ujiyari

UPSC & STATE PCS CURRENT AFFAIRS · UJIYARI.COM

DAILY CURRENT AFFAIRS

Daily Quiz — April 14, 2026

14 April 2026

CURATED & WRITTEN BY

Bharat Choudhary

UPSC Educator & Content Creator

linkedin.com/in/epicbharat

Daily Quiz — April 14, 2026

14 April 2026 · 14 Questions · Based on today's Current Affairs & Editorials

DAILY PRACTICE

Test Your Knowledge

14 questions based on today's current affairs & editorials

14 MCQs | Explanations | Statistics | Timed

CHOOSE NUMBER OF QUESTIONS

5 | 10 | All 14

Read Article

QUESTION 1 OF 14

Dr B.R. Ambedkar's concept of "Constitutional Morality", articulated in his closing speech to the Constituent Assembly on 25 November 1949, refers to:

A. Strict textual fidelity to the Constitution's original provisions by all three branches of government

B. A culture of democratic values and institutional self-restraint that must be cultivated beyond the legal text for the Constitution to function

C. The moral authority of the Supreme Court to interpret fundamental rights consistent with its own evolving conscience

D The binding force of the Directive Principles of State Policy on Parliament when making law

FACT: Ambedkar warned that constitutional institutions (Parliament, executive, courts) could formally function while democracy hollowed out — "democracy in India is only a top-dressing on an Indian soil which is essentially undemocratic." He argued a culture of restraint, deliberation, and respect for norms is as necessary as the text. ANALYSIS: This is the concept the Supreme Court has invoked in Navtej Johar (2018, Section 377), Sabarimala (2018), NCT Delhi v UoI (2018, LG powers), and Electoral Bonds (2024) — framing constitutional morality as a standard that constrains both popular will and institutional overreach.

CONCEPT NOTE

The phrase "Constitutional Morality" was borrowed by Ambedkar from George Grote's *History of Greece*, where Grote used it to describe the informal Athenian norms sustaining formal democratic institutions. Ambedkar applied it in the Indian context in his famous closing speech, identifying three specific challenges: (1) dependence on bloody methods of revolution vs constitutional methods, (2) hero-worship in politics leading to dictatorship, and (3) political democracy without social and economic democracy.

His warning remains central to the Indian constitutional imagination — the text itself can do little if the political culture does not sustain it. The Supreme Court has operationalised this concept in several landmark rulings, holding that religious practices (Sabarimala), penal provisions (Section 377), and executive practices must meet the test of constitutional morality, which is a higher standard than popular morality.

▾ 🎯 **Concept Kit —** tap to expand

🔗 CROSS-PAPER LINKS	**GS1 — Modern History (Constituent Assembly debates); GS2 — Constitutional interpretation, judicial review; GS4 — Ethics (public vs private morality).**
✍️ MAINS KEYWORDS	**Constitutional morality, Ambedkar, top-dressing, Navtej Johar, Sabarimala, constitutional culture.**
⚠️ COMMON MISTAKE	**Treating "Constitutional Morality" as synonymous with "constitutional law" — it is an extra-textual ethical concept, not a legal rule.**

📌 EXAM TIP	**UPSC GS2 2019 asked about "Constitutional Morality". Remember: Ambedkar quoted Grote; the phrase entered Indian jurisprudence via Navtej Johar.**
🎤 INTERVIEW	** Can "constitutional morality" be invoked by courts to strike down legislation that is technically valid but violates the spirit of the Constitution?

📰 Read Full Article →

QUESTION 2 OF 14

Section 3(d) of the Indian Patents Act, 1970 (inserted by the 2005 amendment) — highlighted during India Pharma 2026 — addresses a specific pharmaceutical patent concern known as:

A Compulsory licensing — allowing generic production when a patented drug is not available at affordable prices

B Parallel importation — permitting import of patented drugs from cheaper markets without the patent-holder's consent

C Ever-greening — extending patent life through minor modifications to a known substance that lack enhanced efficacy

D Reverse engineering — legally reproducing a patented drug by working backward from the final product

> FACT: Section 3(d) denies patents for “the mere discovery of a new form of a known substance which does not result in the enhancement of the known efficacy” — specifically targeting ever-greening, where Big Pharma extends patent monopolies by patenting minor molecular variants (new crystal forms, salts, esters, polymorphs) of already-patented drugs. ANALYSIS: This provision, upheld by the Supreme Court in Novartis v. UoI (2013), is foundational to

India's public-health generics model — it keeps critical drugs affordable but is cited by Big Pharma as a disincentive for Indian R&D investment.

📝 CONCEPT NOTE

Section 3(d) was India's response to TRIPS compliance in 2005: while granting product patents in pharmaceuticals (previously only process patents were allowed), India added Section 3(d) as a novelty filter. The Novartis case (2013) involved the crystalline form of imatinib (cancer drug Gleevec) — the Supreme Court held that the new crystalline form did not show enhanced therapeutic efficacy and therefore did not qualify for a patent.

Compulsory licensing (Section 84) is a different provision — it allows a third party to produce a patented drug after three years if the drug is not worked commercially or is not affordable; Natco was granted one for Bayer's Nexavar in 2012. India is one of the few countries with such a strong anti-ever-greening provision, and it has been a long-running tension in US-India trade relations (USTR Special 301 Report routinely flags Section 3(d)).

Simultaneously, the India Pharma 2026 vision of innovation-led pharma requires some accommodation of innovator-firm R&D incentives — this is the policy tension the event sought to address.

🎯 Concept Kit — tap to expand

🔗 CROSS-PAPER LINKS	**GS2 — IR (US-India trade, TRIPS); GS3 — pharma, IP policy; GS4 — ethics (affordability vs innovation).**
✍️ MAINS KEYWORDS	**Section 3(d), ever-greening, Novartis v. UoI, TRIPS, compulsory licensing, Section 84.**
⚠️ COMMON MISTAKE	**Confusing Section 3(d) (novelty filter) with Section 84 (compulsory licensing) — they address different stages of patent life.**
📌 EXAM TIP	**UPSC Prelims 2019 asked about compulsory licensing. Key distinction: 3(d) prevents a weak patent from being granted; 84 limits a strong patent from being abused.**
🎤 INTERVIEW	** Has Section 3(d) struck the right balance between public-health affordability and innovation incentive — and how should India adjust it as it shifts to a value-led pharma model?

