

CUET PG 2026 LLM Question Paper with Solutions

Time Allowed :1 Hour 30 Minutes	Maximum Marks :300	Total Questions :75
---------------------------------	--------------------	---------------------

General Instructions

Read the following instructions very carefully and strictly follow them:

- The Question Paper consists of 75 Multiple Choice Questions (MCQs).
- Total marks for the exam is 300.
- The total duration is 90 minutes; a timer on the screen will display the remaining time, and the exam will automatically submit when the time reaches zero.
- For every correct answer, 4 marks (+4) will be awarded to the candidate, and a 1 mark (-1) will be deducted for every incorrect answer.
- Question papers are available in both English and Hindi.

1. The "Doctrine of Confirmation by Subsequent Events" is found under which section of the Bharatiya Sakshya Adhiniyam (BSA)?

- (A) Section 23
- (B) Section 25
- (C) Section 27
- (D) Section 32

Correct Answer: (A) Section 23

Solution:

Step 1: Understanding the Question:

The question asks to identify the section in the Bharatiya Sakshya Adhiniyam (BSA), 2023, that contains the "Doctrine of Confirmation by Subsequent Events". This doctrine is also known as the principle of discovery statements.

Step 2: Detailed Explanation:

The "Doctrine of Confirmation by Subsequent Events" refers to the principle where a part of a confession made to a police officer, which is otherwise inadmissible, becomes admissible if it leads to the discovery of a new fact.

In the old Indian Evidence Act, 1872, this principle was enshrined in Section 27.

The Bharatiya Sakshya Adhiniyam, 2023, has renumbered many sections. The provision corresponding to Section 27 of the Indian Evidence Act is now Section 23 of the BSA.

Section 23 of the BSA is titled "How much of information received from accused may be proved" and it lays down the conditions under which a statement leading to the discovery of a fact is admissible.

Therefore, the doctrine is found in Section 23 of the BSA.

Step 3: Final Answer:

The correct section in the BSA corresponding to the "Doctrine of Confirmation by Subsequent Events" is Section 23. Thus, option (A) is the correct answer.

💡 Quick Tip

It is crucial to create a comparative table of sections between the old criminal laws (IPC, CrPC, IEA) and the new ones (BNS, BNSS, BSA) for quick revision. Questions directly testing the new section numbers are very common in exams.

2. Which case established the "Principle of Post-Decisional Hearing"?

- (A) Maneka Gandhi v. Union of India
- (B) Kesavananda Bharati
- (C) A.K. Kraipak
- (D) State of West Bengal v. Anwar Ali Sarkar

Correct Answer: (A) Maneka Gandhi v. Union of India

Solution:

Step 1: Understanding the Question:

The question asks to identify the landmark Supreme Court case that established the "Principle of Post-Decisional Hearing". This principle is an aspect of the rules of natural justice, specifically **Audi Alteram Partem** (hear the other side).

Step 2: Detailed Explanation:

The rules of natural justice generally require a hearing to be given **before** a decision is made (pre-decisional hearing). However, in exceptional circumstances, such as emergencies or situations where giving a prior hearing would defeat the purpose of the action, a hearing may be provided **after** the decision has been taken. This is known as a post-decisional hearing.

This principle was authoritatively laid down by the Supreme Court in the case of **Maneka Gandhi v. Union of India (1978)**. In this case, the petitioner's passport was impounded without giving her a prior opportunity to be heard. The Court held that while a pre-decisional hearing is the norm, in certain situations where urgent action is required, a post-decisional hearing could satisfy the requirements of natural justice, provided it is fair and adequate.

Other options:

- **Kesavananda Bharati (1973):** Famous for the "basic structure doctrine" of the Constitution.
- **A.K. Kraipak (1969):** Landmark case on the rule against bias, blurring the lines between quasi-judicial and administrative functions.
- **State of West Bengal v. Anwar Ali Sarkar (1952):** A key case on Article 14 (Right to

Equality) and reasonable classification.

Step 3: Final Answer:

The case that established the principle of post-decisional hearing is *Maneka Gandhi v. Union of India*. Therefore, option (A) is correct.

💡 Quick Tip

For Administrative Law, create a list of landmark cases and the key legal principles they established. For example: *Maneka Gandhi* - Post-decisional hearing, Right to travel; *A.K. Kraipak* - Rule against bias; *Kesavananda Bharati* - Basic Structure Doctrine. This helps in quick recall during exams.

