BBPS. UPI processed 21.70 billion transactions worth ₹28.33 lakh crore in January 2026 — India's share of global real-time payment transactions stands at 49%.

The zero-MDR policy for UPI was introduced in January 2020. NPCI International Payments Ltd (NIPL), a wholly-owned subsidiary, manages UPI's global rollout — live in France, UAE, Singapore, Mauritius, and Sri Lanka.

RBI regulates NPCI under PSSA 2007 as an authorised payment system operator and as a payment system participant, but RBI holds no equity. The ownership structure (banks owning the infrastructure they use) is a significant governance debate — especially given UPI's role in nearly half of all global real-time payments.

Q4  **CONCEPT KIT**
 **CROSS-PAPER**

GS3 — digital payments, financial infrastructure; GS2 — regulatory architecture, public-private governance.

 **MAINS KEYWORDS**

NPCI, UPI, Section 8 company, PSSA 2007, zero-MDR, NPCI International.

 **COMMON MISTAKE**

Calling NPCI a "statutory body" — it is incorporated under the Companies Act (Section 8), not created by an Act of Parliament. RBI authorises but did not create it by statute.

 **EXAM TIP**

UPSC Prelims 2022 asked about NPCI. Remember: NPCI = Section 8 company; SEBI, RBI, IRDAI = statutory bodies under their respective Acts.

 **INTERVIEW**

Should UPI infrastructure — used by 49% of global real-time payments — be treated as a public utility and brought under a statutory framework?

 [Read Full Article →](#)

Question 5

of 14

[Source →](#)

Among Urea, DAP (Di-ammonium Phosphate), and MOP (Muriate of Potash) — India's three largest fertilizer categories by consumption — which one does India have zero domestic production capacity for, making it entirely import-dependent?

- A Urea only
- B DAP only
- C MOP only ✓
- D Both DAP and MOP

ANSWER & ANALYSIS

 **EXPLANATION**

FACT: India has no potash deposits whatsoever — making MOP (the primary potassium source for crops) 100% import-dependent, sourced from Canada (Canpotex), Russia (Uralkali), and Belarus (Belaruskali). Urea has significant domestic production.

DAP is partially produced domestically using imported phosphoric acid — so India is not 100% import-dependent on DAP. **ANALYSIS:** MOP's total import dependence is India's most acute fertilizer vulnerability, compounded by sanctions on Russia and Belarus disrupting supply chains.

 **CONCEPT NOTE**

India's fertilizer subsidy expenditure (FY26): approximately ₹1.95–2 lakh crore. Urea MRP has been frozen at ₹242 per 45 kg bag since 2012, making it the most fiscally expensive item.

The Nutrient Based Subsidy (NBS) scheme covers P and K fertilizers (including DAP and MOP) but explicitly excludes urea — a policy asymmetry that incentivises urea overuse. India's nitrogen use efficiency (NUE) for urea is only 35–40%, meaning 60–65% is lost to the atmosphere or leached into soil.

The ICRIER-Ashok Gulati report (2026) recommends extending NBS to urea, implementing true farmer-level DBT (cash in hand rather than subsidised product), and crop-neutral pricing to correct the NPK imbalance that decades of urea subsidisation have created.

Q5  **CONCEPT KIT**
 **CROSS-PAPER**

GS3 — agriculture, food security, import dependency; GS2 — subsidy policy.

 **MAINS KEYWORDS**

MOP, potash, fertilizer import dependence, NBS, urea NUE, DBT.

 **COMMON MISTAKE**

Assuming DAP is 100% imported — India does produce DAP (FACT, GSFC, Coromandel), but imports phosphoric acid as raw material.
MOP has zero domestic production because India has no potash ore reserves.

 **EXAM TIP**

NBS covers P and K but not N (urea) — this asymmetry is a standard GS3 question on fertilizer policy.

 **INTERVIEW**

With both Russia (Belaruskali) and Canada (Canpotex) as major potash sources facing geopolitical friction, should India invest in potash substitutes or deep-sea nodule extraction?

 [Read Full Article →](#)

Question 6

of 14

[Source →](#)

Which of the following is **INCORRECTLY** stated about the Shompen, the indigenous PVTG of Great Nicobar Island?

