

UPSC & STATE PCS CURRENT AFFAIRS · [UJIYARI.COM](https://ujiyari.com)**DAILY QUIZ — SOLVED**

Daily Quiz, August 12, 2026

12 August 2026



CURATED & WRITTEN BY

Bharat Choudhary

UPSC Educator & Content Creator

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, August 12, 2026

12 August 2026 · 8 Questions · Answers & Explanations Included

Question 1

of 8

[Source →](#)

N. Chandrasekaran's resignation as Tata Sons Chairman revived scrutiny of the governance structure atop the Tata Group. The controlling shareholder, Tata Trusts, is bound by which body of law, distinct from the company-law fiduciary duties owed by directors of an operating company?

- ☐ A Securities law under SEBI
- ☐ B Competition law under the Competition Commission of India
- ☐ C Banking regulation under the RBI's upper-layer NBFC framework
- ☒ D Trust law, governing the charitable trusts that hold the controlling stake ✓

ANSWER & ANALYSIS

✓ EXPLANATION

FACT: Tata Trusts, which holds roughly 66% of Tata Sons, is a set of charitable trusts governed by trust law, under which trustees owe a primarily philanthropic duty, distinct from the fiduciary duty company directors owe to shareholders under the Companies Act, 2013. **ANALYSIS:** This structural mismatch, trust-law control atop a company-law operating group, was also the fault line in the 2016-2022 Tata-Mistry dispute, and resurfaced when Tata Trusts blocked Chandrasekaran's reappointment in February 2026, prompting his August 2026 resignation ahead of the AGM vote.

📖 CONCEPT NOTE

India's largest conglomerates are often structured with an unlisted apex holding company controlled by a family trust, sitting above a network of listed operating companies. Tata Sons remains unlisted despite RBI's upper-layer NBFC framework periodically raising the question of whether systemically important entities of its scale should face listed-company disclosure norms.

Tata Trusts (approximately 66% shareholding, chaired by Noel Tata) exercises this control under trust law, which is oriented toward the trusts' charitable objects rather than shareholder-value fiduciary duties. This mismatch produced the prolonged Tata-Mistry litigation (2016-2022) after Cyrus Mistry's removal as chairman, and resurfaced in 2026 when Tata Trusts blocked Chandrasekaran's reappointment, leading to his resignation on August 12, 2026, ahead of the August 18 AGM, with his term otherwise running until February 20, 2027.

Q1
 **CONCEPT KIT**

CROSS-PAPER

GS3 (corporate governance, Companies Act 2013, SEBI LODR).


MAINS KEYWORDS

trust-controlled conglomerate, unlisted holding company, fiduciary duty, upper-layer NBFC.


COMMON MISTAKE

assuming Tata Sons faces the same disclosure obligations as its listed operating companies like TCS or Tata Motors; the holding company itself remains unlisted.


EXAM TIP

anchor the parallel between the 2016-2022 Mistry dispute and the 2026 Chandrasekaran exit as two instances of the same trust-versus-company-law tension.


INTERVIEW

should India's corporate law require listed-company-style governance for unlisted holding companies of systemic economic importance?


[Read Full Article →](#)

Question 2

of 8

[Source →](#)

Tamil Nadu's August 2026 resolution to permanently freeze Lok Sabha strength at 543 seats seeks to extend a freeze that has been in place, through successive constitutional amendments, since which census year?

- ☐ A 1991 Census
- ☐ B 1981 Census
- ☒ C 1971 Census ✓
- ☐ D 2001 Census

ANSWER & ANALYSIS
✓ EXPLANATION

FACT: The 42nd Constitutional Amendment (1976) froze Lok Sabha seat allocation at 1971 Census levels; the 84th Amendment (2001) extended this freeze until the first census after 2026, while the 87th Amendment (2003) separately allowed constituency boundaries to be redrawn using 2001 Census data without changing each state's total seat count. **ANALYSIS:** Tamil Nadu's resolution seeks to make the 1971-Census-based freeze permanent rather than letting it lapse, since the failed Constitution (131st Amendment) Bill, 2026, which proposed 850 seats, would have reopened population-based seat reallocation.

📌 CONCEPT NOTE

The Lok Sabha seat-freeze framework layers three amendments: the 42nd Amendment (1976) fixed the freeze at 1971 Census levels, originally to avoid penalising states that had controlled population growth; the 84th Amendment (2001) extended this freeze until the first census conducted after 2026; and the 87th Amendment (2003) permitted redrawing constituency boundaries using 2001 Census figures, but explicitly without altering the number of seats allotted to each state. The Constitution (131st Amendment) Bill, 2026, introduced April 16, 2026, proposed expanding the House to 850 seats but failed to secure the two-thirds majority required under Article 368, leading the government to withdraw it along with companion Delimitation and UT Laws Amendment Bills.