3. Statement I: Under BNSS, a police officer can use audio-video electronic means while conducting a search.

Statement II: The BNSS mandates that the victim's statement in rape cases be recorded by a female judicial magistrate as far as possible.

- (A) Both statements are correct.
- (B) Both are incorrect.
- (C) Only I is correct.
- (D) Only II is correct.

Correct Answer: (C) Only I is correct.

Solution:

Step 1: Understanding the Question:

The question asks to evaluate the correctness of two statements related to the provisions of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita (BNSS), 2023. The first statement is about the use of electronic means during a search, and the second is about the recording of a rape victim's statement.

Step 2: Detailed Explanation:

Analyzing Statement I:

Section 105(1) of the BNSS, 2023, which corresponds to Section 103 of the CrPC, 1973, explicitly provides for the use of technology during searches. It mandates that the search and seizure process shall be conducted in the presence of two or more independent and respectable inhabitants of the locality and the proceedings shall be video-graphed, and a copy of the recording shall be provided to the person whose premises is searched. This confirms that a police officer can and must use audio-video electronic means.

Therefore, Statement I is correct.

Analyzing Statement II:

Section 183(1) of the BNSS, 2023, deals with the recording of confessions and statements. The proviso to this section states that the statement of a victim of offences like rape "...shall be recorded by a Judicial Magistrate...". It does not specify that the magistrate must be female. While it is a desirable administrative practice to have a female magistrate record such statements, the BNSS does not create a legal mandate for it. The phrase "as far as possible" is not present in the statute in this context.

Therefore, Statement II is incorrect.

Step 3: Final Answer:

Since Statement I is correct and Statement II is incorrect, the correct option is (C).

Quick Tip

When dealing with questions on new laws like BNSS, BSA, and BNS, pay close attention to the exact wording. The changes from the old laws (CrPC, IEA, IPC) are often subtle but crucial. For example, the mandating of videography in searches is a significant new addition in the BNSS.

4. Statement I: The Attorney General of India has the right to speak in both Houses of Parliament.

Statement II: He has the right to vote in the proceedings of Parliament.

- (A) Both are correct.
- (B) Only I is correct.
- (C) Only II is correct.
- (D) Both are incorrect.

Correct Answer: (B) Only I is correct.

Solution:

Step 1: Understanding the Question:

The question presents two statements about the rights of the Attorney General of India in the Parliament and asks to determine their correctness.

Step 2: Detailed Explanation:

The rights of the Attorney General with respect to the Houses of Parliament are specified in **Article 88 of the Indian Constitution**.

Analyzing Statement I:

Article 88 states: "Every Minister and the Attorney-General for India shall have the right to speak in, and otherwise to take part in the proceedings of, either House, any joint sitting of the Houses, and any committee of Parliament of which he may be named a member...".

This clearly grants the Attorney General the right to speak and participate in the proceedings of both the Lok Sabha and the Rajya Sabha.
Therefore, Statement I is correct.

Analyzing Statement II:

The same Article 88 concludes with the clause: "...but shall not by virtue of this article be entitled to vote."

This explicitly denies the Attorney General the right to vote in the proceedings of Parliament. The right to vote is reserved for the elected or nominated members of the House.
Therefore, Statement II is incorrect.

Step 3: Final Answer:

As Statement I is correct and Statement II is incorrect, the correct option is (B).

 Quick Tip

Remember the key constitutional articles related to important functionaries. For the Attorney General, Article 76 (Appointment) and Article 88 (Rights in Parliament) are crucial. The unique position of the AG is that they can participate in parliamentary proceedings without being a member, but this participation does not extend to voting.

5. A person who is not a partner but by his words or conduct leads others to believe he is a partner is called:

- (A) Sleeping Partner
- (B) Nominal Partner
- (C) Partner by Estoppel
- (D) Sub-partner

Correct Answer: (C) Partner by Estoppel

Solution:

Step 1: Understanding the Question:

The question asks for the legal term for a person who, despite not being an actual partner, is held liable as one because their actions or words led a third party to believe they were a partner and act on that belief.

Step 2: Detailed Explanation:

This concept is governed by the principle of 'holding out' or 'estoppel', as defined in **Section 28 of the Indian Partnership Act, 1932**.

- **(A) Sleeping Partner:** Also known as a dormant partner, is a real partner who contributes capital but does not take an active part in the management of the firm's business.
- **(B) Nominal Partner:** A person who lends their name to the firm but has no real interest

or share in the profits. They are liable to third parties for the debts of the firm. This is very similar to a partner by estoppel, but estoppel is the specific legal doctrine that enforces this liability based on representation.

