

Legal GK Facts Questions for CLAT & IBPS SO Law officer Exam.

Legal GK Facts Quiz 1

Direction: Study the following question carefully and choose the right answer.

1. In which of the following cases Section 66a of IT act was struck down

- A. Shreya singhal vs union of India B. Naz foundation vs NCT Delhi
- C. Sneha singhal vs union of India D. Lilavati vs State of Maharashtra

2. In which of the following cases Supreme court gave legal recognition to Third genders

- A. Yakub Abdul Razak Memon V State of Maharashtra
- B. Sushil Ansal vs State Thr CBI
- C. Novartis v Union of India & Others

D. National Legal Services Authority v Union of India

3. In which case the 42nd Amendment Act were declared as null and void by the Supreme Court?

keeda

- A. Minerva mills vs union of India B. M.c Mehta vs union of India
- C. Kasturi vs state of Rajasthan D. Keshavnanda bharati vs state of kerala

4. Which case laid down the Basic structure doctrine?

- A. Keshavnanada bharati vs state of kerala B. Adm Jabalpur vs union of India
- C. S.b subbarao vs state of tamil nadu D. Janaki das vs union of India

5. Which case laid the guidelines for sexual harassment at workplace?

A. Pooja vs state of M.P	B. Naz foundation vs state				
C. Vishakha vs state of rajasthan	D. Subramanium swamy vs Union Of India				

6. The court laid down basic guidelines for power of President's Rule in

A. S.R bommai vs union of India	B. Minerva mills vs union of India				
C. Sushil mittal vs union of India Pradesh	D. Vidya bharati vs state of Himachal				

7. The court held that Jat reservation is unconstitutional in

A. Ram Singh vs. Union of India	B. Shivam jaat vs State of Haryana			
C. Rajbala vs state of Rajasthan	D. Nishtha Kothari vs state of Goa			

8. In which case SC upheld constitutional validity of section 139AA of Income Tax Act which made mandatory linkage of IT returns with AADHAAR subject to the outcome of main case related to AADHAAR.

A. Subramanium swamy vs union of India	B. Biswam som vs Union of India
--	---------------------------------

C. Puttuswamy vs union of India D. Rajbala vs state of Haryana

9. In which case the Haryana Panchayati Raj (Amendment) Act, 2015 was challenged under Article 14 of the Constitution of India and the Supreme Court of India dismissed the challenge and upheld the constitutionality of the Act.

A. Rajbala vs state of Haryana B. Priyadarshini matoo vs State of U.P

C. Bhupinder singh hooda vs state of Haryana

D. Naamdhari sekhon vs State of Punjab

10. Which case led to the imposition of emergency and was a landmark case regarding election disputes, the primary issue was the validity of clause 4 of the 39th Amendment Act?

- A. MC Mehta v Union Of India
- B. Sunil narain vs Indira Gandhi

C. Raj narain vs Indira Gandhi

D. Sushil Gandhi vs Indira Gandhi

Join us on Telegram for more PDFs . Click here

Correct Answers:

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
А	D	А	А	С	А	А	В	А	С

Explanations:

1. Supreme Court in a landmark judgment struck down section 66A of the Information Technology Act, 2000 which provided provisions for the arrest of those who posted allegedly offensive content on the internet upholding freedom of expression. Section 66A defines the punishment for sending "offensive" messages through a computer or any other communication device like a mobile phone or tablet and a conviction of it can fetch a maximum three years of jail and a fine.

Hence, option A is correct.

2. The Supreme Court, in National Legal Service Authority v. Union of India ("NALSA"), has given legal recognition to the transgender community by mandating that they be treated as the third gender, thereby doing away with the binary understanding of gender.

The Question Bar

Hence, option D is correct.

3. The 42nd Amendment of the Constitution of India, officially known as The Constitution (Forty-second amendment) Act, 1976, was enacted during the Emergency (25 June 1975 – 21 March 1977) by the Indian National Congress government headed by Indira Gandhi. This amendment brought about the most widespread changes to the Constitution in its history, and is sometimes called a "mini-Constitution" or the Constitution of Indira. The radical changes brought in by Indira Gandhi were neutralized by holding them unconstitutional in Minerva Mills's judgement.

Hence, option A is correct.

4. The case of Kesavananda Bharati v. State of Kerala, is perhaps the most well-known constitutional decision of the Supreme Court of India. While ruling that there is no implied limitation on the powers of Parliament to amend the Constitution, it held that no amendment can do violence to its basic structure (the "Basic Structure

Doctrine"). Further, it established the Supreme Court's right of review and, therefore, established its supremacy on constitutional matters.

Hence, option A is correct.

5. Vishakha and others v State of Rajasthan was a 1997 Indian Supreme Court case where Vishakha and other women groups filed Public Interest Litigation (PIL) against State of Rajasthan and Union of India to enforce the fundamental rights of working women under Articles 14, 19 and 21 of the Constitution of India. Justice J.S Verma was also a member of the bench who laid out the guidelines in this case. Later after Nirbhaya case in 2013, Justice Verma Committee was constituted to recommend amendments to the Criminal Law so as to provide for quicker trial and enhanced punishment for criminals accused of committing sexual assault against women. The Committee submitted its report on January 23, 2013.

Hence, option C is correct.

6. S. R. Bommai v. Union of India was a landmark judgment of the Supreme Court of India, where the Court discussed at length provisions of Article 356 of the Constitution of India and related issues. This case had huge impact on Centre-State Relations. The judgement attempted to curb blatant misuse of Article 356 of the Constitution of India, which allowed President's rule to be imposed over state governments.

Hence, option A is correct.

7. In Ram Singh vs. Union of India, the Supreme Court overturned a government decision to grant reservations to the Jat community in nine states (by including them in the Central List of Backward Classes ["Central List"]).

Hence, option A is correct.

8. • the Parliament was fully competent to enact Section 139AA of the Act and its authority to make this law was not diluted by the orders of this Court.

• (ii) Court did not find any conflict between the provisions of Aadhaar Act and Section 139AA of the Income Tax Act inasmuch as when interpreted harmoniously, they operate in distinct fields.

• (iii) Section 139AA of the Act is not discriminatory nor does it offend equality clause enshrined in Article 14 of the Constitution.

Hence, option B is correct.

9. The judgment in the case of Rajbala v State of Haryana, delivered by the Supreme Court, affirmed the amendments (prescribing minimum education) made to the Haryana Panchayat Raj Act, 1994.

Hence, option A is correct.

10. The case of State of Uttar Pradesh v. Raj Narain was a 1975 case heard by the Allahabad High Court that found the Prime Minister of India Indira Gandhi guilty of electoral malpractices.

Hence, option C is correct.



Join us on Telegram for more PDFs Click here