📰 Read Full Article →

QUESTION 3 OF 14

The Mines and Minerals (Development and Regulation) Amendment Act, 2023 introduced a new tenure — the "Exploration Licence (EL)" — which was NOT available under the previous framework. The key feature of the EL is that it:

A. Allows private firms to conduct exploration and, if minerals are discovered, be compensated via a share of the subsequent auction proceeds

B. Automatically converts into a Mining Lease if the licensee invests more than ₹500 crore in exploration

C. Grants ownership rights to the explorer over any minerals discovered, subject to royalty payments to the state

D. Permits only Public Sector Undertakings and joint ventures with foreign state-owned enterprises to conduct exploration

---

FACT: The 2023 MMDR Amendment introduced the Exploration Licence as a new mineral-concession category, allowing private firms (not just the Geological Survey of India or state bodies) to conduct deep-rock exploration. The private explorer does not get mining rights — instead, if minerals are proven commercially viable, the area goes to auction and the licensee receives a share of the premium obtained in that auction.
ANALYSIS: This is designed to solve the chicken-and-egg problem where many Indian mineral blocks failed to sell because exploration data was outdated — private capital now has an incentive to update geological surveys.

📝 CONCEPT NOTE

India's mineral-concession tenures have three tiers: Reconnaissance Permit (RP) for initial survey, Prospecting Licence (PL) for advanced investigation, and Mining Lease (ML) for actual extraction. The pre-2023 framework did not allow private firms to systematically conduct deep-rock exploration — GSI and MECL (government agencies) held that role.
The 2023 amendment's EL regime creates a fourth tenure specifically for private exploration. Importantly, the EL holder does not get the mining right — that still goes via auction — but they earn a premium share.

This is based on Western models (Canada, Australia) where private "junior explorers" are a major part of the mining ecosystem. Combined with the removal of 6 previously-atomic minerals (lithium, beryllium, titanium, niobium, tantalum, zirconium) from the reserved list, the EL regime is designed to bring Rs 50,000+ crore of private exploration investment into the sector by 2030.

▾ 🎯 **Concept Kit —** tap to expand

🔗 CROSS-PAPER LINKS	**GS3 — mineral policy, federalism; GS2 — regulatory architecture, private-sector participation.**
✍️ MAINS KEYWORDS	**Exploration Licence, MMDR 2023, junior explorers, critical minerals auction, reconnaissance permit.**
⚠️ COMMON MISTAKE	**Assuming the EL grants mining rights — it grants exploration rights only; the mining right still goes to auction. The EL holder's benefit is a share of the auction premium.**
📌 EXAM TIP	**Distinguish: Pre-2023 tenures = RP + PL + ML (state-led exploration); Post-2023 = RP + PL + ML + EL (private exploration).**
🎤 INTERVIEW	** Is the EL's "share of premium" model a sufficient incentive for private explorers, or does India need additional tax breaks (similar to Canadian Flow-Through Shares) to build a true junior explorer ecosystem?

📰 Read Full Article →

QUESTION 4 OF 14

The Supreme Court's power under Article 142 to do "complete justice" has been interpreted in a series of landmark rulings. As per *Supreme Court Bar Association v. Union of India* (1998), which principle governs the exercise of this power?

A Article 142 can be invoked to override any substantive statutory provision if the Court considers it necessary for justice

B Article 142 is supplementary to existing laws and cannot be used to contradict express provisions of substantive statute

C Article 142 can be used by both the Supreme Court and High Courts, with similar scope

D Article 142 is available only in matters where both parties consent to its invocation

---

FACT: In SCBA v. UoI (1998), a Constitution Bench clarified that Article 142 is a supplementary power — it fills gaps in existing law but cannot contradict express statutory provisions. This built on A.R. Antulay v. R.S. Nayak (1988), which held that Article 142 cannot be used to contravene statute.
ANALYSIS: This is a critical constraint on what looks like an otherwise unlimited power — without these self-imposed limits, Article 142 would allow the Supreme Court to rewrite substantive law case by case, violating separation of powers.

CONCEPT NOTE

The judicial interpretation of Article 142 shows careful self-constraint. Prem Chand Garg v. Excise Commissioner (1963) held that Article 142 orders must not violate fundamental rights. A.R. Antulay (1988) held that Article 142 cannot be used to contravene express statute — in that case, to try an MLA without sanction that the Prevention of Corruption Act required. SCBA v. UoI (1998) synthesised these, holding Article 142 is "supplementary" — it supplies what is not provided, but does not override what is provided.
Importantly, Article 142 is available only to the Supreme Court — not to High Courts, which have a different (Article 226) writ jurisdiction. In Shilpa Sailesh v. Varun Sreenivasan (2023), a 5-judge bench used Article 142 to grant divorce on irretrievable breakdown — a ground not in the Hindu Marriage Act — arguing this was filling a legislative gap (as 4 Law Commission reports had recommended statutory recognition).
The April 14, 2026 matrimonial ruling applies this framework. The "supplementary not substitutive" doctrine remains the central limit on Article 142.

▾ 🎯 **Concept Kit —** tap to expand

🔗 CROSS-PAPER LINKS	**GS2 — Polity, separation of powers; GS2 — judicial review.**
✍️ MAINS KEYWORDS	**Article 142, SCBA v UoI (1998), A.R. Antulay (1988), Prem Chand Garg (1963), supplementary power, complete justice.**

⚠️ COMMON MISTAKE	**Thinking Article 142 is unlimited — the Supreme Court itself has imposed clear limits (cannot override FRs, cannot contradict statute, cannot be used by HCs).**
📌 EXAM TIP	**Article 142(1) — complete justice; Article 142(2) — contempt, summoning witnesses. Only Supreme Court has this power; High Court uses Article 226 writs.**
🎤 INTERVIEW	** Given that Article 142 has been used in Bhopal Gas Settlement, Vishaka guidelines, Ayodhya, Article 370, Navtej Johar — is the SCBA 1998 principle still constraining the Court, or has it become an illusion?