- A They are classified as a Particularly Vulnerable Tribal Group (PVTG) by the Government of India
- B Their population as recorded in the 2011 Census was 229 individuals
- C They are semi-nomadic hunter-gatherers who have historically avoided contact with outsiders
- D They are governed by the Panchayats (Extension to Scheduled Areas) Act, 1996 (PESA) ✓

ANSWER & ANALYSIS

✓ EXPLANATION

FACT: PESA 1996 applies only to Fifth Schedule areas — tribal-dominated regions in specified mainland states. The Andaman and Nicobar Islands are a Union Territory not covered by the Fifth Schedule, placing the Shompen outside PESA's ambit.

Their rights, to the extent recognised, fall under the Andaman and Nicobar Islands Protection of Aboriginal Tribes Regulation, 1956. **ANALYSIS:** This distinction is critical for the Great Nicobar project debate — the standard PESA-based Free, Prior and Informed Consent framework does not automatically protect them.

📌 CONCEPT NOTE

The Shompen are among India's most isolated indigenous communities, numbering fewer than 300 (Census 2011: 229 individuals). They inhabit Great Nicobar's interior rainforests and are classified as a PVTG — the most vulnerable category within Scheduled Tribes, identified on criteria of pre-agricultural technology, stagnant or declining population, extremely low literacy, and subsistence economy.

India has 75 recognised PVTGs. For constitutional purposes: the Fifth Schedule covers tribal areas in mainland states (Andhra Pradesh, Jharkhand, Odisha, Chhattisgarh, etc.) — PESA applies here.

The Sixth Schedule covers Assam, Meghalaya, Tripura, and Mizoram through autonomous district councils. A&N Islands as a UT fall under neither Schedule in the same manner, making their tribal protection framework a distinct regulatory question.

Q6  **CONCEPT KIT**
 **CROSS-PAPER**

GS2 — tribal rights, constitutional provisions; GS3 — environment vs development.

 **MAINS KEYWORDS**

PVTG, Fifth Schedule, PESA, Sixth Schedule, tribal rights, Shompen.

 **COMMON MISTAKE**

Assuming PESA applies to all tribal areas in India — it is limited to Fifth Schedule states only, not Union Territories or Sixth Schedule areas.

 **EXAM TIP**

Distinguish: 5th Schedule = tribal areas of specified states + PESA; 6th Schedule = autonomous councils in NE states; A&N Islands = separate UT governance.

 **INTERVIEW**

Can infrastructure development and PVTG rights coexist in ecologically sensitive islands, or is the trade-off inherently zero-sum?

 [Read Full Article →](#)

Question 7

of 14

[Source →](#)

The National Green Tribunal Act, 2010, defines NGT's jurisdiction through a Schedule of specific environmental laws. Which of the following statutes is **NOT** covered under that Schedule — meaning disputes arising from it cannot be brought before the NGT?

- A The Water (Prevention and Control of Pollution) Act, 1974
- B The Biological Diversity Act, 2002
- C **The Scheduled Tribes and Other Traditional Forest Dwellers (Recognition of Forest Rights) Act, 2006 ✓**
- D The Forest (Conservation) Act, 1980

ANSWER & ANALYSIS

 **EXPLANATION**

FACT: The Forest Rights Act, 2006 is not in the NGT Act's Schedule I. NGT's jurisdiction is limited to the seven scheduled laws: Water Act 1974, Water Cess Act 1977, Forest Conservation Act 1980, Air Act 1981, Environment Protection Act 1986, Public Liability Insurance Act 1991, and Biological Diversity Act 2002. **ANALYSIS:** This means tribal forest rights disputes under FRA 2006 — including those arising from the Great Nicobar project's impact on Shompen habitat — must be litigated in High Courts, not NGT.

 **CONCEPT NOTE**

The National Green Tribunal was established in 2010 under the NGT Act, replacing the National Environment Tribunal (1995) and National Environment Appellate Authority (1997). It has original jurisdiction over "substantial questions relating to environment" arising from the seven scheduled Acts.

NGT also has appellate jurisdiction over environmental clearances granted under the Environment Protection Act 1986.

The exclusion of FRA 2006 from NGT's schedule is a significant gap — tribal forest rights disputes involving large infrastructure projects must go to High Courts or the Supreme Court.