- **(C) Partner by Estoppel:** This is the precise legal term described in the question. The doctrine of estoppel prevents a person from denying the truth of a statement they made, which another person has relied upon to their detriment. If someone represents themselves as a partner (by words or conduct) and a third party gives credit to the firm based on this representation, the person making the representation is liable as if they were a partner.

- **(D) Sub-partner:** A sub-partner is a person who has an agreement with one of the partners of the firm to share that partner's profits. A sub-partner is not a partner in the main firm and has no rights against the firm.

Step 3: Final Answer:

The description perfectly matches the definition of a "Partner by Estoppel". Therefore, option (C) is the correct answer.

💡 Quick Tip

In Partnership Law, clearly distinguish between the different types of partners. The key difference for "Partner by Estoppel" is the element of representation and the reliance by a third party. This is a common topic for direct definition-based questions.

6. "The Province of Jurisprudence Determined" was written by:

- (A) John Austin
- (B) Jeremy Bentham
- (C) H.L.A. Hart
- (D) Ronald Dworkin

Correct Answer: (A) John Austin

Solution:

Step 1: Understanding the Question:

The question asks to identify the author of the influential legal philosophical work titled "The Province of Jurisprudence Determined".

Step 2: Detailed Explanation:

This is a question of legal theory and the history of jurisprudence.

- **(A) John Austin (1790-1859):** He was an English legal theorist and a key proponent of legal positivism. His most famous work is "**The Province of Jurisprudence Determined**" (published in 1832). In this work, he outlined his command theory of law, defining law as the command of a sovereign backed by the threat of a sanction.

- **(B) Jeremy Bentham (1748-1832):** The founder of modern utilitarianism and a mentor

to John Austin. While he wrote extensively on law and jurisprudence, his major works include "An Introduction to the Principles of Morals and Legislation".

- (C) **H.L.A. Hart (1907-1992)**: A 20th-century legal philosopher, also a legal positivist, who famously critiqued Austin's theory. His seminal work is "The Concept of Law" (1961).

- (D) **Ronald Dworkin (1931-2013)**: An American legal philosopher and a prominent critic of legal positivism, particularly Hart's theory. His major works include "Taking Rights Seriously" and "Law's Empire".

Step 3: Final Answer:

The book "The Province of Jurisprudence Determined" was written by John Austin. Therefore, option (A) is correct.

Quick Tip

For Jurisprudence, create a mind map or a table connecting major theorists with their schools of thought (e.g., Positivism, Natural Law, Sociological) and their most famous books/theories (e.g., Austin -> Command Theory -> "The Province of Jurisprudence Determined"; Hart -> Primary & Secondary Rules -> "The Concept of Law"). This is essential for matching-the-pair and direct author-based questions.

7. "Legal person" includes:

- (A) An idol installed in a temple
- (B) A deceased person
- (C) An unborn child (for certain specific purposes)
- (D) Both A and C

Correct Answer: (D) Both A and C

Solution:

Step 1: Understanding the Question:

The question asks which of the given options are considered a "legal person" or "juristic person" under the law. A legal person is any entity that the law recognizes as having legal rights and duties, such as the ability to sue and be sued, own property, and enter into contracts.

Step 2: Detailed Explanation:

Analyzing Option (A):

In Indian law, a Hindu idol or deity is recognized as a juristic person. Landmark cases like *Pramatha Nath Mullick v. Pradyumna Kumar Mullick* have established that a deity can own property and can sue and be sued, acting through its designated manager or shebait. Thus, an idol installed in a temple is a legal person.

Analyzing Option (B):

A deceased person is not a legal person. Legal personality ceases upon death. While their estate can be part of legal proceedings, it is represented by an executor or legal representative, not the deceased person themselves.

Analyzing Option (C):

An unborn child (*nasciturus pro iam nato habetur*) is granted legal personality for certain specific purposes. For instance, an unborn child can inherit property, provided it is born alive. It can also be a beneficiary under a trust. This legal fiction treats the child in the womb as already born for the purpose of conferring these benefits.

Step 3: Final Answer:

Since both an idol (A) and an unborn child for specific purposes (C) are recognized as legal persons, the most appropriate answer is (D) Both A and C.

💡 Quick Tip

In Jurisprudence, remember the distinction between natural persons (human beings) and legal/juristic persons (entities like corporations, idols, the State). Questions often test the legal status of entities at the margin, such as idols, unborn children, and animals.

