

CLAT 2009 Analysis and Estimated Cut-offs

Section (Chronological Order)	Subject	No. of questions:	Difficulty Level (Scale of 5)	Average time taken	Comments
Section I	English	40	1	20	Based mainly on vocabulary; easy.
Section II	General Knowledge	50	3	25	Based mainly on current events (2007-08)
Section III	Mathematics	20	1	15	Based on simple arithmetic
Section IV	Legal Knowledge/GK	45	2	20	Based mainly on very common terms and concepts
Section V	Logical Reasoning	45	3.5	25	Emphasis on analytical reasoning, and a little difficult.
		Total No. of Questions	Overall difficulty		
		200	Easy to Moderate		

Section-Wise Analysis

Section I- English

Vocabulary and grammar ruled the roost, with 10 questions from each. The questions were based on antonyms and synonyms, and idioms.

Of course, legal terms in Latin were there, and were pretty easy. One look at the Legal Knowledge supplement we provided would have helped you breeze through these.

In grammar, sentence-completion, correction, rearrangement- were there.

Those on sentence-completion looked innocuous, but one needed a strong grip on prepositions and knowledge and application of verbs in order to score full marks there. The questions based on para-jumbles were not difficult at all. One should have easily scored at least 25 + in these questions.

Reading comprehension was based on a topic relevant to the present times- Biological degradation caused by nuclear wars.

Though the subject sounds a little technical, the language of the passage was quiet easy to understand and the length was also less than a page. In total there were 10 questions and all were more inference -based rather than usage based. One should score 10 out of 10 in this section.

Overall, an easy section, comprising mostly sitters and stuff you are already aware of and habituated to practising.

Section II- General Knowledge

There was a proliferation of questions based on Current affairs - although, many would dispute it by saying that events of 2006- 2007 cannot be called 'current'. However, the fact remains that we had always told you that 'current' DOES NOT mandate sticking to the year-gone by only. And our mock tests as well as class exercises had already prepared you well in advance- in fact, many questions came common.

Some questions in this context:

- Who got Outstanding Parliamentarian of the Year 2007 award?
- Which Indian State gave reservations to Muslims and Christians in 2007?
- Winner of the World Food Prize 2008? (There was a lot of confusion (and heartburn, too!) among students regarding this one- because not many are aware of the fact that there is nothing *specifically* known as The World Food Prize! Its more common name is the Norman Borlaugh Medallion.)

The questions on the different policies and schemes launched by the Government were also based on current-affairs –related topics. For example, the Kanya Vidya Dhan Scheme, the Arogya Shree Scheme- all based on the issue of empowerment of the girl-child, public health- which the Government is aggressively pursuing and promoting now.

Same goes for the one on World Tobacco Day- after all, we are aware of the painstaking efforts of Ramadoss & Co (and also the many fireworks, controversies, litigation it all spawned).

The one on the National Judicial Academy would also fall in this category, because judicial reforms are high on the Government's agenda.

It does not mean that there were no questions on very recent events at all- for example, the one on Vikram Pandit (the CEO of Citigroup) was based on a very recent event.

International affairs- the one topic most students ignore, and baulk at- also attracted the Examiners' attention. There were questions on laws governing the treatment of PoWs (The Geneva Conventions), the High Seas (dealt with by the UNCLOS- United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea), as well as the extent of the territorial waters of a country (again, governed by the UNCLOS).

LST students, much against their wishes, had been made to go through the entire corpus (almost) of such stuff- by way of classes and supplements- so there were no unpleasant surprises.

Terms and concepts related to economics- another area we have been constantly harping on, and giving in our mocks- enjoyed good Weightage- there were questions on the WPI (wholesale price index), gilt-edged securities, and capital markets.

The remaining questions can be clubbed under the 'miscellaneous' heading- and covered science, geography, awards, sports, movies (whew! Chak De India, Dadamoni...) and were mostly sitters.

The level of difficulty was moderate, and anyone following our 'prescriptions' should have easily scored more than 40, which is again the desired score in this section.

Section III- Mathematics

Easy- based on simple arithmetic. Comprising profit& loss, percentage (5-6 questions), ratio-proportion (2 questions), averages (4 questions), speed, time and distance (1 question). It came as a huge relief to most that there were none on probability and permutation and combination!