📰 Read Full Article →

QUESTION 5 OF 14

Article 21A of the Constitution (inserted by the 86th Amendment Act, 2002) guarantees free and compulsory education. The PIL heard on April 14, 2026 sought to extend its coverage. The current scope of Article 21A is:

A All children from birth to age 14, covered by the RTE Act 2009

B All children aged 3-14 years, including pre-primary and elementary education

C All children aged 6-14 years, covered by the RTE Act 2009 (ages 3-6 are under Directive Principle Article 45)

D All persons aged 6-18 years, including secondary education, per the NEP 2020 5+3+3+4 structure

FACT: Article 21A covers ages 6-14 only; the RTE Act 2009 is the enabling legislation. Ages 0-6 fall under the Directive Principle Article 45 (which was amended by the 86th Amendment to explicitly mention early childhood care and education for 0-6 years) — but Directive Principles

are not justiciable.

ANALYSIS: This is precisely the gap the April 14 PIL targets — NEP 2020's 5+3+3+4 structure recognises 3-8 years as the foundational stage, but law has not caught up. Without an amendment to Article 21A or RTE Act, ECCE for 3-6 remains aspirational.

CONCEPT NOTE

The 86th Constitutional Amendment Act 2002 did three things: (1) inserted Article 21A as a fundamental right, (2) amended Article 45 (originally covering 0-14) to now cover 0-6 years with "early childhood care and education", and (3) amended Article 51A(k) to make it a fundamental duty of parents/guardians to provide educational opportunities to children 6-14.

The RTE Act 2009 (effective April 1, 2010) operationalised Article 21A for ages 6-14, with provisions including 25% EWS reservation in private unaided schools and neighbourhood schooling.

NEP 2020's 5+3+3+4 structure (foundational 3-8, preparatory 8-11, middle 11-14, secondary 14-18) aligns with global ECCE standards but currently exists as policy, not as enforceable right.

The Mohini Jain (1992) and Unnikrishnan (1993) rulings had earlier read education into Article 21 — which was codified by the 86th Amendment.

ECCE quality in India is primarily delivered through Anganwadi centres (ICDS, MoWCD) — over 1.4 million centres; however, these were originally nutrition-focused, not pedagogy-focused, leading to current debates about institutional upgrade under NEP's Balvatika scheme.

▾ 🎯 **Concept Kit —** tap to expand

🔗 CROSS-PAPER LINKS	**GS2 — Polity (fundamental rights vs Directive Principles); GS2 — Social Justice (RTE, ECCE).**
✍️ MAINS KEYWORDS	**Article 21A, 86th Amendment, RTE Act 2009, Article 45, NEP 2020, Balvatika, Anganwadi.**
⚠️ COMMON MISTAKE	**Assuming Article 21A covers pre-primary or secondary — it covers only 6-14. Article 45 covers 0-6 as DP; Article 41 covers higher education as DP.**
📌 EXAM TIP	**86th Amendment (2002, effective 2010) - three changes: inserted 21A; amended 45; amended 51A(k). Memorise this cluster.**
🎤 INTERVIEW	** Should pre-primary education (ages 3-6) be made a justiciable right by amending Article 21A, and what would be the fiscal and institutional cost of doing so?

Read Full Article →

QUESTION 6 OF 14

Baisakhi marks the 1699 founding of the Khalsa Panth by Guru Gobind Singh. The place where the Khalsa was founded and where the first Amrit Sanchar (Khande di Pahul) initiation of the Panj Pyare ("Five Beloved Ones") occurred is:

A Kartarpur Sahib, Pakistan (currently within Pakistan territory)

B Anandpur Sahib, Punjab (India)

C Amritsar (Harmandir Sahib / Golden Temple), Punjab (India)

D Patna Sahib, Bihar (Guru Gobind Singh's birthplace)

FACT: The Khalsa Panth was founded at Anandpur Sahib on Baisakhi 1699 by Guru Gobind Singh — the 10th and last human Sikh Guru. The Panj Pyare (Daya Singh, Dharam Singh, Himmat Singh, Mohkam Singh, Sahib Singh) received the first Amrit Sanchar (Khande di Pahul) — initiated with Amrit prepared by stirring sugar-water with a double-edged sword — and were given the surname “Singh” (lion).
ANALYSIS: Anandpur Sahib is significant for multiple Sikh events: Guru Tegh Bahadur’s martyrdom (1675); the founding of the Khalsa (1699); and as the geographical heart of Sikh political self-consciousness. Note: “baptism” is a Christian term often loosely applied to Amrit Sanchar but the two ceremonies are theologically distinct — Amrit Sanchar is an initiation into the Khalsa’s martial-spiritual community, not a washing-away of sin.

CONCEPT NOTE

Anandpur Sahib (literally “City of Bliss”) was founded by Guru Tegh Bahadur (9th Guru) in 1665. It gained religious significance as the site of his martyrdom (1675 — he refused to convert to Islam under Aurangzeb’s order) and as his son Guru Gobind Singh’s headquarters.
The 1699 founding of the Khalsa involved specific ritual elements: Guru Gobind Singh called for

volunteers willing to offer their heads; five stepped forward; he initiated them through the **Amrit Sanchar** ceremony (also called **Khande di Pahul** — "rite of the double-edged sword"), in which Amrit (sugar-water stirred with a khanda / double-edged sword while reciting Gurbani) is administered; instituted the Five Ks (Panj Kakars) as articles of faith — Kesh (uncut hair), Kanga (comb), Kara (steel bangle), Kachera (undergarment), Kirpan (sword); and bestowed the surname "Singh" (meaning lion) for men and "Kaur" (princess) for women to transcend caste divisions. Note on terminology: "baptism" is a Christian sacrament and is not the accurate term for Amrit Sanchar, though Western writers have sometimes used it loosely.