Appeals from NGT go to the Supreme Court. NGT applies the precautionary principle, polluter pays principle, and sustainable development as legally binding standards — unlike civil courts which apply CPC.

Q7  **CONCEPT KIT**
 **CROSS-PAPER**

GS3 — environmental law, biodiversity; GS2 — judicial institutions, tribal rights.

 **MAINS KEYWORDS**

NGT jurisdiction, Schedule I Acts, Forest Rights Act, precautionary principle, polluter pays.

 **COMMON MISTAKE**

Assuming NGT has jurisdiction over all environmental disputes — it can only hear cases under its seven scheduled laws. FRA 2006, Wildlife Protection Act 1972, and many other laws are outside NGT's direct jurisdiction.

 **EXAM TIP**

NGT's seven scheduled laws is a standard PYQ topic (Prelims 2015, 2019). The Forest Rights Act is the most commonly tested exclusion.

 **INTERVIEW**

Should the Forest Rights Act be added to NGT's schedule, given that forest rights disputes are inherently environmental in nature?

 [Read Full Article →](#)

Question 8

of 14

[Source →](#)

India's fertilizer DBT (Direct Benefit Transfer) system, introduced in 2018, channels the subsidy to:

- A Farmers directly into their Jan Dhan accounts, based on Aadhaar-linked land records
- B Fertilizer companies, released by the government after the farmer's Aadhaar-authenticated point-of-sale purchase ✓
- C State governments, which then disburse to farmers through cooperative societies and agri-input dealers
- D Farmers through the PM-KISAN framework, with fertilizer subsidy bundled into the annual ₹6,000 transfer

ANSWER & ANALYSIS

 **EXPLANATION**

FACT: Despite the "DBT" label, India's fertilizer subsidy does not go to farmers — it goes to fertilizer companies, released only after a farmer completes an Aadhaar-authenticated PoS transaction at the retailer. The farmer still pays the subsidised MRP; government pays the balance to the manufacturer.

ANALYSIS: This means the farmer has no cash in hand and no flexibility to choose between fertilizers based on crop need — the core critique of ICRIER's reform proposal for true farmer-level cash transfer.

 **CONCEPT NOTE**

The genuine DBT reform proposal would deposit the subsidy equivalent directly into the farmer's Aadhaar-linked account (like PM-KISAN), allowing purchase of any fertilizer at market price. Benefits: (1) end urea overuse caused by below-cost pricing; (2) allow NBS logic to apply to urea; (3) remove diversion incentive to non-agricultural uses.

Risks: without robust land records and banking penetration, marginal farmers could be bypassed. India's fertilizer subsidy (FY26): ~₹1.95–2 lakh crore.

Urea accounts for over half — its MRP has been ₹242/bag since 2012. The current "DBT" is technically point-of-sale (PoS) tracking, not a cash transfer.

Comparing: PM-KISAN = true DBT (₹6,000/year cash to farmer); Fertilizer "DBT" = company reimbursement post-sale.

Q8  **CONCEPT KIT**
 **CROSS-PAPER**


GS3 — agriculture subsidies; GS2 — welfare delivery, DBT architecture.

 **MAINS KEYWORDS**

Fertilizer DBT, NBS, urea MRP, PoS authentication, PM-KISAN comparison.

 **COMMON MISTAKE**

Assuming fertilizer DBT = cash to farmer — the money flows to companies, not farmers. The farmer sees only the subsidised shelf price.

 **EXAM TIP**

UPSC GS3 2020 asked about fertilizer subsidy rationalisation. Distinguish fertilizer DBT (company reimbursement) from PM-KISAN (true cash transfer).

 **INTERVIEW**

Should India implement true farmer-level fertilizer DBT, and who would be the winners and losers — large farmers, marginal farmers, fertilizer companies, and the state?

 [Read Full Article →](#)

Question 9

of 14

[Source →](#)

India's primary offensive interest in the India-UK FTA centred on "Mode 4" services trade. Under the WTO's GATS (General Agreement on Trade in Services), "Mode 4" refers to:

- A Cross-border supply — services delivered electronically from India to UK without physical movement of persons
- B Consumption abroad — UK consumers travelling to India to consume services (e.g., medical tourism)
- C Commercial presence — Indian companies establishing subsidiaries or branches in the UK
- D **Movement of natural persons — Indian service providers temporarily working on-site in the UK ✓**

ANSWER & ANALYSIS

 **EXPLANATION**

FACT: GATS Mode 4 covers temporary movement of natural persons — Indian IT professionals, consultants, and business service providers working at UK client sites. This is the largest source of India's services export earnings.

