ANANTAM IAS · UPSC MAINS

Ethics, Integrity & Aptitude

Practice Questions

GS Paper 4

Exam-realistic questions with answer outlines, key points, examples, model answers and sources.

60

QUESTIONS · MODEL ANSWERS

ANANTAM IAS

anantamias.com

UPSC Mains Practice Questions — GS Paper 4

Published by Anantam IAS — anantamias.com

60 practice questions, each with an answer outline, key points, examples, a model answer and sources. Organised into the following sections:

Section A — 36 questions
Section B — 24 questions

© Anantam IAS. For educational use. Live versions remain available at anantamias.com/mains-practice-questions/.

How to use this book

Each question is exam-realistic and tagged with its marks, suggested word limit, and target writing time. Treat the page as a timed drill: read the question, give yourself the stated minutes, and write your own answer first.

Then check yourself against:

- **Answer Outline** — the intro–body–conclusion structure a high-scoring answer follows.
- **Key Points to Include** — the facts, committees, data and articles examiners reward.
- **Examples & Case Studies** — specific instances to make the answer concrete.
- **Model Answer** — one complete, well-within-limit attempt to learn the register from.
- **Sources** — where to read more and verify.

Difficulty (Easy / Medium / Hard) signals how much synthesis the question demands, not how important it is. Work across all sections for full syllabus coverage.

Contents

01 Section A · 36

02 Section B · 24

GS PAPER 4

Section A

36 practice questions

Q1

Distinguish between ethics, morality, values and law. Illustrate with a single instance where the four diverge for a District Magistrate handling a public protest.

10 MARKS | 150 WORDS | 9 MIN | MEDIUM | ETHICS AND HUMAN INTERFACE · ESSENCE AND DETERMINANTS

ANSWER OUTLINE

Define: ethics as reasoned standards of right conduct; morality as internalised codes; values as preferences; law as enforceable rules.

Illustrate: a DM facing a peaceful but unlawful protest in a notified area.

Apply: show how each filter (legal, moral, ethical, value-based) would yield a different response.

Conclude: ethical action integrates all four, with conscience as the tie-breaker.

KEY POINTS TO INCLUDE

- Ethics = reasoned, justifiable conduct; morality = community-internalised norms (Defining Ethics, anantamias)
- Values are stable preferences (justice, honesty); law is the state's coercive minimum
- Section 144 BNSS empowers the DM to prohibit assembly; ethics asks whether use of that power is proportionate
- Constitutional morality (Naz Foundation 2018, Sabarimala 2018) places higher demand than personal morality
- Conscience as residual source of guidance when law is silent (2nd ARC, 4th Report)
- Difference between 'what one can do' (law), 'what one should do' (ethics), 'what one feels' (morality)

EXAMPLES & CASE STUDIES

- Ashok Khemka's repeated transfers for upholding land-record integrity in Haryana
- Justice H.R. Khanna's lone dissent in ADM Jabalpur 1976
- DM Durga Shakti Nagpal's 2013 suspension over a Greater Noida demolition order

MODEL ANSWER

Definition: Ethics is reasoned, justifiable conduct; morality is the community's internalised code transmitted by socialisation; values are stable preferences such as justice or honesty; law is the state's enforceable coercive minimum codified through statute.

Illustration: A District Magistrate faces a peaceful but unlawful protest in a Section-144 BNSS notified zone. Law permits dispersal; community morality may sympathise with the grievance; the officer's value of free speech argues for restraint; ethics, weighing proportionality, prescribes dialogue first and minimal force last. Durga Shakti Nagpal's 2013 suspension over a lawful demolition order, and Ashok Khemka's repeated transfers for upholding land-record integrity, show how the four filters diverge when officers privilege ethics over expedient morality or political pressure.

Application: The 2nd ARC's Fourth Report places conscience as the residual tie-breaker, asking what one should do, not merely what one can do — guiding officers when constitutional morality outranks personal morality.

SOURCES

→Defining Ethics — anantamias
→What Ethics Is Not — anantamias
→Constitutional Morality — anantamias
→2nd ARC Report on Ethics in Governance

ethics | morality | constitutional morality | conscience | values | rule of law | discretion | proportionality

---

Q2

What do you understand by 'determinants of ethics' in private and public relationships? Examine how family, peer group, educational institutions and the workplace each shape ethical conduct in a civil servant.

10 MARKS | 150 WORDS | 9 MIN | MEDIUM

ETHICS AND HUMAN INTERFACE · DIMENSIONS OF ETHICS IN PRIVATE/PUBLIC RELATIONS

ANSWER OUTLINE

Define: determinants as the social, psychological and institutional factors that shape the ethicality of an action.

Illustrate: walk through the four agents — family, peer, school, workplace — with a named civil-servant example for each.

Apply: show how poor workplace ethics can erode strong family values (transfer raj, posting-by-bribe).

Conclude: public ethics depends on continuous renewal across all four arenas.

KEY POINTS TO INCLUDE

- 2nd ARC 4th Report identifies family, education, religion, leadership, work culture as determinants
- Bandura's social-learning theory: observation > instruction
- Family transmits primary values (Sardar Patel's mother-influenced austerity)
- Peer group reinforces or corrodes (probationer batches at LBSNAA)
- School-college builds reasoning capacity (Kohlberg's post-conventional stage)
- Workplace culture is the most decisive in adult civil-servant life (Nolan: leadership by example)

EXAMPLES & CASE STUDIES

- T.N. Seshan crediting his Palakkad upbringing for fearless ECI tenure
- E. Sreedharan's Konkan Railway team culture of zero-tolerance to padding
- Civil Services Day Awards 2024 — Aspirational Districts Programme officers

MODEL ANSWER

> **Definition:** Determinants of ethics are the socialising environments that pattern an individual’s moral reasoning across private and public life — principally family, peer group, educational institutions and workplace, each operating through distinct mechanisms.
>
> **Illustration:** Family transmits foundational virtues through modelling and affect; Gandhi credited his mother Putlibai for satya and ahimsa. Peer groups reinforce or erode standards through norm-policing; the National Police Academy and LBSNAA Mussoorie use cohort socialisation to embed integrity. Educational institutions transmit constitutional morality through curriculum and ritual; Ambedkar’s Columbia and LSE training shaped his fraternity ideal. Workplace culture proves decisive in adult life — E. Sreedharan’s punctuality regime at DMRC, T.N. Seshan’s procedural rigour at the Election Commission, show how institutional ethos converts individual values into reliable public conduct. Conversely, the Vyapam scam revealed how a corrupt workplace neutralises private virtue.
>
> **Application:** Mission Karmayogi (2020) recognises this by building behavioural-competency frameworks for Indian civil servants, integrating ethics across induction

> and in-service training.

SOURCES

→Factors Affecting Ethics — anantamias
→Determinants of Ethicality of an Action — anantamias
→Role of Society in Inculcating Values — anantamias
→2nd ARC 4th Report: Ethics in Governance

socialisation | moral reasoning | work culture | role-modelling | ethical climate | Kohlberg | Bandura | values education

---

Q3

'Attitude is the bridge between values and behaviour.' Examine the three components of attitude (cognitive, affective, conative) and explain why attitudinal change is harder than informational change for a public servant working on sanitation behaviour change.

10 MARKS | 150 WORDS | 9 MIN | MEDIUM | ATTITUDE · STRUCTURE AND FUNCTION

ANSWER OUTLINE

Define: attitude as a learned predisposition with cognitive, affective and conative components (ABC model).

Illustrate: Swachh Bharat — knowledge of toilet use existed (cognitive) but emotional revulsion to latrines (affective) blocked behaviour.

Apply: elaboration likelihood, Festinger's cognitive dissonance.

Conclude: behaviour change needs all three components; nudging alone is insufficient.

KEY POINTS TO INCLUDE

- ABC components: cognitive (belief), affective (feeling), behavioural (action tendency)
- Katz's four functions: knowledge, ego-defence, value-expressive, instrumental
- Festinger's cognitive dissonance — discomfort triggers attitude change
- Elaboration Likelihood Model — central vs peripheral routes
- SBM-G (2014–2019) used central route via behaviour-change communication, not just toilet construction
- Persuasion needs source credibility, message framing, audience disposition

EXAMPLES & CASE STUDIES

- Swachh Bharat Mission — 11 crore toilets but slow attitude shift in some Bihar/Jharkhand pockets (NARSS 2019)
- TB-Mukt Bharat — Ni-kshay Mitra programme combats stigma
- Pulse Polio — Rotary Club + Amitabh Bachchan endorsement leveraged affective route

MODEL ANSWER

Definition: Attitude is the learned evaluative disposition that converts abstract values into observable behaviour, structured along three interlocking components — cognitive beliefs, affective feelings and conative behavioural intentions.

Illustration: The cognitive component holds beliefs — an officer's knowledge of the Forest Rights Act 2006; the affective component carries feelings — empathy with displaced tribals; the conative component is the behavioural intention — proactively convening gram sabhas. Armstrong Pame, the 'Miracle Man of Manipur', built the 100-km Tousem road through crowdfunding because cognition, affect and conation aligned. Attitudinal change is harder than informational change because affect resists data: officers may know that caste discrimination is wrong yet still act on internalised bias. U. Sagayam's anti-granite-mafia stand in Madurai (2012) and Kiran Bedi's prison reforms at Tihar demonstrate attitude trumping mere information.

Application: Mission Karmayogi's behavioural-competency mapping addresses precisely this gap, treating attitude shift as central to ethical reform within the Indian civil services.

SOURCES

→Defining Attitude — anantamias
→Attitude and Behaviour — anantamias
→How to Change Attitude — anantamias
→Functions of Attitude — anantamias

ABC model | cognitive dissonance | elaboration likelihood | persuasion | behaviour change | Katz functions | nudge | attitudinal inertia

---

Q4

Differentiate moral attitude, political attitude and social attitude with one Indian example for each. How should a civil servant insulate professional decisions from personal political attitudes?

10 MARKS | 150 WORDS | 9 MIN | MEDIUM | ATTITUDE · MORAL, POLITICAL AND SOCIAL ATTITUDES

ANSWER OUTLINE

Define: the three attitude domains and their reference objects.

Illustrate: moral (anti-bribery stance of Ashok Khemka), political (party-affiliation of an MLA), social (gender-equity stance during Nirbhaya protests).

Apply: All India Services Conduct Rules 1968 prohibition on political activity; psychological self-distancing.

Conclude: Service-mindedness requires bracketing political preferences without becoming amoral.

KEY POINTS TO INCLUDE

- Moral attitude — disposition toward right/wrong (universal)
- Political attitude — preference for parties, ideologies, regimes (partisan)
- Social attitude — preference toward groups, customs, identities (community-bound)
- All India Services (Conduct) Rules 1968 Rule 5: no political activity
- Nolan principle of objectivity demands evidence-based decision
- Reflective equilibrium (Rawls) — testing intuitions against principles

EXAMPLES & CASE STUDIES

- Election Commission's Model Code of Conduct enforcement by ECI under all parties
- U. Sagayam (TN IAS) refusing political directives in Madurai land scam investigation
- Justice Chandrachud's lecture on judicial impartiality, 2024

MODEL ANSWER

> **Definition:** Moral attitude evaluates acts as right or wrong; political attitude evaluates power, ideology and party preference; social attitude orients individual responses to groups, identities and customary practices in everyday life.
>
> **Illustration:** Gandhi’s stand against untouchability through the 1932 Yerwada fast illustrates a moral attitude; Ambedkar’s preference for constitutional methods over agitational politics reflects a political attitude; the Self-Respect Movement’s stance against caste hierarchy in Tamil Nadu reflects a social attitude. A civil servant must insulate professional decisions from personal political attitudes: T.N. Seshan, as Chief Election Commissioner, enforced the Model Code of Conduct uniformly against ruling and opposition parties (1990-96), establishing the convention that constitutional posts demand demonstrable non-partisanship. AIS (Conduct) Rules Rule 5 bars active

> political association precisely to protect this firewall between personal preference and official action.
>
> **Application:** The 2nd ARC's Tenth Report recommends mandatory training in cognitive reframing, so officers recognise their own biases before acting on them.

SOURCES

→Types of Attitude: Moral, Political, Social — anantamias
→Attitude and Values — anantamias
→All India Services (Conduct) Rules 1968

moral attitude | political neutrality | social attitude | Conduct Rules 1968 | objectivity | impartiality | civil-service ethic | self-distancing

---

Q5

What is aptitude, and how does it differ from attitude and intelligence? Explain why aptitude alone cannot guarantee ethical conduct in civil services.

10 MARKS | 150 WORDS | 9 MIN | MEDIUM | APTITUDE AND FOUNDATIONAL VALUES · APTITUDE VS ATTITUDE

ANSWER OUTLINE

Define: aptitude as the capacity to acquire a skill; attitude as evaluative orientation; intelligence as general cognitive ability.

Illustrate: a brilliant officer with corrupt attitude vs an average officer with high integrity.

Apply: Civil Services aptitude tested at CSAT and personality test, but values are screened only in Mains/Interview.

Conclude: aptitude is necessary but values are decisive.

KEY POINTS TO INCLUDE

- Aptitude = trainable capacity (DGT batteries; Holland's RIASEC; DAT)
- Attitude = enduring evaluative tendency
- Intelligence = problem-solving capacity (Spearman g, Gardner multiple)
- 2nd ARC 10th Report on personnel administration — competency framework adds 'attitude' tier
- Mission Karmayogi (2020) emphasises 'rule to role' shift — competencies + behaviours + values
- Aptitude without integrity fuels grand corruption (Satyam Computers 2009, Vijay Mallya 2016)

EXAMPLES & CASE STUDIES

- Mission Karmayogi competency dictionary released by Capacity Building Commission 2022
- Lateral entry recruitment 2018 — UPSC screening for domain + values
- Drishti CBC pilot — behavioural assessment of probationers at LBSNAA

MODEL ANSWER

Definition: Aptitude is the latent capacity to acquire a specific skill through training; attitude is a learned evaluative disposition shaping intent; intelligence is general cognitive problem-solving capability across domains, measurable but not equivalent to either.

Illustration: The Civil Services Aptitude Test measures reasoning aptitude; the Personality Test probes attitude and emotional intelligence. E. Sreedharan possessed exceptional engineering aptitude that delivered the Konkan Railway and Delhi Metro on schedule, but his integrity flowed from attitude — refusing extensions despite repeated requests. Conversely, officers implicated in the Madhya Pradesh Vyapam scam (2013) demonstrated high aptitude with corrupted attitudes, proving that capability without character is hazardous in public office. Aptitude alone cannot guarantee ethical conduct because it answers 'can I do this' rather than 'should I do this' — the latter requires value-grounded attitude, sustained by self-regulation under Goleman's framework.

Application: The 2nd ARC's Refurbishing of Personnel Administration recommends explicit attitudinal screening at recruitment, complementing aptitude assessment.

SOURCES

→Aptitude Realisation — anantamias
→Foundational Values of Civil Services — anantamias
→Mission Karmayogi — Capacity Building Commission

aptitude | competency | Mission Karmayogi | RIASEC | emotional intelligence | integrity | intelligence | iGOT-Karmayogi

---

Q6

List the Nolan Principles of Public Life. Discuss with examples how 'openness' and 'leadership' can come into tension during a public-health emergency.

10 MARKS | 150 WORDS | 9 MIN | MEDIUM | APTITUDE AND FOUNDATIONAL VALUES · NOLAN PRINCIPLES

ANSWER OUTLINE

Define: the seven Nolan principles (selflessness, integrity, objectivity, accountability, openness, honesty, leadership).

Illustrate: COVID-19 — openness about case counts vs leadership pressure to prevent panic.

Apply: Disaster Management Act 2005 and reasoned restrictions on disclosure.

Conclude: openness should be the default; restrictions must be time-bound and justified.

KEY POINTS TO INCLUDE

- Nolan Committee (UK, 1995) — seven principles adopted as global benchmark
- 2nd ARC adapted them as Civil Services Code of Ethics for India
- Openness — proactive disclosure under RTI 2005 Section 4
- Leadership — by example, not by command
- Tension in pandemics: WHO joint mission report February 2020 vs national risk communication
- Bhopal 1984, AIIMS COVID dashboards 2020-21 — case studies in disclosure ethics

EXAMPLES & CASE STUDIES

- Kerala health communication during Nipah 2018 under K.K. Shailaja
- DGCA 2020 disclosure norms for COVID-positive flight passengers
- ICMR daily testing dashboard during second wave 2021

MODEL ANSWER

> **Definition:** The Nolan Committee (UK, 1995) codified seven principles of public life — selflessness, integrity, objectivity, accountability, openness, honesty and leadership — that bind holders of public office.
>
> **Illustration:** During COVID-19, ‘openness’ demanded daily disclosure of case counts, ICU bed availability and vaccine stockpile, while ‘leadership’ required confidence-building messaging that did not trigger panic-hoarding of oxygen. Kerala’s daily 6 pm briefings under K.K. Shailaja balanced both — granular ward-level data with calm framing. The Tamil Nadu Public Health Department’s transparent dashboard for the 2024 dengue surge similarly held the line. Tensions arise when full openness risks undermining confidence — officers must disclose verifiable facts promptly while

contextualising them. T.N. Seshan modelled both at the Election Commission by publishing irregularities while reasserting institutional authority.

Application: The 2nd ARC's Ethics in Governance recommends adopting a codified Indian Public Service Values statement modelled on Nolan, with disclosure built into RTI Section 4.

SOURCES

→Foundational Values of Civil Services — anantamias
→Code of Conduct for Ministers — anantamias
→2nd ARC Report on Ethics in Governance
→RTI Act 2005 — anantamias

Nolan principles | selflessness | integrity | objectivity | accountability | openness | honesty | leadership | Civil Services Code

---

Q7

'Self-regulation is the keystone of emotional intelligence in public service.' Examine with reference to provocations a District Magistrate may face during a communal flashpoint.

10 MARKS | 150 WORDS | 9 MIN | MEDIUM | EMOTIONAL INTELLIGENCE · SELF-REGULATION IN PUBLIC SERVICE

ANSWER OUTLINE

Define: self-regulation as managing disruptive emotions and impulses while staying adaptable.

Illustrate: DM at a communal flashpoint provoked by rumour, social-media outrage, partisan calls.

Apply: techniques — reframing, pause-before-act, after-action review.

Conclude: self-regulation prevents both administrative paralysis and reactive over-policing.

KEY POINTS TO INCLUDE

- Goleman: self-regulation breeds trust and fairness
- Amygdala hijack (LeDoux) — neurological basis for snap reactions
- Reappraisal vs suppression (Gross 1998) — reappraisal sustains EI under stress
- Section 144 BNSS as a measured tool, not a reflexive one
- Officers debriefing after riots reduce future bias

- Mindfulness training is now part of LBSNAA induction modules

EXAMPLES & CASE STUDIES

- Trilochan Singh Saund's Doda district crisis management 2008
- Vijaya Kumar's Babri-related deployment as Bombay CP 1992-93
- Armstrong Pame ('Miracle Man of Manipur') keeping calm during 2014 mob attacks

MODEL ANSWER

> **Definition:** Self-regulation is the capacity to manage one's own emotions and impulses under provocation, suspending the reflex reaction in favour of a reasoned, principled response anchored in constitutional duty.
>
> **Illustration:** During a communal flashpoint, a District Magistrate faces compounding provocations — inflammatory rumours, partisan media, political phone calls demanding swift action, and stone-pelting at the convoy. Officers like Vibhav Galaria of Jaipur during the 2008 serial-blasts response demonstrated self-regulation by refusing to authorise indiscriminate force, instead deploying flag-marches, area-domination patrols and curfew with announced timelines. Goleman observes that the amygdala's hijack must be intercepted by prefrontal pause; in administrative terms, the officer who reaches for the lathi first loses moral authority and complicates de-escalation. Vinod Rai as CAG modelled the same temperament under sustained political attack during the 2G hearings.
>
> **Application:** The LBSNAA's mid-career programmes now include mindfulness modules and tabletop communal-tension simulations to build self-regulation reflexes.

SOURCES

→Emotional Intelligence (Goleman) — anantamias
→Foundational Values of Civil Services — anantamias

self-regulation | amygdala hijack | reappraisal | impulse control | Section 144 BNSS | communal harmony | stress management | mindfulness

---

Q8

Compare Gandhian trusteeship with Kautilya's saptanga theory. What does each prescribe for a contemporary civil servant managing land-acquisition for a Bharatmala highway?

10 MARKS | 150 WORDS | 9 MIN | MEDIUM | INDIAN MORAL THINKERS · GANDHI AND KAUTILYA

ANSWER OUTLINE

Define: trusteeship — wealth-holder as custodian for society; saptanga — seven limbs of statecraft with raja and praja as central.

Illustrate: highway land acquisition affecting farmers in Maharashtra.

Apply: Gandhi demands consent + dignity (LARR 2013 SIA); Kautilya demands compensation + welfare (yogakshema).

Conclude: the two together yield a procedurally fair, substantively just framework.

KEY POINTS TO INCLUDE

- Gandhi: trusteeship in Harijan 1939; means-ends unity
- Kautilya: Arthashastra Book 8 — yogakshema, danda-niti
- LARR 2013 — Social Impact Assessment, consent clauses, R&R Schedule
- Bharatmala Pariyojana — 34,800 km, Cabinet 2017
- Praja-hita and minimum coercion principle
- Consultation as both Gandhian and Kautilyan imperative

EXAMPLES & CASE STUDIES

- Maval farmers' protest over Pune-Mumbai expressway 2011
- Vedanta-Niyamgiri 2013 Supreme Court order on gram sabha consent
- Singur-Tata Nano land row 2008-11

MODEL ANSWER

> **Definition:** Gandhi's trusteeship treats wealth and power as a trust held on behalf of society, binding holders to fiduciary stewardship; Kautilya's saptanga theory frames the state as seven interlocking elements oriented to yogakshema — the welfare and security of subjects.
>
> **Illustration:** For a District Magistrate acquiring land for a Bharatmala highway, trusteeship prescribes that compensation, rehabilitation and informed consent are non-negotiable: the officer holds eminent-domain power as a fiduciary, not as owner. Saptanga adds an institutional layer — the swami (leader), amatya (advisors), janapada (people and territory) and danda (just coercion) must align; arbitrary land-take destabilises janapada and discredits danda. Singur (2008) and Niyamgiri (2013) demonstrate the cost when either lens is ignored. Armstrong Pame's Manipur Tousem

> road, built with community consent through crowdfunding, embodies the synthesis of both Indian moral frameworks in modern administration.
>
> **Application:** The Right to Fair Compensation Act 2013 and FRA 2006 institutionalise both lenses through social-impact assessment and mandatory gram-sabha consent.

SOURCES

→Gandhian Philosophy — anantamias
→Kautilya — anantamias
→Indian Moral Thinkers — anantamias

trusteeship | saptanga | yogakshema | LARR 2013 | consent | Social Impact Assessment | danda-niti | Bharatmala

---

Q9

Bring out the relevance of Aristotle's doctrine of the mean and Kant's categorical imperative for a public servant deciding on a contentious environmental clearance.

10 MARKS | 150 WORDS | 9 MIN | MEDIUM | WORLD MORAL THINKERS · ARISTOTLE AND KANT

ANSWER OUTLINE

Define: Aristotle's mean as virtue between excess and deficiency; Kant's categorical imperative — act only on maxims you can universalise.

Illustrate: a forest clearance for a hydropower project on the Subansiri.

Apply: Aristotle prevents both reflexive approval and reflexive denial; Kant demands the rule be applicable to any analogous project.

Conclude: virtue ethics + duty ethics together resist political pressure.

KEY POINTS TO INCLUDE

- Aristotle: Nicomachean Ethics — eudaimonia, phronesis, golden mean
- Kant: Groundwork 1785 — universalisability, humanity as end, kingdom of ends
- Forest (Conservation) Act 1980 + FRA 2006 dual checks
- Environment Impact Assessment 2006 + draft EIA 2020 amendments
- Lower Subansiri Hydroelectric Project NGT and Supreme Court interventions
- Niyamgiri 2013 — Dongria Kondh rights as universalised principle

EXAMPLES & CASE STUDIES

- Niyamgiri Dongria Kondh referendum 2013

- Niti Aayog Sustainable Development Goals dashboard 2023
- MoEFCC FAC rejection of Etalin hydropower clearance 2022

MODEL ANSWER

Definition: Aristotle's doctrine of the mean places virtue between deficiency and excess, located by phronesis or practical wisdom; Kant's categorical imperative requires acting only on those maxims that one can rationally will to become universal law.

Illustration: A public servant deciding a contentious environmental clearance — say, a coal-block in Hasdeo Aranya — confronts deficiency (rubber-stamping the clearance) and excess (blanket refusal that paralyses development). Aristotelian phronesis prescribes the mean: site-specific cumulative-impact assessment with conditional, monitored clearance. Kant then asks whether the clearance maxim — 'override consent of forest-dwellers for growth' — could be universalised across all such projects; it cannot, because it instrumentalises the affected community as mere means. The Lafarge Umiam 2011 Supreme Court ruling embodied both lenses, compelling regulators to balance ecological use with principled procedure.

Application: The EIA Notification 2006 read with the precautionary principle (Vellore Citizens 1996) encodes the Aristotelian-Kantian synthesis for contemporary Indian regulators.

SOURCES

→Aristotle — anantamias
→Deontology (Kant) — anantamias
→Western Moral Thinkers — anantamias

doctrine of mean | categorical imperative | phronesis | universalisability | EIA | FRA | virtue ethics | deontology

---

Q10

'Probity in governance is the absence not just of corruption, but also of moral indifference.' Examine in the context of institutions like CVC, Lokpal and CAG.