Kartarpur Sahib is in Pakistan — it is the site of Guru Nanak's last years and death, and houses his mausoleum; the Kartarpur Corridor (opened Nov 2019) allows Indian pilgrims visa-free access. Amritsar (Harmandir Sahib/Golden Temple) was founded by Guru Ram Das (4th Guru) and completed by Guru Arjan Dev (5th Guru); it is the spiritual centre but not the founding site of the Khalsa.

Patna Sahib is Guru Gobind Singh's birthplace (1666) — Takht Sri Patna Sahib is one of the five Takhts (seats of Sikh authority).

▾ 🎯 **Concept Kit —** tap to expand

🔗 CROSS-PAPER LINKS	**GS1 — Art & Culture (Sikh history, festivals); GS2 — minority/religious rights.**
✍️ MAINS KEYWORDS	**Khalsa Panth, Guru Gobind Singh, Anandpur Sahib, Panj Pyare, Five Ks, Baisakhi, Amrit Sanchar.**
⚠️ COMMON MISTAKE	**Confusing Anandpur Sahib (Khalsa founding) with Harmandir Sahib/Amritsar (Golden Temple, central shrine). The Five Takhts are: Akal Takht (Amritsar), Patna Sahib (Bihar), Keshgarh Sahib (Anandpur), Hazur Sahib (Nanded), Damdama Sahib (Talwandi Sabo).**
📌 EXAM TIP	**1699 Khalsa founding = Anandpur Sahib; not Amritsar.**
🎤 INTERVIEW	** What was the political context of Guru Gobind Singh's decision to institute the Khalsa in 1699 — relative to Mughal persecution, the execution of Guru Tegh Bahadur, and the rise of the Sikh political identity?

📰 Read Full Article →

QUESTION 7 OF 14

The Monetary Policy Committee (MPC), which held the repo rate at 5.25% on April 8, 2026, was constituted by amendment to the Reserve Bank of India Act, 1934. The legislative foundation and composition of the MPC is governed by:

A Section 45ZB of the RBI Act — MPC has 6 members: 3 from RBI (including Governor) + 3 external experts appointed by Centre

B Section 7 of the RBI Act — MPC has 9 members chaired by the Governor, with majority from RBI

C The Banking Regulation Act, 1949 — MPC has 5 members appointed by the Centre on Governor's recommendation

D Executive notification — MPC composition is determined by the RBI Governor after consultation with the Centre

---

FACT: The MPC was constituted by the Finance Act 2016 which inserted Sections 45ZA-45ZN into the RBI Act 1934. Under Section 45ZB, the MPC has 6 members: the RBI Governor (ex-officio Chairperson), the RBI Deputy Governor in charge of monetary policy, and one RBI official nominated by the Board; plus 3 external members appointed by the Central Government.
Decisions require majority; Governor has casting vote in case of tie. ANALYSIS: This structure was designed to move monetary policy from a unilateral RBI decision to a rule-based, committee-based framework — a key reform aligned with global inflation-targeting central bank practice.

📝 CONCEPT NOTE

The MPC was part of India's transition to formal inflation targeting (Urjit Patel Committee 2014 recommended this framework). The current inflation target is 4% with a band of ±2% (2-6%), reviewed every 5 years under Section 45ZA of the RBI Act.
Meetings occur at least 4 times a year (typically 6); minutes are published 14 days after each meeting; each member must give a statement on their vote. The April 2026 MPC meeting held repo at 5.25% (unchanged from previous meeting), with SDF at 5.00% and MSF/Bank Rate at 5.50%.
The stance was neutral. Governor Sanjay Malhotra (appointed December 2024, replacing

Shaktikanta Das) chaired.
Current external members (as of April 2026) are appointed for 4-year terms, non-renewable, by the Appointments Committee of the Cabinet. The MPC architecture has been broadly praised — RBI's inflation record post-2016 compares favourably with the pre-MPC era, though the 2026 West Asia crisis is testing the framework's durability.

▾ 🎯 **Concept Kit —** tap to expand

🔗 CROSS-PAPER LINKS	**GS3 — Economy (monetary policy); GS2 — regulatory institutions.**
✍️ MAINS KEYWORDS	**MPC, Section 45ZB, RBI Act 1934, inflation targeting, repo rate, Urjit Patel Committee.**
⚠️ COMMON MISTAKE	**Assuming MPC has 7 or 9 members or is chaired by Finance Minister. Correct: 6 members, 3+3 (RBI + external), Governor chairs.**
📌 EXAM TIP	**The 6-member structure and 3+3 split is a standard Prelims question. Memorise: Finance Act 2016 → Sections 45ZA-45ZN of RBI Act 1934 → MPC with 4%±2% inflation target.**
🎤 INTERVIEW	** Should the MPC have a dual mandate (inflation + growth), like the US Federal Reserve, rather than its current primary focus on inflation?

📰 Read Full Article →

QUESTION 8 OF 14

The Supreme Court in *Association for Democratic Reforms v. Union of India* (February 2024) struck down the Electoral Bonds Scheme. The primary constitutional ground on which the scheme was invalidated was violation of:

A Article 14 — arbitrary classification between anonymous and disclosed political donors

B Article 19(1)(a) — the voter's implied right to know the sources of political party funding

C Article 324 — the Election Commission of India's exclusive jurisdiction over electoral processes

D Article 326 — the universal adult suffrage principle as it affects the integrity of elections

FACT: The 5-judge Constitution Bench held that Article 19(1)(a) — the freedom of speech and expression — includes an implied "right to know" about political party funding sources. Voters cannot make informed choices without this information.
The scheme's anonymity provisions were therefore unconstitutional. ANALYSIS: This judgment extends earlier Article 19(1)(a) jurisprudence (PUCL v. UoI 2003 — candidate asset disclosure) to the collective right of the electorate to know party funding — a significant expansion of the "right to know" doctrine in Indian constitutional law.