ANALYSIS: The UK's post-Brexit immigration framework treats Indian professionals as non-EU nationals subject to salary thresholds and visa fees — Mode 4 liberalisation in the FTA is India's mechanism to lower these barriers.






 **CONCEPT NOTE**

GATS defines four modes of services supply: Mode 1 (Cross-border — software emailed to a UK client); Mode 2 (Consumption abroad — UK tourist buys Ayurveda in Kerala); Mode 3 (Commercial presence — Infosys opens a London office); Mode 4 (Natural persons — TCS sends a consultant to a client site in Manchester). India's IT-BPM sector earns approximately \$227 billion annually (FY24), with UK among the top 3 destination markets.

Post-Brexit, the UK's points-based immigration system imposes salary floors and sponsor licence requirements that constrain Mode 4 flows. An FTA chapter on Mode 4 — covering intra-company transferees, business visitors, and independent professionals — could significantly lower these barriers.

Compare: India-UAE CEPA (2022) includes Mode 4 provisions for specified professional categories.

Q9  **CONCEPT KIT**

 CROSS-PAPER	GS2 — bilateral trade agreements; GS3 — services trade, IT-BPM sector.
 MAINS KEYWORDS	GATS Mode 4, services trade, India-UK FTA, IT-BPM, movement of natural persons.
 COMMON MISTAKE	Confusing Mode 1 (digital cross-border delivery) with Mode 4 (physical movement of person) — India earns significantly from both, but Mode 4 faces the largest policy barriers post-Brexit.
 EXAM TIP	All four GATS modes appear regularly in UPSC Prelims — memorise with examples: Mode 1=code emailed, Mode 2=medical tourist, Mode 3=foreign bank branch, Mode 4=IT consultant abroad.
 INTERVIEW	Should India push harder for Mode 3 commitments (commercial presence) in FTAs to build globally recognised Indian service brands, rather than focusing primarily on Mode 4 labour mobility?

 [Read Full Article →](#)

Question 10

of 14

[Source →](#)

The Disorders Inquiry Committee (Hunter Commission), set up to investigate the Jallianwala Bagh Massacre, concluded in its 1920 report that General Dyer's action was:

- A Fully justified as a military emergency measure; Dyer was cleared of all wrongdoing
- B **An error in judgment, for which Dyer was censured and asked to resign, but no criminal prosecution was recommended ✓**
- C A war crime under existing international law, with the Commission recommending his court-martial
- D A breach of duty that resulted in Dyer's immediate imprisonment by the colonial government

ANSWER & ANALYSIS

✓ EXPLANATION

FACT: The Hunter Commission was a split verdict — the British majority found it an "error of judgment" and recommended Dyer resign but face no criminal charges. Indian members dissented sharply, describing it as deliberate massacre.

Dyer resigned but was never prosecuted. **ANALYSIS:** The leniency scandalised Indian public opinion.

Winston Churchill's condemnation in the House of Commons ("a monstrous event, without precedent") was stronger than the Commission's own conclusion — and Britain has since expressed only "regret," never a formal apology.

📌 CONCEPT NOTE

The Disorders Inquiry Committee was chaired by Lord William Hunter (former Solicitor-General for Scotland). It submitted its report in March 1920.

The British majority exonerated Dyer of moral culpability; Indian members (including Sir Chimanlal Setalvad and Pandit Jagat Narayan Mulla) filed a dissent. Dyer was asked to resign and barred from re-employment but received no criminal punishment.

The British public raised a "Morning Post Fund" of £26,000 in his support. Rabindranath Tagore renounced his knighthood. The massacre and the Commission's mild response convinced many constitutional moderates — including Motilal Nehru — that reform within empire was futile. Britain expressed "deep regret" through Queen Elizabeth II's Amritsar visit in 1997 but has never issued a formal state apology.

Note: The Hunter Commission is distinct from the Rowlatt Committee (Justice Sidney Rowlatt, 1918) which preceded the Act.