8. Roscoe Pound categorized interests into:

- (A) Private, Public, and Social
- (B) Individual, State, and Global
- (C) Legal and Equitable
- (D) Primary and Secondary

Correct Answer: (A) Private, Public, and Social

Solution:**Step 1: Understanding the Question:**

The question asks about the classification of interests proposed by Roscoe Pound, a prominent jurist from the Sociological School of Jurisprudence.

Step 2: Detailed Explanation:

Roscoe Pound's theory of "social engineering" involves balancing conflicting interests in society. To facilitate this, he classified interests into three main categories:

1. **Individual Interests (or Private Interests):** These are claims or demands or desires involved in and looked at from the standpoint of the individual life. This includes interests of personality (physical integrity, reputation), domestic relations, and substance (property, freedom of contract).

2. **Public Interests:** These are claims or demands or desires asserted by individuals from the standpoint of political life. They are interests of the state as a juristic person, such as the interest in the preservation of the state.
3. **Social Interests:** These are claims or demands or desires thought of in terms of social life and generalized as claims of the social group. This includes interests in general security, security of social institutions, general morals, conservation of social resources, etc.

The options provided use "Private" instead of "Individual," which is a common alternative term for the same concept in this context. Therefore, "Private, Public, and Social" accurately reflects Pound's classification.

Step 3: Final Answer:

Based on Roscoe Pound's theory, the correct categorization of interests is Private (Individual), Public, and Social. Thus, option (A) is correct.

 Quick Tip

Remember Roscoe Pound is associated with "Social Engineering" and the balancing of "Interests". His three-fold classification (Individual/Private, Public, Social) is a fundamental concept in the Sociological School of Jurisprudence and is frequently tested.

9. A "Decree" under CPC includes:

- (A) Rejection of a plaint
- (B) Any adjudication from which an appeal lies as an appeal from an order
- (C) Any order of dismissal for default
- (D) All of the above

Correct Answer: (A) Rejection of a plaint

Solution:

Step 1: Understanding the Question:

The question asks to identify what is included in the definition of a "Decree" as per the Code of Civil Procedure, 1908 (CPC).

Step 2: Detailed Explanation:

The definition of "Decree" is provided in **Section 2(2) of the CPC**. A decree is the formal expression of an adjudication which, so far as regards the Court expressing it, conclusively determines the rights of the parties with regard to all or any of the matters in controversy in the suit.

The definition in Section 2(2) has two parts: what it *includes* (deemed decrees) and what it *excludes*.

Inclusions:

- Section 2(2) states that a decree "shall be deemed to **include the rejection of a plaint** and the determination of any question within section 144...". Therefore, option (A) is correct.

Exclusions:

- The definition explicitly states that a decree "shall not include— (a) **any adjudication from which an appeal lies as an appeal from an order**; or (b) **any order of dismissal for default**."
- This means option (B) is explicitly excluded from the definition of a decree.
- This also means option (C) is explicitly excluded from the definition of a decree.

Step 3: Final Answer:

Based on the clear definition in Section 2(2) of the CPC, only the rejection of a plaint is included in the definition of a decree among the given options. Therefore, option (A) is the correct answer.

💡 Quick Tip

The definition of 'Decree' in Section 2(2) of the CPC is extremely important. Memorize both the inclusions (rejection of plaint, determination under S.144) and the exclusions (appealable orders, dismissal for default). Questions often test these specific points.

10. Under the Limitation Act, the period of limitation for a "Money Suit" is:

- (A) 3 years
- (B) 1 year
- (C) 12 years
- (D) 30 years

Correct Answer: (A) 3 years

Solution:**Step 1: Understanding the Question:**

The question asks for the general period of limitation for filing a "Money Suit" under the Limitation Act, 1963.

Step 2: Detailed Explanation:

The Limitation Act, 1963, in its Schedule, prescribes different limitation periods for different kinds of suits.

- A "Money Suit" is a broad category for suits filed for the recovery of money.
- The Schedule to the Act, under Part II (Suits relating to contracts), lists various types of

money suits. For example:

- Suit for the price of goods sold and delivered (Art. 14): 3 years.
- Suit for money payable for money lent (Art. 19): 3 years.
- Suit on a bill of exchange or promissory note (Arts. 28-34): 3 years.
- Even the residuary article, Article 113, which applies to any suit for which no period of limitation is provided elsewhere in the Schedule, prescribes a period of **3 years** from the time when the right to sue accrues.
- Periods like 12 years and 30 years are generally associated with suits relating to immovable property (e.g., for possession, mortgage redemption). A 1-year period is typically for suits related to torts like defamation.