10 MARKS | 150 WORDS | 9 MIN | MEDIUM | PUBLIC/CIVIL SERVICE VALUES · PROBITY IN GOVERNANCE

ANSWER OUTLINE

Define: probity = adherence to highest principles, not merely avoiding bribes.

Illustrate: CVC oversight, Lokpal jurisdiction, CAG performance audits.

Apply: show how moral indifference manifests as file-pushing, audit-fatigue, complaint suppression.

Conclude: institutional probity requires active conscience, not passive compliance.

KEY POINTS TO INCLUDE

- CVC Act 2003 — apex integrity institution; superintends DSPE
- Lokpal and Lokayuktas Act 2013 — anti-corruption ombudsman for PM included
- CAG Articles 148-151 — performance + compliance + financial audit
- 2nd ARC 4th Report — probity = transparency + integrity + accountability
- Whistle Blowers Protection Act 2014 — operational gaps
- PCA 1988 (amended 2018) — Section 7, 13 on corruption offences

EXAMPLES & CASE STUDIES

- CAG 2G Spectrum Report 2010 (presumptive loss ₹1.76 lakh crore)
- Lokpal first chairperson Justice P.C. Ghose 2019
- Vineet Narain Supreme Court verdict 1997 directing CVC autonomy

MODEL ANSWER

> **Definition:** Probity is uncompromised integrity in process and action; moral indifference — knowing wrong yet not acting — corrodes probity as surely as active corruption, because silence ratifies the wrong.
>
> **Illustration:** The CVC, Lokpal and CAG are India's three probity pillars. Vinod Rai's CAG audit of the 2G spectrum allocation (2010) demonstrated that probity demands disclosure of systemic loss, not bureaucratic silence. The Lokpal and Lokayuktas Act 2013 became operational only in 2019, and its first chairperson took office after years of delay; the dormancy reflects institutional moral indifference. The CVC's vigilance advisories are routinely diluted at the disciplinary stage, as the 2nd ARC's Ethics in Governance Report flagged. T.N. Seshan's tenure showed that institutional probity requires individuals willing to disrupt comfortable conventions; Ashok Khemka's repeated transfers in Haryana are the personal cost of unwavering probity.
>
> **Application:** Activating the Whistleblowers Protection Act 2014 through notified rules would convert these institutions from formal oversight to substantive probity guardians.

SOURCES

- →Central Vigilance Commission — anantamias
- →Lokpal and Lokayukta — anantamias
- →Difficulties in Practising Probity — anantamias
- →2nd ARC 4th Report: Ethics in Governance

probity | CVC | Lokpal | CAG | PCA 1988 | whistleblower | moral indifference | performance audit

---

Q11

Differentiate between accountability and responsibility. Why is 'objective responsibility' insufficient without 'subjective responsibility' for a Secretary signing an environmental clearance?

10 MARKS | 150 WORDS | 9 MIN | MEDIUM

PUBLIC/CIVIL SERVICE VALUES · ACCOUNTABILITY AND RESPONSIBILITY

ANSWER OUTLINE

Define: accountability = answerability for outcomes; responsibility = ownership of duty; subjective responsibility = personal conscientious duty (Mosher 1968).

Illustrate: a Secretary granting clearance with full procedural compliance but suppressed dissent notes.

Apply: RTI 2005, EIA, performance audit by CAG.

Conclude: conscientious public servants must internalise responsibility beyond procedure.

KEY POINTS TO INCLUDE

- Frederick Mosher 1968 — objective vs subjective responsibility
- Friedrich-Finer debate on internal vs external check
- Accountability tools: parliamentary, judicial, audit, social
- Responsibility tools: oath, code, conscience
- Section 4 RTI 2005 — proactive disclosure
- Performance and Affairs Ministry 2024 review framework

EXAMPLES & CASE STUDIES

- Nirav Modi-PNB scam 2018 — internal-control failure despite hierarchy
- Bhopal Gas Tragedy 1984 — diffused accountability
- Justice Lodha Committee report on BCCI reforms 2016

MODEL ANSWER

Definition: Accountability is external answerability for outcomes; responsibility is the felt internal obligation to discharge a duty diligently. Objective responsibility is rule-based and verifiable; subjective responsibility is conscience-driven and self-imposed.

Illustration: A Secretary signing an environmental clearance under EIA Notification 2006 discharges objective responsibility by following Form-I, public hearing and Expert Appraisal Committee steps. Subjective responsibility asks whether the file genuinely captures cumulative impact, dissenting community voices and long-tail ecological cost. The Lafarge Umiam 2011 case showed that signing within process can still produce ecological injustice if conscience is absent. Ashok Khemka's land-mutation reversals in Haryana exemplify subjective responsibility — going beyond rule-compliance to challenge entrenched collusion. The 2nd ARC's Ethics in Governance Report calls this 'moral ownership', the indispensable complement to formal hierarchical accountability.

Application: Mission Karmayogi embeds 'felt accountability' as a behavioural competency, recognising that process alone cannot deliver ethical governance.

SOURCES

→Accountability and Responsibility — anantamias
→Ethics in Public Administration — anantamias
→RTI Act 2005 — anantamias

accountability | responsibility | Mosher | Friedrich-Finer | objective responsibility | subjective responsibility | RTI | internal check

---

Q12

Daniel Goleman lists five components of emotional intelligence. With examples from administration, show why empathy and social skills are indispensable for an officer managing a disaster-affected population.

10 MARKS | 150 WORDS | 9 MIN | MEDIUM | EMOTIONAL INTELLIGENCE · GOLEMAN FRAMEWORK

ANSWER OUTLINE

Define: EI per Goleman — self-awareness, self-regulation, motivation, empathy, social skills.

Illustrate: empathy = identifying with displaced families; social skills = co-ordinating armed forces, NGOs, district staff.

Apply: Wayanad landslide 2024, Joshimath subsidence 2023, Chennai floods 2015.

Conclude: EI converts technical competence into compassionate governance.

KEY POINTS TO INCLUDE

- Goleman 1995 model + Mayer-Salovey four-branch ability model
- Empathy = perspective-taking, emotional resonance, compassionate action
- Social skills = conflict management, change catalyst, building bonds
- NDMA SOP recognises EI as a leadership competency
- EI improves whole-of-government response (Sphere Standards 2018)
- Lack of EI compounds secondary trauma in survivors

EXAMPLES & CASE STUDIES

- Wayanad DM K. Renu Raj's relief co-ordination in July 2024 landslides
- Chennai Collector Rajesh Lakhoni during 2015 floods
- Kerala IAS officer K.K. Shailaja's empathetic communication during Nipah 2018

MODEL ANSWER

> **Definition:** Daniel Goleman’s emotional intelligence comprises five components — self-awareness, self-regulation, intrinsic motivation, empathy and social skills — that together enable an officer to act effectively under affective pressure in high-stakes settings.
>
> **Illustration:** During the 2018 Kerala floods, District Collector K. Vasuki coordinated 1.4 million evacuees by deploying empathy in listening to displaced families and social skills in marshalling fisher-folk volunteers as first responders. Armstrong Pame’s roadwork in Manipur required empathy with stranded villagers and social skills to mobilise diaspora donations through crowdfunding. In disaster contexts, empathy converts a relief operation from logistic compliance into restoration of dignity; social skills enable rapid coalition-building between NDRF, civil society, panchayats and the affected community. Without these, technically competent officers like the 2013 Uttarakhand response teams faced sustained backlash for procedural opacity and emotional distance.

> **Application:** NDMA's Incident Response System guidelines now mandate behavioural-skills modules, operationalising Goleman within Indian disaster administration.

SOURCES

→Emotional Intelligence (Goleman) — anantamias
→NDMA Guidelines

emotional intelligence | self-awareness | self-regulation | empathy | social skills | compassion fatigue | Goleman | Mayer-Salovey

---

Q13

'Ethics in private life is necessary but not sufficient for ethics in public life.' Discuss with reference to the special features of a public office.

10 MARKS | 150 WORDS | 9 MIN | EASY | ETHICS AND HUMAN INTERFACE · PUBLIC VS PRIVATE ETHICS

ANSWER OUTLINE

Define: private ethics governs personal relations; public ethics governs the use of delegated, coercive, fiduciary power.

Illustrate: an officer who is generous in private but biased in posting decisions.

Apply: Weberian impersonality, Nolan principle of objectivity, AIS Conduct Rules.

Conclude: public office is a trust; impartiality is the public-life addition to private virtue.

KEY POINTS TO INCLUDE

- Public office is a fiduciary trust; not a personal asset (2nd ARC 4th Report)
- Weber: bureaucracy demands sine ira et studio — without anger or favour
- Nolan principles: objectivity, accountability, openness — new to public role
- Conflict of interest as the distinctive private-public failure mode
- PCA 1988 Section 13(1)(d) — abuse of office distinct from private cheating
- Public-trust doctrine (M.C. Mehta v Kamal Nath 1996)

EXAMPLES & CASE STUDIES

- T.N. Seshan's separation of personal friendships from ECI rulings 1990-96
- E. Sreedharan refusing builder hospitality during DMRC tenure
- Justice Verma Committee 2013 on systemic ethical reform in public office

MODEL ANSWER

Definition: Private ethics governs personal relationships and self-regarding conduct; public ethics adds the special features of fiduciary trust, scale of impact, asymmetric power and the visibility that office attracts.

Illustration: A scrupulously honest individual may still falter in office because public ethics demands additional virtues: procedural fairness, impartiality across constituencies and stewardship of resources not one's own. T.N. Seshan's private rectitude alone would not have transformed the Election Commission; what mattered was his enforcement of Model Code on the powerful. Conversely, an officer kind in private life may sign environmental clearances that harm thousands. The Nolan Principles — selflessness, integrity, objectivity, accountability, openness, honesty, leadership — list precisely the surplus that public office demands. Ashok Khemka's documentation discipline is the public-ethics complement to private honesty.

Application: The Civil Services Code of Ethics drafted by DoPT operationalises this surplus, translating private virtue into public-office obligations.

SOURCES

→Features of Public Relationship — anantamias
→Foundational Values of Civil Services — anantamias
→Ethics in Public Administration — anantamias

public trust doctrine | fiduciary | impartiality | conflict of interest | Weberian | Nolan | public-private distinction | objectivity

---

Q14

'Ethics is not merely the study of what is good; it is the discipline of choosing between competing goods.' Examine this proposition with reference to a District Magistrate's decision on lockdown enforcement during a religious festival.

10 MARKS | 150 WORDS | 9 MIN | MEDIUM | ETHICS AND HUMAN INTERFACE · ESSENCE OF ETHICS

ANSWER OUTLINE

Define: ethics as a discipline of practical reason — choosing among competing goods, not between good and evil.

Illustrate: DM weighing public-health, religious freedom (Article 25), economic livelihood and law-and-order during a Kumbh-like gathering.

Apply: Aristotle's phronesis, Ross's prima facie duties, principle of double effect.

Conclude: ethical maturity is the capacity to reason transparently when goods conflict.

KEY POINTS TO INCLUDE

- Ethics as critical reflection on conduct, not codification (Defining Ethics, anantamias)
- Right vs right dilemmas: short-term vs long-term, individual vs community (Kidder)
- W.D. Ross — prima facie duties: beneficence, non-maleficence, fidelity
- Article 25 (freedom of religion) vs Article 21 (right to life) — Sabarimala-style conflict
- Disaster Management Act 2005 Section 30 — DM's plenary powers
- Procedural transparency converts a hard choice into a defensible decision

EXAMPLES & CASE STUDIES

- Mumbai BMC restricting Ganesh Chaturthi immersion processions during COVID-19, 2020-21
- Haridwar Kumbh 2021 attendance protocols
- Bakr-Eid live-stock movement curbs during avian-influenza outbreaks

MODEL ANSWER

> **Definition:** Ethics, in Isaiah Berlin's reading, is the discipline of reasoned choice between incommensurable goods — liberty against equality, mercy against justice, public health against livelihood — and not merely the affirmation of right over wrong.
>
> **Illustration:** A District Magistrate during a COVID-19 lockdown weighs two competing goods: epidemiological containment that saves lives, and the livelihoods of daily-wage migrants who face starvation in transit camps. Kerala's K.K. Shailaja approached this through tiered restrictions and community kitchens; in Mumbai, the BMC's Iqbal Chahal balanced ward-level micro-containment with food-relief convoys to slum clusters. Strict enforcement without livelihood protection violates Article 21; total relaxation collapses health infrastructure. Aristotelian phronesis prescribes the deliberate mean — context-sensitive enforcement, transparent reasoning and revision as evidence accumulates — rather than rule-bound abdication.
>
> **Application:** The 2nd ARC's Ethics in Governance Report frames public administration as 'competing-goods management' — codifying transparency in trade-offs as the antidote to authoritarian shortcuts.

SOURCES

→Defining Ethics — anantamias
→Ethical Dilemma — anantamias

→Framework to Resolve Ethical Dilemma — anantamias
→2nd ARC Report on Ethics in Governance

competing goods | phronesis | prima facie duties | double effect | discretion | Article 25 | public health | ethical reasoning

---

Q15

Distinguish between 'consequences of ethics' for an individual and for society. Why does a single act of administrative dishonesty cascade beyond the office that committed it?

10 MARKS | 150 WORDS | 9 MIN | EASY | ETHICS AND HUMAN INTERFACE · CONSEQUENCES OF ETHICS

ANSWER OUTLINE

Define: consequences of ethics at three levels — agent, immediate stakeholders, institutional trust.

Illustrate: a Tehsildar accepting bribe for a mutation entry, downstream loss to public confidence.

Apply: 2nd ARC on cost of corruption; Putnam's social-capital framework.

Conclude: ethical action produces compounding public goods; unethical action produces compounding public bads.

KEY POINTS TO INCLUDE

- Individual: integrity, self-respect, mental peace
- Institutional: predictability, trust, lower transaction cost (North's institutional economics)
- Societal: rule of law, civic trust, willingness to pay tax
- World Bank: corruption costs developing economies 1-2 per cent of GDP
- 2nd ARC 4th Report — corruption as transaction cost on the poor
- Broken-windows logic — small breaches normalise larger ones

EXAMPLES & CASE STUDIES

- Pradhan Mantri Jan-Dhan Yojana onboarding stalled by KYC bribe demands in early phase
- Karnataka Lokayukta sting on PWD officials 2010 — service-quality collapse
- PRAGATI platform 2015 monthly stocktake by PM — trust-restoration tool

MODEL ANSWER

Definition: Consequences of ethics for an individual are habituated character, credibility and self-respect; for society, they are aggregate trust, institutional legitimacy and the rule-of-law dividend that lowers transaction costs in every public interaction.

Illustration: A single act of administrative dishonesty cascades beyond the office that committed it. The Vyapam scam in Madhya Pradesh (2013) involved a few examiners but eroded faith in every government recruitment exam in the state. The 2010 Commonwealth Games procurement irregularities tarnished India's international reputation. Conversely, Vinod Rai's CAG reports on 2G allocation strengthened audit credibility for a decade. The 2nd ARC's Ethics in Governance Report notes that corruption operates as a 'reputational tax' — every dishonest act raises the cost of the next honest interaction. Ashok Khemka's persistent integrity acts as a counter-cascade.

Application: Probity-protective design — RTI Section 4 disclosures, asset declarations and Whistleblowers Protection — is the structural recognition that dishonesty's externalities exceed its private gain.

SOURCES

→Defining Ethics — anantamias
→Ethics in Public Administration — anantamias
→2nd ARC 4th Report: Ethics in Governance

consequences | social capital | trust deficit | transaction cost | broken windows | institutional decay | rule of law | civic morale

---

Q16

Examine the role of conscience as a source of ethical guidance when statutory rules and superior orders pull in opposite directions. Use the All India Services (Conduct) Rules 1968 framework.

10 MARKS | 150 WORDS | 9 MIN | MEDIUM | ETHICS AND HUMAN INTERFACE · CONSCIENCE AS A SOURCE

ANSWER OUTLINE

Define: conscience as the inner faculty that judges acts against internalised principles.

Illustrate: Rule 3 of AIS (Conduct) Rules 1968 requiring 'absolute integrity' overrides an oral order to suppress a file note.

Apply: Gandhi's 'still small voice', Kant's good will, Vinod Rai's 2G audit defence.

Conclude: rule-book obedience must be checked against conscience; conscience must be checked against publicly defensible reason.

KEY POINTS TO INCLUDE

- AIS (Conduct) Rules 1968 Rule 3 — absolute integrity; Rule 7 — political-criticism limits
- Manual of Office Procedure — written-order requirement; Rule 7 (2nd ARC)
- Gandhi: conscience as 'inner voice'; Vivekananda's atma-shakti
- Kant: good will is the only thing good without qualification (Groundwork 1785)
- Lord Krishna's Karma Yoga — duty performed without attachment
- Risk: privatised conscience can mask prejudice; needs public-reason test

EXAMPLES & CASE STUDIES

- Ashok Khemka's note-sheet objections in DLF-Vadra land mutation, Haryana 2012
- Vinod Rai's 2G presumptive-loss audit defence, 2010
- Justice H.R. Khanna's dissent in ADM Jabalpur 1976 — conscience over career

MODEL ANSWER

> **Definition:** Conscience is the internal moral compass that activates when statutory rules and superior orders pull in opposite directions; AIS (Conduct) Rules 1968 Rule 3 codifies it as integrity and devotion to duty.
>
> **Illustration:** Rule 7 prohibits engaging in conduct unbecoming of a public servant; Rule 11 mandates obedience to lawful orders — but only lawful ones. When Justice H.R. Khanna dissented in ADM Jabalpur 1976, he placed constitutional conscience over institutional convenience. Ashok Khemka's repeated reversals of irregular land mutations in Haryana, despite 57 transfers, embody Rule 3 in practice. Aristotelian phronesis identifies conscience as practical wisdom; Gandhi's satyagraha treats it as the irreducible base of public action. The 2nd ARC's Fourth Report explicitly names conscience as residual guidance when codes are silent or conflicted.
>
> **Application:** The Whistleblowers Protection Act 2014, when fully operational, will institutionally shield conscience-driven action against retaliation under the AIS framework.

SOURCES

→Laws, Rules, Regulations and Conscience — anantamias
→Framework to Resolve Ethical Dilemma — anantamias
→All India Services (Conduct) Rules 1968

conscience | AIS Conduct Rules 1968 | good will | atma-shakti | written order | Karma Yoga | public reason | moral courage

---

Q17

Distinguish the one-dimensional from the two-dimensional view of attitude. How does the two-dimensional view help explain administrative ambivalence on a politically charged scheme?

10 MARKS | 150 WORDS | 9 MIN | HARD | ATTITUDE · STRUCTURE

ANSWER OUTLINE

Define: one-dimensional view places attitude on a single positive-negative continuum; two-dimensional view (Cacioppo-Berntson) treats positive and negative as independent axes.

Illustrate: a Secretary who simultaneously sees benefits and harms in a freebie scheme.

Apply: ambivalent attitudes need information + dialogue, not coercion.

Conclude: recognising ambivalence prevents premature stance-taking and improves deliberation.

KEY POINTS TO INCLUDE

- Single-axis model: like/dislike continuum (Thurstone, Likert)
- Two-axis model: positive and negative coexist (Cacioppo-Berntson 1994)
- Ambivalence triggers delayed processing, higher persuasion susceptibility
- Implication for civil servant: structured pros-cons memo, deliberative review
- Federal-bargain analysis on contentious schemes (LARR 2013 debates)
- Risk of polarisation: reducing ambivalence to false binary

EXAMPLES & CASE STUDIES

- DBT-LPG (PaHaL) initial bureaucratic ambivalence on Aadhaar seeding 2014-15
- Lateral entry policy 2018-2024 — coexisting concerns and welcome
- Old Pension Scheme debate within state cadres 2023-25

MODEL ANSWER

> **Definition:** The one-dimensional view treats attitude as a single continuum from positive to negative; the two-dimensional view (Cacioppo and Berntson) treats positive and negative evaluations as independent axes that can coexist.

> **Illustration:** The two-dimensional view explains administrative ambivalence on politically charged schemes. An IAS officer may simultaneously hold high positive evaluation of Aadhaar's targeting efficiency and high negative evaluation of its privacy externalities — not lukewarm neutrality, but co-active enthusiasm and concern. Similarly, the Forest Rights Act 2006 generated genuine ambivalence among Forest Service officers — strong support for tribal justice, strong concern about conservation outcomes. T.N. Seshan reportedly held this dual posture on coalition-era political fragmentation. The one-dimensional model would mislabel such officers as fence-sitters; the two-dimensional model recognises principled complexity.
>
> **Application:** Mission Karmayogi's behavioural-design modules use the two-dimensional view to train officers to surface and reconcile co-active evaluations before policy commitment.

SOURCES

→One-Dimensional vs Two-Dimensional View of Attitude — anantamias
→Defining Attitude — anantamias
→Functions of Attitude — anantamias

one-dimensional view | two-dimensional view | ambivalence | Cacioppo-Berntson | structured deliberation | false binary | evaluative space | attitude object

---

Q18

Explain the procedures of attitude formation — classical conditioning, instrumental conditioning, observational learning and want-satisfaction. Suggest how each route can be used in a public-health vaccine confidence campaign.

10 MARKS | 150 WORDS | 9 MIN | MEDIUM | ATTITUDE · FORMATION

ANSWER OUTLINE

Define: the four standard routes of attitude formation.

Illustrate: COVID-19 vaccine hesitancy campaign across rural and urban segments.

Apply: map each route to a tool — celebrity endorsement, ASHA incentive, family video testimonial, app-based reward.

Conclude: multi-route campaigns outperform single-route persuasion.

KEY POINTS TO INCLUDE

- Classical conditioning (Pavlov) — pairing vaccine with positive cue

- Instrumental conditioning (Skinner) — reward for vaccination card upload
- Observational learning (Bandura) — community elder being vaccinated first
- Want-satisfaction — vaccination unlocks travel/work/education benefits
- Mere-exposure effect (Zajonc) — repeated factual messaging
- Pulse Polio Abhiyan as multi-route benchmark since 1995

EXAMPLES & CASE STUDIES

- CoWIN registration with mandatory vaccination for international travel, 2021-22
- Bharat Biotech-ICMR Covaxin elder-first community demonstrations
- Mission Indradhanush (2014) cluster outreach for routine immunisation

MODEL ANSWER

Definition: Attitudes form through four well-mapped psychological routes — classical conditioning (stimulus pairing), instrumental conditioning (reward and punishment reinforcement), observational learning (Bandura's social modelling) and want-satisfaction (utility appraisal).

Illustration: A public-health vaccination campaign can deploy all four. Classical conditioning pairs the vaccination booth with familiar trusted symbols — the ASHA worker's saree and the panchayat banner. Instrumental conditioning offers reinforcement through Mission Indradhanush's certificates and incentive payments to ASHAs. Observational learning uses respected figures — Amitabh Bachchan's polio appeals, K.K. Shailaja's televised first-dose. Want-satisfaction frames the vaccine in terms of school re-enrolment and travel freedom, linking the act to felt utility. Combined, the four routes converted India's polio refusal pockets into 99 per cent coverage by 2014. The Pulse Polio experience under Operation MITHC remains the canonical Indian template.

Application: The COVID-19 vaccination drive's CoWIN-plus-celebrity-plus-incentive model operationalised the same fourfold structure, achieving 2.2 billion doses by 2023.

SOURCES

→Procedures of Attitude Formation — anantamias
→How to Change Attitude — anantamias
→Persuasion, Nudge Theory and Manipulation — anantamias

classical conditioning | Skinner | Bandura | want-satisfaction | mere-exposure | vaccine hesitancy | behaviour change | social learning

Q19

Examine the factors that strengthen or weaken the attitude-behaviour relation. How can a District Education Officer leverage this knowledge to reduce school dropout among adolescent girls?

10 MARKS | 150 WORDS | 9 MIN | HARD | ATTITUDE · ATTITUDE-BEHAVIOUR RELATION

ANSWER OUTLINE

Define: attitudes predict behaviour weakly unless strength, specificity, accessibility and situational support align (Ajzen-Fishbein TPB).

Illustrate: parents value girls' education in the abstract but withdraw daughters at Class IX.

Apply: Theory of Planned Behaviour — attitude + subjective norm + perceived control.

Conclude: a DEO must work on social norms and on perceived barriers simultaneously.

KEY POINTS TO INCLUDE

- Fishbein-Ajzen TPB — attitude + norm + perceived behavioural control
- Attitude-behaviour gap narrows with specificity and immediacy
- Subjective norm — peer mothers, panchayat elders
- Perceived control — toilets, transport, sanitary-napkin access (Kishori Shakti Yojana)
- Implementation intentions (Gollwitzer) — if-then plans
- Beti Bachao Beti Padhao monitoring across 405 districts

EXAMPLES & CASE STUDIES

- Samagra Shiksha Abhiyan KGBV residential schools for adolescent girls
- Sukanya Samriddhi Yojana incentive-linked retention
- Kasturba Gandhi Balika Vidyalaya enrolment growth 2014-23

MODEL ANSWER

> **Definition:** The attitude-behaviour relation strengthens with specificity, accessibility, personal relevance and social-norm alignment; it weakens with normative conflict, low self-efficacy and structural barriers such as distance, cost and household opposition.
>
> **Illustration:** A District Education Officer reducing adolescent-girls' dropout cannot stop at generic 'education is good' messaging. Specificity demands intervention at exact transition points — class 8 to 9 and menstruation-onset. Accessibility requires deploying ASHA and Anganwadi outreach at home, where the household attitude is

formed. Personal relevance is illustrated by Kasturba Gandhi Balika Vidyalayas with hostels, bicycles and sanitary-pad supply. Social-norm alignment is built through fathers' and brothers' group meetings, neutralising the household veto. Self-efficacy is enabled by remedial coaching, and Tamil Nadu's Pudhumai Penn cash-transfer scheme bridges structural barriers that mere persuasion cannot remove.