Tamil Nadu's resolution, passed August 12, 2026, asks that the freeze be made permanent at 543 seats rather than resuming population-based reallocation.

Q2

 CONCEPT KIT

CROSS-PAPER

GS2 (Constitution, Article 81, federalism).


MAINS KEYWORDS

42nd Amendment, 84th Amendment, 87th Amendment, delimitation freeze.


COMMON MISTAKE

confusing the 84th Amendment (extends the seat-count freeze) with the 87th Amendment (redraws boundaries using newer census data without changing seat counts); they address different aspects of delimitation.


EXAM TIP

anchor "1971 Census equals the frozen base year" as a fixed Prelims fact, distinct from whichever census year is used for redrawing boundaries.


INTERVIEW

does a permanent freeze protect federal balance, or does it permanently disadvantage states with faster population growth regardless of the reasons for that growth?


[Read Full Article →](#)

Question 3

of 8

[Source](#)

Kerala's induction of tribal representatives onto its State Board for Wildlife activates a requirement that has existed since the Wildlife (Protection) Act, 1972 was enacted. Under which section, and what is the minimum mandated Scheduled Tribe representation among nominated members?

A Section 6; at least two of ten nominated members ✓

B Section 18; at least one of five nominated members

C Section 33; no fixed minimum, left to state discretion

D Section 12; at least four of twelve nominated members

ANSWER & ANALYSIS
EXPLANATION

FACT: Section 6 of the Wildlife (Protection) Act, 1972 constitutes the State Board for Wildlife, chaired by the Chief Minister, and requires that at least two of its ten nominated members be representatives of Scheduled Tribes.

ANALYSIS: Kerala's August 2026 induction of Raman Raja Mannan and Vinod is therefore the first actual exercise of a nearly five-decade-old statutory entitlement, not the creation of a new representational category, a distinction that changes how the development should be framed in a Mains answer.

CONCEPT NOTE

The Wildlife (Protection) Act, 1972's Section 6 constitutes State Boards for Wildlife with the Chief Minister as chairperson (or the Administrator in a Union Territory) and mandates that at least two of ten nominated members represent Scheduled Tribes, alongside eminent conservationists, ecologists and environmentalists. The Board's function is advisory: it guides state wildlife-conservation policy, reviews protected-area management, and advises on species-protection measures. Kerala's August 2026 induction of Raman Raja Mannan (Mannan community) and Vinod (Cholanaikkan community, Nilambur) at the Forest Department's "Oorunaru" programme, Periyar Tiger Reserve, marks the state's first actual use of this provision, alongside a Rs 50-crore Periyar ecotourism package including a Rs 20-crore tiger museum. This sits alongside the Scheduled Tribes and Other Traditional Forest Dwellers (Recognition of Forest Rights) Act, 2006, which recognises community forest resource rights based on traditional practices.

Q3
 **CONCEPT KIT**
 CROSS-PAPER

GS3 (Wildlife Protection Act 1972, statutory conservation bodies); GS1 (tribal communities, traditional ecological knowledge).

 MAINS KEYWORDS

Section 6 WPA 1972, State Board for Wildlife, Forest Rights Act 2006, participatory conservation.

 COMMON MISTAKE

assuming Kerala's move created a new legal category of tribal representation; the requirement already existed in the 1972 Act and had simply gone unexercised.

 EXAM TIP

memorise "Section 6, ten nominated members, at least two Scheduled Tribe representatives" as a fixed WPA 1972 fact.

 INTERVIEW

why might a statutory representation requirement go unexercised for decades, and what does that reveal about the gap between law on paper and law in practice?

 [Read Full Article →](#)

Question 4

of 8

[Source →](#)

The SMILE-Beggary sub-scheme's shift from criminalising begging toward rights-based rehabilitation is most directly anchored in which pair of constitutional provisions?

- A** Article 19 (freedom of speech) and Article 32 (right to constitutional remedies)
- B** Article 46 (DPSP, promotion of SC/ST educational and economic interests) alone
- C** Article 15 (prohibition of discrimination) alone
- D** Article 21 (right to life and dignity) and Article 41 (DPSP, right to public assistance) ✓

ANSWER & ANALYSIS
✓ EXPLANATION

FACT: Courts have increasingly held that criminalising begging, historically done under state laws modelled on the Bombay Prevention of Begging Act, 1959, violates the dignity protected under Article 21, while Article 41's Directive Principle obliges the state to provide public assistance in cases of undeserved want, within its economic capacity.