Q10  **CONCEPT KIT**
 **CROSS-PAPER**

GS1 — Modern Indian History, colonial accountability; GS2 — international law on state responsibility.

 **MAINS KEYWORDS**

Hunter Commission, colonial accountability, Jallianwala Bagh, formal apology, Non-Cooperation Movement.

 **COMMON MISTAKE**

Confusing Hunter Commission (post-massacre inquiry body, 1919-20) with Rowlatt Committee (1918, pre-Act). Both appear in UPSC GS1.

 **EXAM TIP**

Key sequence: Rowlatt Committee report (1918) → Rowlatt Act (1919) → Jallianwala Bagh massacre (April 13, 1919) → Hunter Commission (1919-20).

 **INTERVIEW**

107 years on, should Britain issue a formal state apology, and what would this mean under the International Law Commission's Articles on State Responsibility?

 [Read Full Article →](#)

Question 11

of 14

[Source →](#)

The Khalsa Panth, commemorated every Baisakhi, was founded in 1699 at:

- A Amritsar, by Guru Tegh Bahadur
- B Fatehgarh Sahib, by Guru Gobind Singh
- C Anandpur Sahib, by Guru Gobind Singh ✓
- D Patna Sahib, by Guru Gobind Singh

ANSWER & ANALYSIS

EXPLANATION

FACT: Guru Gobind Singh, the 10th Sikh Guru, founded the Khalsa Panth at Anandpur Sahib (present-day Punjab) on Baisakhi, April 13, 1699 — instituting the Panj Pyare (Five Beloved Ones) and the Amrit Sanchar ceremony.

ANALYSIS: The Khalsa transformed Sikhism from a devotional community into an egalitarian martial brotherhood, directly responding to Mughal persecution after the execution of Guru Tegh Bahadur (the 9th Guru) in 1675.

CONCEPT NOTE

Baisakhi marks the solar new year across several regional calendars: Vishu (Kerala), Bihu (Assam), Puthandu (Tamil Nadu). For Sikhs, it additionally commemorates the Khalsa's founding.

Guru Gobind Singh created the Khalsa as an initiated community bound by the Panj Kakars (five K's: Kesh, Kanga, Kara, Kachha, Kirpan). The founding was an act of resistance: Guru Tegh Bahadur (9th Guru) had been executed by Aurangzeb in 1675 for refusing to convert.

The Khalsa's egalitarian ethos — admitting members from all castes into the brotherhood — was a direct challenge to the social hierarchy the Mughal state was exploiting. Patna Sahib is Guru Gobind Singh's birthplace; Fatehgarh Sahib is where two of his younger sons were martyred in 1704; neither is the Khalsa's founding site.

Q11  **CONCEPT KIT**
 **CROSS-PAPER**

GS1 — Bhakti and Sikh traditions, Modern India; GS1 — cultural geography and festivals.

 **MAINS KEYWORDS**

Khalsa Panth, Panj Pyare, Baisakhi, Guru Gobind Singh, Anandpur Sahib, Sikh history.

 **COMMON MISTAKE**

Confusing Guru Tegh Bahadur (9th Guru, martyred 1675) with Guru Gobind Singh (10th Guru, founded Khalsa 1699) — both are frequently confused in MCQs.

 **EXAM TIP**

Anandpur Sahib (Khalsa 1699) and Fatehgarh Sahib (martyrdom of Zorawar Singh and Fateh Singh, 1704) are two distinct Sikh historical sites in Punjab.

 **INTERVIEW**

How does the Khalsa's founding ethos — rejecting caste distinctions — engage with contemporary debates about caste within Sikh communities?

 [Read Full Article →](#)

Question 12

of 14

[Source →](#)

Exercise DUSTLIK, India's joint military exercise with Uzbekistan, focuses primarily on:

- A Amphibious warfare and maritime counter-piracy operations in Central Asian waterways
- B Counter-terrorism operations and special forces interoperability training ✓
- C Humanitarian assistance and disaster relief (HADR) in landlocked terrain
- D Air combat tactics and fighter interoperability drills with the Uzbek Air Force

ANSWER & ANALYSIS

✓ EXPLANATION

FACT: Exercise DUSTLIK focuses on counter-terrorism operations and special forces training. The 7th edition (April 12–25, 2026, Uzbekistan) involved 60 Indian personnel — primarily the MAHAR Regiment alongside Air Force elements.