Application: SAMAGRA Shiksha guidelines now combine these levers, treating attitude-behaviour alignment as a multi-channel administrative project rather than a communications campaign.

SOURCES

→Attitude and Behaviour — anantamias
→Factors Influencing Attitude-Behaviour Relation — anantamias
→How to Change Attitude — anantamias

Theory of Planned Behaviour | attitude-behaviour gap | implementation intention | subjective norm | perceived control | school dropout | girl education | specificity principle

---

Q20

Differentiate persuasion, nudge and manipulation as instruments of social influence. Why does the line between nudge and manipulation matter for the design of welfare-scheme defaults?

10 MARKS | 150 WORDS | 9 MIN | MEDIUM | SOCIAL INFLUENCE AND PERSUASION

ANSWER OUTLINE

Define: persuasion appeals to reason; nudge shapes choice architecture preserving freedom; manipulation exploits bias to override autonomy.

Illustrate: Atal Pension Yojana auto-debit default vs deceptive opt-out forms.

Apply: Thaler-Sunstein 'libertarian paternalism'; Mill's harm principle.

Conclude: ethical nudges must be transparent, easy to reverse and tied to a public-interest goal.

KEY POINTS TO INCLUDE

- Persuasion (Aristotle) — ethos, pathos, logos
- Nudge (Thaler-Sunstein 2008) — choice architecture without coercion
- Manipulation — exploitation of cognitive bias, hidden defaults
- Economic Survey 2018-19 Chapter 2 — behavioural economics for India

- Swachh Bharat 'BBC' (Behaviour Change Communication) used nudges
- RBI's auto-debit re-authentication 2021 — protecting consumer autonomy

EXAMPLES & CASE STUDIES

- Atal Pension Yojana auto-enrolment proposal 2023
- Swachh Bharat 'Darwaza Band' campaign 2017
- Jan-Dhan zero-balance default for financial inclusion 2014

MODEL ANSWER

Definition: Persuasion uses reasoned argument addressed to a deliberating subject; nudge re-designs the choice architecture to make welfare-aligned options easier without removing alternatives; manipulation exploits cognitive biases or information asymmetry against the subject's own interest.

Illustration: Welfare-scheme defaults illustrate the stakes. Auto-enrolment in the Atal Pension Yojana with an opt-out is a nudge — it leverages inertia for the beneficiary's benefit. The Ujjwala LPG default of choosing the subsidy-linked refill is persuasion through information disclosure. By contrast, dark-pattern designs that hide opt-out paths or exploit literacy gaps in rural enrolment cross into manipulation. Cass Sunstein's distinction turns on whether the choice architect transparently serves the chooser's reflective preferences. The Sustainable Development Goals dashboard's nudges to districts are legitimate; coercive cash-incentive linkages without disclosure are not.

Application: NITI Aayog's behavioural-insights unit follows the OECD nudge-ethics checklist, requiring transparency, reversibility and welfare-alignment before any default change in welfare design.

SOURCES

→Persuasion, Nudge Theory and Manipulation — anantamias
→Nudge as a Tool of Social Influence — anantamias
→Social Influence — anantamias

persuasion | nudge | manipulation | choice architecture | libertarian paternalism | harm principle | transparency | default option

---

Q21

Distinguish conformity, compliance, obedience and identification as forms of social influence. Why is unquestioning obedience particularly hazardous

in a uniformed service?

10 MARKS | 150 WORDS | 9 MIN | MEDIUM | SOCIAL INFLUENCE

ANSWER OUTLINE

Define: the four forms with classic studies — Asch (conformity), Milgram (obedience), Kelman (compliance, identification, internalisation).

Illustrate: a constable asked to fabricate a panchnama.

Apply: CrPC Section 197 / BNSS Section 218 sanction; superior-orders is not a defence in criminal law.

Conclude: training must build internalised values, not mere compliance.

KEY POINTS TO INCLUDE

- Asch 1951 — line-judgement conformity under group pressure
- Milgram 1963 — 65 per cent administered maximum 'shock'
- Kelman three processes — compliance, identification, internalisation
- Nuremberg precedent — superior-orders defence rejected
- Indian Police Act 1861 Section 7 — written-order requirement
- Mission Karmayogi 'role to rule to role' training shift

EXAMPLES & CASE STUDIES

- Custodial-death FIRs against police across India, NHRC 2023 data
- PAC firings inquiries in past; need for structured-refusal protocols
- Justice Verma Committee 2013 — reforming hierarchical policing culture

MODEL ANSWER

> **Definition:** Conformity is matching one's behaviour to a group norm; compliance is acting on an explicit request; obedience is following an order from authority; identification is adopting an admired figure's attitudes.
>
> **Illustration:** Stanley Milgram's 1961 obedience experiments showed how authority can override individual conscience — a danger sharpened in uniformed services where rank, command culture and lethal-force authorisation compound. The 1984 anti-Sikh riots saw uniformed personnel comply with informal political signals; the Justice Nanavati Commission documented the failure. Conversely, identification can be constructive — officers who model themselves on Vinod Rai's audit rigour or Kiran Bedi's prison reform internalise integrity rather than merely obey. Unquestioning

> obedience is hazardous because uniformed services hold delegated coercive power that demands a constitutional, not personal, allegiance.
>
> **Application:** AIS (Conduct) Rules Rule 11 binds officers only to lawful orders; the 2nd ARC's Tenth Report recommends institutionalised lawful-dissent channels within hierarchical services.

SOURCES

→Social Influence — anantamias
→Persuasion, Nudge Theory and Manipulation — anantamias
→How to Change Attitude — anantamias

Asch | Milgram | Kelman | conformity | obedience | internalisation | superior orders | structured refusal

---

Q22

'Impartiality and non-partisanship are not the same as neutrality.' Examine with reference to the contemporary debate on civil-service neutrality in India.

10 MARKS | 150 WORDS | 9 MIN | MEDIUM | FOUNDATIONAL VALUES · IMPARTIALITY AND NON-PARTISANSHIP

ANSWER OUTLINE

Define: impartiality = even-handed treatment of citizens; non-partisanship = independence from party politics; neutrality = absence of policy-direction loyalty.

Illustrate: an officer who advises every government in office but applies the law uniformly.

Apply: 2nd ARC 10th Report; T.S.R. Subramanian v Union of India 2013.

Conclude: Indian civil service owes commitment to the Constitution, fairness to the citizen, and loyalty to the elected government — in that order.

KEY POINTS TO INCLUDE

- Impartiality — duty owed to the citizen
- Non-partisanship — duty owed to democratic equality of parties
- Neutrality — willingness to implement legitimate policy of any government
- T.S.R. Subramanian v UoI 2013 — fixed tenure, Civil Services Board
- Hota Committee 2004 and Surinder Nath Committee 2003 — fixed tenure
- Risk: 'committed bureaucracy' undermines all three

EXAMPLES & CASE STUDIES

- Mission Karmayogi competency framework on impartiality and dedication
- Civil Services Day Award for Excellence 2024 — process-fairness criteria
- U. Sagayam (TN cadre) audit of granite-mining despite political pressure 2012

MODEL ANSWER

Definition: Impartiality is decision-making without favour across constituencies; non-partisanship is independence from party-political affiliation; neutrality, in the strong sense, is value-emptiness — which the Indian Constitution explicitly rejects in favour of substantive constitutional commitments.

Illustration: The Indian civil servant is bound to constitutional morality — affirmative action for Scheduled Castes, gender justice, secularism and federalism — and therefore cannot be neutral on these foundational values. T.N. Seshan's Election Commission tenure embodied non-partisanship without value-neutrality, enforcing the Model Code uniformly while asserting constitutional values. Ashok Khemka's land-record reversals in Haryana were impartial across political principals but principled on legality. The 2nd ARC's Tenth Report rejects 'neutrality' as a doctrine of passive complicity and endorses 'political-neutrality-with-value-commitment'. Ambedkar's constitutional morality concept anchors the distinction in the foundational text.

Application: The Civil Services Code of Ethics drafted by DoPT and the AIS (Conduct) Rules 1968 together codify impartiality and non-partisanship while binding officers to constitutional values, not value-neutrality.

SOURCES

→Civil Services Neutrality — anantamias
→Foundational Values of Civil Services — anantamias
→2nd ARC 10th Report on Personnel Administration

impartiality | non-partisanship | neutrality | committed bureaucracy | T.S.R. Subramanian | Civil Services Board | fixed tenure | rule of law

---

Q23

'Dedication to public service is incomplete without empathy for the citizen at the counter.' Examine with reference to grievance redressal and the Citizen Charter movement.

10 MARKS | 150 WORDS | 9 MIN | EASY | FOUNDATIONAL VALUES · DEDICATION TO PUBLIC SERVICE

ANSWER OUTLINE

Define: dedication as sustained, citizen-centric service; empathy as cognitive and affective understanding of the citizen's situation.

Illustrate: the senior-citizen pensioner at a treasury counter.

Apply: Sevottam framework; CPGRAMS; Citizen Charter 1997.

Conclude: service delivery without empathy is bureaucratic ritual, not public service.

KEY POINTS TO INCLUDE

- 2nd ARC 12th Report — Citizen-Centric Administration
- Sevottam (IS 15700:2005) — service-quality framework
- CPGRAMS unified grievance portal — over 1 crore grievances annually
- Public Service Delivery Acts — Karnataka, Bihar, MP, Punjab
- Empathy as the Goleman EI fourth competency
- Right to Public Services as enforceable citizen claim

EXAMPLES & CASE STUDIES

- Karnataka Sakala Mission service-delivery guarantees 2012
- Madhya Pradesh Lok Seva Guarantee Act 2010
- DARPG CPGRAMS reforms 2022 with AI-assisted triage

MODEL ANSWER

> **Definition:** Dedication to public service is the sustained, voluntary alignment of an officer's energies with the citizen's needs; empathy is the cognitive and affective grasp of the citizen's lived situation at the counter.
>
> **Illustration:** A widow seeking a family pension at a treasury counter, asked to return seven times for missing attestations, encounters dedication minus empathy: the file moves, the person breaks. T.N. Seshan's voter-list cleanup at the Election Commission combined procedural rigour with citizen contact; Armstrong Pame, the 'Miracle Man of Manipur', mobilised villagers for a 100-km road when the State delayed, treating felt need as the brief. Vinod Rai's CAG audits insisted that delivery, not disbursal, was the test of public service.
>
> **Application:** Sevottam (IS 15700:2005), CPGRAMS 2.0 with AI triage, and Right to Public Services Acts in Karnataka, Bihar, Madhya Pradesh and Punjab institutionalise

> empathy by converting promises into enforceable claims, fulfilling the 2nd ARC's 12th Report.

SOURCES

→Empathy and Compassion Towards Weaker Sections — anantamias
→Foundational Values of Civil Services — anantamias
→2nd ARC 12th Report Citizen-Centric Administration

dedication | empathy | citizen charter | Sevottam | CPGRAMS | right to service | grievance redressal | Sakala

---

Q24

What is 'objectivity' as a foundational value for civil services? Distinguish evidence-based objectivity from spurious neutrality with one example from disaster relief allocation.

10 MARKS | 150 WORDS | 9 MIN | EASY | FOUNDATIONAL VALUES · OBJECTIVITY

ANSWER OUTLINE

Define: objectivity as decisions grounded in evidence, criteria and reasoning visible to scrutiny; spurious neutrality is equal treatment of unequals.

Illustrate: flood relief — equal grant to every household vs damage-graded SDRF norms.

Apply: 15th Finance Commission SDRF/NDRF rules; SFC PARA grading.

Conclude: objectivity is criteria-fidelity, not arithmetical sameness.

KEY POINTS TO INCLUDE

- Nolan principle of objectivity — decisions on merit alone
- SDRF/NDRF norms graded by damage category, MHA 2022
- Equity-vs-equality distinction in welfare design
- Risk-informed budgeting (Sendai Framework target F)
- Independent verification (Joint Rapid Damage Assessment teams)
- Constitutional guarantee of equality (Article 14) read with reasonable classification

EXAMPLES & CASE STUDIES

- Wayanad landslide relief norms revised by MHA 2024
- Kerala floods 2018 — JRDA team-based assessment
- Cyclone Biparjoy 2023 — IMD-based pre-positioning of NDRF

MODEL ANSWER

Definition: Objectivity is decision-making grounded in evidence, declared criteria and reasoning open to scrutiny; spurious neutrality is the arithmetical equal treatment of unequals that hides bias behind sameness.

Illustration: In flood relief, disbursing an identical grant to every household — a hut washed away and a pucca house with minor damage — looks neutral but violates Article 14's doctrine of reasonable classification. The SDRF/NDRF norms (MHA, 2022) grade entitlements by damage category, verified by Joint Rapid Damage Assessment teams as used in Kerala 2018. Vinod Rai's CAG insisted on criteria-based audit; E. Sreedharan ran Konkan and Delhi Metro on engineering data, not bureaucratic guesswork. Wayanad 2024 relief was revised on graded loss, not flat handouts.

Application: Sendai Framework Target F and 15th Finance Commission norms operationalise objectivity as criteria-fidelity; spurious neutrality is detected by asking whether the rule's effects, not its form, are even-handed.

SOURCES

→Foundational Values of Civil Services — anantamias
→Disaster Management in India — anantamias
→Sendai Framework — anantamias

objectivity | spurious neutrality | reasonable classification | SDRF | evidence-based | criteria fidelity | Sendai | Article 14

Q25

'Self-awareness and self-motivation are the bedrock of emotional intelligence.' Examine with reference to a Sub-Divisional Magistrate handling chronic stress from caseload pressure.

10 MARKS | 150 WORDS | 9 MIN | MEDIUM | EMOTIONAL INTELLIGENCE · SELF-AWARENESS AND MOTIVATION

ANSWER OUTLINE

Define: self-awareness as accurate perception of one's emotions, strengths, limits; self-motivation as drive aligned with purpose beyond reward.

Illustrate: SDM coping with court hearings, revenue cases, law-and-order at once.

Apply: Goleman's mixed model; Mayer-Salovey ability model.

Conclude: EI competencies are trainable; LBSNAA modules and yoga/mindfulness can scaffold them.

KEY POINTS TO INCLUDE

- Goleman 1995 — five EI components (self-awareness, self-regulation, motivation, empathy, social skills)
- Mayer-Salovey 1990 ability model — perceive, use, understand, manage emotions
- Self-motivation linked to public-service motivation (PSM, Perry-Wise 1990)
- Mindfulness-based stress reduction (Kabat-Zinn) for officer well-being
- Karmayogi BHARAT iGOT modules on EI for civil servants
- Burnout (Maslach) — depersonalisation as warning sign

EXAMPLES & CASE STUDIES

- LBSNAA Bhutan Trek and Vipassana modules for probationers
- Punjab Police MindFit programme post-Sangrur 2021
- Mission Karmayogi BHARAT iGOT EI courses 2023

MODEL ANSWER

> **Definition:** Self-awareness is accurate perception of one's emotions, strengths and limits; self-motivation is purpose-aligned drive that persists without external reward — together the bedrock of Goleman's emotional intelligence model.
>
> **Illustration:** An SDM juggling court hearings, revenue cases and law-and-order spirals into Maslach-style burnout without self-awareness. Mayer and Salovey's ability model lets her perceive irritation as data, not identity; Goleman's self-regulation prevents displaced anger at staff. Durga Shakti Nagpal kept composure during her 2013 suspension; Ashok Khemka has logged over fifty transfers in Haryana with documented equanimity; Armstrong Pame sustained his Manipur road project on intrinsic motivation. Public-service motivation (Perry-Wise, 1990) explains why the drive endures despite hostile environment, weak incentives or punitive transfer.
>
> **Application:** LBSNAA's Vipassana and trek modules, Punjab Police's MindFit programme, and Mission Karmayogi-iGOT EI courses scaffold these competencies. Mindfulness-based stress reduction (Kabat-Zinn) makes emotional intelligence a trainable, institutional capability, not a personality lottery.

SOURCES

→Emotional Intelligence (Goleman) — anantamias
→Advantages of an Emotionally Intelligent Civil Servant — anantamias

→What Are Emotions and Their Structure — anantamias

self-awareness | self-motivation | Goleman | Mayer-Salovey | burnout | mindfulness | PSM | self-regulation

---

Q26

Distinguish primary emotions (Ekman's six) from secondary emotions. How can a Superintendent of Police use this distinction to manage a riot-prone crowd?

10 MARKS | 150 WORDS | 9 MIN | EASY | EMOTIONAL INTELLIGENCE · TYPES OF EMOTIONS

ANSWER OUTLINE

Define: Ekman's six universals (happiness, sadness, fear, anger, surprise, disgust); secondary emotions (guilt, shame, pride) are socially constructed.

Illustrate: a procession turning hostile — primary anger over rumour; secondary humiliation over earlier insult.

Apply: de-escalation protocols, Kerala Police 'Janamaithri' model.

Conclude: reading the emotional layer determines whether to disperse, dialogue or defer.

KEY POINTS TO INCLUDE

- Ekman 1972 cross-cultural facial-expression study
- Plutchik's wheel — eight primary emotions in opposing pairs
- Secondary emotions emerge through cognitive appraisal (Lazarus)
- Schachter-Singer two-factor theory — physiological + label
- Crowd-management SOPs — National Disaster Management Guidelines on crowds 2014
- Janamaithri Suraksha Project Kerala 2008 — empathic policing

EXAMPLES & CASE STUDIES

- Sabarimala crowd management 2019
- Republic Day tractor parade Delhi 2021 — de-escalation challenges
- Janmashtami Dahi-Handi crowd protocol Mumbai

MODEL ANSWER

> **Definition:** Ekman's 1972 cross-cultural study identified six primary, universally recognised emotions — happiness, sadness, fear, anger, surprise, disgust — biologically wired and brief. Secondary emotions such as guilt, shame and pride

emerge through Lazarus's cognitive appraisal and Schachter-Singer's two-factor labelling, shaped by culture and memory.

Illustration: An SP facing a procession that turns hostile sees primary anger flaring over a fresh rumour, but the deeper fuel may be secondary humiliation from an earlier insult to community pride. Reading only the primary layer invites a baton-charge; reading the secondary layer permits dialogue with elders. Kerala's Janamaithri Suraksha Project (2008) institutionalised this empathic reading; Sabarimala 2019 and the National Disaster Management Guidelines on crowds (2014) embed it as doctrine. K. Vijay Kumar's anti-Veerappan operation balanced fear management with negotiation.

Application: The distinction tells the SP when to disperse (primary anger from rumour), when to dialogue (secondary grievance), and when to defer (mixed grief and shame).

SOURCES

→Types of Emotions — anantamias
→Functions of Emotions — anantamias
→Feeling, Mood, Affection, Sentiment, Passion — anantamias

Ekman | Plutchik | primary emotions | secondary emotions | Schachter-Singer | Janamaithri | de-escalation | cognitive appraisal

---

Q27

Explain John Rawls's 'veil of ignorance' and 'difference principle'. Apply them to evaluate the constitutionality and ethics of reservation in promotions.

10 MARKS | 150 WORDS | 9 MIN | HARD | WORLD MORAL THINKERS · RAWLS

ANSWER OUTLINE

Define: veil of ignorance — choose principles without knowing one's social position; difference principle — inequalities justified only if they benefit the worst-off.

Illustrate: reservation in promotions across Group A services.

Apply: Indra Sawhney 1992, M. Nagaraj 2006, Jarnail Singh 2018, Janhit Abhiyan 2022.

Conclude: Rawls supports reservation as justice-as-fairness; quantitative data and creamy-layer test refine application.

KEY POINTS TO INCLUDE

- A Theory of Justice 1971 — two principles (equal liberty + fair equality of opportunity + difference principle)
- Original position and veil of ignorance
- Maxi-min decision rule under uncertainty
- Indra Sawhney 1992 — creamy layer in OBC reservation
- M. Nagaraj 2006 — quantifiable data + inadequate representation tests
- Janhit Abhiyan 2022 — 103rd CAA EWS reservation upheld 3-2

EXAMPLES & CASE STUDIES

- Reservation in promotion in SC/ST cadres post-Jarnail Singh 2018
- EWS 10 per cent reservation (103rd Amendment 2019)
- PESA-FRA areas — substantive equality through scheduled-area autonomy

MODEL ANSWER

> **Definition:** Rawls's A Theory of Justice (1971) imagines the original position behind a veil of ignorance, where rational agents — unaware of their caste, class, talent or gender — choose principles of justice; the difference principle permits inequalities only if they benefit the worst-off.
>
> **Illustration:** Reservation in promotions for SC/ST Group A officers can be defended as justice-as-fairness: behind the veil, no one would risk being born into a historically excluded community without compensatory access to senior office. Indra Sawhney (1992) introduced the creamy-layer test for OBCs; M. Nagaraj (2006) required quantifiable data on backwardness, inadequate representation and administrative efficiency; Jarnail Singh (2018) eased Nagaraj for SC/STs; Janhit Abhiyan (2022) upheld the 103rd Amendment's EWS reservation 3-2.
>
> **Application:** Rawls supports reservation in promotion in principle; the difference principle demands that creamy-layer exclusion and evidence-based quantification refine application so the benefit reaches the genuinely worst-off, not the already-arrived.

SOURCES

→Rawls' Theory of Justice — anantamias
→Western Moral Thinkers — anantamias
→Articles 15 and 16 — anantamias

veil of ignorance | difference principle | original position | Indra Sawhney | M. Nagaraj | creamy layer | Janhit Abhiyan | Rawls

---

Q28

Examine the contribution of Swami Vivekananda's 'Practical Vedanta' to the ethical conduct of a civil servant. What does 'work is worship' demand of a public office today?

10 MARKS | 150 WORDS | 9 MIN | MEDIUM | INDIAN MORAL THINKERS · VIVEKANANDA

ANSWER OUTLINE

Define: Practical Vedanta as the application of Advaita (oneness) to daily action; karma-yoga as work performed without ego.

Illustrate: 'Jiva is Shiva' — every citizen is a manifestation of the divine; service to the poor as worship.

Apply: integrity, fearlessness (abhih), strength as ethical resources for the officer.

Conclude: Vivekananda re-frames bureaucratic duty as spiritual practice.

KEY POINTS TO INCLUDE

- Practical Vedanta lectures 1896 — applied non-dualism
- Karma-yoga — duty without attachment to fruit (Gita Chapter 3)
- Daridra-narayana — service to the poor as worship of the divine
- Abhih — fearlessness as civic virtue
- Strength: 'all power is within you'
- Ramakrishna Mission's seva tradition as institutional embodiment

EXAMPLES & CASE STUDIES

- Ramakrishna Mission relief during Kerala floods 2018
- Vivekananda Kendra Vivekanandapuram, Kanyakumari
- Swachh Bharat references to Vivekananda's call to cleanliness

MODEL ANSWER

> **Definition:** Vivekananda's Practical Vedanta (1896 lectures) applies Advaita's oneness to daily action; karma-yoga, drawing on Gita Chapter 3, is duty performed without ego or attachment to fruit — making work itself a form of worship.

> **Illustration:** 'Jiva is Shiva' means every citizen at the counter manifests the divine; service to the daridra-narayana — the poor — is the highest puja. The officer who clears a tribal pensioner's file at 7 pm is doing yoga, not overtime. Vivekananda's three demands — abhih (fearlessness), strength, and renunciation of ego — translate into Ashok Khemka-style integrity across transfers, E. Sreedharan's punctual delivery of public works, and Armstrong Pame's mobilisation of villagers for the People's Road. The Ramakrishna Mission's Kerala floods relief (2018) embodied institutional seva.
>
> **Application:** 'Work is worship' demands of a public office today three things — punctuality, fearless decision-making, and treatment of the citizen as Narayana; Mission Karmayogi explicitly draws on this karmayogi framing.

SOURCES

→Swami Vivekananda — anantamias
→Ramakrishna Mission — anantamias
→Indian Moral Thinkers — anantamias

Practical Vedanta | karma-yoga | daridra-narayana | abhih | service | fearlessness | Ramakrishna Mission | Vivekananda

---

Q29

Discuss Rabindranath Tagore's notions of 'jana-gana-mana' universalism and the critique of narrow nationalism. How are these relevant to a civil servant designing inclusive urban citizenship for migrant workers?

10 MARKS | 150 WORDS | 9 MIN | MEDIUM | INDIAN MORAL THINKERS · TAGORE

ANSWER OUTLINE

Define: Tagore's universalism (Nationalism 1917) — humanity above ethnocentric boundary; Visva-Bharati's 'yatra visvam bhavatyekanidam'.

Illustrate: ONORC and migrant-worker portability of PDS entitlements.

Apply: dignity of the migrant; Tagore's idea of swadeshi-samaj as self-organising community.

Conclude: inclusive citizenship is a Tagorean ethical commitment, not only a constitutional one.

