

PYQ Vault

560

QUESTIONS

50

DAYS

10

YEARS OF PYQS

DAY 39

10 QUESTIONS

Indian Foreign Policy: Determinants & Institutions

Every question carries a **Flow Snapshot** — how the answer moves — and a handwritten model answer on the channel.

No PYQ will be unfamiliar.

PREVIOUS YEAR QUESTION

UPSC 2018 · 10 marks

Do you agree with the view that the Indian Foreign Policy is increasingly being shaped by the Neoliberal outlook? Elaborate

FLOW SNAPSHOT — how the answer moves

Intro routes

- R1** neoliberal FP = minimal regulation + free trade → **Keohane & Nye**: complex interdependence sustains peace → India shows a growing imprint
- R2** from Nehruvian idealism + economic isolation → 1991 LPG reforms as the pivot → neoliberal outlook increasingly visible

Body flow

Nehruvian isolation → 1991 LPG pushes private sector abroad (**Velasco**) → markers: Look East '93 · India–Africa Summits · US ties · WTO services · FTAs · NDB/AIIB → deeper architecture: DTAAAs · Act East · Connect Central Asia

Counter-view

realism persists: surgical strikes, Doklam, Galwan → caution on RCEP/BRI → multi-alignment + strategic autonomy → South–South + egalitarian WTO/UN/climate stands qualify the shift

Conclusion routes

- R1** **Bajpai**: neoliberal position predominates in pragmatic FP → agree, with qualification
- R2** increasingly visible, but not the single decisive factor → India no prisoner to one stream

Neoliberal foreign policy expects states to minimise regulation and ease the flow of trade, resting on Robert Keohane & Joseph Nye's idea that complex interdependence sustains peace.

India's foreign policy shows a growing neoliberal imprint, though it has not displaced older instincts. India began with Nehruvian idealism & economic isolation. Andres Velasco states that 1991 LPG reforms changed this, pushing the private sector to seek markets abroad. The markers followed Look East (1993), India Africa Summits, mending ties with the US, the WTO for services, FTAs & the NDB & AIIB. With DTAA's, Act East & Connect Central Asia India deepens the trade architecture.

A realist perspective still persists like the surgical strikes, Doklam & Galwan, caution over RCEP and BRI.

There is a steady preference for multi-alignment & strategic autonomy, South-South cooperation and egalitarian stands at the WTO, UN & climate forums also qualify the shift.

Kanti Bajpai argues that the neoliberal position still predominates in India's pragmatic foreign policy.

The outlook is increasingly visible, but it is not the single decisive factor. India cannot be a prisoner to one stream of thought.

PREVIOUS YEAR QUESTION

UPSC 2018 · 10 marks

“India is often said to have a rich strategic culture.”
Discuss.

FLOW SNAPSHOT — how the answer moves

Intro routes

R1 **Snyder** defines strategic culture → whether India has one is contested

R2 India acts strategically, yet is charged with *lacking* strategic culture (**Tanham**) → sets up the rebuttal

Body flow

Snyder's definition → **Tanham's** 1992 denial (geography / history / culture / Raj + Hindu 'time' → reactive foreign policy) → **Menon's** rebuttal (independent actor, frugal diplomacy, pluralistic-secular-defensive) → India's own tradition (Arthashastra, Panchsheel, non-alignment; **Kautilya's** *mandala* behind Nehru's non-alignment)

Counter-view

Karnad (strategic autonomy → strategic diminution; Wei-qi outscores *mandala*) vs **Malone** (no grand strategy = advantage; improvisation suits a pragmatic power)

Conclusion routes

R1 distinctive, not absent → the debate itself proves its depth

R2 not the Western grand-strategy type, but a Kautilyan, pluralistic tradition → richness lies in adaptability, not a fixed doctrine

Jack Snyder (1977) described strategic culture as the principles, conditioned emotional reactions & habitual behaviour a strategic community shares about strategy.

Whether India possesses such a culture has long been contested. George K. Tanham argued in 1992 that India lacked one, tracing this to its geography, history, culture & the British Raj and to a Hindu sense of time that discouraged planning. The result was a foreign policy that was reactive rather than proactive.

Shirshankar Menon holds that India has always been an independent actor practising frugal diplomacy. It's economical in entanglements but not engagements and guided by a pluralistic, secular & defensive outlook.

India's strategic tradition is old and distinct. The Arthashastra, Panchsheel and non-alignment, with Nehru's non-alignment drawing on Kautilya's mandala of concentric circles.

Bharat Karnad argues that strategic autonomy has caused strategic diminution, the Chinese Wei-qi model outscoring India's mandala-infused approach. David Malone, by contrast, finds the absence of a grand strategy advantageous, since improvisation suits a pragmatic power.