ANALYSIS: SMILE-Beggary's shelter, skilling and family-reunification model operationalises this shift from a criminal-justice framing to a welfare framing, distinct from Article 46 (which targets SC/ST-specific promotion) or Article 15 (a general non-discrimination guarantee) alone.

📌 CONCEPT NOTE

For decades, Indian states criminalised begging under laws modelled on the Bombay Prevention of Begging Act, 1959, empowering police to detain and institutionalise persons found begging. Multiple High Courts have since struck down or read down such provisions, holding that begging is frequently a consequence of poverty, destitution or disability rather than a voluntary offence, and that criminalising it violates the dignity guaranteed under Article 21.

The Union government's SMILE (Support for Marginalised Individuals for Livelihood and Enterprise) scheme's Beggary sub-component, launched in October 2023 under the Ministry of Social Justice and Empowerment, operationalises the alternative welfare approach through shelter-based rehabilitation centres offering healthcare, skill training, employment linkage and family reunification, anchored in Article 41's directive that the state make effective provision for public assistance. Over 31,000 persons have been identified and nearly 10,000 rehabilitated so far.

The scheme targets rehabilitating 35,000 persons and expanding from 216 to 295 cities by FY 2030-31, aligning with SDG 1 (No Poverty). Note: the Garima Greh shelter-home network (21 operational across 17 states) is a distinct SMILE sub-component for transgender persons, not the beggary sub-scheme.

Q4
 **CONCEPT KIT**

CROSS-PAPER

GS2 (welfare schemes, DPSPs, fundamental rights); GS1 (poverty and social exclusion).


MAINS KEYWORDS

Article 21 dignity, Article 41 DPSP, decriminalisation of begging, Garima Greh.


COMMON MISTAKE

citing Article 46, which specifically targets SC/ST educational and economic promotion, as the anchor for general anti-poverty welfare; Article 41 is the correct general DPSP for public assistance.


EXAM TIP

pair "decriminalisation of begging equals Article 21 dignity plus Article 41 public assistance" as a fixed constitutional-linkage fact.


INTERVIEW

does welfare-based rehabilitation risk under-resourcing enforcement against organised begging rackets that exploit vulnerable people, and how should policy distinguish the two?


[Read Full Article →](#)

Question 5

of 8

[Source](#)

The Indian Navy's 11-ship Next Generation Offshore Patrol Vessel programme, under which GRSE launched Shruti on August 11, 2026, splits construction between GRSE and which other shipyard?

A Mazagon Dock Shipbuilders Limited

B Goa Shipyard Limited ✓

C Cochin Shipyard Limited

D Hindustan Shipyard Limited

ANSWER & ANALYSIS
✓ EXPLANATION

FACT: The Rs 9,781-crore, 11-vessel NGOPV programme, contracted March 30, 2023, splits construction between Goa Shipyard Limited (7 vessels) and GRSE (4 vessels), with GRSE launching its first vessel, Sanghmitra, on May 20, 2026, and its second, Shruti, on August 11, 2026. **ANALYSIS:** Distributing production across two Defence Public Sector Undertakings, rather than concentrating the full order at one yard, builds parallel shipbuilding capacity and reduces single-yard schedule risk, a deliberate industrial-policy choice within India's Atmanirbhar Bharat defence-manufacturing push.

📌 CONCEPT NOTE

GRSE (Garden Reach Shipbuilders and Engineers), a Navratna Defence Public Sector Undertaking under the Ministry of Defence, launched Shruti (Yard 3037) on August 11, 2026, its second Next Generation Offshore Patrol Vessel after Sanghmitra (May 20, 2026). The NGOPV design specifications are 113 metres length, 14.6 metres beam, approximately 3,000-tonne displacement, 23-knot top speed, and 8,500 nautical mile endurance at 14 knots, intended for maritime surveillance, coastal security, anti-piracy operations and Sea Lines of Communication protection.

The full 11-vessel programme, worth Rs 9,781 crore and contracted March 30, 2023, splits construction between Goa Shipyard Limited (7 vessels) and GRSE (4 vessels), a capacity-distribution model that sustains indigenous shipbuilding employment across more than one industrial cluster while supporting Atmanirbhar Bharat in defence manufacturing.

Q5
 **CONCEPT KIT**

CROSS-PAPER

GS3 (defence indigenisation, Atmanirbhar Bharat, DPSU capacity).