ANALYSIS: Uzbekistan is landlocked (ruling out amphibious and maritime angles), and the exercise fits India's Connect Central Asia policy and its SCO framework engagement, positioning India as a counter-terror partner in a region historically dominated by Russian security influence.

📌 CONCEPT NOTE

Uzbekistan is a member of the Shanghai Cooperation Organisation (SCO), which India joined as a full member in 2017. India's Central Asia engagement includes bilateral exercises (DUSTLIK with Uzbekistan), the International North-South Transport Corridor (INSTC), and the Chabahar port route as an alternative to Pakistan-controlled land access. "DUSTLIK" means "friendship" in Uzbek.

India conducts over 50 bilateral military exercises annually; other notable ones include SHAKTI (India-France), YUDH ABHYAS (India-USA), NOMADIC ELEPHANT (India-Mongolia), and CYCLONE (India-Egypt). HADR exercises are more typical with maritime neighbours (e.g., India-Sri Lanka MITRA SHAKTI).

The SCO framework has made Central Asian counter-terrorism cooperation a growing area of India's defence diplomacy — alongside simultaneous engagement with NATO countries.

Q12  **CONCEPT KIT**

 CROSS-PAPER	GS2 — defence diplomacy, Central Asia policy, SCO; GS3 — internal security, counter-terrorism.
 MAINS KEYWORDS	Exercise DUSTLIK, Uzbekistan, SCO, Connect Central Asia policy, counter-terrorism, MAHAR Regiment.
 COMMON MISTAKE	Confusing bilateral exercises — DUSTLIK = Uzbekistan; NOMADIC ELEPHANT = Mongolia; CYCLONE = Egypt; SHAKTI = France. UPSC Prelims frequently tests the country-name pairing.
 EXAM TIP	Uzbekistan = DUSTLIK; Mongolia = NOMADIC ELEPHANT; Egypt = CYCLONE; France = SHAKTI; USA = YUDH ABHYAS.
 INTERVIEW	Does India's simultaneous participation in SCO exercises (with China and Russia) and NATO-aligned exercises (with France, USA) create strategic contradictions, or does it exemplify strategic autonomy?

 [Read Full Article →](#)

Question 13

of 14

[Source →](#)

Which of the following is **INCORRECTLY** stated about the Ganges River Dolphin (*Platanista gangetica*)?

- A It is India's National Aquatic Animal, declared so at the first National Ganga River Basin Authority meeting in October 2009
- B Its current IUCN Red List status is Vulnerable ✓
- C It is listed under Schedule I of the Wildlife Protection Act, 1972, conferring the highest level of legal protection
- D It relies entirely on echolocation for navigation and hunting, being functionally blind

ANSWER & ANALYSIS

 **EXPLANATION**

FACT: The Ganges River Dolphin is listed as Endangered (not Vulnerable) on the IUCN Red List — a status it has held since 1996 and confirmed in the most recent 2022 assessment. **ANALYSIS:** Endangered vs Vulnerable is not merely a label — Endangered triggers higher-priority intervention under both domestic wildlife law and international conventions, making this distinction operationally significant for conservation funding and legal protection thresholds.

 **CONCEPT NOTE**

The Gangetic Dolphin was declared India's National Aquatic Animal on October 5, 2009 at the inaugural meeting of the National Ganga River Basin Authority (NGRBA), chaired by PM Manmohan Singh. It is one of only four freshwater dolphin species remaining worldwide (alongside Indus river dolphin, Irrawaddy dolphin, and Amazon river dolphin). It is functionally blind — the lens of the eye does not focus light — and uses echolocation for navigation and prey detection. WPA 1972 Schedule I affords absolute protection: no hunting, trade, or possession. The Wildlife Institute of India (WII) 2026 report found that reduced Chambal River flow (due to irrigation extraction) is forcing dolphins downstream toward the Yamuna confluence. The Chambal runs through Madhya Pradesh, Rajasthan, and Uttar Pradesh and is one of India's least-polluted major rivers.