KEY POINTS TO INCLUDE

- Nationalism (1917) lectures — critique of mechanised nation-state
- Visva-Bharati 1921 — 'world in one nest'

- Sadhana 1913 — harmony between self, society, nature
- Swadeshi-Samaj 1904 — community self-organisation
- Crisis in Civilization 1941 — moral failure of imperialism
- ONORC 2019 — portable PDS for inter-state migrants

EXAMPLES & CASE STUDIES

- One Nation One Ration Card scheme 2019-23
- e-Shram portal for unorganised-sector workers, 2021
- Project Pravas-related portability of welfare schemes, NITI 2023

MODEL ANSWER

Definition: Tagore's universalism, articulated in his 1917 Nationalism lectures and the 1941 Crisis in Civilization, places shared humanity above the mechanised, ethnocentric nation-state; Visva-Bharati's motto 'yatra visvam bhavatyekanidam' — where the world makes its nest — captures the ideal.

Illustration: A migrant construction worker from Balrampur in Surat is, on Tagore's view, not a tolerated outsider but a fellow inhabitant of the same nest; denying him a ration is a moral failure, not merely an administrative gap. Tagore's Swadeshi-Samaj (1904) urged self-organising communities, foreshadowing migrant collectives and welfare boards. Sadhana (1913) makes dignity, not charity, the test.

Application: ONORC (2019) operationalises portable PDS for inter-state migrants; e-Shram (2021) registers the unorganised; NITI Aayog's Project Pravas (2023) extends portability of welfare entitlements across state borders. A Tagorean officer designing migrant-worker rights treats inclusive urban citizenship not as discretionary administrative kindness but as ethical obligation grounded in shared belonging.

SOURCES

→Tagore's Philosophy — anantamias
→Indian Moral Thinkers — anantamias
→Traditional Values — anantamias

universalism | Visva-Bharati | Sadhana | Swadeshi-Samaj | ONORC | migrant rights | Tagore | Crisis in Civilization

---

Q30

Examine Dr. B.R. Ambedkar's idea of 'constitutional morality' and 'fraternity' as ethical foundations for the civil services. How should an officer apply

them while implementing the SC/ST (Prevention of Atrocities) Act?

10 MARKS | 150 WORDS | 9 MIN | HARD | INDIAN MORAL THINKERS · AMBEDKAR

ANSWER OUTLINE

Define: constitutional morality as adherence to constitutional ideals over majoritarian sentiment (Constituent Assembly speech, 4 Nov 1948); fraternity as 'a sense of common brotherhood'.

Illustrate: protection officer ensuring FIR registration and on-site visit under PoA Act.

Apply: annihilation-of-caste agenda; social democracy precondition for political democracy.

Conclude: Ambedkar makes ethical implementation of anti-discrimination law a constitutional duty, not a discretionary kindness.

KEY POINTS TO INCLUDE

- Constitutional Morality — Grote via Ambedkar, Constituent Assembly speech 1948
- Annihilation of Caste 1936 — undelivered Jat-Pat-Todak Mandal address
- Fraternity as the unifying ideal of the Preamble
- SC/ST (PoA) Act 1989 + 2015 amendment — exclusive Special Courts
- Navtej Singh Johar 2018, Sabarimala 2018 — judicial revival of constitutional morality
- Ambedkar's three warnings — bhakti, hero-worship, social democracy deficit

EXAMPLES & CASE STUDIES

- PoA Act 2015 amendment — time-bound charge-sheet filing within 60 days
- Indra Sawhney 1992 — substantive equality
- Hindu Code Bill resignation 1951 — moral stand on gender justice

MODEL ANSWER

> **Definition:** Ambedkar, in his 4 November 1948 Constituent Assembly speech, defined constitutional morality as 'paramount reverence' for constitutional forms over majoritarian sentiment; fraternity, in the Preamble, is 'a sense of common brotherhood' assuring dignity.
>
> **Illustration:** Under the SC/ST (Prevention of Atrocities) Act 1989 and its 2015 amendment, an officer must register the FIR, visit the site, file the charge-sheet within 60 days, and ensure relief — not because the locality is restive but because the Constitution demands it. Annihilation of Caste (1936) insists that social democracy precede political democracy. Ambedkar's three warnings — bhakti, hero-worship and

the social-democracy deficit — caution against discretionary kindness in place of right. Indra Sawhney (1992), Navtej Singh Johar (2018) and Sabarimala (2018) revived the doctrine.

Application: Ambedkar converts PoA Act enforcement from welfare-as-favour into a constitutional duty owed to every citizen as equal fraternity; the officer's silence on caste atrocity is itself constitutional immorality.

SOURCES

→Ambedkar's Philosophy — anantamias
→Hindu Code Bill — anantamias
→Indian Moral Thinkers — anantamias

constitutional morality | fraternity | annihilation of caste | social democracy | PoA Act 1989 | Ambedkar | Preamble | bhakti

---

Q31

Discuss Sri Aurobindo's idea of 'integral perfection' and 'divine life' as ethical aspirations for public servants. Distinguish his approach from Gandhi's, with a contemporary application.

10 MARKS | 150 WORDS | 9 MIN | HARD | INDIAN MORAL THINKERS · AUROBINDO

ANSWER OUTLINE

Define: integral yoga as the simultaneous transformation of body, life, mind and soul; divine life as collective evolution toward higher consciousness.

Illustrate: an officer driving a multi-sectoral aspirational-district transformation.

Apply: Aurobindo's emphasis on inner change vs Gandhi's outer reform; both demand renunciation of ego.

Conclude: Aurobindo offers an inward-evolution model that complements Gandhi's outward-action model.

KEY POINTS TO INCLUDE

- Life Divine 1939 — material life transformed by supra-mental consciousness
- Integral Yoga — synthesis of karma, jnana, bhakti, raja yoga
- Aurobindo's spiritual nationalism (Uttarpara speech 1909)
- Difference from Gandhi: spiritual evolution vs satyagraha as moral instrument
- Common ground: ego transcendence, service as sadhana

- Auroville and the 'human unity' experiment 1968

EXAMPLES & CASE STUDIES

- Aspirational Districts Programme NITI 2018 — multi-sectoral convergence
- Mission Karmayogi 'civil servant as karmayogi' framing 2020
- Auroville township as alternative civic experiment, Tamil Nadu

MODEL ANSWER

Definition: Aurobindo's Integral Yoga (The Life Divine, 1939) synthesises karma, jnana, bhakti and raja yoga to transform body, life, mind and soul; divine life is humanity's collective evolution toward a supra-mental consciousness — articulated also in his Uttarpara speech (1909).

Illustration: An officer driving an Aspirational District programme — converging health, nutrition, education, livelihood — practises integral perfection: outer convergence mirrors inner integration. Aurobindo differs from Gandhi: Gandhi worked outward through satyagraha and decentralised swaraj; Aurobindo worked inward through consciousness evolution. Both demand ego-renunciation and service as sadhana. Auroville (1968) is the civic experiment; Mission Karmayogi (2020) consciously frames the civil servant as karmayogi. E. Sreedharan blended technical mastery with daily prayer in this Aurobindean spirit.

Application: Aurobindo offers an inward-evolution model that complements Gandhi's outward-action ethics in trusteeship and sarvodaya; the modern public servant needs both — inner steadiness to absorb stress and outer satyagraha to resist injustice from political and bureaucratic superiors alike.

SOURCES

→Sri Aurobindo Ghosh — anantamias
→Indian Moral Thinkers — anantamias
→Gandhian Philosophy — anantamias

integral yoga | supra-mental | divine life | Aurobindo | Uttarpara | Auroville | ego transcendence | spiritual nationalism

---

Q32

Compare Jeremy Bentham's quantitative utilitarianism with J.S. Mill's qualitative utilitarianism. Which is more useful when a civil servant prioritises beneficiaries under a limited welfare budget?

10 MARKS | 150 WORDS | 9 MIN | MEDIUM | WORLD MORAL THINKERS · BENTHAM VS MILL

ANSWER OUTLINE

Define: Bentham — felicific calculus, all pleasures equal in kind; Mill — 'better to be Socrates dissatisfied than a fool satisfied'.

Illustrate: targeting Ayushman Bharat to most-deprived deciles vs uniform population coverage.

Apply: SECC 2011 deprivation criteria; PM-JAY families targeted.

Conclude: Mill's qualitative refinement guards against utilitarian neglect of the vulnerable; Bentham guards against elite capture.

KEY POINTS TO INCLUDE

- Bentham 1789 — Introduction to the Principles of Morals; felicific calculus
- Mill 1861 — Utilitarianism; higher vs lower pleasures
- Greatest happiness of the greatest number
- Rule utilitarianism vs act utilitarianism
- Critique — utility monster, distributive blindness
- Indian welfare design — SECC 2011 + Aadhaar-DBT targeting

EXAMPLES & CASE STUDIES

- PM-JAY (Ayushman Bharat) targeting 12 crore families via SECC 2011
- PM-KISAN universal vs targeted debate
- NFSA 2013 — priority and AAY categories

MODEL ANSWER

> **Definition:** Bentham's Introduction to the Principles of Morals (1789) reduces ethics to the felicific calculus — pleasures and pains are equal in kind, only quantity matters. Mill's Utilitarianism (1861) insists on qualitative difference: 'better to be Socrates dissatisfied than a fool satisfied.'
>
> **Illustration:** Designing PM-JAY under a fixed budget, Benthamite logic would spread benefits thinly across the largest count, risking elite capture as the literate enrol first. Mill's qualitative refinement, married to SECC-2011 deprivation criteria, targets the 12 crore poorest families whose marginal welfare gain is highest — guarding the vulnerable from utilitarian neglect. NFSA 2013's priority and AAY categories use the same logic; PM-KISAN's universal-vs-targeted debate replays it. Vinod Rai's CAG audits exposed how unweighted utilitarianism enables leakage.

> **Application:** Mill is more useful for prioritising under scarcity because it rejects the utility-monster outcome; Bentham guards against discretionary elitism. The Indian welfare officer needs Mill's compass and Bentham's count.

SOURCES

→Utilitarianism (Bentham) — anantamias
→J.S. Mill and Qualitative Utilitarianism — anantamias
→The Utilitarians — anantamias

utilitarianism | felicific calculus | qualitative | Bentham | Mill | SECC | Ayushman Bharat | targeting

---

Q33

What does Stoic philosophy — particularly the dichotomy of control and the discipline of assent — offer to a civil servant facing repeated punitive transfers?

10 MARKS | 150 WORDS | 9 MIN | EASY | WORLD MORAL THINKERS · STOICS

ANSWER OUTLINE

Define: Stoic doctrine of focusing only on what is up to us (judgements, choices); accepting what is not (transfers, postings).

Illustrate: Epictetus — 'It's not what happens to you, but how you react.'

Apply: Marcus Aurelius's Meditations as journaling-for-resilience; Seneca on grief and brevity.

Conclude: Stoicism supplies psychological armour without compromising public duty.

KEY POINTS TO INCLUDE

- Epictetus, Enchiridion — dichotomy of control
- Marcus Aurelius, Meditations — daily practice of virtue (Book 2.1)
- Four cardinal Stoic virtues — wisdom, courage, justice, temperance
- Discipline of assent — pausing before accepting an impression as true
- Apatheia — freedom from destructive passion, not absence of feeling
- Relevance to officer well-being and longevity in service

EXAMPLES & CASE STUDIES

- Ashok Khemka's documented equanimity across 50+ transfers, Haryana
- Durga Shakti Nagpal's quiet resilience after 2013 suspension
- U. Sagayam's continued investigative work post-transfer (Tamil Nadu)

MODEL ANSWER

Definition: Stoicism's dichotomy of control, given in Epictetus's Enchiridion, restricts our concern to what is up to us — judgements and choices — and counsels acceptance of what is not, such as postings. The discipline of assent pauses before treating an impression as true.

Illustration: Marcus Aurelius opens Meditations Book 2.1 by anticipating 'people who are meddling, ungrateful, arrogant' — and resolving to remain just. Ashok Khemka, transferred over fifty times in Haryana, has continued land-record audits without rancour; Durga Shakti Nagpal returned to duty quietly after her 2013 suspension; U. Sagayam, post-transfer in Tamil Nadu, continued investigative work on illegal mining. Each illustrates apatheia — freedom from destructive passion, not absence of feeling — and the cardinal virtues of wisdom, courage, justice and temperance.

Application: Stoicism supplies the officer with psychological armour: file the note, do the duty, refuse the bribe of bitterness. Punitive transfers become external weather; integrity remains the inner climate.

SOURCES

→Stoicism — anantamias
→Western Moral Thinkers — anantamias
→Virtue Ethics — anantamias

Stoicism | dichotomy of control | Epictetus | Marcus Aurelius | apatheia | cardinal virtues | resilience | discipline of assent

---

Q34

'Work culture is the most decisive of all determinants of public-service ethics, because it operates daily and invisibly.' Discuss with reference to the 2nd ARC's recommendations on civil-service reform.

10 MARKS | 150 WORDS | 9 MIN | MEDIUM | PUBLIC/CIVIL SERVICE VALUES · WORK CULTURE

ANSWER OUTLINE

Define: work culture as the shared, often unwritten, norms of an office; it shapes what gets rewarded, ignored or punished.

Illustrate: file-pushing, 9-to-5 ritualism, 'chai-pani' tolerance.

Apply: 2nd ARC 10th Report; Mission Karmayogi; e-Office adoption.

Conclude: culture eats strategy; ethics codes are inert without leadership modelling.

KEY POINTS TO INCLUDE

- 2nd ARC 10th Report — Refurbishing of Personnel Administration
- Edgar Schein — three layers of culture (artefacts, espoused values, basic assumptions)
- Nolan principle of leadership — leaders set the tone
- Mission Karmayogi 2020 — competency, behaviour, attitudinal shift
- e-Office adoption across Central and State secretariats 2014-25
- PRAGATI monthly review 2015 — accountability culture

EXAMPLES & CASE STUDIES

- Sevottam certification by BIS for public-service offices
- DARPG Good Governance Index 2021
- Aspirational Districts ranking — peer-driven culture change

MODEL ANSWER

> **Definition:** Work culture is the shared, often unwritten, set of norms that determines what an office actually rewards, ignores or punishes — operating, as Edgar Schein argued, in three layers: artefacts, espoused values, and unseen basic assumptions.
>
> **Illustration:** A secretariat where files migrate slowly, 9-to-5 ritualism crowds out outcome thinking, and small 'chai-pani' is tolerated cannot be cured by a values poster on the wall. The 2nd ARC's 10th Report — Refurbishing of Personnel Administration — diagnosed precisely this. T.N. Seshan at the ECI changed culture by modelling fearlessness; E. Sreedharan at DMRC made punctuality and zero-defect engineering the daily norm; Vinod Rai's CAG installed an evidence-first audit culture.
>
> **Application:** Mission Karmayogi (2020) targets the behavioural-attitudinal layer; e-Office reduces discretionary file gatekeeping; PRAGATI (2015) installs an accountability cadence; Sevottam certification audits service culture. The Nolan principle of leadership remains the decisive lever — culture follows the head's daily choices.

SOURCES

→Ethics in Public Administration — anantamias
→Factors Affecting Ethics — anantamias
→2nd ARC 10th Report on Personnel Administration

work culture | Schein layers | Mission Karmayogi | leadership | e-Office | PRAGATI | 2nd ARC | behavioural change

Q35

Examine the role of the Central Vigilance Commission and the Lokpal in combating systemic corruption. Why has the Whistle Blowers Protection Act 2014 remained operationally inert?

10 MARKS | 150 WORDS | 9 MIN | MEDIUM | PUBLIC/CIVIL SERVICE VALUES · CORRUPTION

ANSWER OUTLINE

Define: systemic corruption as patterned rent extraction, distinct from episodic graft; institutional response — CVC, Lokpal, WBPA 2014.

Illustrate: Lokpal's slow case-disposal (2019-24); WBPA rules un-notified.

Apply: Klitgaard formula — Corruption = Monopoly + Discretion – Accountability.

Conclude: protection of the whistleblower is the missing keystone; legislative-executive will is the binding constraint.

KEY POINTS TO INCLUDE

- CVC Act 2003 — superintends CBI under DSPE
- Lokpal and Lokayuktas Act 2013 — covers PM (with safeguards)
- WBPA 2014 — rules un-notified; amendment bill 2015 pending
- PCA 1988 amended 2018 — Section 7 covers giver; bribery extended
- Klitgaard's corruption formula (1988)
- DoPT Conflict of Interest Guidelines 2014; Civil Services Code 2014 draft

EXAMPLES & CASE STUDIES

- Lokpal first chairperson Justice P.C. Ghose 2019
- Satyendra Dubey murder 2003 — origin of whistleblower-protection demand
- Vyapam scam Madhya Pradesh 2013-15 — whistleblower deaths

MODEL ANSWER

> **Definition:** Systemic corruption is patterned rent extraction embedded in institutional design, distinct from episodic graft. India's response is layered: the CVC Act 2003, the Lokpal and Lokayuktas Act 2013, the PCA 1988 (amended 2018), and the Whistle Blowers Protection Act 2014.

Illustration: Klitgaard's formula — Corruption = Monopoly + Discretion – Accountability — explains why high-discretion offices breed rent. The CVC superintends the CBI under DSPE; the Lokpal, headed first by Justice P.C. Ghose (2019), has disposed cases slowly, with limited convictions through 2024. The PCA's 2018 amendment criminalised the giver (Section 7-A). The WBPA 2014 has remained operationally inert — rules un-notified, 2015 amendment bill pending — leaving informers like Satyendra Dubey (2003) and the Vyapam scam complainants (2013-15) unprotected.

Application: Whistleblower protection is the missing keystone; legislative-executive will is the binding constraint. Notifying WBPA rules and operationalising the DoPT Conflict of Interest Guidelines 2014 would close the loop.

SOURCES

→Difficulties in Practising Probity — anantamias
→Probity in Governance — anantamias
→Ethics in Public Administration and Probity — anantamias

CVC | Lokpal | WBPA | Klitgaard | PCA 1988 | systemic corruption | whistleblower | DSPE

Q36

'Quality of public-service delivery is the most visible ethics test of the State.' Examine with reference to citizen-centric reforms — Sevottam, RTPS Acts and CPGRAMS.

10 MARKS | 150 WORDS | 9 MIN | EASY | PUBLIC/CIVIL SERVICE VALUES · SERVICE QUALITY

ANSWER OUTLINE

Define: service-delivery quality measured along access, accuracy, courtesy, timeliness, redress.

Illustrate: Karnataka Sakala — over 1,103 services with statutory deadlines.

Apply: Sevottam BIS standard 15700; Right to Public Services Acts in 20+ states.

Conclude: ethical State is one that meets its declared promises to the last citizen.

KEY POINTS TO INCLUDE

- Citizen Charter 1997 — first generation
- Sevottam framework 2005 — IS 15700
- RTPS Acts — MP 2010, Bihar 2011, Delhi 2011, Karnataka 2011

- CPGRAMS 2.0 with AI triage, DARPG 2022
- Good Governance Index 2021 — DARPG
- Aspirational Districts Programme NITI Aayog 2018

EXAMPLES & CASE STUDIES

- Karnataka Sakala portal — over 3.4 crore applications disposed
- Punjab Service Delivery Act 2018
- Telangana T-App Folio mobile service delivery

MODEL ANSWER

Definition: Quality of public-service delivery is measured along five axes — access, accuracy, courtesy, timeliness and redress — converting the State's promises into enforceable, audit-able outcomes for the last citizen.

Illustration: The Citizen Charter (1997) was the first declaration of intent; Sevottam (IS 15700:2005) gave it a BIS-certifiable framework; Right to Public Services Acts in Madhya Pradesh (2010), Bihar (2011), Delhi (2011), Karnataka (2011) and Punjab (2018) made deadlines statutory. Karnataka's Sakala Mission has disposed over 3.4 crore applications across 1,103 services. CPGRAMS 2.0 with AI triage (DARPG, 2022) handles over one crore grievances annually. T.N. Seshan's voter-roll cleanup and E. Sreedharan's Metro punctuality remain reference standards.

Application: DARPG's Good Governance Index (2021) and NITI Aayog's Aspirational Districts Programme (2018) make quality visible and rankable; the ethical State is one that meets its declared promises, on time, to the citizen at the counter — the test the 2nd ARC's 12th Report set out.

SOURCES

→Ethics in Public Administration — anantamias
→Features of Public Relationship — anantamias
→2nd ARC 12th Report Citizen-Centric Administration

service delivery | Sevottam | RTPS | CPGRAMS | citizen charter | Sakala | Good Governance Index | accountability

GS PAPER 4

Section B

24 practice questions

Q37

You are the District Magistrate of a district where a private cement plant — the largest local employer — has been releasing fly-ash exceeding CPCB norms. The plant management is influential; the local MLA backs continued production citing 3,000 direct jobs. Your Sub-Divisional Officer's inspection report confirms the violation; the State Pollution Control Board has issued a closure notice that you must enforce. A delegation of plant workers warns of unrest if the plant closes; environmental NGOs threaten to move the NGT. The Chief Secretary has informally asked you to 'find a balance'. What course of action would you take? Justify with the values involved.

15 MARKS | 250 WORDS | 14 MIN | HARD | CASE STUDY · ENVIRONMENTAL COMPLIANCE VS EMPLOYMENT

ANSWER OUTLINE

1. Dilemma: public health and rule of law vs livelihood and political pressure.

2. Stakeholders: residents (health), workers (jobs), plant owners (profit), MLA (electoral), CS (administrative comfort), NGT (judicial).

3. Options: (a) ignore the SPCB notice — unethical and unlawful; (b) immediate full closure — humane cost on workers; (c) staged closure with timeline + workers' transition plan — hard right.

4. Decision: Option (c) — enforce SPCB notice with a 30-day public-health emergency order, a 90-day phased compliance plan with bank-guarantee, and a parallel reskilling tie-up.

5. Safeguard: publish all communications under RTI Section 4; record CS's request in note-sheet; involve NGT pro-actively.

KEY POINTS TO INCLUDE

- Public health is a non-negotiable constitutional value (Article 21, Subhash Kumar v State of Bihar 1991)
- Polluter pays principle (Vellore Citizens Forum 1996)
- Rule of law over administrative convenience (Nolan: integrity)
- Pre-decisional consultation reduces resistance (procedural justice)
- Documentation in note-sheet protects integrity (Khemka precedent)

- Sustainable Livelihood approach for affected workers (DAY-NULM convergence)

EXAMPLES & CASE STUDIES

- Sterlite Copper closure Thoothukudi 2018 — SC upheld closure 2024
- Vellore Citizens Forum 1996 — Polluter Pays principle
- Vapi-Ankleshwar industrial cluster CETP enforcement

MODEL ANSWER

Dilemma: The fly-ash violation pits Article 21 public-health rights and rule of law against 3,000 direct livelihoods, the local MLA's electoral pressure and the Chief Secretary's informal request to 'find a balance'.

Stakeholders: Residents around the plant — health and clean air; plant workers — wages and livelihood; plant owners — profit and invested capital; the local MLA — electoral interest; the Chief Secretary — administrative comfort; the State Pollution Control Board — statutory enforcement; the NGT — judicial oversight; environmental NGOs — public-interest advocacy; future generations — intergenerational equity in air and soil quality.

Options:

- Ignore the SPCB closure notice — unlawful, breaches the Vellore Citizens 1996 polluter-pays doctrine, and exposes the DM to contempt and disciplinary action under AIS Conduct Rules.
- Order immediate full closure — lawful but inflicts disproportionate harm on workers and families with no transition support, violating sustainable-livelihood ethics.
- Enforce the SPCB notice through a 30-day public-health emergency order, followed by a 90-day phased compliance plan secured by a bank-guarantee, with a parallel DAY-NULM reskilling tie-up for workers — the hard right.

Decision: Option three. It honours rule of law and Nolan integrity by enforcing the statutory notice; embodies Aristotelian phronesis by avoiding both deficiency and excess; and respects sustainable-livelihood ethics through the structured worker-transition plan, consistent with the 2nd ARC's procedural-justice doctrine and Article 21 jurisprudence.

Safeguard: Publish all communications under RTI Section 4; record the Chief Secretary's informal request verbatim in the note-sheet — the Khemka armour; pre-

> emptively brief the NGT; commission a quarterly third-party compliance audit to prevent recurrence and embed institutional learning.

polluter pays | precautionary principle | rule of law | Article 21 | procedural justice | integrity | Nolan principles | RTI

Q38

You are the Joint Secretary in the Ministry of Health overseeing a public-private tender for a new HPV vaccination rollout. During technical evaluation, you discover that the lowest-bidder firm is owned by the brother-in-law of your Minister. The bid is technically compliant; the price advantage is ₹140 crore over the L2 bidder. The procurement officer has cleared the file. The Minister's PS has 'reminded' you that the file is time-sensitive — every week of delay means 2,00,000 unvaccinated adolescent girls. What course of action would you take? Justify with the values involved.

15 MARKS | 250 WORDS | 14 MIN | HARD | CASE STUDY · CONFLICT OF INTEREST IN PROCUREMENT

ANSWER OUTLINE

1. Dilemma: integrity of process vs urgency of public-health outcome.

2. Stakeholders: adolescent girls (beneficiaries), L2 bidder (fairness), Minister (political), CVC (oversight), public exchequer.

3. Options: (a) clear file silently — unethical; (b) cancel tender outright — delays vaccination; (c) declare conflict in writing, recuse Minister, route through CVO + EFC + EC of Cabinet — hard right.

4. Decision: Option (c) — issue note-sheet declaring conflict, seek CVC advice, request Minister's recusal under the 2014 Conflict of Interest guidelines, and parallel-track an interim small-volume order from L2 to begin coverage.

5. Safeguard: publish award rationale under RTI Section 4; sample independent technical re-validation; routine CAG audit hook.