CONCEPT NOTE

The Electoral Bonds Scheme (2018) allowed anonymous bearer bonds to be purchased from SBI in denominations of ₹1,000 to ₹1 crore, redeemable only by registered political parties within 15 days. It was bundled with amendments to the Companies Act (removed cap on corporate donations + disclosure requirement), Income Tax Act (donor exemption from disclosure), FCRA (allowed foreign company donations), and Representation of the People Act (removed disclosure requirement).
The 5-judge bench (CJI DY Chandrachud, J.B. Pardiwala, B.R. Gavai, J.B. Pardiwala, Sanjiv Khanna, Manoj Misra) struck down all these amendments as a package. Importantly, SBI was ordered to disclose all bond purchases and redemptions — which revealed a pattern where corporations facing ED/IT investigations disproportionately purchased bonds for certain parties, and where many donor companies received government contracts shortly after.
The judgment did not ban political donations — it required transparent mechanisms. This is now considered a landmark ruling on the "right to know" dimension of electoral democracy, alongside PUCL v. UoI (2003, candidate affidavit disclosure) and Lily Thomas v. UoI (2013, immediate disqualification of convicted MPs).

▾ 🎯 **Concept Kit —** tap to expand

CROSS-PAPER LINKS **GS2 — Polity (fundamental rights, electoral democracy); GS2 — Governance (political finance reform).**

✍️ MAINS KEYWORDS	**Electoral Bonds, ADR v. UoI 2024, Article 19(1)(a), right to know, PUCL v. UoI, Chandrachud bench.**
⚠️ COMMON MISTAKE	**Assuming the scheme was struck down on Article 14 (equality) or Article 324 (ECI powers) — the primary ground was Article 19(1)(a). Article 14 was a secondary ground (re corporate donation cap removal).**
📌 EXAM TIP	**PUCL v. UoI (2003) + ADR v. UoI (2024) = the two pillars of electoral "right to know" jurisprudence. Lily Thomas (2013) is the pillar for candidate disqualification.**
🎤 INTERVIEW	** The judgment requires transparency but does not cap corporate donations — is this enough, or should India move to a state-funded elections model to remove corporate influence altogether?

📰 Read Full Article →

QUESTION 9 OF 14

India's Strategic Petroleum Reserve (SPR), critical during the 2026 West Asia crude crisis, is managed by Indian Strategic Petroleum Reserves Limited (ISPRL). The current Phase 1 SPR capacity and its equivalent in days of India's net crude imports is approximately:

A 5.33 MMT (~39 million barrels) equivalent to ~10 days of net imports

B 11.5 MMT (~85 million barrels) equivalent to ~20 days of net imports

C 20 MMT (~150 million barrels) equivalent to ~30 days of net imports

D 45 MMT (~330 million barrels) equivalent to the IEA-standard 90 days of net imports

FACT: Phase 1 SPR totals 5.33 MMT (~39 million barrels) across three sites — Visakhapatnam (1.33 MMT), Mangalore (1.50 MMT), and Padur (2.50 MMT) — equivalent to about 10 days of India's net crude imports. This is far below the IEA-standard 90-day equivalent that OECD members maintain.
ANALYSIS: Phase 2 (under construction) will add ~6.5 MMT at Chandikhol and Padur-II, pushing the total to ~22 days-equivalent — still well below international standards and inadequate for a country with ~90% crude import dependence.

📝 CONCEPT NOTE

ISPRL was established in 2004 as a subsidiary of the Oil Industry Development Board (OIDB). Phase 1 facilities became operational between 2015 and 2018.
In international comparison: USA maintains ~90 days equivalent (400+ million barrels); Japan ~200+ days (public + private combined); South Korea ~100 days; China estimated ~90+ days. The IEA requires member countries to maintain 90 days equivalent; India is an Associate member (not full member) and maintains bilateral strategic petroleum cooperation with the USA. Phase 2 SPR (~6.5 MMT across 4 sites) was approved 2018-2021 and remains under construction as of 2026.
Phase 3 is under discussion and would aim for 30-45 days. The 2020 COVID price crash prompted India to exploit the opportunity by filling Phase 1 reserves at historically low prices — a rare instance of contra-cyclical buying.
The 2026 West Asia crisis exposes the inadequacy of the current buffer: at 10 days of imports, SPR cannot absorb even a short-term disruption of the Strait of Hormuz. Crude source diversification (Russia's share now ~33%) has reduced acute vulnerability somewhat but does not substitute for inadequate strategic reserves.

▾ 🎯 **Concept Kit —** tap to expand

🔗 CROSS-PAPER LINKS	**GS2 — IR (energy diplomacy, IEA); GS3 — Economy (oil imports, CAD); GS3 — Security (strategic autonomy).**
✍️ MAINS KEYWORDS	**ISPRL, SPR, Strategic Petroleum Reserve, Visakhapatnam, Mangalore, Padur, IEA, 90-day rule.**
⚠️ COMMON MISTAKE	**Overestimating India's SPR capacity — the media often cites the Phase 1 + Phase 2 (combined) figure without noting Phase 2 is still under construction. Current operational: 5.33 MMT ≈ 10 days only.**
📌 EXAM TIP	**Phase 1 = 5.33 MMT (3 sites); Phase 2 approved = 6.5 MMT (4 new sites, under construction); IEA standard = 90 days; India**

	operational = ~10 days.
🎤 INTERVIEW	** Given India's 90% crude import dependence, should strategic reserve expansion (Phase 3) be prioritised over further supplier diversification, and what would the fiscal cost of a 90-day equivalent be?