There was one question, probably Question No. 99 in which most candidates are saying there was some information missing, and hence, it was erroneous. We advise you all to wait till you get the last word on this from the authorities themselves (because many are overjoyed at the 'prospect' of being 'gifted' one mark!)

Any average student could have easily scored 15 and above in this section.

Section IV- Legal Knowledge

It was a huge, huge relief for students that this section was easy, because everyone was apprehensive about it, especially because the switch from legal reasoning to questions based on 'general knowledge related to law' came at the eleventh hour.

It was a mixed bag-

- Constitution and polity (Keshavananda Bharati case, Preamble, powers of the Attorney-General, protection against double jeopardy, the Chief Information Commissioner, bicameral legislature)
- Commissions and Committees- the Phukan Commission, the M.M. Punchhi Commission (which replaced the Sarkaria Commission)
- Concepts related to criminal law- accomplice, infanticide, burden of proof, perjury, abetment, sedition, testimony of child victims of sexual abuse through video-conferencing (the Praful B. Desai case), parole, and compoundable offences..
- Legal terms- caveat, intestate, parties to a suit, posthumous...

- Miscellaneous- oldest source of law (Manusmriti), *Waqf*, Restitution of Conjugal Rights, Negotiable Instruments Act,...
- Torts, contracts, etc- vicarious liability, fiduciary relationship, ...

Most of the above are from pretty common and well- known areas, though it can be said that there was a slight tilt towards Constitutional and Criminal law.

The questions were neither very ‘unique’ nor special, and therefore cannot be attributed to any particular source (books, websites, and the like).

Though we can sit back and smile with satisfaction, because almost everything had been covered either in our classroom lectures, or in the exercises and mock tests, along with the large number of online supplements which we had provided.

Moreover, our mock tests and materials had prepared students for ‘the worst’, and it was only natural that they came out with big smiles after attempting this section.

A score of 40+ was quite achievable, and we are sure that LSTians would do us proud.

Section V- Logical Reasoning

This year, the emphasis was on Analytical reasoning, and there were hardly any questions on Critical Reasoning.

The topics included Analogies, Strengthening and weakening arguments, Assertions and Reasons, Blood Relations and Statements & Conclusions. Some questions were ridiculously easy, especially the ones on analogies.

Without going too much into detail, it can be confidently said that anyone having good practice in the above areas, and who has gone through the LST mocks and exercises, as well as the past years’ papers of NALSAR (something we kept on screaming ad nauseam till the very end!) could have sailed through, and scored at least 35 in this section.

Overall, the paper was of a moderate level of difficulty (‘Easy’ would have been too presumptuous), and the cut-offs will therefore hit the northward trail. There would also be a very close fight-to-the-finish, since almost everyone has done really well.

Estimated Cut-offs for Different Law Schools

Now that you have a fair idea (and a good deal of confidence!) about how you would fare in the examination, let's look at the plausible targets- which law school you can expect to reach with your scores.

A word of caution here- these cut-offs are only LST's *estimates*, and subject to a minor variation of +/- 5 marks. Also, a lot will depend upon the preferences of law schools which you had mentioned in your CLAT 09 Application Form.

Another significant thing- this time we have decided not to give the cut-offs for individual law schools; instead, we are going by the 'hierarchy' of law schools. This is based on the no-nonsense, impartial manner in which we have ranked law schools all over India. (Visit www.lawentrance.com/rankings.htm for details)

<i>National Law School</i>	<i>Expected cut-off</i>
Tier I	150-165
Tier II	140-145
Tier III (which includes the new law schools in Patna, Kochi, Lucknow and Patiala)	125-130

This has been done because the easy standard of the paper would definitely result in a situation where there would be many (as many as 50/ 60) students ending up with the same score, and hence, it would be a very close contest.

In case of a clash in scores, the parameters and criteria adopted by the CLAT Committee shall be applicable. (As of now they have not come out with anything specific, so keep a close watch on www.clat.ac.in)

Now that the nail-biting anxiety is gone, just sit back and soak in the feeling of satisfaction. You have given your best, and in the circumstances, your faith will be vindicated, and your merit and hard work would surely propel you to the law school of your dreams.

All the very best for the results!

The LST Team