

Corrigendum/Explanation SFG 2026 Level 1 Test 6

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

In Q.6) There was a doubt raised with respect to Statement II of the question that Recommendation for the removal of the judges of the Supreme Court is the Judicial Function of the Parliament of India.

Explanation- Statement II is correct. The judicial functions of the Parliament include considering the proposals for removal of President, Vice-President and Judges of High Courts and Supreme Court.

Source: <https://ncert.nic.in/textbook.php?keps2=5-10> (page 109)

<https://www.egyankosh.ac.in/bitstream/123456789/76699/1/Unit-6.pdf> (page 92)

In Q.8) There was a doubt raised with respect to Statement I of the question that will it be constitutionally valid for the President of India to dissolve the House of the People if no party or coalition of parties is able to form a stable government.

Explanation- Statement I is correct. It will be constitutionally valid for the President of India to dissolve the House of the People if no party or coalition of parties is able to form a stable government. If, after a general election or after the fall of a government, **no party or coalition is able to secure majority support and form stable government**, the President may use **situational discretion** and dissolve the House of the People.

The question does not ask about the Constitutional vs situational discretion of the President of India. It asks about some actions performed by the President in certain situations if these actions are constitutionally valid or not.

In Q.10) There was a doubt raised with respect to Statement I of the question that “This address (Special Address by the President to the Parliament under the Constitution of India) has to be to both houses of the Parliament assembled together only.”

Explanation- Statement I is correct. The provisions related to the Special Address by the President to the Parliament under the Constitution of India are explicitly mentioned under Article 87 of the Constitution (not under Article 86). Article 87 of the Constitution states that “At the commencement of the first session after each general election to the House of the People **and at the commencement of the first session of each year the President shall address both Houses of Parliament assembled together and** inform Parliament of the causes of its summons.”

Source:

<https://cdnbbsr.s3waas.gov.in/s380537a945c7aaa788ccfcdf1b99b5d8f/uploads/2024/07/20240716890312078.pdf> (Article 87, page 40)

In Q.24) There was a doubt raised with respect to Statement IV of the question that S/he (Speaker of the Lok Sabha) is the appointing authority of Deputy Speaker of Lok Sabha.

Explanation- Statement IV is incorrect. As per Article 93 of the Indian Constitution - The House of the People shall, as soon as may be, choose two members of the House to be respectively Speaker and Deputy Speaker. So the Deputy Speaker of Lok Sabha is neither appointed by the Speaker nor is subordinate to the Speaker. S/he is a Constitutional post similar to that of Speaker and elected by the House of People itself.

Source:

<https://cdnbbsr.s3waas.gov.in/s380537a945c7aaa788ccfcdf1b99b5d8f/uploads/2024/07/20240716890312078.pdf> (Article 93, page 92)

In Q.31) There was a doubt raised with respect to Statement 3 of the question that the Panel of Chairperson consists of 10 members and one of them presides over the House when both Speaker and Deputy Speaker are not there.

Explanation- Statement 3 is correct. The Panel of Chairperson consists of 10 members and one of them presides over the House when both Speaker and Deputy Speaker are not there. This is a previous year question (PYQ) of UPSC CAPF 2020. The official answer key considers the statement correct. Although the language of the question statement should have been better at the end of UPSC and it should have been clarified that “both Speaker and Deputy Speaker are not there” means the absence of Speaker and Deputy Speaker and not the vacancy of their office. But here UPSC has considered that “not there means absent”.

In case of Vacancy in office of Speaker and Deputy Speaker, the President decides who will preside in the House of People.

In Q.46) There was a doubt raised with respect to Statement II of the question that “A private member of the House of people cannot introduce such types of bills (Money bills) in the House.”

Explanation- Statement II is incorrect. There are no explicit provisions in the Constitution or the Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business in Lok Sabha which prohibits the Private member from introducing a Money Bill.

After careful discussions and referring to the rules of procedure of Lok Sabha it is clear that there is nothing in the Constitution or parliamentary procedures which stops a private member from introducing a money bill. **A RTI has been filed by some students in the past year and the RTI also clears that Private members can introduce a money bill in the House of People. Also, we have filed a similar RTI at our end to clarify this issue once and for all. We will further update the students with the official copy of RTI as soon as we get the official reply.**