

Corrigendum/Explanation SFG 2025 Level 1 Test 5

There are no changes to the solutions/answers. Explanations have been provided for the students who have raised doubts.

Q.7) There was a doubt raised with respect to Statement 1 of the question that confessions made in police custody cannot be used as evidence against the accused.

Explanation- Statement 1 is correct as the confessions made in police custody are equivalent to self incrimination under article 20(3) of the Constitution of India (hence a fundamental right of the accused) and can not be used as evidence in the courts. This view has been established by the Supreme Court of India in THE STATE OF BOMBAY Vs. KATHI KALU OGHAD AND OTHERS case while deciding the validity of Section 27 of the Indian Evidence Act, 1872.

Q.10) There was a doubt raised with respect to Statement 2 of the question that if the motion for his/her removal is taken up for voting, the law requires it to be backed by each House of Parliament and supported by the majority of total membership of that House.

Explanation- The statement 2 is incorrect. As per Article 124 (4) of the Constitution of India “A Judge of the Supreme Court shall not be removed from his office except by an order of the President passed after an address **by each House of Parliament supported by a majority of the total membership of that House and by a majority of not less than two-thirds of the members of that House present and voting** has been presented to the President in the same session for such removal on the ground of proved misbehaviour or incapacity.” So, the majority of total membership of the house is not sufficient to address the removal of a Supreme Court Judge **and the majority of not less than two-thirds of the members of that House present and voting is also required.**

Q.22) There was a doubt raised with respect to Statement 1 of the question that Central Administrative Tribunal’s

chairman is appointed by the President of India after consultation with the Chief Justice of India.

Explanation- The statement 1 is correct. As per the section 6 (3) of THE ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNALS ACT, 1985 “The Chairman and every other Member of the Central Administrative Tribunal shall be appointed after consultation with the Chief Justice of India by the President.”

Q.26) There was a doubt raised with respect to Statement 3 of the question that a Collegium system headed by the Chief Justice of India for the appointment of Judges of higher courts is or is not a safeguard to secure the independence of judiciary provided under the Constitution of India.

Explanation- The statement 3 is incorrect as the Collegium system is not provided under the Constitution of India and the question asks about how the Constitution of India secures the independence of judiciary. So the Collegium system may secure the independence of Judiciary according to the Supreme Court of India but is not the provision of the Constitution of India.

Note: There was a doubt raised for Q.38 with respect to the pecuniary jurisdiction of NCDRC. There is a conflict between the act and the rules. We are trying to confirm the same from other sources and will update the same in the clarification of the next test.