Step 3: Final Answer:

The standard and most common period of limitation for a money suit under the Limitation Act is 3 years. Therefore, option (A) is correct.

Quick Tip

For the Limitation Act, focus on the most common time periods. Remember: 3 years for most contracts, money suits, and torts (with some exceptions at 1 year); 12 years for possession of immovable property; and 30 years for mortgage redemption.

11. Under BNS, "Organized Crime" (Section 111) includes:

- (A) Kidnapping for ransom
- (B) Contract killing
- (C) Cyber-crimes having severe consequences
- (D) All of the above

Correct Answer: (D) All of the above

Solution:

Step 1: Understanding the Question:

The question asks which of the listed offences are included within the definition of "Organized Crime" under Section 111 of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita (BNS), 2023.

Step 2: Detailed Explanation:

Section 111(1) of the BNS defines "organized crime" as any continuing unlawful activity by a member of an organised crime syndicate, using violence or other unlawful means for material benefit. The section provides a non-exhaustive, illustrative list of such unlawful activities. The definition explicitly states: "...continuing unlawful activity including, but not limited to, **kidnapping for ransom, contract killing, economic offence, cyber-crimes having severe consequences, trafficking in person, drugs, illicit goods or services and weapons...**".

- Option (A) "Kidnapping for ransom" is explicitly mentioned.
- Option (B) "Contract killing" is explicitly mentioned.
- Option (C) "Cyber-crimes having severe consequences" is explicitly mentioned.

Since all three options are included in the statutory definition of organized crime under the BNS, the correct choice is (D).

Step 3: Final Answer:

All the given options (A, B, and C) fall under the definition of "Organized Crime" in Section 111 of the BNS. Therefore, the correct answer is (D) All of the above.

💡 Quick Tip

The BNS has introduced new offences like "Organized Crime" (S.111) and "Terrorist Act" (S.113). Pay close attention to the definitions and illustrations provided in these new sections, as they are prime areas for exam questions.

12. Match List I (Subject) with List II (BNS Section)

List I (Subject)	List II (BNS Section)
a) Abetment	i) Section 143
b) Unlawful Assembly	ii) Section 45
c) Theft	iii) Section 187
d) Disobedience to order of public servant	iv) Section 303

- (A) a-ii, b-i, c-iv, d-iii
 (B) a-i, b-ii, c-iii, d-iv
 (C) a-iii, b-iv, c-ii, d-i
 (D) a-iv, b-iii, c-ii, d-i

Correct Answer: (A) a-ii, b-i, c-iv, d-iii

Solution:

Step 1: Understanding the Question:

The question requires matching the offences listed in List I with their corresponding section numbers in the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita (BNS), 2023, from List II.

Step 2: Detailed Explanation:

Let's map the old IPC sections to the new BNS sections for the given offences to find the correct pairings.

- **a) Abetment:** The provisions for abetment, which started from Section 107 of the IPC, are now in Chapter IV of the BNS, starting from **Section 45**. So, **a matches with ii**.
- **b) Unlawful Assembly:** The definition of unlawful assembly, which was in Section 141 of the IPC, is now in **Section 187** of the BNS. So, **b matches with iii**.

- **c) Theft:** The definition of theft, which was in Section 378 of the IPC, is now in **Section 303** of the BNS. So, **c matches with iv.**
- **d) Disobedience to order of public servant:** This offence, covered under Section 188 of the IPC, is now under Section 221 of the BNS. This section is not present in List II.

Let's analyze the given options based on our correct mappings (a-ii, b-iii, c-iv):

- The question as presented contains significant errors, as the correct combination (a-ii, b-iii, c-iv) does not appear fully in any option, and the pairing for item 'd' is not factually correct in any option.
- However, in an exam setting, one must choose the best possible option. Let's evaluate Option (A).
- **Option (A) is a-ii, b-i, c-iv, d-iii.**
- 'a-ii' (Abetment - Sec 45) is **Correct**.
- 'b-i' (Unlawful Assembly - Sec 143) is **Incorrect**. (Sec 187 is Unlawful Assembly; Sec 143 BNS is for Promoting Enmity).
- 'c-iv' (Theft - Sec 303) is **Correct**.
- 'd-iii' (Disobedience... - Sec 187) is **Incorrect**. (Sec 187 is Unlawful Assembly).