India's strategic culture is therefore distinctive rather than absent & the debate itself proves its depth.

PREVIOUS YEAR QUESTION

UPSC 2018 · 10 marks

“India's current foreign policy marks significant qualitative shifts from that of previous regimes”. Discuss.

FLOW SNAPSHOT — how the answer moves

Intro routes

- R1** shift is real → but measured in ambition, pace, risk-appetite → not a break with core interests
- R2** question tests rupture vs evolution → stake: qualitative shift genuine, yet grounded in continuity

Body flow

change of self-image: balancing power → leading power → institutional markers (Quad, JAI trilateral, Act East, foundational agreements with US, SAGAR) → West Asia recalibration: **Desai** (Palestine no longer zero-sum) → **Pant** (old balancing dropped, UAE/Saudi ties) → firmer posture (Doklam, surgical + pre-emptive strikes) → new risk-appetite

Counter-view

continuities persist → Gandhian idealism, Gujral Doctrine with some neighbours, strategic autonomy, South-South cooperation

Conclusion routes

- R1** **Raja Mohan's** 'Third Republic' → new chapter after Nehruvian and Manmohan eras
- R2** shifts genuine but build on strategic autonomy + civilisational identity → evolution, not rupture

The shift under the present government is real, but lies in ambition, pace and risk-appetite. It is not a break with India's core interests.

Its sharpest marker is a change of self-image i.e. where India once accepted the role of balancing power, PM Modi has claimed that of a leading power. It shows in new markers like the Quad, the JAI trilateral, Act East, foundational agreements with the US and SAGAR.

According to Ronak Desai, India no longer treats the Palestine question in zero sum terms. Harsh V. Pant states that its engagement has dropped the old balancing approach, deepening ties with the UAE and Saudi Arabia. A firmer posture like Doklam, the surgical strikes & pre-emptive strikes against Pakistan confirms a new appetite for risk.

These rests on Gandhian idealism, the Aijral Doctrine with some neighbours, strategic autonomy & South-South cooperation all persist. This is why C. Raja Mohan, in Modi's World, calls the change as India's "Third Republic", after the Nehruvian and Manmohan eras.

The shifts are therefore genuine, but build on continuities of strategic autonomy & civilisational identity.

PREVIOUS YEAR QUESTION

UPSC 2019 · 10 marks

Examine the role of 'parliamentary diplomacy' in India's foreign policy.

FLOW SNAPSHOT — how the answer moves

Intro routes

- R1 parliamentary diplomacy = legislators acting beyond the executive → through delegations & dialogues → a democratic layer, but bounded
- R2 executive holds the defining role → legislative reach widens external engagement → works within clear limits

Body flow

Tharoor: democratic/representative dimension, bipartisan bridge → committees (foreign affairs & defence) scrutinise & influence in national interest → IPU + CPA → multilateralism + democratic values projected abroad → **Raja Mohan:** amplifies India's voice, cultivates bilateral/regional ties → MP-to-MP understanding on climate change, terrorism, development

Counter-view

Chaudhuri: Parliament limits but does not dictate → no legal requirement for approval → practice underutilised, executive dominates

Conclusion routes

- R1 integrates democratic oversight + enhances soft power, yet potential constrained by executive primacy
- R2 a supporting instrument, not a driver → democratic reach is real but bounded by executive dominance

Parliamentary diplomacy is the involvement of legislators in international affairs, extending beyond executive-driven foreign policy through delegations & dialogues.

In India, where the executive holds the defining role, this legislative reach adds a democratic layer to external engagement, though it works within clear limits.

Shashi Tharoor views that parliamentarians bring a more democratic & representative dimension, bridging political divides & fostering bipartisan support. Parliamentary committees on foreign affairs & defence allow members to scrutinise & influence policy in line with national interest.

According to C. Raja Mohan, such participation amplifies India's voice & cultivates bilateral & regional relationships, while MP-to-MP interaction builds mutual understanding on climate change, terrorism & development.

Rudra Chandhary argues that Parliament places limits on the executive but does not dictate policy; there is no legal requirement for its approval.

Parliamentary diplomacy thus integrates democratic oversight & enhances soft power, but its potential stays constrained by executive dominance.

PREVIOUS YEAR QUESTION

UPSC 2019 · 20 marks

Examine the increasing significance of maritime security in India's foreign policy.