MAINS KEYWORDS

NGOPV, GRSE, Goa Shipyard, Sea Lines of Communication.


COMMON MISTAKE

assuming all offshore patrol vessels under one Navy programme are built at a single yard; the NGOPV order is deliberately split between two DPSUs.


EXAM TIP

anchor "GRSE builds 4, Goa Shipyard builds 7, total 11, Rs 9,781 crore" as a fixed NGOPV fact cluster.


INTERVIEW

does splitting a single warship class across two yards improve resilience, or does it risk inconsistent build quality and schedule coordination problems?

 [Read Full Article →](#)

Question 6

of 8

[Source →](#)

RITES Limited, which brokered the LHB coach export deal between RCF Kapurthala and Bangladesh Railway, holds which public-sector enterprise classification, under which ministry?

- ☐ A Miniratna, under the Ministry of Railways
- ☒ B Navratna, under the Ministry of Railways ✓
- ☐ C Maharatna, under the Ministry of Commerce and Industry
- ☐ D Miniratna, under the Ministry of External Affairs

ANSWER & ANALYSIS
✓ EXPLANATION

FACT: RITES Limited is a Navratna Central Public Sector Enterprise under the Ministry of Railways, upgraded from Miniratna to Navratna status in October 2023 (India's 16th Navratna CPSE), and functions as India's principal transport-engineering consultancy and export-facilitation arm. **ANALYSIS:** RITES brokered the current 200-coach, European Investment Bank-financed order for Bangladesh Railway, whose first 19-coach rake, built to EN 15227 crashworthy standard for Bangladesh's 415V system, rolled out from RCF Kapurthala on August 12, 2026, extending a relationship that also included 120 LHB coaches supplied in 2015-16.

📌 CONCEPT NOTE

RITES Limited (Navratna, Ministry of Railways) structures India's rail-engineering and rolling-stock export deals, pairing domestic manufacturing capacity, in this case Rail Coach Factory (RCF) Kapurthala's LHB (Linke Hofmann Busch) coach-building expertise, with external financing such as the European Investment Bank funding the current 200-coach, seven-variant order for Bangladesh Railway (deliveries June 2026 to December 2027). RITES held Miniratna status from 2002 until October 2023, when it was elevated to Navratna alongside IRCON. The first 19-coach rake (3 AC Sleeper, 3 AC Chair Car, 11 Non-AC Chair Car, 2 Power Cars) rolled out August 12, 2026, built to European Standard EN 15227 crashworthy design and configured for Bangladesh Railway's 415V electrical system, distinct from Indian Railways' own 750V standard. This builds on an earlier 120-coach supply in 2015-16 and sits within India's "Neighbourhood First" policy, alongside connectivity projects like the Agartala-Akhaura rail link and the Maitri Setu framework.

Q6
 **CONCEPT KIT**
 CROSS-PAPER

GS2 (Neighbourhood First policy, India-Bangladesh relations); GS3 (Make in India, manufacturing exports).

 MAINS KEYWORDS

RITES Limited, Navratna, rail connectivity diplomacy, Neighbourhood First.

 COMMON MISTAKE

assuming RITES still holds its earlier Miniratna status; RITES was upgraded to Navratna in October 2023, alongside IRCON, making it India's 16th Navratna CPSE.

 EXAM TIP

anchor "RITES equals Navratna since October 2023, Ministry of Railways, export/consultancy arm" as a fixed institutional fact.

 INTERVIEW

how effective is rolling-stock export as a tool of regional soft power compared with high-visibility summit-level connectivity announcements?

 [Read Full Article →](#)

Question 7

of 8

[Source →](#)

The bee species *Colletes bhutanicus*, recorded in India for the first time in Arunachal Pradesh's Tawang district, belongs to which broader ecological category, distinguishing it from social honeybees?

- ☐ A A eusocial bee with a queen-worker hierarchy
- ☒ B A solitary, non-colonial pollinator ✓
- ☐ C A parasitic brood-cuckoo bee
- ☐ D A stingless bee farmed for honey production

ANSWER & ANALYSIS
✓ EXPLANATION

FACT: *Colletes bhutanicus*, family Colletidae, is a solitary "plasterer" bee, meaning individual females construct and provision their own nests rather than living in a colony with a queen-worker hierarchy as social honeybees (*Apis* species) do. **ANALYSIS:** Its first India record, by the Zoological Survey of India in Tawang district (1,500-3,800 m elevation), extends a range previously known only from Bhutan (first described 2003) and China's Xizang region, and the species was documented visiting roughly two dozen flowering plant species including mustard, buckwheat and coriander, giving it direct agricultural-pollination relevance.