Read Full Article →

QUESTION 10 OF 14

The Bruhat Bengaluru Mahanagara Palike (BBMP) mandated rainwater harvesting (RWH) for buildings above a specified plot size under 2009 bye-laws. Independent audits suggest actual compliance is low. In Indian urban water policy, this pattern — strong mandate, weak compliance — most closely illustrates:

A The "race to the bottom" in competitive federalism, where states weaken environmental rules to attract investment

B The "implementation deficit" — where well-drafted rules fail due to inadequate monitoring, enforcement capacity, or political will

C The "regulatory capture" phenomenon, where the regulator is influenced by the industry it is meant to regulate

D The "tragedy of the commons" — where common-pool resources are overused due to individual rationality

FACT: The "implementation deficit" — where regulatory rules are on the books but enforcement machinery is inadequate — is a widely-recognised feature of Indian governance. BBMP's RWH mandate covers 60,000+ buildings; independent estimates put real compliance at ~20%, primarily because monitoring is manual, rare, and consequence-free for non-compliant property owners.
ANALYSIS: This pattern is not unique to water — similar implementation deficits occur in building bye-laws, environmental clearance conditions, labour laws, and food safety

regulation. The pattern suggests that adding new regulations, without investing in compliance infrastructure, produces purely symbolic law.

CONCEPT NOTE

The term "implementation deficit" is associated with work by political scientists including Lant Pritchett (Harvard) and scholars at the Centre for Policy Research. Indian governance is often described as showing "isomorphic mimicry" — adopting the forms of advanced-country regulation without the compliance substance.

Specific drivers in the BBMP RWH case: (1) compliance verification requires physical inspection, and BBMP has very few inspectors per ward; (2) penalty structures are weak — fines are low and rarely levied; (3) new building approvals can proceed with RWH as a paper formality (structure built and then disconnected); (4) maintenance failures go unaddressed because no follow-up inspection is triggered. The 80/20 solution is routinely identified in urban water literature: dashboard-based real-time compliance tracking (linking building permits to RWH monitoring); heavy penalties for non-compliance; positive incentives (water tariff rebates for verified RWH).

International comparisons: Chennai has had slightly better RWH compliance (~35-40%) due to stronger enforcement under Tamil Nadu's rainwater harvesting mandate (2003); Singapore's Active, Beautiful, Clean Waters (ABC) programme integrates urban hydrology into every building approval. The BBMP RWH case is a classic example of the gap between Indian regulatory ambition and regulatory enforcement.

Concept Kit — tap to expand

CROSS-PAPER LINKS	**GS2 — Governance (regulatory architecture, public administration); GS3 — Environment (urban water); GS4 — Ethics (compliance, public trust).**
MAINS KEYWORDS	**Implementation deficit, isomorphic mimicry, rainwater harvesting, BBMP, regulatory capture, tragedy of commons.**
COMMON MISTAKE	**Confusing "implementation deficit" (weak enforcement) with "regulatory capture" (co-optation of regulator) or "tragedy of commons" (overuse of common resources). They are distinct governance failures.**
EXAM TIP	**Implementation deficit is a recurring GS2 theme — applies to pollution control boards (SPCBs), building bye-laws, PCPNDT Act, and many others. The pattern: well-drafted law + weak enforcement = symbolic regulation.**

🎤 INTERVIEW

** How can India's regulatory system move beyond implementation deficits without adding more laws — what is the infrastructure of compliance that actually works?

📰 Read Full Article →

QUESTION 11 OF 14

India's Second Generation (2G) ethanol production — promoted under the PM JI-VAN Yojana (2019) — differs fundamentally from First Generation (1G) ethanol in that it:

A Produces ethanol with a higher blending percentage (up to E100) compared to 1G ethanol's E20 ceiling

B Uses lignocellulosic feedstocks (crop residue, bagasse, forestry waste) instead of starch or sugar from food crops

C Is produced through chemical synthesis rather than biological fermentation

D Requires vehicles equipped with Flex-Fuel (FFV) engines, unlike 1G ethanol compatible with all BS6 vehicles

FACT: 2G (second-generation) ethanol uses lignocellulosic feedstocks — rice straw, wheat straw, bagasse, corn stover, forestry waste — instead of starch/sugar from sugarcane juice or food grains (which are 1G feedstocks). This eliminates the food-vs-fuel tension and directly addresses stubble burning in Punjab-Haryana.
ANALYSIS: The production process is technically more complex (requires cellulase enzymes for breakdown), making 2G plants ~3x more capital-intensive than 1G. PM JI-VAN Yojana (2019) provides capital subsidy to bridge this cost gap.

📝 CONCEPT NOTE

Generation classification of biofuels: 1G — uses food crops (sugarcane, maize, rice, wheat, soybean, palm). 2G — uses non-food biomass (crop residue, forestry waste, dedicated non-

food grasses). 3G — uses algae. 4G — uses synthetic biology (theoretical). India's ethanol mix (2024-25): ~60% sugarcane molasses/juice (1G), ~30% damaged food grain (1G), ~5% 2G, ~5% other.

The 2G commercial plants as of 2026: Panipat (IOCL, 2022 commissioning), Bathinda (HPCL), Numaligarh (NRL), Bargarh (BPCL), Gorakhpur (IOCL). Technology challenges: cellulase enzymes (licensed from Novozymes, DuPont) cost ~30% of production.

Feedstock aggregation from thousands of small farmers. PM JI-VAN Yojana (Pradhan Mantri JI-VAN: Jaivik Indhan - Vatavaran Anukool Fasal Awashesh Nivaran) provides capital subsidy up to 40% of project cost.

The policy rationale: 2G addresses three problems simultaneously — air pollution (stubble burning elimination), food security (no diversion of food crops), and climate change (lifecycle CO2 reduction 60-80% vs 30-40% for 1G). The India Brazil model combines sugarcane 1G with bagasse 2G in integrated plants — an approach India is adopting.

The target: 2G share rising from current ~5% to 30%+ by 2030.

▾ 🎯 **Concept Kit —** tap to expand

🔗 CROSS-PAPER LINKS	**GS3 — Environment (biofuels, stubble burning); GS3 — Energy; GS3 — Agriculture (crop residue utilisation).**
✍️ MAINS KEYWORDS	**2G ethanol, PM JI-VAN Yojana, lignocellulosic, cellulase enzymes, bagasse, stubble burning, E20, food-vs-fuel.**
⚠️ COMMON MISTAKE	**Confusing 1G and 2G — both produce ethanol, both can be blended with petrol, both are compatible with current vehicles. The difference is feedstock (food vs non-food).**
📌 EXAM TIP	**Generation classification: 1G food crops, 2G agri residue, 3G algae, 4G synthetic biology. PM JI-VAN (2019) specifically targets 2G.**
🎤 INTERVIEW	** If 2G addresses food-vs-fuel and stubble burning simultaneously, why has scale-up been so slow — and what policy intervention would close the gap with Brazil's integrated sugarcane-bagasse model?