FLOW SNAPSHOT — how the answer moves

Intro routes

- R1** largest littoral state + Indian Ocean = busiest sea lane → **Mahan**: sea power / choke points → Indo-Pacific shift raises salience → maritime security moving to the centre
- R2** India's continental, defensive mindset → the sea long under-weighted → rising maritime focus corrects a neglected destiny

Body flow

Mahan (sea power / choke points) → Indo-Pacific shift → **Tanham** (charge of no strategic culture yet his own record of naval denial + blue-water navy) → **Panikkar & Menon** (geography compels naval presence) → peninsular projection / Indian Ocean control → Act East + net security provider → **Bajpai** (widened security = global commons, freedom of high seas) → operationalised: SAGAR, Quad, BIMSTEC, Project Mausam, IORA → contest for choke points (Duqm, Sabang, 2018) → **Rao** (strategic autonomy driven by maritime security)

Counter-view

Pant: strategic thought still inconsistent → net-security-provider = aspiration > capability → continental pull (China pressure in the Indian Ocean and the Himalayas) tests the ambition

Conclusion routes

- R1** margin to centre → maritime security now a defining pillar, integral to strategic autonomy and the net-security-provider identity
- R2** significance real but transition incomplete → ambition ahead of capability → a defining yet still-maturing maritime turn

India is the largest littoral state of the Indian ocean, with a long coastline that commands the world's busiest sea lane of communication.

Alfred T. Mahan believes that naval power & location build great powers & control of strategic choke points such as Suez & Malacca commands the sea. The shift of the global theatre to the Indo-Pacific has sharpened this logic, moving maritime security from the margins of India's foreign policy towards its centre.

George K. Tanham argued that a defensive mindset left India without a strategic culture. He recorded that India built naval capabilities to deny any extra-regional power a presence in the Indian Ocean. K.M. Panikkar & Shivshankar Menon hold that geography compels a strong naval presence.

As the idea of security widened, Kanti Bajpai placed the global commons & freedom of the high seas within national security. This runs through SAGAR in the Indian Ocean & through the Quad, BIMSTEC, Project Mausam & IORA. The contest for choke points shows in the Duqm (Oman) & Sabang (Indonesia) ports secured in 2018. Nirupama Rao ties the quest for strategic autonomy directly to energy & maritime security.

Haush V. Pant argues Indian strategic thought still inconsistent, and the net-security-provider role remains more aspiration than settled capability. Persistent Chinese pressure is now felt in the Indian Ocean as well as the Himalayas.

The maritime security has moved from a neglected edge to a defining pillar of India's foreign policy.

PREVIOUS YEAR QUESTION

UPSC 2022 · 10 marks

Peaceful co-existence remains the cornerstone of India's foreign policy. Comment.

FLOW SNAPSHOT — how the answer moves

Intro routes

- R1** core task of foreign policy = security + territorial integrity + peaceful environment → India pursues it by reconciliation, not revenge
- R2** **Appadorai's** pacifism as deliberate method → taproot in *Vasudhaiva Kutumbakam* + Buddhism + Gandhian non-violence

Body flow

Panchsheel (1954) → Five Principles → basis for non-alignment + concrete form of UN Charter → principle still guides conduct → China (Himalayas / Indian Ocean → amicable resolution) → Pakistan (UN + democratic means on cross-border terror) → Ukraine crisis (co-existence + strategic autonomy) → constructive role → rival blocs together + pandemic global good

Counter-view

co-existence now paired with a firmer, more risk-taking posture

Conclusion routes

- R1** continuity of principle alongside pragmatic adaptation
- R2** cornerstone holds; practice turns more assertive

The primary task of any foreign policy is a nation's security, its territorial integrity & a peaceful external environment.

India has pursued these through reconciliation rather than revenge.

According to A. Appadorai, this pacifism is a deliberate method that values the temper of peace over a spirit of hatred. Its deepest root is Vasudhaiva Kutumbakam, sharpened by Buddhism & Gandhian non-violence.

This outlook found concrete form in panchsheel, the Sino-Indian Agreement of 1954. Its 5 principles of peaceful co-existence became the basis for non-alignment & gave expression to the UN charter.

The principle still guides conduct. Despite persistent Chinese aggression in the Himalayas & the Indian Ocean, India has sought amicable resolution. With Pakistan, it has used UN platforms & democratic means to raise cross-border terrorism.

India has also brought rival blocs together & worked for the global good during the pandemic. The co-existence sits beside a firmer, more risk-taking posture.

Continuity of principle, therefore runs alongside pragmatic adaptation. The cornerstone holds, even as its practice turns more assertive.

PREVIOUS YEAR QUESTION

UPSC 2022 · 15 marks

Critically examine the major factors responsible for a turnaround in the trajectory of India's foreign policy in the post-cold war period.