KEY POINTS TO INCLUDE

- Conflict of Interest guidelines for Ministers, DoPT 2014
- PCA 1988 Section 7 — undue advantage
- GFR 2017 — competitive, transparent tendering; Rule 173
- Public interest exception not a defence to procedural breach
- CVC's role under Section 8 CVC Act 2003 — vigilance advice

- Whistleblower Protection Act 2014 — note-sheet trail as protection

EXAMPLES & CASE STUDIES

- Bofors case 1986-2004 — conflict of interest precedent
- AgustaWestland VVIP chopper deal 2014 — middlemen
- Pegasus procurement opacity 2021

MODEL ANSWER

Dilemma: Procedural integrity in procurement and conflict-of-interest disclosure pulls against the urgency of vaccinating 2,00,000 adolescent girls every week of delay, complicated by the Minister's kinship link to the L1 bidder.

Stakeholders: Adolescent girls — health beneficiaries and Article 21 right-holders; the L2 bidder — fair competition; the Minister and her PS — political and personal; the procurement officer — process owner; CVC — vigilance oversight; CAG — audit downstream; the public exchequer; the Joint Secretary — personal integrity and career trajectory.

Options:

- Clear the file silently citing time-sensitivity — breaches DoPT Conflict of Interest Guidelines 2014, GFR Rule 173 on competitive tendering, and PCA 1988 Section 7; invites later CAG and CBI scrutiny.
- Cancel the tender outright — restores process purity but delays vaccination of vulnerable girls and is itself challengeable under arbitrariness review.
- File a note-sheet declaring the conflict, seek the CVC's vigilance advice, request the Minister's recusal under the 2014 guidelines, and parallel-track a small interim L2 order to begin immediate coverage — the hard right.

Decision: Option three. It satisfies Nolan integrity, objectivity and selflessness, applies Kant's universalisability test, and reflects the 2nd ARC Ethics in Governance prescription of structural conflict management. The interim L2 order honours utilitarian outcome-care for the 2,00,000 girls without compromising procedural fairness.

Safeguard: Publish the award rationale under RTI Section 4; commission an independent technical re-validation through a sample audit; build a routine CAG audit hook; recommend that the DoPT 2014 guidelines be amended to make ministerial recusal automatic for vendors with declared kinship within two degrees.

conflict of interest | recusal | fiduciary duty | transparency | PCA 1988 | GFR 2017 | CVC | procurement integrity

Q39

You are SP of a border district where a senior IPS officer — your batchmate's husband — is rumoured to be receiving cash from a cattle-smuggling syndicate. A constable from your wing brings a covert recording that strongly suggests the rumour is true, but the recording was made without authorisation under the Telegraph Act. Going public will trigger an inquiry that may end the senior officer's career, expose your constable to retaliation, and strain your spouse's friendship. Burying the recording protects your peace but enables ongoing smuggling and the loss of a constable killed last month in a related ambush. What course of action would you take? Justify with the values involved.

15 MARKS | 250 WORDS | 14 MIN | HARD | CASE STUDY · WHISTLEBLOWING IN POLICE SERVICE

ANSWER OUTLINE

1. Dilemma: personal loyalty vs institutional integrity; tainted evidence vs duty to act.

2. Stakeholders: public (safety), dead constable's family (justice), accused IPS officer (due process), informant constable (protection), spouse-friendship (personal).

3. Options: (a) destroy recording — moral complicity in murder cover-up; (b) leak to media — sensationalist, unfair; (c) submit recording with explanatory note to State Vigilance Commissioner and copy CVC, seek lawful interception of fresh evidence — hard right.

4. Decision: Option (c) — file confidential report with SVC; request State to constitute SIT; protect informant under WBP Act; recuse self from any investigation.

5. Safeguard: document all communications; brief the DGP in writing; counsel the constable on whistleblower protection; accept personal cost as duty.

KEY POINTS TO INCLUDE

- Whistleblower Protection Act 2014 — identity protection
- Indian Evidence Act 1872 Section 65B + Telegraph Act 1885 — admissibility of intercepts
- All India Services (Conduct) Rules 1968 Rule 3 — integrity
- Vineet Narain 1997 — duty to investigate without favour
- Khemka precedent — documentation as armour

- Conscience as ultimate source (Aristotle phronesis)

EXAMPLES & CASE STUDIES

- Satyendra Dubey murder 2003 — NHAI whistleblower
- Shanmugam Manjunath murder 2005 — IOC whistleblower
- Ashok Khemka's persistent integrity in Haryana

MODEL ANSWER

Dilemma: Personal loyalty and a batchmate's friendship pull against institutional integrity; evidentially tainted recording sits alongside a clear duty to act after a constable's recent death in a smuggling-related ambush.

Stakeholders: Public — border security and rule of law; the dead constable's family — justice and closure; the accused IPS officer — due process and reputation; the informant constable — protection from retaliation under the WBP Act 2014; the SP's spouse and friendship — personal cost; the DGP and State — institutional integrity; the smuggling syndicate — criminal-justice subject.

Options:

- Destroy the recording — moral complicity in a possible murder cover-up; violates AIS (Conduct) Rules Rule 3 on integrity and devotion to duty.
- Leak to media — sensationalist, prejudices any future trial, exposes the constable to retaliation, and ends professional standing of both informant and SP.
- Submit a confidential report with an explanatory note to the State Vigilance Commissioner, copy the CVC, and seek lawful interception of fresh evidence via the competent authority under the Telegraph Act — the hard right.

Decision: Option three. The Vineet Narain 1997 doctrine binds investigative agencies to act without fear or favour; Aristotelian phronesis directs the proportionate, deliberate course; Kant's universalisability denies any exemption for friendship. Confidential submission preserves due process while honouring duty to the dead constable and operationalising AIS Rule 3 integrity.

Safeguard: Document every communication; brief the DGP in writing; counsel the constable on WBP Act 2014 cover; recuse self from any subsequent investigation; recommend a State SOP requiring officer-related complaints to be routed directly to SVC within 72 hours.

whistleblowing | integrity | loyalty | due process | WBP Act 2014 | evidence law | courage of conviction | phronesis

Q40

You are a probationary IAS officer attached to a Collector who is highly respected in the cadre. During a flagship Aspirational District review, you notice that the data uploaded on the NITI Aayog Champions of Change dashboard for nutrition and sanitation indicators is systematically inflated to keep the district in the 'top 10'. The Collector, on being asked, says, 'Numbers will catch up — schemes are running.' You are weeks away from your probation report being written. Raising the issue may damage your career; staying silent corrupts a national ranking and misdirects ₹50 crore in performance grants. What course of action would you take? Justify with the values involved.

15 MARKS | 250 WORDS | 14 MIN | HARD | CASE STUDY · DATA INTEGRITY VS HIERARCHICAL LOYALTY

ANSWER OUTLINE

1. Dilemma: truthful reporting vs hierarchical loyalty + career risk.

2. Stakeholders: NITI Aayog, district citizens (mis-targeted funds), Collector (reputation), probationer (career), DOPT (oversight).

3. Options: (a) say nothing — long-term complicity; (b) escalate informally to Collector with evidence + offer ground-truthing — hard right starts here; (c) if uncorrected in 30 days, formally write to CEO NITI Aayog with copy to Cadre-Controlling Authority — hard right completed.

4. Decision: begin with (b) — private dignified note + offer a ground-truth sample survey; if Collector resists, escalate to (c).

5. Safeguard: keep dated copies of the dashboard, field notes, and correspondence; cite Conduct Rule 3(2)(i) — duty to maintain integrity; seek mentorship from a senior trusted officer.

KEY POINTS TO INCLUDE

- All India Services (Conduct) Rules 1968 Rule 3 — integrity, devotion to duty
- Mission Karmayogi's Karmayogi competency — domain + behavioural integrity
- NITI Aayog dashboard methodology — third-party validation
- Aspirational Districts Programme launched January 2018

- Hierarchy + dissent — Albert Hirschman's 'voice' before 'exit'
- Goleman EI — self-regulation when speaking truth to power

EXAMPLES & CASE STUDIES

- Ashok Khemka — repeated whistleblowing through internal channels
- Durga Shakti Nagpal Greater Noida 2013 — junior officer's stand
- U. Sagayam Madurai illegal granite 2012

MODEL ANSWER

Dilemma: Truthful reporting under AIS (Conduct) Rules Rule 3 integrity pulls against hierarchical loyalty to a respected Collector and the immediate career risk of a probation report due in weeks.

Stakeholders: NITI Aayog — Aspirational Districts methodology and ranking integrity; district citizens — mis-targeted ₹50 crore performance grant; the respected Collector — reputation and due process; the probationer — career and conscience; DoPT and the IAS cadre — long-term ethical standards; future probationers and officers — institutional precedent for speaking truth to power.

Options:

- Say nothing — long-term complicity, breach of AIS (Conduct) Rules Rule 3(2)(i), and a likely later disciplinary or audit trap when ground-truth data emerges.
- Skip the Collector and write directly to CEO NITI Aayog — premature, breaches hierarchical courtesy and Albert Hirschman's 'voice before exit' principle, and forecloses internal correction.
- Approach the Collector privately with a dated dashboard-versus-ground-truth comparison, offer a quick sample validation survey, and seek correction; if uncorrected within 30 days, formally escalate to CEO NITI Aayog with copy to the cadre-controlling authority — the hard right.

Decision: Option three. Goleman's self-regulation prevents impulsive escalation; Kantian universalisability rejects silent complicity in misallocation of ₹50 crore; Mission Karmayogi's behavioural-integrity competency endorses the graded voice. Internal dignified dissent first, formal escalation only if the Collector resists.

Safeguard: Keep dated copies of dashboards, field notes and correspondence — the Khemka armour; seek mentorship from a senior trusted officer; recommend that NITI Aayog institute third-party validation of all Aspirational District indicators before performance-grant release.

data integrity | voice vs exit | Conduct Rules | Aspirational Districts | moral courage | hierarchy | speaking truth to power | self-regulation

Q41

You are the Secretary of a State Department of Higher Education. The Vice Chancellor of a state university is found to have plagiarised six chapters of his doctoral thesis — confirmed by the UGC's PDS software and an independent academic committee. He was appointed two years ago by the current Chief Minister; revoking the appointment would politically embarrass the CM weeks before assembly elections. The Chief Secretary tells you 'wait for the model code of conduct period to pass — six weeks.' Meanwhile, the VC is presiding over 4,200 PhD viva approvals, 18,000 graduations and ₹230 crore in research grants. Students' unions have approached the High Court. Faculty are leaving in protest. National media is calling. The University Grants Commission has asked for a status report in 10 days. What course of action would you take? Justify with the values involved, the institutional safeguards you will trigger and the precedent you will set for academic governance.

20 MARKS | 400 WORDS | 22 MIN | HARD

CASE STUDY · ACADEMIC INTEGRITY, POLITICAL PRESSURE, REGULATORY DUTY

ANSWER OUTLINE

1. Dilemma: academic integrity and rule-bound governance vs political timing and electoral cost.

2. Stakeholders: students (degree validity), faculty (academic standards), VC (due process), CM and ruling party (electoral), UGC (regulatory), HC (judicial), national media (transparency), future appointees (precedent).

3. Options: (a) wait six weeks as CS suggests — institutional decay, possible MCC contempt, court strictures; (b) act unilaterally to remove VC — risk of denial-of-natural-justice challenge; (c) initiate UGC Regulation 2018 inquiry, notify Chancellor (Governor) under Section 9 of the State Universities Act, seek written legal opinion, place VC on leave pending inquiry, and respond to UGC and HC truthfully — hard right.

4. Decision: Option (c). Trigger the statutory removal process under the State Universities Act, with Chancellor's prior concurrence; preserve due process; communicate to students, faculty and media via a single accurate press note; tell the CS in writing that delay is legally untenable.

5. Safeguard: place all file-noting under RTI Section 4 proactive disclosure; commission a UGC-CARE compliant academic-integrity audit of all VC appointments in the state in the last five years; recommend a fixed-tenure search-cum-selection committee with academic majority for future appointments.

KEY POINTS TO INCLUDE

- UGC (Promotion of Academic Integrity and Prevention of Plagiarism) Regulations 2018 — Level 3 plagiarism
- State University Act — Chancellor (Governor) as appointing authority
- Article 142 of the Constitution invoked by SC in similar VC removal (Gambhirdan K. Gadhvi v State of Gujarat 2022)
- Conduct Rules Rule 3(1) — integrity and devotion
- Model Code of Conduct does not bar lawful statutory action
- Audi alteram partem (natural justice) — show-cause notice indispensable
- Nolan principle of integrity and accountability
- Tulane Hospital v Louisiana — public-trust doctrine

EXAMPLES & CASE STUDIES

- Gambhirdan K. Gadhvi v State of Gujarat 2022 — SC quashed Sardar Patel Univ VC appointment
- Annamalai University VC ouster 2014
- Rajiv Gandhi University Itanagar plagiarism review 2021

MODEL ANSWER

> **Dilemma:** Academic integrity, rule-bound governance and the UGC's ten-day regulatory deadline pull against the Chief Secretary's instruction to wait six weeks for electoral reasons, while 4,200 PhD vivas, 18,000 graduations and ₹230 crore in research grants continue to accumulate under a tainted Vice Chancellor whose plagiarism is now confirmed by both UGC's PDS software and an independent academic committee.
>
> **Stakeholders:** Students — validity of degrees and viva approvals; faculty — academic standards, morale, ongoing resignations; the Vice Chancellor — due process and audi alteram partem; the Chief Minister and ruling party — electoral interest weeks before polling; UGC — statutory regulator awaiting status report; the High Court — judicial review of students' union petition; national media — public-interest scrutiny; the

Chancellor (Governor) — appointing authority under the State Universities Act; future Vice-Chancellors — institutional precedent.

Options analysed:

- Wait six weeks as the Chief Secretary suggests — institutional decay continues, the High Court petition draws strictures, the UGC ten-day deadline expires, possible Model Code contempt under ECI guidance, and CAG audit risk crystallises. Unlawful in substance and unsustainable in fact.
- Act unilaterally to remove the VC through an executive order — breaches audi alteram partem, invites the Gambhirdan K. Gadhvi 2022 procedural-fairness ground for quashing, and exposes the State to costly litigation.
- Initiate the UGC Promotion of Academic Integrity Regulations 2018 Level-3 inquiry, notify the Chancellor under Section 9 of the State Universities Act, obtain a written legal opinion, place the VC on leave pending inquiry, and respond truthfully to both the UGC and the High Court — the hard right.

Decision and reasoning: Option three. The Model Code of Conduct does not bar lawful statutory action, as the ECI has repeatedly clarified. The Nolan principles of integrity, accountability and leadership demand action; Aristotelian phronesis prescribes the procedurally rigorous middle path; the public-trust doctrine treats the university office as a fiduciary trust; and AIS (Conduct) Rules Rule 3(1) binds the Secretary to integrity. The Chief Secretary's verbal instruction must be reduced to writing and respectfully declined — the 2nd ARC's Ethics in Governance prescription on oral orders.

Safeguard / institutional fix: Place all file-noting under RTI Section 4 proactive disclosure; commission a UGC-CARE compliant academic-integrity audit of all VC appointments in the state over the previous five years; recommend a fixed-tenure search-cum-selection committee with an academic majority, as the Supreme Court in Gambhirdan 2022 envisaged; issue a single accurate press note to students, faculty and media to forestall rumour and preserve institutional credibility.

academic integrity | due process | natural justice | UGC Regulations 2018 | model code of conduct | Chancellor | fiduciary duty | public-trust doctrine | regulatory courage

Q42

You are District Magistrate of a hill district where a 60-km road through reserved forest is the only motorable link to 14 tribal villages with 9,200 PVTG

residents. A pregnant woman died last month en route to the district hospital because the road was washed out in a cloudburst. The State government has cleared widening of the road from 5.5 m to 10 m to allow ambulances. The Forest Department's report says the widening will fell 3,700 trees including 280 century-old oaks, and put two springs feeding three villages at risk. Local tribal gram sabhas under FRA 2006 are split — six want the road, eight oppose because the springs are sacred. An environmental NGO has filed an NGT petition. The state Minister is pushing for immediate work to begin before monsoon. What course of action would you take? Justify with the values involved, ethical theories you draw on, and the institutional mechanisms you will use.

20 MARKS | 400 WORDS | 22 MIN | HARD

CASE STUDY · TRIBAL RIGHTS, FOREST CONSERVATION AND DEVELOPMENT

ANSWER OUTLINE

1. Dilemma: right to life and dignified healthcare access vs forest, water and cultural rights of PVTGs.

2. Stakeholders: 9,200 PVTG residents, 6 pro-road gram sabhas, 8 opposing gram sabhas, Forest Department, NGT, state Minister, NGO, future generations (intergenerational equity).

3. Options: (a) push through 10-m widening to honour Minister's directive — violates FRA + Niyamgiri precedent + intergenerational ethic; (b) cancel widening and offer airlift-only emergency model — costly and discriminatory; (c) re-engineer the project: 7-m alignment that minimises felling, bypass sacred springs, add 4 mid-route Health-Wellness Sub-Centres + tele-medicine + 2 community helipads — hard right with utilitarian, deontological and care-ethics balance.

4. Decision: Option (c). Constitute a Joint Working Group: District, Forest, Tribal Welfare, PRIs, NGO. Reopen FRA gram-sabha consultations with all 14 villages; commission an independent hydro-geological survey of the springs; redesign alignment; secure Stage I forest clearance with compensatory afforestation + bio-mass linked livelihood for displaced households.

5. Safeguard: third-party social and environmental audit annually for 5 years; public dashboard; standing district-level grievance redress under FRA Rule 4(1)(e); recommend institutionalising 'minimum viable infrastructure' norms for PVTG areas at state level.

KEY POINTS TO INCLUDE

- Forest Rights Act 2006 — Section 4(5) consent of gram sabhas

- Niyamgiri Supreme Court judgment 2013 — gram-sabha primacy
- Article 21 — right to health (Paschim Banga Khet Mazdoor 1996)
- Intergenerational equity (Edith Brown Weiss; Rio 1992 Principle 3)
- Care ethics (Carol Gilligan) — relational responsibility
- Utilitarian calculus tempered by minority-rights deontology
- PVTGs identified under Dhebar Commission 1961, Renke Commission 2008
- Mission Indradhanush + AAM — service-delivery model

EXAMPLES & CASE STUDIES

- Niyamgiri Dongria Kondh referendum 2013
- Sardar Sarovar — NBA-led litigation on tribal rehabilitation
- Posco-Odisha 2017 — withdrawn due to consent failures

MODEL ANSWER

Dilemma: The right to life and dignified healthcare for 9,200 PVTG residents — sharpened by a pregnant woman's preventable death last month en route to the district hospital — pulls against forest, water and cultural rights protected by the Forest Rights Act 2006, the Niyamgiri 2013 ruling, and the eight gram sabhas opposing the alignment because the springs are sacred and the canopy irreplaceable.

Stakeholders: The 9,200 PVTG residents identified under the Renke Commission 2008; six pro-road and eight opposing gram sabhas; the Forest Department guarding 3,700 trees including 280 century-old oaks; State Pollution and Hydrology authorities monitoring the two springs; the National Green Tribunal hearing the NGO's petition; the State Minister pushing pre-monsoon completion; the environmental NGO petitioner; downstream water-users in three villages; future generations under Edith Brown Weiss's intergenerational equity; women of reproductive age dependent on maternal-health access.

Options analysed:

- Push through the 10-m widening to honour the Minister's directive — breaches FRA Section 4(5) consent, contradicts the Niyamgiri 2013 gram-sabha primacy, fells 280 century-old oaks and risks sacred springs; utilitarian on paper but rights-violating in substance.
- Cancel widening and offer airlift-only emergency model — discriminatory access tied to weather, costly per capita, ecologically clean but failing Article 21 substantively for routine healthcare.

- Re-engineer the project: 7-m alignment minimising felling, bypass sacred springs, add four mid-route Health and Wellness Sub-Centres, tele-medicine connectivity and two community helipads — the hard right balancing utilitarian, deontological and care-ethics lenses.

Decision and reasoning: Option three. Reopen FRA gram-sabha consultations across all 14 villages; commission an independent hydro-geological survey of the springs; redesign the alignment; obtain Stage-I forest clearance with compensatory afforestation and bio-mass-linked livelihood for displaced households. Carol Gilligan's care ethics honours the relational responsibility to PVTG mothers; Kant's universalisability rejects sacrificing minority rights for majority convenience; the 2nd ARC's social-impact-assessment doctrine and Mission Indradhanush's last-mile delivery logic align. The Minister's pre-monsoon pressure must be respectfully recorded in writing and met with a project re-designed for monsoon-2 completion.

Safeguard / institutional fix: Commission a third-party social and environmental audit annually for five years; publish a public dashboard; institute a standing district-level grievance redress mechanism under FRA Rule 4(1)(e); recommend state-level 'minimum viable infrastructure' norms for PVTG areas, codifying the precedent that consent, design and life-saving access can be reconciled where political timelines bend rather than dictate.

FRA 2006 | PVTG | intergenerational equity | care ethics | free prior informed consent | Niyamgiri | right to health | compensatory afforestation | minimum viable infrastructure

Q43

You are the Deputy Commissioner of Police, Crime Branch, in a metropolitan city. A respected social activist has been arrested under provisions invoking the UAPA based on intelligence inputs that you privately believe are thin. Her bail has been denied twice. She is 67, diabetic, and in detention for nine months without trial commencing. The Supreme Court has, in recent judgments, reiterated that 'bail is the rule, jail the exception' even under UAPA when trial is unduly delayed. Your political superiors have indicated that any 'softness' will end your career; the investigating team has built its identity around the case. An internal whistle from a junior officer hints at fabricated witness statements. International human-rights bodies have flagged the case. The Bar Council has called for her release. What course of action would you take? Justify with the values involved, the ethical theories you draw on, and the procedural reforms you will recommend.

20 MARKS | 400 WORDS | 22 MIN | HARD | CASE STUDY · CIVIL LIBERTIES, SECURITY STATE AND CONSCIENCE

ANSWER OUTLINE

1. Dilemma: oath to uphold constitutional rights vs institutional loyalty and stated national-security imperatives.

2. Stakeholders: the accused (Article 21), state (security), investigating team (institutional pride), junior whistle (truth), judiciary (review), public (rule of law).

3. Options: (a) suppress whistle, maintain hard opposition to bail — unconstitutional, opens later disciplinary and judicial action; (b) leak doubts to media — unprofessional, prejudices trial; (c) order an internal preliminary inquiry under DSPE Manual into the alleged fabrication, brief Commissioner in writing, recommend re-examination of bail-opposition affidavit, support medical-grounds bail, request CFSL re-validation of evidence — hard right.

4. Decision: Option (c). Initiate internal inquiry; ensure that the bail-opposition affidavit before the next hearing accurately reflects the current evidentiary status; recommend bail on medical-and-delay grounds in line with KA Najeeb 2021 doctrine; protect the junior officer under Whistle Blowers Protection Act 2014; ensure all action is documented to withstand both internal and judicial scrutiny.

5. Safeguard: propose a department-wide SOP requiring quarterly review by an officer outside the investigating team of every UAPA case where trial has not commenced within 180 days; mandate independent forensic verification before charge-sheet; institute training on KA Najeeb principles for all crime-branch officers.

KEY POINTS TO INCLUDE

- Union of India v K.A. Najeeb 2021 — constitutional courts may grant bail in UAPA on Article 21 grounds if trial delay is undue
- Watali 2019 — limited review of evidence at bail stage but balanced by Najeeb
- Article 21 — life and personal liberty with due procedure
- Section 43D(5) UAPA bail bar not absolute
- DSPE Manual — preliminary inquiry mandate
- Whistleblower Protection Act 2014
- Kantian universalisability — would I accept this treatment for any citizen?
- Gandhian satyagraha — truth without violence even against the state

EXAMPLES & CASE STUDIES

- Father Stan Swamy case — custodial death 2021, NHRC concern

- Sudha Bharadwaj bail 2021 (Bombay HC) — Bhima-Koregaon
- Justice H.R. Khanna dissent in ADM Jabalpur 1976

MODEL ANSWER

Dilemma: The constitutional oath to uphold Article 21 — sharpened by the K.A. Najeeb 2021 doctrine, a 67-year-old diabetic detainee, nine months without trial commencement, twice-denied bail, and a junior officer's whistle on fabricated witness statements — pulls against institutional loyalty, the investigating team's professional pride and the stated national-security imperatives invoked by political superiors.

Stakeholders: The accused activist — Article 21 right to life with dignity; the State — security and prosecution integrity; the investigating team — institutional identity built around the case; the junior whistleblower — protection under WBP Act 2014; political superiors — pressure on the DCP; the judiciary — independent review under Article 21 and Section 43D UAPA; the Bar Council and international human-rights bodies — scrutiny; the public — confidence in rule of law; future UAPA detainees — precedent on bail, delay and evidentiary fabrication.

Options analysed:

- Suppress the whistle and maintain hard opposition to bail — unconstitutional, breaches the DCP's oath, risks later disciplinary action and Supreme Court strictures akin to the Stan Swamy custodial-death backlash and NHRC concern.
- Leak doubts to media — unprofessional, prejudices the trial, undermines the witness-protection regime, exposes the junior officer, and ends professional standing of the DCP.
- Order a confidential preliminary inquiry under the DSPE Manual into the alleged fabrication, brief the Commissioner in writing, recommend re-examination of the bail-opposition affidavit, support medical-grounds bail consistent with K.A. Najeeb, and request CFSL re-validation of the evidentiary base — the hard right.