Q13  **CONCEPT KIT**
 **CROSS-PAPER**

GS3 — biodiversity, freshwater ecosystems; GS2 — conservation legislation.

 **MAINS KEYWORDS**

Gangetic dolphin, IUCN Endangered, WPA Schedule I, National Aquatic Animal, Chambal River.

 **COMMON MISTAKE**

The classic UPSC trap: calling the Gangetic Dolphin "Vulnerable" — its status is Endangered (has been since 1996). Compare: Gharial = Critically Endangered; Irrawaddy Dolphin = Endangered; Indus River Dolphin = Endangered.

 **EXAM TIP**

Appeared in UPSC Prelims 2014 and 2019 — IUCN status is the most-tested fact about this species.

 **INTERVIEW**

India declared the Ganga a "living entity" in a 2017 Uttarakhand High Court order (later stayed by Supreme Court) — should the Gangetic Dolphin's right to a pollution-free river be made legally justiciable?

 [Read Full Article →](#)

Question 14

of 14

[Source →](#)

The MoU signed between FIU-IND and I4C brings together two agencies operating under which pair of ministries respectively?

- A Ministry of Home Affairs and Ministry of Finance
- B Ministry of Finance and Ministry of Home Affairs ✓
- C Ministry of Electronics and IT and Ministry of Finance
- D Reserve Bank of India and Ministry of Home Affairs

ANSWER & ANALYSIS
✓ EXPLANATION

FACT: FIU-IND (Financial Intelligence Unit — India) functions under the Ministry of Finance, Department of Revenue. I4C (Indian Cyber Crime Coordination Centre) operates under the Ministry of Home Affairs.

The MoU bridges these two agencies to cover the full financial crime cycle — from cyber fraud commission (I4C's domain) to money trail and asset recovery (FIU-IND's domain). **ANALYSIS:** Option A is the classic trap — it reverses the two ministries.






📌 CONCEPT NOTE

FIU-IND was established in November 2004 under Ministry of Finance (Department of Revenue). It analyses suspicious transaction reports (STRs) under the Prevention of Money Laundering Act (PMLA), 2002, and reports to the Economic Intelligence Council.

I4C was established by MHA in 2018 and made operational in January 2020; it manages the National Cybercrime Reporting Portal (cybercrime.gov.in) and coordinates inter-agency response to cyber fraud. India recorded over 18 lakh cybercrime complaints in 2023 (NCRB).

The FIU-IND + I4C MoU targets cyber-enabled financial fraud — where a digital crime generates illicit proceeds subsequently laundered through the formal financial system, requiring both agencies' distinct expertise. This coordination model follows FATF recommendations on virtual assets and cyber-enabled financial crime.

Q14  **CONCEPT KIT**

 CROSS-PAPER	GS2 — governance, institutional design; GS3 — cybersecurity, money laundering.
 MAINS KEYWORDS	FIU-IND, I4C, PMLA, cybercrime, financial intelligence, inter-agency coordination.
 COMMON MISTAKE	The defining trap: option A reverses Finance and Home Affairs. FIU-IND = Finance (Revenue Dept); I4C = Home Affairs. ED (Enforcement Directorate) is also under Finance (Revenue) — not to be confused with FIU-IND.
 EXAM TIP	FIU-IND is India's Financial Intelligence Unit as designated under FATF. It is distinct from ED (which prosecutes under PMLA) — FIU-IND collects and analyses intelligence, ED enforces.
 INTERVIEW	Should India create a unified financial crimes authority integrating FIU-IND, ED, and I4C, or does specialisation across agencies serve better?

 [Read Full Article →](#)



CURATED & WRITTEN BY

Bharat Choudhary

UPSC Educator & Content Creator

[LinkedIn](#)[Read Full Edition](#)**ALSO FROM THE CREATOR**

BharatNotes

Free UPSC study platform — notes across all 4 GS papers, MCQs, PYQ analysis & progress tracking. **100% Free.**

bharatnotes.com →**ADVERTISE WITH UJIYARI**

Reach **thousands of UPSC & State PCS aspirants** daily through our PDFs, website & social channels.

Coaching • EdTech • Publishers • Exam apps

[✉ epicbharat@gmail.com](mailto:epicbharat@gmail.com)

“A person who never made a mistake never tried anything new.”

— Albert Einstein