📰 Read Full Article →

QUESTION 12 OF 14

The Witness Protection Scheme 2018 — approved by the Supreme Court in *Mahender Chawla v. Union of India* (2018) — requires courts to provide physical separation between witnesses and accused parties. Surveys indicate ~60% of Indian trial courts lack such facilities. This compliance failure is most directly rooted in:

A Inadequate judicial manpower, with judge vacancy rates at 23-25% in subordinate courts

B Limitations in procedural codes (CrPC/BNSS) that do not mandate separate entries or waiting areas

C The design of colonial-era court buildings, which prioritised imperial authority over litigant-centric layouts

D State governments' low priority for women's witness protection in budgetary allocation

---

FACT: The physical infrastructure of Indian courts — including most district and High Court complexes — dates to British colonial design (1872-1976, Bombay HC 1878; Madras HC 1892; Delhi HC 1976). The design prioritised ceremonial authority over citizen access, with vast halls, elevated benches, and single-entry architecture.
Retrofitting separate entries, witness waiting areas, and victim-accused separation is physically constrained. ANALYSIS: This is a case where substantive law reform (Witness Protection Scheme 2018) cannot be effectively implemented because the physical infrastructure was not designed to support it.

CONCEPT NOTE

The Witness Protection Scheme 2018 was drafted by the Ministry of Home Affairs after the Supreme Court's direction in Mahender Chawla v. UoI (2018) — which itself came from the sustained problem of witness hostility and retraction in Indian trials. The Scheme classifies witnesses into three threat categories (A, B, C) and provides for: (1) physical protection (security detail), (2) identity protection (name change, relocation), (3) in-court protection (in-camera proceedings, video testimony, separate entry/waiting).
The last category — in-court protection — requires physical court infrastructure redesign. The 60% non-compliance figure is from bar association surveys and HC-level audits.
Similar gaps exist for POCSO Act 2012 (child witness protection requires child-friendly rooms

— only a handful of courts have them) and Sexual Harassment of Women at Workplace Act 2013 (specific witness rooms). Delhi HC's 2020 modernisation study documented acoustic, accessibility, and witness-separation defects.
The Colombian court architecture reform (post-2000) and Dutch Paleis van Justitie redesign provide international models; India lacks equivalent standards. The April 14 Indian Express editorial on colonial architecture specifically highlighted this issue — court design shapes institutional capacity in ways often not noticed until they fail to deliver.

▾ 🎯 **Concept Kit —** tap to expand

🔗 CROSS-PAPER LINKS	**GS2 — Polity (access to justice, witness protection); GS2 — Governance (infrastructure, RPWD Act 2016 compliance); GS2 — Social Justice (women's access to justice).**
✍️ MAINS KEYWORDS	**Witness Protection Scheme 2018, Mahender Chawla v. UoI, colonial court architecture, RPWD Act, POCSO, Delhi HC 2020 study.**
⚠️ COMMON MISTAKE	**Attributing WPS 2018 compliance failures to law enforcement or judge vacancies alone — the physical court design is a structural barrier that no staffing or procedural reform can bypass without building redesign.**
📌 EXAM TIP	**Witness Protection Scheme 2018 → Mahender Chawla v. UoI (2018); POCSO 2012 → child-friendly courts; Sexual Harassment Act 2013 → workplace and court-side witness protection.**
🎤 INTERVIEW	** Is judicial infrastructure — the physical design of courts — an under-examined bottleneck in India's access-to-justice equation, or does it receive appropriate priority given other pressing reforms?

📰 Read Full Article →

QUESTION 13 OF 14

The BBNJ Treaty (2023) — Biodiversity Beyond National Jurisdiction — adopted at the UN, addresses a governance gap that had been left open by the 1982 UN Convention

on the Law of the Sea (UNCLOS). The gap that BBNJ specifically fills is:

A Establishing rules for sovereign EEZ (Exclusive Economic Zone) resources within 200 nautical miles

B Regulating deep-sea mining in the international seabed (Area) beyond national jurisdiction

C Providing a framework for biodiversity conservation and marine genetic resource sharing on the high seas (beyond EEZs)

D Mandating flag-state responsibility for fishing vessels operating outside their home waters

---

FACT: BBNJ (Biodiversity Beyond National Jurisdiction) — also called the "High Seas Treaty" — addresses marine biodiversity and genetic resource sharing in the high seas (waters beyond 200 nautical miles from any coast, covering ~64% of the ocean). It establishes rules for marine protected areas on the high seas, benefit-sharing from marine genetic resources, environmental impact assessments, and capacity-building for developing states.
ANALYSIS: Deep-sea mining in the Area is regulated by the International Seabed Authority (ISA) under UNCLOS; EEZ resources are within national jurisdiction; flag-state responsibility is covered elsewhere — BBNJ's unique contribution is high-seas biodiversity, previously an ungoverned common.

CONCEPT NOTE

UNCLOS (1982) established three jurisdictional zones: territorial waters (12 nm), EEZ (200 nm — sovereign resource rights), and the Area (international seabed beyond EEZs, managed by ISA). The gap: while UNCLOS covered seabed minerals beyond EEZs and fisheries in broad terms, it left marine biodiversity in the high seas water column relatively unregulated.
The BBNJ negotiations began formally in 2006, culminating in the June 2023 treaty adoption at the UN. Ratification threshold: 60 states; as of 2026, ~70 states have signed, ~20 have ratified. India signed the BBNJ Treaty in September 2024.
Key BBNJ provisions: (1) marine protected areas in the high seas (ABMTs — Area-Based Management Tools); (2) benefit-sharing for marine genetic resources including pharmaceuticals developed from high-seas organisms; (3) environmental impact assessments for activities; (4) capacity-building for developing states. BBNJ is distinct from but complementary to UNCLOS

— it fills the biodiversity gap without replacing UNCLOS's jurisdictional framework.
Related bodies: International Maritime Organization (IMO) for shipping; International Seabed Authority (ISA) for seabed minerals; Regional Fisheries Management Organisations for specific stocks. The BBNJ is directly relevant to India's Deep Ocean Mission and broader blue economy strategy — for instance, any bioprospecting of deep-sea organisms by Samudrayaan will be subject to BBNJ's genetic-resource benefit-sharing rules.