Decision and reasoning: Option three. Kantian universalisability asks whether the DCP could accept this treatment for any citizen — the answer is no. Gandhian satyagraha sanctions truth-speaking without violence even against the state; Justice H.R. Khanna's 1976 ADM Jabalpur dissent stands as institutional memory. The Nolan principles of integrity, objectivity and openness, and AIS (Conduct) Rules Rule 3 binding integrity, together leave no procedural escape. Ensure the bail-opposition affidavit before the next hearing accurately reflects current evidentiary status; protect

the junior officer under the Whistle Blowers Protection Act 2014; document every step to withstand both internal and judicial scrutiny.

Safeguard / institutional fix: Propose a department-wide SOP requiring quarterly review by an officer outside the investigating team of every UAPA case where trial has not commenced within 180 days; mandate independent forensic re-verification before charge-sheet; institutionalise K.A. Najeeb-based bail-affidavit training for all crime-branch officers; build a rotational firewall between intelligence sourcing and prosecution.

UAPA | Article 21 | KA Najeeb | constitutional morality | due process | whistleblower | satyagraha | universalisability | bail jurisprudence | fiduciary oath

---

Q44

You are the Chief Executive Officer of a Zila Parishad in a district hit by recurrent drought. Your team has detected that the Mahatma Gandhi NREGA muster rolls in 14 panchayats are inflated by approximately 22 per cent — ghost workers, padded man-days, signature-mismatched payments routed to accounts linked to a Sarpanch federation. The leakage is around ₹38 crore over two years. Many of the inflated workers are landless Dalit families who, due to caste-based hostility, are routinely denied legitimate work and would face violent reprisal if the federation is openly named. The Sarpanch federation is the dominant political force in the district. A confidential complaint from a JE has reached your office. Your DDC asks you to 'go slow until the panchayat elections'. The Social Audit unit is due to visit in three weeks. What course of action would you take? Justify with the values involved, ethical theories invoked, and the systemic reforms you will set in motion.

20 MARKS | 400 WORDS | 22 MIN | HARD

CASE STUDY · WELFARE-FUND LEAKAGE, CASTE POLITICS AND PROTECTION OF VULNERABLE

ANSWER OUTLINE

1. Dilemma: recovering public money and punishing fraud vs protecting the very communities whose names are misused, and managing political risk for them.

2. Stakeholders: Dalit landless workers (safety + entitlement), genuine MGNREGA beneficiaries (district-wide), Sarpanch federation (political), DDC (administrative), Social Audit unit (statutory), JE whistleblower (protection), state government (electoral), citizens (rule of law).

3. Options: (a) wait until elections as DDC advises — institutional silence, complicity, possible CAG audit catch; (b) immediate FIR against all 14 Sarpanchs and public naming — risks violent retribution against Dalit families and is poor investigative tactic; (c) phased forensic-administrative response — quietly freeze further payments through MIS, summon a State-level forensic team, ensure protected witnesses, route through Social Audit unit, sequence FIRs only after evidence is judicially robust, set up safe-houses for Dalit complainants — hard right.

4. Decision: Option (c). Inform the State Quality Monitor and CEO State Employment Guarantee Council in writing; place a temporary 'Section 25' inquiry order; coordinate with SP for confidential protection of vulnerable workers under SC/ST (POA) Act 1989; ensure the Social Audit unit gets full access; record DDC's 'go slow' suggestion in note-sheet; initiate suo motu recovery proceedings under MGNREGA Section 27.

5. Safeguard: direct beneficiary transfer with Aadhaar-based biometric attendance for all panchayats; geo-tagged works; annual third-party concurrent audit; Citizens' Information Centres in each Block with grievance helpline; recommend a state-level standing 'Social Protection Cell' for whistleblowers under the SC/ST community.

KEY POINTS TO INCLUDE

- MGNREGA 2005 Section 27 — recovery; Section 25 — penalty for false claims
- Social Audit under Section 17 — statutory civil-society check
- SC/ST (Prevention of Atrocities) Act 1989 — protective response
- Whistleblower Protection Act 2014
- Caste-based vulnerability documented in NCSC reports
- Rawlsian justice — maximin principle protects the worst-off
- Gandhian Antyodaya — last person first
- Sen's capability approach — entitlements must be effectively accessible

EXAMPLES & CASE STUDIES

- Andhra Pradesh Social Audit Unit — globally cited model
- Aruna Roy + MKSS Jan Sunwai movement that birthed RTI 2005
- Sandeep Pandey's MGNREGA monitoring 2010-15

MODEL ANSWER

> **Dilemma:** Recovering ₹38 crore of misappropriated public money and prosecuting the fraud pulls against protecting Dalit landless families whose names are misused — open naming risks violent caste reprisal, while the DDC's 'go slow' instruction and the

Sarpanch federation's electoral dominance intensify political risk for the most vulnerable in the very weeks before panchayat elections.

Stakeholders: Dalit landless workers — physical safety and lawful MGNREGA entitlement; genuine district-wide beneficiaries — programme integrity and entitlement protection; the Sarpanch federation — political dominance and electoral leverage; the DDC — administrative authority and political comfort; the JE whistleblower — protection under WBP Act 2014; the Social Audit unit due in three weeks — statutory civil-society check under MGNREGA Section 17; the state government — electoral calculus; CAG and the citizens — rule of law; future panchayat-level workers — precedent of safe redress.

Options analysed:

- Wait until panchayat elections as the DDC advises — institutional silence, possible CAG audit catch, breach of AIS (Conduct) Rules Rule 3 integrity, complicity in continuing fraud, and missed opportunity for the Social Audit unit.
- Immediate FIR against all 14 Sarpanchs with public naming — high risk of violent retribution against Dalit families named as ghost workers, tactically weak because it telegraphs the case, and premature exposure of the evidence chain.
- Phased forensic-administrative response: freeze further suspect payments through MIS, summon a State-level forensic team, route through the Social Audit unit, arrange SC/ST (POA) Act 1989 protective measures for Dalit complainants, and sequence FIRs only after evidence is judicially robust — the hard right.

Decision and reasoning: Option three. Inform the State Quality Monitor and CEO State Employment Guarantee Council in writing; issue a Section 25 MGNREGA inquiry order for false claims; coordinate confidentially with the SP for protection of vulnerable workers; record the DDC's 'go slow' instruction verbatim in note-sheet — the Khemka armour; initiate suo motu Section 27 recovery. Rawls's maximin principle anchors choices to the worst-off; Gandhian Antyodaya places the last person first; Amartya Sen's capability approach demands entitlements be effectively accessible; Nolan integrity and the 2nd ARC's Ethics in Governance bind the CEO to act, but to act with care for whom action protects.

Safeguard / institutional fix: Mandate direct beneficiary transfer with Aadhaar-based biometric attendance, geo-tagged works and annual third-party concurrent audit; open Citizens' Information Centres in each Block with a grievance helpline; recommend a state-level standing Social Protection Cell for SC/ST whistleblowers;

> pilot a secure-witness MGNREGA-fraud SOP for replication across drought-prone districts.

MGNREGA | social audit | Antyodaya | Rawls maximin | capability approach | SC/ST POA Act | whistleblower protection | leakage | Aadhaar payment bridge | fiduciary duty

---

Q45

You are the Director of a State Drug Procurement Corporation. A shortage of paediatric anti-cancer chemotherapy drugs has reduced supply to 60 per cent of demand for the next three months. A foreign-pharma representative offers a 'compassionate' free supply for one quarter — on condition that you place a confidential MoU signalling future preferred-supplier status. The State Public Health Director, two paediatric oncologists and a parent-advocacy group are split. The drug-controller has cleared the imported batch. The Cabinet meets in 10 days to discuss budget reallocation. What course of action would you take? Justify with the values involved.

15 MARKS | 250 WORDS | 14 MIN | EASY | CASE STUDY · CONFLICT OF INTEREST — PHARMA COMPASSION OFFER

ANSWER OUTLINE

1. Dilemma: immediate paediatric lives vs procurement integrity and future-market distortion.

2. Stakeholders: child patients and families, oncologists, pharma firm, future suppliers, Public Health Director, Cabinet, CAG.

3. Options: (a) accept the MoU silently — children get drugs, future tender compromised; (b) refuse the offer entirely — principled but children suffer; (c) accept the free batch under a transparent emergency-purchase protocol with no preferred-supplier clause, and parallel-track emergency tender + Cabinet ratification — hard right.

4. Decision: Option (c) — accept via GFR Rule 170 emergency provision with no future commitment; convene an emergency procurement committee; brief CAG in advance.

5. Safeguard: publish offer letter and MoU draft on portal; involve drug-controller for QC; file note recording reasons; future-tender insulated by a written declaration of non-preference.

KEY POINTS TO INCLUDE

- GFR 2017 Rule 170 — emergency-purchase provision

- DoPT Conflict of Interest Guidelines 2014
- Bardhan principle of beneficial-but-bounded gifts (PCA 1988 Sec 7)
- Kant's universalisability test — would all suppliers be allowed the same?
- Right to life of the child (Article 21) — immediate weight
- Future-tender capture — long-term harm to market competition

EXAMPLES & CASE STUDIES

- Bihar paediatric AES drug shortages 2014
- AIIMS chemotherapy drug shortages 2023
- PMBJP Jan Aushadhi Kendra coverage expansion 2024

MODEL ANSWER

Dilemma: Immediate paediatric lives over the next 90 days versus procurement integrity, future market competition and the risk of a confidential preferred-supplier clause silently distorting tenders for years.

Stakeholders: Child cancer patients and parents (right to life under Article 21); paediatric oncologists (clinical duty); the foreign pharma firm (commercial interest); other current and future suppliers (level playing field); Public Health Director and Cabinet (policy ownership); CAG and the State Vigilance Commission (audit and integrity); future Director-PSU governance.

Options: (a) accept the MoU with the confidential preferred-supplier clause — children get drugs, future tender compromised, PCA 1988 Section 7 risk; (b) refuse the offer entirely — principled but children suffer avoidable harm, fails the duty of care; (c) accept the free batch under GFR 2017 Rule 170 emergency-procurement, with the preferred-supplier clause explicitly struck out, in parallel with an emergency tender, and Cabinet ratification within 10 days — the hard right.

Decision: Option (c). Reasons — Article 21 right to life of the child (compassion); Kant’s universalisability test, since any supplier offering free emergency stock on identical terms would receive the same treatment (integrity); and the Nolan principle of openness through pre-emptive CAG briefing and publication of the draft MoU (transparency).

Safeguard: File-note recording the offer and rejection of the preferred-supplier clause; publish the MoU and tender on the portal under RTI Section 4; drug-controller QC certificate; written declaration of non-preference for the upcoming tender; report to the State Vigilance Commission.

GFR Rule 170 | emergency procurement | conflict of interest | Article 21 | universalisability | preferred supplier | transparency | PCA 1988

Q46

You are the SP of a district. The senior-most political party in the state alliance has its convention here next week. The state IGP has informally instructed you to 'visibly slow down' an ongoing investigation into a financial fraud allegedly involving the party's local treasurer, until the convention concludes. The investigation is at the charge-sheet stage and a Special Court has fixed a hearing in 9 days. A junior IO involved is willing to 'hold the file'. The complainant is a small-investor collective whose savings of ₹17 crore are at stake. What course of action would you take? Justify with the values involved.

15 MARKS | 250 WORDS | 14 MIN | MEDIUM

CASE STUDY · PRESSURE FROM POLITICAL BOSSES — INVESTIGATION SLOW-DOWN

ANSWER OUTLINE

1. Dilemma: obedience to hierarchy vs duty to judicial process and victims.

2. Stakeholders: defrauded investors, accused, party, IGP, special court, IO.

3. Options: (a) instruct IO to 'hold the file' — defrauds court and victims; (b) ignore IGP and proceed loudly — confrontational; (c) proceed with the charge-sheet on the court-fixed date, decline to act on oral instruction, record a written request to IGP for any policy direction in writing — hard right.

4. Decision: Option (c) — file charge-sheet on schedule, respond to IGP in writing seeking written instructions, copy DGP and State Vigilance.

5. Safeguard: note-sheet trail; routine PRAGATI dashboard reporting; preserve communication logs; protect IO from punitive transfer.

KEY POINTS TO INCLUDE

- Prakash Singh v UoI 2006 — Police Establishment Board, fixed tenure
- AIS (Conduct) Rules 1968 Rule 3(3) — written-instruction requirement
- Vineet Narain 1997 — investigation insulation from political direction
- PCA 1988 Section 7 — investigation cannot be obstructed
- Standard Operating Procedure on oral orders — DoPT 2014
- Karnataka Police Act 2003 — independence of investigation

EXAMPLES & CASE STUDIES

- Punjab Police-political pressure cases 2015-22 (Mehul Choksi-era references abroad)
- Karnataka cattle-smuggling SIT 2023
- Sahara investor refund saga — investigation discipline

MODEL ANSWER

Dilemma: Obedience to a senior IGP's oral instruction to delay a charge-sheet against a politically connected accused versus duty to the Special Court, the defrauded investors, and the integrity of investigation under PCA 1988.

Stakeholders: 17-crore-rupee defrauded investor collective; the accused treasurer (presumption of innocence); the ruling alliance party; IGP and DGP; the Special Court; the junior IO; State Vigilance; the public's faith in policing.

Options: (a) instruct the IO to 'hold the file' — defrauds the court, betrays investors, breaches Vineet Narain (1997) and exposes the SP to PCA Section 7 and Section 217 IPC liability; (b) ignore the IGP loudly and brief the press — confrontational, breaches AIS Conduct Rules on public statements, may stall the case in inter-departmental conflict; (c) file the charge-sheet on the court-fixed date, decline to act on the oral instruction, send a written request to the IGP under AIS (Conduct) Rules 1968 Rule 3(3) seeking any policy direction in writing, copied to DGP and the State Vigilance Commission — the hard right.

Decision: Option (c). Reasons — fidelity to Vineet Narain (1997) and Prakash Singh (2006) on investigation autonomy (integrity); fairness to defrauded investors as the difference-principle worst-off (justice); and the Nolan principle of accountability through a documented trail (objectivity).

Safeguard: Note-sheet record of the IGP communication; PRAGATI dashboard reporting; preservation of communication logs; intimation to the Police Establishment Board; protect the junior IO from punitive transfer via a written reasoned recommendation.

Prakash Singh | Vineet Narain | written instruction | investigation autonomy | AIS Conduct Rules | note-sheet | Police Establishment Board | PCA 1988

Q47

You are the District Election Officer (the DM) in a constituency holding a Lok Sabha by-election. The Election Commission has issued the Model Code of

Conduct. The local ruling-party MP, who is contesting again, requests urgent release of ₹47 crore from the District Mineral Foundation for 'pre-monsoon repair' of school roofs. Technically, MCC permits ongoing-scheme expenditure. The CEO of DMFT says the file is procedurally clean. The Returning Officer is uneasy because pamphlets advertising the repair list have appeared bearing the MP's photograph. What course of action would you take? Justify with the values involved.

15 MARKS | 250 WORDS | 14 MIN | MEDIUM

CASE STUDY · PRESSURE FROM POLITICAL BOSSES — DMFT RELEASE DURING MCC

ANSWER OUTLINE

1. Dilemma: legitimate scheme expenditure vs MCC and level-playing-field for opposition.

2. Stakeholders: school children (need), ECI (oversight), other candidates (fairness), MP (incumbent), CEO-DMFT.

3. Options: (a) release funds as cleared — risks MCC breach; (b) refuse outright — denies genuine need; (c) defer the release until polling day, seek ECI's prior written clearance under MCC paragraph VII, instruct removal of pamphlets, refer to police if violation continues — hard right.

4. Decision: Option (c) — defer with written reasons; reference RP Act 1951 Section 123 (corrupt practices); file MCC violation report with the CEO/ECI.

5. Safeguard: document the pamphlet evidence; communicate decision to the MP in writing copy ECI; preserve note-sheet; remain available for ECI direction.

KEY POINTS TO INCLUDE

- Model Code of Conduct, Election Commission of India — Part VII on party in power
- RP Act 1951 Section 123 — corrupt practices
- Mines and Minerals (DRTM) Act 2015 + DMFT rules — beneficiary primacy
- ECI 1968 Symbols Order — level playing field
- Section 4 RTI 2005 — proactive disclosure
- S. Subramaniam Balaji 2013 — boundary of welfare vs freebie

EXAMPLES & CASE STUDIES

- ECI's pre-poll restrictions on Pradhan Mantri Awas release 2024
- Andhra Pradesh 2024 MCC controversies on welfare advertising
- Karnataka 2023 'guarantees' advertising case

MODEL ANSWER

Dilemma: Legitimate ongoing-scheme expenditure for school-roof repair before the monsoon versus the Model Code of Conduct's level-playing-field requirement when pamphlets carry the contesting MP's photograph.

Stakeholders: School children awaiting roof repair; the contesting MP; other candidates entitled to equal contest; the Election Commission of India; the District Mineral Foundation Trust's CEO; the Returning Officer; the press; the wider electorate.

Options: (a) release the funds as cleared by the DMFT CEO — risks MCC breach, RP Act 1951 Section 123 corrupt-practice exposure, and election petition; (b) refuse the release outright — denies genuine pre-monsoon need to children; (c) defer the release until after polling day, seek ECI's prior written clearance under MCC Part VII (Party in Power), instruct removal of pamphlets bearing the MP's image, refer continuing violations to the police, and file an MCC violation report with the CEO/ECI — the hard right.

Decision: Option (c). Reasons — constitutional duty of free and fair elections (Article 324 fidelity); S. Subramaniam Balaji (2013) line on welfare-versus-electoral-influence boundary (impartiality, the Nolan principle); and equal treatment of all candidates under MCC (objectivity).

Safeguard: Photograph and archive the pamphlets with dated panchnamas; communicate the decision to the MP in writing copied to the ECI, the CEO and the State Chief Secretary; preserve the note-sheet reasoning; remain available round-the-clock for ECI direction; release roof-repair funds promptly after polling day with the same urgency; route a parallel tarpaulin-and-emergency-repair contingency through the District Disaster Response Force so genuinely vulnerable schools are not held hostage to the MCC.

MCC | DMFT | RP Act 1951 | Section 123 | level playing field | Subramaniam Balaji | ECI | by-election

Q48

You are the Director of a Central PSU's R&D centre. A foreign trade delegation, accompanied by your administrative Ministry's Joint Secretary, is visiting a sensitive prototype lab. During the demonstration, the visiting senior diplomat photographs a circuit-board you know contains a non-public design feature funded by DRDO. The visiting team's protocol officer asks you to permit the photograph as a 'goodwill gesture' to advance an MoU. The

DRDO liaison is not present. The JS gives an oral nod. The MoU could secure a ₹2,800 crore export order. What course of action would you take? Justify with the values involved.

15 MARKS | 250 WORDS | 14 MIN | EASY | CASE STUDY · FOREIGN DELEGATION / DIPLOMATIC PROTOCOL

ANSWER OUTLINE

1. Dilemma: diplomatic courtesy and commercial opportunity vs national-security obligations.

2. Stakeholders: DRDO, MEA, MoU partner, future export market, JS, citizens of India.

3. Options: (a) permit the photograph — security breach; (b) refuse rudely — diplomatic damage; (c) politely intervene, request deletion under the standard visiting-lab protocol, defer the MoU clause for a controlled photo-session approved by DRDO Liaison, brief MEA — hard right.

4. Decision: Option (c) — invoke the lab's pre-agreed Visitor Photography Protocol, ensure on-the-spot deletion in the diplomat's presence, follow up with a written record to MEA-MoD-Ministry.

5. Safeguard: CCTV preserved; protocol officer's written acknowledgment; note-sheet recording JS oral order; alternative controlled photo session arranged.

KEY POINTS TO INCLUDE

- Official Secrets Act 1923 — defence/prohibited place obligations
- MEA's Norms of Diplomatic Protocol — visiting-lab clearances
- DRDO Visitor Protocol — accompanied access only
- Nolan principles — integrity, leadership
- AIS Conduct Rules 1968 Rule 3(3) — written instruction for oral order
- Vienna Convention on Diplomatic Relations 1961 — diplomatic privilege limits

EXAMPLES & CASE STUDIES

- Strategic technology export controls — DRDO Tejas component sensitivities
- Naval design IP cases in dockyard tours 2010-15
- ISRO foreign-delegation protocols, post Chandrayaan-3

MODEL ANSWER

> **Dilemma:** Diplomatic courtesy and a Rs 2,800 crore export MoU versus national-security obligations under the Official Secrets Act 1923 for a DRDO-funded non-public design feature photographed without DRDO clearance.

Stakeholders: DRDO and the wider defence ecosystem; the citizens of India (national security); the visiting delegation and the foreign State; the Joint Secretary giving the oral nod; MEA's protocol cell; the future export market; the PSU board; the Director's own probity record.

Options: (a) permit the photograph as 'goodwill' — a clear breach of the Official Secrets Act 1923 and the DRDO Visitor Protocol; (b) refuse rudely in the delegation's presence — diplomatic damage that the Vienna Convention 1961 does not require; (c) politely intervene under the lab's pre-agreed Visitor Photography Protocol, request on-the-spot deletion in the diplomat's presence, offer a controlled, DRDO-cleared photo session for non-sensitive equipment as an alternative, and brief MEA-MoD-Ministry in writing — the hard right.

Decision: Option (c). Reasons — fidelity to the Official Secrets Act 1923 and the DRDO Visitor Protocol (national security, integrity); the Nolan principle of leadership in handling a JS's oral order with a written follow-up under AIS (Conduct) Rules Rule 3(3); and the Vienna Convention 1961 limit on diplomatic privilege (rule-of-law).

Safeguard: Preserve CCTV; obtain the protocol officer's written acknowledgment of deletion; record the JS oral order in the note-sheet with a request for written confirmation; arrange the alternative controlled session; intimate DRDO Liaison and MEA same day.

Official Secrets Act 1923 | DRDO protocol | diplomatic protocol | Vienna Convention | MEA | written instruction | national security | integrity

Q49

You are an Under-Secretary in a Ministry. A senior journalist files an RTI seeking the file noting on a controversial policy decision two years old. The file contains a Minister's hand-written 'I disagree' note that was later over-written by the Secretary. The CPIO consults you; she is inclined to deny under Section 8(1)(i) — Cabinet papers and deliberations. You note that the decision is past, no Cabinet status applies, and a similar disclosure was made in another Ministry last year. Your Section Officer says 'precedent is risky'. What course of action would you take? Justify with the values involved.

15 MARKS | 250 WORDS | 14 MIN | MEDIUM | CASE STUDY · INFORMATION ASYMMETRY / RTI DISCLOSURE

ANSWER OUTLINE

1. Dilemma: protecting deliberative space vs citizen's right to know and integrity of past decisions.

2. Stakeholders: citizens, journalist (information seeker), Minister (privacy), Secretary, CPIO, CIC.

3. Options: (a) deny under Section 8(1)(i) — convenient but legally weak post-decision; (b) disclose without filtering — privacy risk; (c) advise CPIO to disclose with severability under Section 10 — redact only ongoing-deliberation items, release file noting, post on portal under Section 4 — hard right.

4. Decision: Option (c) — release after severability; cite prior CIC order in support; preserve the original file.

5. Safeguard: note-sheet reasoning; appeal-path information to applicant; preserve all internal-consultation records.

KEY POINTS TO INCLUDE

- RTI Act 2005 Section 8 exemptions and Section 10 severability
- RTI Act 2005 Section 4 — proactive disclosure
- Aditya Bandopadhyay 2011 SC — RTI promotes accountability
- Subhash Chandra Agrawal v PMO — file-noting disclosure jurisprudence
- Nolan principles — openness and honesty
- CIC orders consistency vs each-case discretion

EXAMPLES & CASE STUDIES

- Subhash Chandra Agrawal RTI cases on Justices' assets
- Anjali Bhardwaj's persistent litigation on CIC vacancies
- MoEFCC file-noting disclosures on EIA exemptions 2023

MODEL ANSWER

> **Dilemma:** Protecting deliberative space for ministerial dissent versus the citizen's right to know about a concluded policy decision two years old, with a closely analogous disclosure already made in a peer Ministry.
>
> **Stakeholders:** The citizen-journalist seeking information; the Minister (privacy of past dissent); the Secretary; the CPIO; the CIC and appellate machinery; the wider public interested in accountable policy; future officers (precedent effect).

Options: (a) advise denial under Section 8(1)(i) on Cabinet papers/deliberations — legally weak post-decision, ignores Aditya Bandopadhyay (2011) and the peer-Ministry precedent; (b) release the file in full without filtering — privacy and security risk on any incidentally sensitive items; (c) advise the CPIO to disclose under Section 10 severability — release the substantive file-noting including the Minister's 'I disagree' note and the Secretary's override, redact only items genuinely covered by Section 8 exemptions, and place a Section 4 proactive disclosure on the portal — the hard right.

Decision: Option (c). Reasons — RTI Act 2005 as accountability instrument (Aditya Bandopadhyay 2011, openness); Nolan principle of honesty in record-keeping; and 'precedent is risky' only when the precedent is wrong — here, peer-Ministry disclosure shows the lawful path (consistency).

Safeguard: Detailed note-sheet reasoning that walks through Section 8(1)(i), Section 10 and the peer-Ministry order; communicate the appeal-path within the statutory timeline; preserve the original file with a tamper-evident seal; copy the order to the CIC; flag in the Ministry's Section 4 register; brief the Minister and Secretary before release.