📌 CONCEPT NOTE

Bee ecology divides broadly into eusocial species (like *Apis* honeybees, with queen-worker colony structures) and solitary species, where individual females independently build and provision nests without a shared colony. *Colletes bhutanicus* (family Colletidae, the "plasterer" bees, named for their habit of lining nest cells with a cellophane-like secretion) is solitary. First described from Bhutan in 2003 and previously known only from Bhutan and China's Xizang (Tibet) region, its confirmed record in Tawang district, Arunachal Pradesh, by Zoological Survey of India researchers extends its known range into India's Eastern Himalaya for the first time. The record carries direct agricultural relevance, since the species was observed visiting flowering species across ten plant families, including mustard, buckwheat and coriander, positioning it as a regionally significant, climate-resilient pollinator.

Q7
 **CONCEPT KIT**

CROSS-PAPER

GS3 (biodiversity documentation, pollinator ecology); GS1 (Eastern Himalaya biogeography).


MAINS KEYWORDS

solitary bee, Colletidae, range extension, pollinator conservation.


COMMON MISTAKE

assuming all bees are eusocial like honeybees; many bee families, including Colletidae, are solitary.


EXAM TIP

anchor "Colletidae equals plasterer bees, solitary, first described Bhutan 2003" as a fixed species fact cluster.


INTERVIEW

does documenting range extensions of solitary pollinators in under-surveyed Himalayan districts argue for expanding biodiversity-monitoring infrastructure beyond flagship-species programmes?


[Read Full Article →](#)

Question 8

of 8

[Source →](#)

Nuclear engineer M.P. Parameswaran left BARC in 1975 to join a Kerala-based organisation credited with pioneering India's grassroots "People's Science Movement." Which organisation was this?

- ☐ A Bharat Gyan Vigyan Samiti
- ☐ B Vigyan Prasar
- ☒ C Kerala Sasthra Sahithya Parishad (KSSP) ✓
- ☐ D Kerala State Council for Science, Technology and Environment (KSCSTE)

ANSWER & ANALYSIS
✓ EXPLANATION

FACT: M.P. Parameswaran, who died on August 11, 2026 at age 91, left the Bhabha Atomic Research Centre in 1975 to join the Kerala Sasthra Sahithya Parishad (KSSP), a grassroots science-popularisation organisation he helped build into a founding pillar of India's People's Science Movement, and later helped found the All India People's Science Network. **ANALYSIS:** Bharat Gyan Vigyan Samiti is a related but organisationally distinct national literacy and science-popularisation body founded later; Vigyan Prasar and KSCSTE are government-institutional science-communication bodies, not the grassroots movement Parameswaran is credited with pioneering.

📌 CONCEPT NOTE

India's "People's Science Movement" refers to a network of grassroots organisations that popularise scientific literacy, promote rational and evidence-based public discourse, and campaign on science-linked development issues, distinct from government science-communication bodies like Vigyan Prasar (under the Department of Science and Technology) or state-level institutional bodies like the Kerala State Council for Science, Technology and Environment (KSCSTE). The Kerala Sasthra Sahithya Parishad (KSSP), which M.P. Parameswaran joined in 1975 after leaving BARC (where he held a nuclear-engineering PhD from the Moscow Power Engineering Institute), is widely credited as a founding and model organisation for this movement, later informing the formation of the All India People's Science Network and influencing the separately established Bharat Gyan Vigyan Samiti.

Parameswaran is also credited with developing the "Fourth World Theory" of alternative development and designing a Malayalam typewriter keyboard layout, and received the Kerala Sree Award in 2022.

Q8
 **CONCEPT KIT**
 CROSS-PAPER

GS1 (history of science movements in India); GS4 (scientific temper, ethics of public engagement).

 MAINS KEYWORDS

People's Science Movement, KSSP, scientific temper, grassroots science communication.

 COMMON MISTAKE

conflating KSSP (the grassroots movement pioneer) with Vigyan Prasar or KSCSTE, which are government science-communication institutions rather than grassroots movements.

 EXAM TIP

anchor "KSSP equals Kerala, 1975 onward, People's Science Movement pioneer" as a fixed organisational fact.

 INTERVIEW

what obligations, if any, do publicly trained scientists have to redirect their expertise toward public science communication rather than institutional research alone?

 [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)

“An investment in knowledge pays the best interest.”

— Benjamin Franklin

Free UPSC & State PCS Current Affairs · ujiyari.com · bharatnotes.com