▾ 🎯 **Concept Kit —** tap to expand

🔗 CROSS-PAPER LINKS	**GS2 — IR (multilateral treaties, UN law); GS3 — Environment (ocean biodiversity); GS3 — Economy (marine genetic resources, bioprospecting).**
✍️ MAINS KEYWORDS	**BBNJ Treaty 2023, UNCLOS, ISA, Area-Based Management Tools, marine genetic resources, Deep Ocean Mission, Samudrayaan.**
⚠️ COMMON MISTAKE	**Confusing BBNJ with UNCLOS (BBNJ is an implementing agreement under UNCLOS, focused on biodiversity); or with ISA (ISA regulates seabed minerals, BBNJ regulates biodiversity).**
📌 EXAM TIP	**UNCLOS 1982 = framework; BBNJ 2023 = biodiversity gap-filler; ISA = seabed minerals; IMO = shipping; RFMOs = fisheries. Memorise the division of labour.**
🎤 INTERVIEW	** Should India, as a major Indian Ocean maritime power, push for an Indian-Ocean-specific BBNJ implementation body, similar to RFMOs, to address the region's specific biodiversity concerns?

📰 Read Full Article →

QUESTION 14 OF 14

The Kali Tiger Reserve in Karnataka is among India's 58 tiger reserves. India's tiger-conservation framework is anchored in the National Tiger Conservation Authority (NTCA). The NTCA was established as a statutory body by:

A Executive notification under Project Tiger in 1973

B The Wildlife (Protection) Act, 1972 (original 1972 Act)

C The 2006 amendment to the Wildlife (Protection) Act, 1972

D The Biological Diversity Act, 2002, as part of the National Biodiversity Authority framework

---

FACT: NTCA was established by the 2006 amendment to the Wildlife (Protection) Act, 1972. Project Tiger had existed since 1973 as a centrally-sponsored scheme, but the 2005 Tiger Task Force (chaired by Sunita Narain) found that Project Tiger lacked statutory teeth and recommended creating a statutory authority.
The 2006 amendment created NTCA with powers to approve tiger conservation plans, regulate tourism, and oversee tiger reserve designation and management. ANALYSIS: This is an example of converting a scheme into a statutory institution when enforcement gaps become evident — Project Tiger's transformation parallels the FRA 2006's creation of statutory rights over forest-dwelling community access.

CONCEPT NOTE

Tiger conservation timeline: Project Tiger launched April 1, 1973 with 9 tiger reserves (Jim Corbett, Ranthambore, Kanha, etc.). By 1984, it had 15 reserves.
By 2006, the Tiger Task Force Report (Sunita Narain) found that the Project had lost direction — tiger populations had declined in several reserves (Sariska in Rajasthan had lost all its tigers by 2005). The 2006 WPA amendment created NTCA and the Wildlife Crime Control Bureau.
NTCA's key functions: (1) approval of Tiger Conservation Plans for each reserve, (2) regulation of tourism and hotel construction in reserves, (3) oversight of habitat corridors, (4) coordination with state forest departments. The tiger reserve count has grown to 58 as of 2026 (last notified: Veerangana Durgavati Tiger Reserve, MP, 2023; Madhav Tiger Reserve, MP, 2024; Ratapani, MP and Guru Ghasidas-Tamor Pingla, Chhattisgarh, both 2024-25).
Tiger population as per All-India Tiger Estimation 2022: ~3,682 (up from 1,411 in 2006, a low point). India's share of global tiger population: ~75%.
Tiger species: Bengal tiger (Panthera tigris tigris) in Indian subcontinent. IUCN Red List: Endangered.

CITES: Appendix I. WPA Schedule I. Kali Tiger Reserve (Karnataka) — notified 2007 (Anshi + Dandeli merger); area ~1,300 sq km; ~5-10 resident tigers estimated.

▾ 🎯 **Concept Kit —** tap to expand

🔗 CROSS-PAPER LINKS	**GS3 — Environment (wildlife conservation, tiger reserves); GS2 — Governance (statutory bodies vs schemes).**
✍️ MAINS KEYWORDS	**NTCA, Project Tiger, 2006 WPA Amendment, Tiger Task Force, Kali Tiger Reserve, IUCN Endangered.**
⚠️ COMMON MISTAKE	**Dating NTCA to 1973 (Project Tiger launch) or 1972 (original WPA). Correct: NTCA = 2006 amendment. Project Tiger was a scheme before NTCA was a statutory body.**
📌 EXAM TIP	**Distinguish: Project Tiger (1973, scheme) → NTCA (2006 amendment, statutory body). Biological Diversity Act 2002 → NBA (National Biodiversity Authority). CAMPA Act 2016 → Compensatory Afforestation Fund.**
🎤 INTERVIEW	** Should India expand NTCA's model (scheme-to-statutory-body conversion with teeth) to other conservation areas — elephant reserves, coastal/marine ecosystems, wetlands — each of which currently lacks comparable statutory authority?

📰 Read Full Article →

—
/ 14

PERFORMANCE

✓ Correct 0

QUESTION-WISE RESULT

✗ Incorrect	0
% Accuracy	0%
⏱ Time Taken	–

CURATED & WRITTEN BY

Bharat Choudhary

UPSC Educator & Content Creator

linkedin.com/in/epicbharat

📖 Read Full Article on Ujiyari →

https://ujiyari.com/daily/2026/04/14/quiz/