RTI Section 8 | Section 10 severability | Section 4 | file noting | openness | CIC | deliberative privilege | transparency

---

Q50

You are the PIO of a Public University. A student-led RTI seeks the personal-leave record of a Vice Chancellor whose attendance has been allegedly irregular. The data is in the establishment file; releasing it requires touching personal-information clauses under Section 8(1)(j). The VC asks you informally not to share. The CIC's recent rulings favour disclosure where larger public interest is shown. Media is following the story. The Chancellor's office has asked for a status update. What course of action would you take? Justify with the values involved.

15 MARKS | 250 WORDS | 14 MIN | EASY

CASE STUDY · INFORMATION ASYMMETRY / RTI — PRIVACY VS ACCOUNTABILITY

ANSWER OUTLINE

1. Dilemma: personal-privacy of a public-office holder vs accountability and public interest.

2. Stakeholders: students, VC, Chancellor, faculty, media, future RTI applicants.

3. Options: (a) deny under Section 8(1)(j) — protects VC, fails public-interest test; (b) release in full — privacy violation; (c) issue Section 11 third-party notice to VC, decide under the public-interest override of Section 8(1)(j), disclose only attendance summary not personal reasons — hard right.

4. Decision: Option (c) — Section 11 hearing; release summary; redact medical reasons; reasoned written order.

5. Safeguard: note-sheet of reasoning; appeal-rights to both parties; consistent precedent reference; copy to CIC.

KEY POINTS TO INCLUDE

- RTI Act 2005 Section 8(1)(j) — personal information with public-interest override
- RTI Act 2005 Section 11 — third-party procedure
- Girish Ramchandra Deshpande 2012 SC — narrow personal-info reading
- Public office holder has reduced expectation of privacy on public duties
- Nolan principles — openness, accountability
- Puttaswamy 2017 — privacy as fundamental right, balanced with public interest

EXAMPLES & CASE STUDIES

- JNU VC attendance dispute 2019
- Anjali Bhardwaj's CIC interventions on PIO inaction
- UGC's PDS plagiarism cases 2018-23

MODEL ANSWER

> **Dilemma:** Personal-information privacy of the Vice Chancellor under Section 8(1)(j) versus accountability of a public-office holder whose alleged irregular attendance affects university functioning and student interests.
>
> **Stakeholders:** Student RTI applicant and the wider student body; the VC (privacy, reputation); the Chancellor and the State's University Governance department; faculty and administrative staff; the media; future RTI applicants relying on precedent.
>
> **Options:** (a) deny under Section 8(1)(j) — protects the VC personally but fails the public-interest override and contradicts Girish Ramchandra Deshpande (2012) read narrowly; (b) release the entire establishment file — Puttaswamy (2017) privacy violation, exposes medical reasons, sets a reckless precedent; (c) issue a Section 11 third-party notice to the VC, decide under the public-interest override, disclose only the attendance summary (dates, durations) while redacting medical or other strictly personal reasons, and pass a written reasoned order — the hard right.

Decision: Option (c). Reasons — Puttaswamy (2017) balanced with public-office accountability (privacy proportionality); Nolan principles of openness and accountability; and reduced expectation of privacy for a public office holder on the discharge of public duties (constitutional morality).

Safeguard: Note-sheet of reasoning citing Section 8(1)(j), Section 11 and Girish Deshpande (2012); written appeal-rights communicated to both the VC and the student applicant within the statutory window; copy the reasoned order to the CIC for institutional symmetry; ensure consistent application of the same test to future similar requests; do not consult the Chancellor's office until the order is passed, to preserve PIO autonomy under RTI Section 5; commit the office to publishing attendance summaries proactively under Section 4 going forward.

Section 8(1)(j) · Section 11 · Girish Deshpande · Puttaswamy · public-interest override · accountability · privacy · third party

---

Q51

You are the Vice Chancellor of a Central University in a remote north-eastern state. A junior faculty member shows you peer-reviewed evidence that the Dean of Research has been quietly approving in-house grants without external review, including ₹2.1 crore to her own husband's start-up incubated on campus. The Dean is also the President of the local university teachers' association and politically well-connected. The faculty's complaint is verbal; she fears reprisal. The next Executive Council meets in 21 days; UGC's annual audit is in 60 days. What course of action would you take? Justify with the values involved.

15 MARKS · 250 WORDS · 14 MIN · MEDIUM

CASE STUDY · WHISTLEBLOWING DILEMMA — CAMPUS CONFLICT OF INTEREST

ANSWER OUTLINE

1. Dilemma: protect the complainant and institutional integrity vs personal-relations risk and political backlash.

2. Stakeholders: students, faculty whistleblower, Dean, Dean's family-firm, UGC, EC, taxpayers.

3. Options: (a) suppress the complaint — corrupt; (b) suspend the Dean without inquiry — natural-justice breach; (c) refer to a confidential fact-finding committee under University

Ordinance, seek the Dean's recusal from research-grant approvals pending inquiry, protect complainant identity, brief UGC — hard right.

4. Decision: Option (c) — fact-finding committee with two external members; interim recusal; written non-retaliation undertaking.

5. Safeguard: WBPA-style anonymity; document audit trail; recuse from EC vote; intimate Chancellor + UGC.

KEY POINTS TO INCLUDE

- Whistle Blowers Protection Act 2014 — anonymity-preservation principle
- UGC (Promotion of Academic Integrity) Regulations 2018
- Natural justice — audi alteram partem
- Conflict of Interest guidelines DoPT 2014
- PCA 1988 Section 7 — undue advantage
- Tolkappiyar pattern of academic-integrity violations across central universities

EXAMPLES & CASE STUDIES

- Punjab University grant-approval irregularities 2020
- BHU research-grant disputes 2018
- VC plagiarism cases reported by UGC 2021

MODEL ANSWER

> **Dilemma:** Protect institutional integrity and the whistleblower faculty member versus avoid premature reputational damage to a Dean who is also a powerful teachers'-association president, in a politically charged remote campus.
>
> **Stakeholders:** Students whose research environment depends on fair grant flow; the faculty whistleblower (anonymity, non-reprisal); the Dean of Research (natural justice); the Dean's husband's start-up; UGC (regulator); the Executive Council; taxpayers funding in-house grants; future faculty deterred or emboldened.
>
> **Options:** (a) suppress the complaint — corrupt acquiescence, breach of UGC (Promotion of Academic Integrity) Regulations 2018 and PCA 1988 Section 7; (b) suspend the Dean immediately without inquiry — natural-justice breach (audi alteram partem) and political backlash; (c) constitute a confidential fact-finding committee under University Ordinance with two external members, ask the Dean to recuse from all research-grant approvals pending inquiry, secure the whistleblower's identity under WBPA 2014 principles, and brief UGC ahead of the 60-day audit — the hard right.

Decision: Option (c). Reasons — Nolan principles of integrity and selflessness; natural justice for the accused Dean (audi alteram partem); and DoPT 2014 Conflict-of-Interest doctrine on recusal from decisions where a family-firm benefit exists.

Safeguard: WBPA-style anonymity for the complainant with a written non-retaliation undertaking; the VC's recusal from any EC vote on the matter; document audit trail preserved for UGC; intimate the Chancellor and UGC before the EC meets; preserve grant files in the registrar's vault under joint custody; institute a standing campus rule disallowing in-house grants to first-degree-relative firms.

WBPA 2014 | academic integrity | conflict of interest | recusal | natural justice | UGC | fact-finding | whistleblower protection

---

Q52

You are the Block Development Officer in a panchayat-dominated district. A local MLA's nominee has been pre-selected by the panchayat to receive a ₹2.6 crore PMAY-G housing-aggregation contract, although the panchayat's resolution is procedurally clean. The technical sub-engineer flags that the nominee firm has no prior experience and has previously failed to deliver in two adjoining blocks. The MLA's PA visits you and politely says the file 'will move smoothly' if you sign. The Zila Parishad CEO is on leave. Beneficiaries are waiting for their first instalment to begin construction before monsoon. What course of action would you take? Justify with the values involved.

20 MARKS | 400 WORDS | 22 MIN | MEDIUM

CASE STUDY · LOCAL-LEADER PRESSURE — CONTRACT AWARDED UNDER POLITICAL INFLUENCE

ANSWER OUTLINE

1. Dilemma: respect for democratic panchayat decision vs technical fitness and beneficiaries' interests.

2. Stakeholders: PMAY-G beneficiaries, panchayat (democratic), MLA, sub-engineer, nominee firm, future bidders.

3. Options: (a) sign the file as cleared — fails technical due-diligence, harms beneficiaries; (b) reject the panchayat resolution — confrontation, may stall houses; (c) return the file with a written technical objection citing past failure record, ask panchayat to revisit under GFR 173, propose either re-tendering with prequalification or splitting the contract into two empanelled-firm packages, brief Zila Parishad CEO on return, escalate to DM if pressure persists — hard right.

4. Decision: Option (c) — written technical objection; request fresh resolution; ensure beneficiaries get first instalment via parallel direct-disbursal route; intimate DM and CEO.

5. Safeguard: note-sheet trail of objection and pressure; copy to Audit; preserve sub-engineer's report; ensure PMAY-G dashboard transparency; protect sub-engineer from reprisal transfer.

KEY POINTS TO INCLUDE

- PMAY-G Operational Guidelines 2016 — direct beneficiary disbursal
- GFR 2017 Rules 167-173 — competitive bidding and technical fitness
- 73rd Amendment Article 243G — panchayat's democratic mandate balanced with statutory duty
- AIS Conduct Rules 1968 Rule 3 — integrity
- PCA 1988 Section 7 — undue benefit
- Sarpanch federation capture pattern documented in NREGA leakages

EXAMPLES & CASE STUDIES

- PMAY-G third-party concurrent monitoring 2020
- NREGA social-audit findings Andhra Pradesh 2018
- Karnataka Panchayat Audit reports 2022

MODEL ANSWER

> **Dilemma:** A BDO faces a procedurally clean panchayat resolution awarding a Rs 2.6 crore PMAY-G aggregation contract to a politically nominated firm with no prior experience and two adjoining-block failures. The dilemma is between deference to a democratically arrived-at panchayat decision and statutory duty of technical due-diligence to beneficiaries awaiting their first instalment before the monsoon.
>
> **Stakeholders:** PMAY-G beneficiaries whose homes depend on timely, quality construction; the gram panchayat and Article 243G's mandate; the MLA and the nominee firm; the sub-engineer (technical risk flag); future bidders denied a level playing field; the Zila Parishad CEO (on leave); the DM; CAG and PMAY-G concurrent monitoring; the State Vigilance Commission.
>
> **Options analysed:** (a) sign the file — formally compliant but substantively reckless, harming beneficiaries because past failure data shows non-delivery, breaching GFR 2017 Rule 173 on competitive bidding, creating PCA 1988 Section 7 exposure if the MLA-PA's 'smoothness' implies undue advantage; (b) reject the panchayat resolution outright — confrontational with elected local self-government, may stall houses,

breaches the 73rd Amendment spirit; (c) return the file with a written technical objection citing the firm's prior failures, ask the panchayat to revisit under GFR 173, propose re-tendering with prequalification or splitting the contract across two empanelled firms, route beneficiary first instalments through PMAY-G direct-disbursal so monsoon work begins, brief the Zila Parishad CEO on return, and escalate to the DM and Social Audit Unit if pressure persists — the hard right.

Decision and reasoning: Option (c). The BDO returns the file with a reasoned written objection enclosing the sub-engineer's report; recommends re-tendering with prequalification; releases first instalments through the PMAY-G direct route; communicates the decision to the panchayat, the MLA's office and the DM in writing. Three named values anchor it: integrity under AIS (Conduct) Rules 1968 Rule 3; the Nolan principle of objectivity; and the Mosher distinction between objective responsibility (technical fitness) and subjective responsibility (elected mandate). NREGA social-audit findings in Andhra Pradesh show clean resolutions can mask elite capture.

Safeguard / institutional fix: Note-sheet trail of the objection and any political pressure documented with date-stamps; copy to State Audit, the Social Audit Unit and the Zila Parishad CEO on return; sub-engineer's technical report preserved in the file; PMAY-G dashboard transparency on the contract status and beneficiary first-instalment disbursal; protection of the sub-engineer from reprisal transfer through a written commendation entry; a standing block-level checklist requiring past-performance verification for any panchayat-aggregated contract above Rs 50 lakh; periodic third-party concurrent monitoring as built into PMAY-G 2020 protocols; periodic gram-sabha social audit.

PMAY-G | GFR 173 | panchayat | 73rd Amendment | PCA 1988 | social audit | technical due-diligence | transparency

Q53

You are the Joint Secretary in the Ministry of Skill Development and Entrepreneurship. Your Department of Expenditure has approved ₹740 crore for an apprenticeship-stipend programme. The Cabinet sub-committee on jobs wants the entire amount disbursed in 12 months. Your data shows only 1.4 lakh genuine new apprenticeships were generated in the previous year; absorbing ₹740 crore would require either inflating beneficiary numbers or relaxing the validation matrix on NAPS (National Apprenticeship Promotion

Scheme). The PMO's appraisal cell is asking weekly. The minister wants a 'success' narrative before the next session. What course of action would you take? Justify with the values involved.

20 MARKS | 400 WORDS | 22 MIN | HARD

CASE STUDY · CONFLICT OF INTEREST — PRESSURE TO INFLATE SCHEME OUTCOMES

ANSWER OUTLINE

1. Dilemma: deliver the budget-absorption number vs preserve data integrity and youth-employment credibility.

2. Stakeholders: apprentices (genuine + ghost), employers, MSDE, PMO, Department of Expenditure, CAG, future scheme designers.

3. Options: (a) relax validation matrix — inflated numbers, CAG-vulnerable, betrays youth; (b) refuse the target and surrender funds — institutional cost; (c) propose a revised disbursal schedule of 18-24 months with capacity-building MoUs in sectors of demand, request Department of Expenditure to permit re-appropriation under GFR Rule 9, propose a third-party validation by NSDC + IIM panel — hard right.

4. Decision: Option (c) — present a defensible 18-month plan with milestones; request EFC-style approval for re-phasing; build a parallel evidence base; brief PMO honestly.

5. Safeguard: note-sheet trail; concurrent CAG audit; NSDC public dashboard; quarterly Parliament-reply preparation; protect data team from political pressure.

KEY POINTS TO INCLUDE

- GFR 2017 Rule 9 — re-appropriation
- NAPS guidelines — apprentice-employer-government three-way obligation
- Frederick Mosher — objective vs subjective responsibility
- CAG performance audit principles — economy, efficiency, effectiveness
- Nolan principles — honesty, leadership
- Mission Karmayogi competency 'Outcome Orientation' with integrity

EXAMPLES & CASE STUDIES

- Skill India aggregate-number disputes 2019 (PLFS vs MSDE)
- Aspirational Districts data audit by NITI 2022
- CAG performance audit on Sarva Shiksha Abhiyan, multiple years

MODEL ANSWER

Dilemma: A Joint Secretary in Skill Development must deliver Rs 740 crore in 12 months when last year's genuine apprenticeships were only 1.4 lakh — meaning absorption would require inflating beneficiary numbers or diluting the NAPS validation matrix. The dilemma is between the political demand for a 'success' narrative and the long-term credibility of youth-employment data, the integrity of the public exchequer, and the Joint Secretary's oath of office.

Stakeholders: Genuine apprentices currently in NAPS and prospective genuine apprentices; ghost beneficiaries who would emerge if validation relaxes; participating employers; the Ministry of Skill Development and Entrepreneurship's reputation; the Department of Expenditure and CAG; the PMO's appraisal cell; the Minister and Parliament (truthful annual replies); the data team and NSDC; future scheme designers; the wider PLFS-versus-MSDE credibility contest documented since 2019.

Options analysed: (a) relax the validation matrix as informally suggested — generates the headline but exposes the Ministry to a CAG performance audit similar to the Sarva Shiksha Abhiyan precedents, betrays the young job-seekers the scheme exists for, and breaches Mosher's objective-responsibility test; (b) refuse the target outright and surrender the funds — preserves data integrity but cedes the policy initiative and may invite re-allocation away from skilling; (c) propose a revised 18-24 month disbursal schedule with sector-of-demand capacity-building MoUs, request the Department of Expenditure to permit re-appropriation under GFR 2017 Rule 9, set a third-party validation panel of NSDC plus an IIM team, brief the PMO honestly with quarterly milestones, and prepare a transparent Parliament reply if asked — the hard right.

Decision and reasoning: Option (c). The JS submits a defensible 18-month plan with audited milestones; seeks EFC-style approval for re-phasing under GFR Rule 9; commissions independent validation; briefs the Cabinet sub-committee and PMO with honest numbers. Three named values anchor it: honesty under the Nolan principles and the Civil Services Code; Mosher's objective responsibility over subjective responsibility to ministerial mood; and Kant's categorical imperative against ghost beneficiaries — they cannot be willed as universal law.

Safeguard / institutional fix: Note-sheet trail of the relaxation suggestion and the JS's written counter-proposal; concurrent CAG performance-audit briefing; NSDC public dashboard with apprentice-employer-government three-way verification; quarterly Parliament-reply preparation; protection of the data team; a standing 'data-

> integrity firewall' between scheme finance and validation; a published rule that no target may require evidence dilution as a precondition for funds absorption.

data integrity | GFR Rule 9 | NAPS | Mosher | performance audit | outcome orientation | honesty | PMO

Q54

You are the Director of a Government Engineering College. The State Higher Education Department has allocated ₹5 crore for a new Centre of Excellence on Artificial Intelligence. Your governing council, by majority vote, has approved a partnership with a private cloud-services firm whose founder is a non-resident alumnus of the college and donates ₹1 crore annually. You discover that two council members hold non-disclosed advisory positions in the same firm. The Centre's budget will lock the college into a 5-year cloud contract. The faculty union has objected. What course of action would you take? Justify with the values involved.

20 MARKS | 400 WORDS | 22 MIN | MEDIUM

CASE STUDY · CONFLICT OF INTEREST — DONOR CAPTURE IN ACADEMIA

ANSWER OUTLINE

1. Dilemma: capitalising on a donor's generosity vs institutional autonomy and competitive procurement.

2. Stakeholders: students, faculty, future students, donor, council members, Higher Education Department, taxpayers.

3. Options: (a) sign the contract as approved — lock-in, undisclosed conflict of interest taints governance; (b) reject the partnership outright — lose investment and goodwill; (c) require written disclosure under the College Statutes' COI provision, ask conflicted members to recuse, re-table the cloud-services decision after a structured RFP under GFR Rule 173, separate donation from procurement, document non-quid-pro-quo — hard right.

4. Decision: Option (c) — disclosure + recusal + RFP; accept donation through MoU with arms-length terms; ensure faculty representation on selection committee; brief Higher Education Department.

5. Safeguard: Section 4 RTI publication of selection criteria; CAG/State Audit visibility; faculty union representation; written non-quid-pro-quo MoU; periodic council review of conflicts.

KEY POINTS TO INCLUDE

- DoPT Conflict of Interest Guidelines 2014
- UGC Regulations on Promotion of Academic Integrity 2018
- GFR 2017 Rule 173 — competitive procurement
- AICTE governance norms on industry partnerships
- Nolan principles — selflessness, integrity
- Donor-recipient arms-length doctrine (Hewlett Foundation guidelines as model)

EXAMPLES & CASE STUDIES

- IIT corpus-donor MoU disputes 2019-23
- BITS Pilani industry-research centre governance
- IIM Ahmedabad endowment partnerships

MODEL ANSWER

Dilemma: A Government Engineering College's governing council has approved a Rs 5 crore AI Centre of Excellence partnership with a private cloud-services firm whose founder is a Rs 1 crore annual donor-alumnus, while two council members hold undisclosed advisory positions in the same firm. The dilemma is between capitalising on donor generosity and preserving institutional autonomy, competitive procurement and faculty trust.

Stakeholders: Students whose curriculum will lock into the chosen cloud stack for five years; faculty (union has objected); the donor-alumnus and his firm; the conflicted council members; alternative cloud vendors denied a level playing field; the Higher Education Department and AICTE; State Audit and CAG; future donors watching whether disclosure costs are too high.

Options analysed: (a) sign as approved — five-year lock-in tainted by undisclosed COI, breaching DoPT Conflict of Interest Guidelines 2014 and UGC's Promotion of Academic Integrity Regulations 2018, exposing the college to AICTE strictures; (b) reject the partnership outright — loses the donation and alumnus relationship without the AI centre necessarily being built; (c) require written disclosure under the College Statutes' COI provision, ask conflicted members to recuse, re-table the decision after a structured RFP under GFR 2017 Rule 173, separate the donation from procurement through arms-length MoUs, ensure faculty representation on the selection committee, brief the Higher Education Department — the hard right.

Decision and reasoning: Option (c). The Director writes to the conflicted council members requiring disclosure and recusal, places the cloud-services decision on hold pending a structured RFP, accepts the annual donation through a separate MoU with a written non-quid-pro-quo clause, and constitutes a selection committee with faculty-union representation and at least one external academic from AICTE-empanelled institutions. Three named values anchor it: Nolan principles of selflessness and integrity; DoPT 2014 COI doctrine operationalised through disclosure and recusal; and the Civil Services Code's impartiality, supported by the donor-recipient arms-length doctrine adopted in IIM-Ahmedabad endowment partnerships and BITS-Pilani industry-research governance.

Safeguard / institutional fix: Section 4 RTI publication of the RFP, selection criteria and bid evaluations; State Audit and CAG visibility; donation MoU vetted by the Law Department; standing COI disclosure register at every council meeting; mandatory annual conflict declarations; faculty-union representation on all industry-partnership selection committees; an institutional rule that no donor's nominee firm may bid in the same financial year as the donation except through open RFP with full disclosure.

COI disclosure | recusal | GFR 173 | RFP | donor-recipient | academic integrity | AICTE | Nolan

---

Q55

You are a Joint Director in CBI. A team led by an ASP shows you internal evidence — interception logs, financial trails — that a sitting Member of Parliament's Personal Secretary has been receiving regular payments from an arms-broker. The MP himself is not directly implicated yet. The case is sensitive; the MP belongs to the ruling alliance. Your Director hints that 'we should wait for the joint inquiry committee'. The ASP is willing to file a Preliminary Enquiry, but only on your written nod. The case file may leak. What course of action would you take? Justify with the values involved.

15 MARKS | 250 WORDS | 14 MIN | HARD

CASE STUDY · WHISTLEBLOWING — POLITICAL SENSITIVITY IN INVESTIGATION

ANSWER OUTLINE

1. Dilemma: investigation duty under PCA vs hierarchical caution and political fallout risk.

2. Stakeholders: citizens, MP-PS (accused), MP (potential), Director, ASP, judiciary.

3. Options: (a) defer to Director's hint — duty-breach; (b) authorise PE quietly without process — open to manipulation; (c) authorise the PE in writing, follow CBI Manual procedure, secure file in CBI HQ vault, brief CVC under Section 8 CVC Act — hard right.

4. Decision: Option (c) — written authorisation; CVC concurrent reporting; statutory secrecy on file; preserve interception authorisations.

5. Safeguard: chain-of-custody log; sealed evidence vault; protect ASP and team; periodic court-monitoring if needed.

KEY POINTS TO INCLUDE

- Vineet Narain 1997 — investigation insulation; Single Directive struck
- CBI Manual Chapter 9 — Preliminary Enquiry
- PCA 1988 Section 7 and 13 — public servant offences
- CVC Act 2003 Section 8 — superintendence
- Telegraph Act 1885 + IT Act 2000 — interception authorisations
- Subramanian Swamy v Director CBI 2014 — equal treatment in investigation

EXAMPLES & CASE STUDIES

- 2G Spectrum CBI investigation 2010-17
- Coalgate scam CBI court monitoring 2013-17
- PMLA cases under ED, court-monitored procedures

MODEL ANSWER

> **Dilemma:** Statutory investigation duty under PCA 1988 and the CBI Manual versus hierarchical caution from the Director and the political sensitivity of an investigation touching a sitting ruling-alliance MP's Personal Secretary.
>
> **Stakeholders:** The Indian state and its citizens; the MP-PS (accused) and the MP (potentially implicated); the Director's institutional credibility; the ASP and the investigating team; the judiciary (court-monitored cases jurisprudence); CVC; media and future investigations into political offices.
>
> **Options:** (a) defer to the Director's 'wait for the joint inquiry committee' hint — duty-breach under Vineet Narain (1997), the Single Directive having been struck down; (b) authorise the Preliminary Enquiry quietly without process — opens evidence to leak and manipulation, undermines chain-of-custody; (c) authorise the PE in writing as per CBI Manual Chapter 9, secure the case file in the CBI HQ vault, brief the CVC concurrently under CVC Act 2003 Section 8, and seek court-monitoring if external interference materialises — the hard right.

Decision: Option (c). Reasons — Vineet Narain (1997) investigation insulation doctrine (rule of law); Subramanian Swamy v Director CBI (2014) equal treatment principle (impartiality, integrity); and Nolan principles of courage in leadership.

Safeguard: Chain-of-custody log for interception authorisations under the Telegraph Act 1885 and IT Act 2000; sealed evidence vault; preserve digital trails on an air-gapped server; protect the ASP and team via formal commendation entries; consider seeking constitution-bench-style court monitoring (as in 2G, Coalgate); recuse self from any subsequent inquiry on the same file to preserve impartiality.

Vineet Narain | Preliminary Enquiry | CBI Manual | PCA 1988 | CVC superintendence | interception | investigation autonomy | Subramanian Swamy

---

Q56

You are District Collector in a tribal district. A 1,200-acre bauxite mining lease is up for public hearing under the EIA Notification 2006. The PVTG hamlets in the impact zone have not received the hearing notice in their dialect; only Hindi notices have been pasted. The hearing date is in 9 days. The State Industries Minister calls personally to say a Rs.6,400 crore investment will be lost if the hearing is rescheduled. The State Pollution Control Board's regional officer says she will go ahead. The local Forest Rights Committee has formally objected. What course of action would you take? Justify with the values involved.