This option contains two correct matches, which is more than any other option. It is highly likely that this is the intended answer despite the errors in the question's construction.

Step 3: Final Answer:

Given the options, Option (A) is the most plausible answer as it contains the highest number of correct pairings (two). The question itself is flawed.

💡 Quick Tip

When facing a 'matching' question about the new criminal laws, it's vital to have a comparison table of old IPC/CrPC/IEA sections versus the new BNS/BNSS/BSA sections. If you encounter a flawed question like this one, identify the correct pairs you are sure about and select the option that contains the most of them.

13. The "Doctrine of Pith and Substance" is used to determine:

- (A) Violation of Fundamental Rights
- (B) Legislative competence under Article 246
- (C) The validity of a Constitutional Amendment
- (D) The powers of the President

Correct Answer: (B) Legislative competence under Article 246

Solution:

Step 1: Understanding the Question:

The question asks about the purpose of the "Doctrine of Pith and Substance" in Indian Constitutional Law.

Step 2: Detailed Explanation:

The Doctrine of Pith and Substance is a legal principle of interpretation used to resolve questions of legislative competence between the Centre and the States in a federal system.

- The Indian Constitution, under **Article 246** read with the **Seventh Schedule**, distributes law-making powers between the Parliament and State Legislatures into three lists: List I (Union List), List II (State List), and List III (Concurrent List).
- A conflict arises when a law passed by one legislature appears to encroach upon the subject matter assigned to another.
- To resolve this, the court applies the doctrine of pith and substance. It looks at the "true nature and character" or the "essence" (pith and substance) of the legislation.
- If the substance of the law falls within the powers of the legislature that enacted it, the law is held to be valid, even if it incidentally touches upon subjects in another list.
- Therefore, its primary function is to determine the **legislative competence** of Parliament or a State Legislature.

Step 3: Final Answer:

The doctrine is specifically used to ascertain whether a legislature has made a law within its constitutional power under Article 246. Thus, option (B) is the correct answer.

💡 Quick Tip

Associate key constitutional doctrines with their purposes. For instance: - **Pith and Substance:** Legislative competence (Centre-State). - **Colourable Legislation:** Disguised unconstitutional law. - **Severability:** Separating valid parts of a law from invalid ones. - **Eclipse:** A pre-constitutional law becoming dormant due to conflict with Fundamental Rights. - **Basic Structure:** Validity of Constitutional Amendments.

14. Which case established the "Principle of Post-Decisional Hearing"?

- (A) Maneka Gandhi v. Union of India
- (B) Kesavananda Bharati
- (C) A.K. Kraipak
- (D) State of West Bengal v. Anwar Ali Sarkar

Correct Answer: (A) Maneka Gandhi v. Union of India

Solution:

Step 1: Understanding the Question:

The question asks to identify the landmark Supreme Court case that established the "Principle

of Post-Decisional Hearing”. This principle is an aspect of the rules of natural justice, specifically **Audi Alteram Partem** (hear the other side).

Step 2: Detailed Explanation:

The rules of natural justice generally require a hearing to be given **before** a decision is made (pre-decisional hearing). However, in exceptional circumstances, such as emergencies or situations where giving a prior hearing would defeat the purpose of the action, a hearing may be provided **after** the decision has been taken. This is known as a post-decisional hearing.

This principle was authoritatively laid down by the Supreme Court in the case of **Maneka Gandhi v. Union of India (1978)**. In this case, the petitioner’s passport was impounded without giving her a prior opportunity to be heard. The Court held that while a pre-decisional hearing is the norm, in certain situations where urgent action is required, a post-decisional hearing could satisfy the requirements of natural justice, provided it is fair and adequate.

Other options:

- **Kesavananda Bharati (1973)**: Famous for the “basic structure doctrine” of the Constitution.
- **A.K. Kraipak (1969)**: Landmark case on the rule against bias, blurring the lines between quasi-judicial and administrative functions.
- **State of West Bengal v. Anwar Ali Sarkar (1952)**: A key case on Article 14 (Right to Equality) and reasonable classification.

Step 3: Final Answer:

The case that established the principle of post-decisional hearing is *Maneka Gandhi v. Union of India*. Therefore, option (A) is correct.

💡 Quick Tip

For Administrative Law, create a list of landmark cases and the key legal principles they established. For example: *Maneka Gandhi* - Post-decisional hearing, Right to travel; *A.K. Kraipak* - Rule against bias; *Kesavananda Bharati* - Basic Structure Doctrine. This helps in quick recall during exams.