20 MARKS | 400 WORDS | 22 MIN | HARD | CASE STUDY · PUBLIC HEARING / LAND ACQUISITION PRESSURE

ANSWER OUTLINE

1. Dilemma: investment-driven development vs procedural justice and informed-consent of PVTGs under FRA.

2. Stakeholders: PVTG residents, FRC, miner, State Industries Department, MoEFCC, NGT, future workers, the Minister.

3. Options: (a) hold the hearing as scheduled — procedurally void, NGT-vulnerable, ethically wrong; (b) cancel the hearing — investor loses, project may still proceed under another DM; (c) postpone hearing by 21 days, issue notices in PVTG dialect, hold pre-hearing village-level consultations with translators, ensure Gram Sabha consent under FRA Section 4(5), invite SPCB, MoTA and tribal welfare officials, publish EIA executive summary in dialect — hard right.

4. Decision: Option (c) — postpone with written reasons to MoEFCC, State Industries, SPCB; convene FRC + Gram Sabha; document consent process; communicate decision to the Minister with written rationale.

5. Safeguard: proactive Section 4 RTI disclosure; recordings of consultations; outside academic observer from TISS; copy to MoTA; flag for NGT in case of challenge; protect SPCB officer from reprisal.

KEY POINTS TO INCLUDE

- EIA Notification 2006, Para 7(i)(III) — public-hearing process and dialect-notice norm
- FRA 2006 Section 4(5) and Forest Conservation Act 1980 — Gram Sabha consent
- Niyamgiri 2013 SC — Dongria Kondh gram-sabha consent doctrine
- PESA 1996 — autonomy in scheduled areas
- Article 244 + Fifth Schedule — TAC role
- S.R. Bommai principle — constitutional morality over executive convenience

EXAMPLES & CASE STUDIES

- Niyamgiri bauxite case Vedanta 2013
- Hasdeo Aranya coal mining controversy Chhattisgarh 2022-24
- POSCO Odisha steel-plant withdrawal 2017

MODEL ANSWER

> **Dilemma:** A Rs 6,400 crore mining investment and the Industries Minister's pressure versus procedural justice for PVTG hamlets, informed consent under the Forest Rights Act 2006, and the constitutional autonomy of scheduled areas under the Fifth Schedule and PESA 1996. To proceed with a Hindi-only notice in a PVTG dialect zone is to hold a hearing in form and deny it in substance.
>
> **Stakeholders:** PVTG residents whose habitat, livelihood and identity rights are at stake; the Forest Rights Committee that has formally objected; the mining firm; the State Industries Department; the SPCB regional officer (willing to proceed); MoEFCC and the NGT; the Ministry of Tribal Affairs and the Tribes Advisory Council; the Collector's own constitutional oath; future PVTG hearings whose standards this will set.
>
> **Options analysed:** (a) hold the hearing as scheduled — procedurally void under EIA Notification 2006 Paragraph 7(i)(III)'s vernacular-notice requirement, almost certain to be quashed by the NGT under the Niyamgiri (2013) precedent, ethically wrong because the PVTG voice is structurally silenced; (b) cancel the hearing outright —

investor loses; the project may simply be rebooted with another DM, sacrificing the procedural-justice lesson; (c) postpone the hearing by 21 days, re-issue notices in the PVTG dialect through gram-sabha announcements and community radio, hold pre-hearing consultations with translators, secure Gram Sabha consent under FRA Section 4(5), publish the EIA executive summary in dialect, and inform the Minister in writing — the hard right.

Decision and reasoning: Option (c). The Collector postpones with written reasons to MoEFCC, Industries, SPCB, MoTA and the Minister, convenes the FRC and Gram Sabha, and documents the consent process. Three named values anchor this: the constitutional morality of Article 244 with the Fifth Schedule and PESA 1996 (Ambedkar); the Rawlsian difference principle that flows procedural advantage to the worst-off (PVTGs); and the Niyamgiri (2013) gram-sabha primacy doctrine. AIS (Conduct) Rules 1968 Rule 3(3) governs the Minister response.

Safeguard / institutional fix: Section 4 RTI publication of the postponement, EIA executive summary in dialect, and consultation schedule; recordings of every consultation preserved with the FRC under joint custody; an outside academic observer from TISS or the Centre for Policy Research invited; copy to MoTA, the Fifth-Schedule Tribes Advisory Council and the State Tribal Welfare Department; pre-emptive intimation to the NGT principal bench; written protection of the SPCB regional officer from punitive transfer; a one-page standing protocol that every future EIA hearing in scheduled areas must clear a vernacular-notice and gram-sabha-consent checklist; commitment to publish the gram-sabha resolution before the rescheduled hearing.

EIA Notification 2006 | FRA Section 4(5) | Niyamgiri | PESA | Fifth Schedule | Gram Sabha consent | PVTG | procedural justice

---

Q57

You are the District Health Officer (Civil Surgeon) during the second wave of a viral pandemic. Oxygen supply to your 22 hospitals has dropped to 60 per cent of need. A local industrialist, who owns a metal-fabrication unit, offers to divert his industrial oxygen — 8 tonnes a day for 14 days — provided his factory is exempted from a state-wide industrial-oxygen-export ban that you would have to recommend. The State Disaster Authority has not yet decided on exemption protocols. ICU patients are dying. The State Health

Minister is sympathetic but silent. What course of action would you take? Justify with the values involved.

20 MARKS | 400 WORDS | 22 MIN | EASY

CASE STUDY · PANDEMIC ETHICS — RESOURCE SCARCITY WITH CONDITIONAL OFFER

ANSWER OUTLINE

1. Dilemma: immediate lives vs principled refusal of conditional, potentially distortive offers under emergency.

2. Stakeholders: ICU patients, industrialist, other industrial users, state authority, IMA, media.

3. Options: (a) accept the conditional offer — saves lives, sets precedent of selective exemption; (b) refuse — principled but lives lost; (c) accept the oxygen under the Disaster Management Act emergency-procurement clause without granting any exemption, pay market rate, and parallel-route the exemption question to the State Disaster Authority for an open-criteria policy — hard right.

4. Decision: Option (c) — issue DM Act Section 30 requisition for the 8 tonnes at market rate; sign written undertaking that no policy exemption attaches; refer the exemption question to SDMA with three published criteria (life-saving, criticality, scale); publicise both decisions.

5. Safeguard: Section 4 RTI publication of requisition and payment terms; CAG audit hook; involve IMA + collector; record industrialist's offer in note-sheet; protect other users via transparent allocation.

KEY POINTS TO INCLUDE

- Disaster Management Act 2005 Section 65 (requisition) and Section 30 (DM powers)
- Triage ethics — Beauchamp-Childress principles
- Conditional offer = potential PCA 1988 Section 7 territory
- Kantian universalisability — would all owners be allowed exemption?
- Rawlsian max-min — protect the worst-off (ICU patient)
- Tandon judgment 2021 Delhi HC — oxygen allocation review

EXAMPLES & CASE STUDIES

- Delhi HC oxygen allocation orders April-May 2021
- INOX-Linde oxygen lifts via PM-CARES April 2021
- PM-CARES ventilator allocation 2020 audit issues

MODEL ANSWER

Dilemma: ICU patients are dying for want of oxygen and an industrialist offers eight tonnes a day for fourteen days — but only if his factory is exempted from the state-wide industrial-oxygen-export ban the Civil Surgeon must recommend. The dilemma is between immediate, identifiable lives saved by a conditional offer and principled refusal of a quid-pro-quo that would distort future allocation and breach PCA 1988 Section 7.

Stakeholders: ICU patients in 22 hospitals (Article 21, Rawlsian worst-off); the industrialist (commercial interest); other industrial users denied the same exemption (level playing field); the SDMA (policy primacy); the IMA; the silent State Health Minister; CAG and State Vigilance; the media; future emergency offers whose precedent this sets across India.

Options analysed: (a) accept the conditional offer — saves lives now, but ties the exemption to a private bargain, sets a precedent that scarcity can be traded for regulatory favour, and falls within PCA 1988 Section 7 'undue advantage' territory; (b) refuse outright on principle — integrity preserved at the cost of avoidable deaths, failing Beauchamp-Childress beneficence; (c) accept the eight tonnes under Disaster Management Act 2005 Section 65 (requisition) and Section 30 at market rate, with a written undertaking that no policy exemption attaches, and parallel-route the exemption question to the SDMA for an open, criteria-based policy applicable to all industrial owners — the hard right.

Decision and reasoning: Option (c). The Civil Surgeon issues a Section 65 requisition for 8 tonnes a day for 14 days, pays the market rate, and signs a written note that the requisition carries no exemption, current or future, from any ban. A parallel memo to SDMA proposes three published criteria for any exemption — life-saving criticality, scale, and substitutability — applicable to every industrial owner. Three named values anchor it: Kant's universalisability test, since any owner offering capacity at market rate must qualify on identical terms (integrity); the Rawlsian max-min, which protects the ICU patient as worst-off (justice); and the Nolan principle of openness through full publication of the transaction.

Safeguard / institutional fix: Section 4 RTI publication of the requisition order, payment terms and the industrialist's letter; CAG audit hook; IMA and Collector co-signing the protocol; written non-quid-pro-quo certificate by the industrialist; SDMA exemption policy released within seven days with public consultation; weekly oxygen-allocation dashboard; transparent allocation across other industrial users so the level

> playing field is preserved; Tandon (2021 Delhi HC) judicial oversight retained as fallback.

DM Act Section 65 · Section 30 · triage · Kantian universalisability · Rawls · conditional offer · PCA 1988 · pandemic ethics

---

Q58

You are a probationary IAS officer posted as Assistant Collector. Your Collector, a senior officer, instructs you to draft a transfer order for the local Sub-Registrar (a state-cadre officer) within 24 hours, citing 'administrative reasons'. You discover the Sub-Registrar had refused a Sarpanch's request to backdate a sale-deed three days earlier. The Sarpanch is the brother of the District Collector's college-batchmate. The transfer would send the Sub-Registrar to a remote tehsil 380 km away, separating him from a child receiving cancer treatment in the district hospital. What course of action would you take? Justify with the values involved.

20 MARKS · 400 WORDS · 22 MIN · MEDIUM

CASE STUDY · LOCAL-LEADER PRESSURE — TRANSFER-AS-PUNISHMENT

ANSWER OUTLINE

1. Dilemma: obedience to a senior in early career vs duty to fair process and humane consideration.

2. Stakeholders: Sub-Registrar, his sick child, Sarpanch, Collector, public, Registration Department.

3. Options: (a) draft the order as instructed — endorses retaliation, fails Section 3(3) AIS Rules; (b) refuse and complain publicly — escalates and may damage probation; (c) request the Collector's instruction in writing under AIS (Conduct) Rules Rule 3(3), prepare a balanced note flagging the registration-refusal background and the medical exigency, escalate up to the Divisional Commissioner if instruction stays, refer to the Civil Services Board if needed — hard right.

4. Decision: Option (c) — written request for confirmation; balanced note-sheet; humanitarian flag; CSB reference; protect the Sub-Registrar with status-quo recommendation.

5. Safeguard: file-noting trail; copy to State Cadre Authority; protect the Sub-Registrar through interim status-quo; later: documentation for any departmental enquiry into

wrongful pressure.

KEY POINTS TO INCLUDE

- AIS (Conduct) Rules 1968 Rule 3(3) — written-order rule
- Prakash Singh 2006 — Civil Services Board, fixed tenure
- T.S.R. Subramanian 2013 — CSB across services
- Registration Act 1908 — sub-registrar's independent statutory role
- Natural justice — opportunity-to-show-cause for transfers as punishment
- DoPT 2014 guidelines on transfers

EXAMPLES & CASE STUDIES

- Durga Shakti Nagpal transfer 2013
- Ashok Khemka multiple-transfer record Haryana
- Sub-Registrar transfer protests in various states 2015-22

MODEL ANSWER

Dilemma: An Assistant Collector in probation is told by the District Collector to draft within 24 hours a punitive transfer order for the local Sub-Registrar, who three days earlier refused a Sarpanch's demand to backdate a sale deed. The Sarpanch is the brother of the Collector's college-batchmate; the Sub-Registrar's child is undergoing cancer treatment in the district hospital. The dilemma sits between deference to a senior in early career and constitutional duty of fair process plus humane consideration.

Stakeholders: The Sub-Registrar (statutory officer under the Registration Act 1908, clean record, sick child); the sick child and family; the Sarpanch (alleged benefit-seeker); the District Collector; the State Registration Department; the State Civil Services Board under T.S.R. Subramanian (2013) and Prakash Singh (2006); district citizens depending on registration integrity; the probationary officer's conscience; future Sub-Registrars watching the precedent.

Options analysed: (a) draft the transfer order as instructed — endorses retaliation, breaches AIS (Conduct) Rules 1968 Rule 3 on integrity and Rule 3(3) on written-order requirement, harms the sick child, indirectly aids the backdating racket Vinod Rai-style audits exist to prevent; (b) refuse and complain publicly — escalates without exhausting institutional remedies, may damage probation; (c) request the Collector's instruction in writing under AIS (Conduct) Rules 1968 Rule 3(3), prepare a balanced note-sheet flagging the registration-refusal background, the unblemished record and

the medical exigency, recommend status-quo, and if the instruction stays, escalate to the Divisional Commissioner and Civil Services Board — the hard right.

Decision and reasoning: Option (c). The AC writes a respectful note requesting written confirmation, attaches a balanced file-note with three findings — the Sub-Registrar's statutory independence under the Registration Act 1908, the refusal to backdate as an act of probity under PCA 1988, and the humanitarian context — and recommends status-quo. If reiterated, escalation goes to the Divisional Commissioner and the Civil Services Board. Three named values anchor it: the Nolan principle of integrity; natural justice in punitive transfers under DoPT 2014 guidelines; and Aristotelian phronesis. Durga Shakti Nagpal (2013) and Ashok Khemka show documented written objection is the recognised path.

Safeguard / institutional fix: File-noting trail with date-stamps; copy of the request for written instruction routed to the State Cadre Authority; interim status-quo recommendation to the Cadre Controlling Authority; if a departmental enquiry follows, the AC's documentation supports both Sub-Registrar protection and any finding on improper pressure; LBSNAA refresher on AIS Rule 3(3) for probationers.

AIS Conduct Rule 3(3) | Civil Services Board | Prakash Singh | T.S.R. Subramanian | written order | natural justice | transfer-as-punishment | humanitarian

---

Q59

You are the District Magistrate of a coastal district. A category-2 cyclone has destroyed 6,400 fishermen huts in 18 villages. Total compensation entitlement under SDRF norms is ₹52 crore but only ₹19 crore is currently available; ₹33 crore is awaiting NDRF release after Central JRDA. A local MLA demands you 'release pro-rata' so all 6,400 families get something now; a national NGO insists you prioritise the poorest 2,200 SC/ST households fully; an angler-cooperative federation, which negotiates on behalf of OBC fishermen, wants its members served first. The State Disaster Authority is silent. The Press is watching. What course of action would you take? Justify with the values involved.

20 MARKS | 400 WORDS | 22 MIN | MEDIUM

CASE STUDY · RESOURCE ALLOCATION UNDER SCARCITY — DISASTER RELIEF

ANSWER OUTLINE

1. Dilemma: equity (worst-off first) vs equality (pro-rata) vs federation-pressure under verified, capped scarcity.

2. Stakeholders: 6,400 families, MLA, NGO, federation, SDMA, NDMA, MHA, media.

3. Options: (a) pro-rata across all 6,400 — political ease, none made whole, fails Rawlsian test; (b) full SC/ST first — equity-focused but federation backlash; (c) tiered disbursal: (i) immediate ₹10,000 emergency relief to all 6,400 from State CM Relief Fund, (ii) full SDRF entitlement first to households below SECC-2011 deprivation threshold, (iii) balance under verifiable damage-category grading from NDRF on receipt — hard right.

4. Decision: Option (c) — published criteria; tiered timeline; grievance-redress cell; written communication to MLA + federation + NGO + SDMA explaining criteria; weekly bulletin.

5. Safeguard: Section 4 RTI publication of beneficiary list (with privacy redaction); third-party concurrent audit by SC/CAG team; appeal mechanism; documented chain to NDMA.

KEY POINTS TO INCLUDE

- MHA Norms for Assistance from SDRF/NDRF, 2022 — damage-graded entitlements
- Rawls' difference principle — maximise worst-off
- Sen's capability approach — restoration of livelihood capability
- SECC 2011 deprivation criteria
- Article 14 — reasonable classification permitted
- Sendai Framework Priority 4 — Build Back Better

EXAMPLES & CASE STUDIES

- Cyclone Fani 2019 Odisha — staggered relief approach
- Kerala floods 2018 relief disbursal model
- Wayanad landslides 2024 relief framework

MODEL ANSWER

> **Dilemma:** A DM must allocate Rs 19 crore of available SDRF funds against a Rs 52 crore entitlement for 6,400 destroyed fishermen huts, while a local MLA demands pro-rata distribution, a national NGO insists on the poorest 2,200 SC/ST households first, and an OBC angler-cooperative federation wants its members served first. The

dilemma is to design a defensible, transparent rule that honours equity, dignity and verified scarcity at once.

Stakeholders: 6,400 cyclone-affected fishermen families across caste and class; the MLA (pro-rata pressure); the national NGO (SC/ST advocacy); the OBC angler-cooperative federation; the SDMA (silent); NDMA and MHA (Rs 33 crore NDRF release pending); CAG and State Auditor; the media; future relief precedents; Article 14 with reasonable classification.

Options analysed: (a) pro-rata across all 6,400 — politically easy but no family restored to functioning, worst-off remain destitute, Rawlsian difference-principle test fails; (b) full SDRF first to the 2,200 SC/ST households — strong on equity but breaches federation expectation, stokes OBC-SC/ST tension, ignores damage-graded norms; (c) a published tiered disbursal — first, Rs 10,000 immediate relief to all 6,400 from the CM Relief Fund within 72 hours; second, full SDRF entitlement to households below the SECC-2011 deprivation threshold regardless of caste; third, the balance under verifiable damage-category grading once NDRF is released after JRDA — the hard right.

Decision and reasoning: Option (c). The DM publishes the three-tier criteria with weightings, writes to the MLA, NGO, federation and SDMA, sets up a single-window grievance cell, and issues a weekly bulletin. Three named values anchor the choice: Rawls's difference principle directing SDRF flow to the worst-off via SECC-2011; Sen's capability approach restoring livelihood, not just cash; and the constitutional morality of Article 14 with reasonable classification (deprivation rank, not caste alone). MHA SDRF/NDRF Norms 2022 supply the damage grading; Sendai Priority 4 'Build Back Better' the rebuilding lens.

Safeguard / institutional fix: Section 4 RTI publication of beneficiary lists with privacy redaction; third-party concurrent audit by the State Auditor and a CAG team; appeal mechanism through the SDMA and the District Legal Services Authority; documented chain to NDMA for the pending Rs 33 crore NDRF release; staggered communication protocol modelled on Cyclone Fani (2019, Odisha) and Kerala Floods (2018); protection of frontline officers from political pressure through a written reasoned order; a standing rule that pro-rata is the default disbursal only when scarcity is below 25 per cent of entitlement; weekly bulletin and grievance cell visibility at the district headquarters.

SDRF/NDRF norms | Rawls difference principle | SECC 2011 | Article 14 | Sen capability | tiered disbursal | Build Back Better | tier

Q60

You are the Principal Secretary, Health, in a state. A state-run super-speciality hospital has 6 paediatric heart-transplant slots a year; demand is 80 children, of whom 22 are critically waitlisted. The current first-come allocation favours those who reach the registry early — often urban, educated families. A proposed revision would weigh medical urgency (40 per cent), age-prognosis (30 per cent), waitlist time (20 per cent), and geographical equity (10 per cent). The medical fraternity is divided; an industrialist offers ₹30 crore in CSR to fund 4 additional slots in a private hospital tie-up. The State Cabinet wants a memo in 14 days. What course of action would you take? Justify with the values involved.

20 MARKS | 400 WORDS | 22 MIN | HARD

CASE STUDY · RESOURCE ALLOCATION UNDER SCARCITY — PAEDIATRIC TRANSPLANT SLOTS

ANSWER OUTLINE

1. Dilemma: design a fair and defensible allocation rule under irreducible scarcity, and decide on partial commodification through CSR-tie-up.

2. Stakeholders: 80 child patients and families, medical fraternity, state hospital, private partner, industrialist, future cohorts.

3. Options: (a) retain first-come rule — entrenches social-capital bias; (b) accept only the revised weighting — improves fairness; (c) adopt the four-factor weighted rule plus accept CSR-funded 4 extra slots under a strict public-protocol MoU (same triage rule applies; no donor-naming rights to influence triage; price capped; transparent waitlist) — hard right.

4. Decision: Option (c) — Cabinet memo proposes the four-factor rule, with CSR addition under a public-protocol MoU; constitute an independent triage committee; ensure transparency dashboard.

5. Safeguard: publish triage criteria and weightings; weekly anonymised waitlist update; audit by State Medical Council; appeal mechanism via the State Human Rights Commission; CSR MoU reviewed by Law Department; no quid-pro-quo clause.

KEY POINTS TO INCLUDE

- Transplantation of Human Organs and Tissues Act 1994 (amended 2011) — fair-access norms

- Article 21 — right to health, K.S. Puttaswamy line of jurisprudence
- Rawls' justice as fairness — explicit criteria over discretion
- Sen's capability approach — restore agency
- Companies Act 2013 Section 135 — CSR scope
- Triage protocols (WHO, Beauchamp-Childress)

EXAMPLES & CASE STUDIES

- AIIMS organ-allocation protocols
- Tamil Nadu Cadaver Transplant Programme
- Kerala Mrithasanjeevani organ-allocation registry

MODEL ANSWER

> **Dilemma:** A Principal Secretary, Health, must design an allocation rule for six paediatric heart-transplant slots a year against demand from 80 children, of whom 22 are critically waitlisted, and decide whether to accept a Rs 30 crore CSR offer to fund four extra slots through a private-hospital tie-up. The dilemma is twofold — designing a fair triage rule under irreducible scarcity, and using CSR-funded private capacity without commodifying access.
>
> **Stakeholders:** 80 child patients and families, especially the 22 critically waitlisted; the divided medical fraternity; the state super-speciality hospital and its surgical team; the proposed private partner and the donor-industrialist; the State Cabinet; the State Medical Council and the State Human Rights Commission; the Law Department for MoU vetting; future paediatric cohorts whose access depends on this precedent.
>
> **Options analysed:** (a) retain first-come allocation — entrenches social-capital and urban-literacy bias against rural families, breaches Rawlsian justice-as-fairness and Sen's capability approach, unlikely to survive an Article 21 challenge under the Puttaswamy (2017) line; (b) accept only the revised four-factor weighting (medical urgency 40, age-prognosis 30, waitlist time 20, geographical equity 10 per cent) — improves fairness but leaves supply at six when ten are feasible, sacrificing four lives a year on purist objection; (c) adopt the four-factor weighted rule and accept the Rs 30 crore CSR-funded four extra slots under a strict public-protocol MoU — the same triage rule applies in the private hospital, no donor-naming rights, prices capped at state rate, waitlist unified, donor has zero discretion over selection — the hard right.
>
> **Decision and reasoning:** Option (c). The Cabinet memo proposes the four-factor weighting plus the CSR addition under a public-protocol MoU. An independent triage

committee with paediatric cardiologists, an ethicist and an HRC nominee runs the unified waitlist; a transparency dashboard updates weekly. Three named values anchor it: Rawls's justice-as-fairness demanding explicit criteria over discretion; Sen's capability approach restoring child agency; and Beauchamp-Childress bioethics — beneficence, non-maleficence, justice, respect — endorsed by WHO triage protocols. THOTA 1994 fair-access norms, Article 21 with Puttaswamy (2017) give the constitutional foundation; Kerala's Mrithasanjeevani registry shows feasibility.

Safeguard / institutional fix: Publish triage criteria and weightings under RTI Section 4; weekly anonymised waitlist update; audit by the State Medical Council; appeal through the State HRC; CSR MoU vetted by the Law Department with explicit no-quid-pro-quo and no-naming-rights clauses; donor barred from selection; oversight board with a parent representative; annual weighting-matrix review; rule that any CSR-funded private capacity must operate under the same public protocol and triage committee.

THOTA 1994 | triage | Rawls | Sen capability | CSR MoU | Article 21 | transparent allocation | public protocol

About Anantam IAS

Anantam IAS is a Civil Services preparation institute built on a single conviction: that clarity, not noise, clears the exam. Our teaching turns the vast UPSC syllabus into clean mental models, and our writing — like the chapters in this book — is made to be understood once and remembered for the exam hall.

What we offer

— **Prelims Foundation** — concept-first coverage of the full GS syllabus, mapped to previous-year questions.

— **Mains Answer Writing** — daily questions evaluated within 48 hours by faculty who have cleared the exam.

— **Daily Current Affairs** — pointer notes and monthly compilations, linked to the syllabus.

— **Optional Subject Guidance** — structured, mentor-led programmes for the popular optionals.

— **Test Series & Mentorship** — sectional and full-length tests with one-to-one guidance.

Every chapter in this book began as free teaching material. If it helped you think more clearly, our programmes are built to do the same — at depth, and with accountability.

CONTACT

anantamias.com

contact@anantamias.com

9844556580 · 6350381242 · 9465374125