FLOW SNAPSHOT — how the answer moves

Intro routes

- R1 Cold War's end unsettled post-1947 assumptions → two pressures (systemic + economic) forced a reframing, not a rupture
- R2 1991 the hinge → external shock meets domestic breakdown → doctrine reworked, core aims kept

Body flow

systemic shock (**Ganguly**: USSR collapse + Cold War's end → nonalignment lost meaning) → unipolar adjustment (accommodate US, full ties with Israel, economy at centre) → economic crisis (1991 fiscal shock: oil, Gulf repatriation, lost remittances → end of import-substitution) → **Baru**: economy the necessary foundation of power → doctrinal reframing (**Nirupama Rao**: strategic autonomy from growth, energy/maritime security, technology, all-power ties) → non-alignment → strategic autonomy + multi-alignment (polycentric order) → Indo-US civil nuclear deal as marker

Counter-view

Menon: sovereignty & territorial integrity remain foundational → India cautious on coercive norms (R2P) → limits of the turnaround

Conclusion routes

- R1 real in posture and method → but older ideals reworked, not discarded
- R2 strategic autonomy the constant thread → change as evolution, adapted to a transformed order

The end of the Cold War unsettled India's foreign-policy assumptions since 1947. The turnaround after 1991 came from two pressures acting together i.e. a transformed international order & a domestic economic breakdown.

Sumit Ganguly states that the collapse of the Soviet Union & the end of the Cold War "forced India's policymakers to make drastic changes," and that non-alignment ceased to have much meaning.

The 1991 fiscal crisis i.e. rising oil prices after the invasion of Kuwait, repatriation from the Gulf & lost remittances pushed India to abandon import-substitution & dismantle its control. For Sanjay Baru, economic capability is the necessary foundation of political, diplomatic & military power.

According to Nirupama Rao, the quest for strategic autonomy grew from sustained growth, energy & maritime security & access to technology, secured through well-rounded ties with every major power. Non-alignment became strategic autonomy & multi-alignment in a polycentric order; the Indo-US civil nuclear agreement marked the shift.

Shivshankar Menon holds that sovereignty & territorial integrity remain the foundation of the international system, which explains India's caution towards coercive norms like R2P.

The change was real in posture & method, but it reworked older ideals rather than discarding them.

PREVIOUS YEAR QUESTION

UPSC 2023 · 10 marks

Explain the major features of India's Foreign Policy in the 21st century.

FLOW SNAPSHOT — how the answer moves

Intro routes

- R1 21st-century IFP breaks from Cold War non-alignment → proactive engagement on many fronts
- R2 defining feature = multi-alignment → strategic autonomy held with many partners at once (**Raja Mohan**)

Body flow

multi-alignment (**Raja Mohan**: US, Russia, France, Japan, ASEAN) → Neighbourhood First (co-existence, connectivity, development) → Act East (from Look East, balance China) → economic diplomacy (**Pant**: Make in India, Digital India, FTAs) → multilateral activism (**Tharoor**: UN, BRICS, G20, SCO, UNSC bid) → security (Quad, maritime, counter-terror) → soft power (vaccine diplomacy, ISA, diaspora, Indo-Pacific)

Counter-view

features look like a qualitative break, but rest on continuity → autonomy now pursued *through* engagement, not distance (new means, old value)

Conclusion routes

- R1 many new instruments, one constant thread — strategic autonomy
- R2 move from reactive non-alignment to proactive multi-alignment reads as evolution, not rupture — old principles carried into new priorities

India's 21st century foreign policy has shifted from the Cold War's reactive non-alignment to proactive engagement on many fronts. Its defining feature is multi-alignment.

As per C. Raja Mohan, India keeps its strategic autonomy while building partnerships with the US, Russia, France, Japan and ASEAN, without joining any single bloc.

Closer to home, Neighbourhood links peaceful co-existence with connectivity & development cooperation. Act East, a shift from the older Look East, deepens ties with South-East & East Asia to balance China's influence.

Harsh V. Pant connects Make in India & Digital India with FTAs & regional arrangements. India is also assertive multilaterally. Shashi Tharoor points to its activism in UN, BRICS, the G20 & the SCO and its bid for a permanent UNSC seat.

Security has gained a maritime & counter-terror emphasis through the Quad. Vaccine diplomacy, the ISA & diaspora outreach project soft-power & shape the Indo-Pacific construct.

The strategic autonomy is pursued through partnership rather than distance, combining India's older principles with contemporary priorities.

PREVIOUS YEAR QUESTION

UPSC 2024 · 20 marks

Would you concur with the view that of late, India's foreign policy has been in a transition mode from Nehruvianism to Neoliberalism? Support your answer with the help of suitable examples.

FLOW SNAPSHOT — how the answer moves

Intro routes

- R1** partial concurrence staked → Nehruvian pole (**Sikri**: sovereignty + autonomy + peace/disarmament) vs neoliberal pole (openness, interests) → autonomy qualifies the shift
- R2** 1991 as the watershed → idealism giving way to economic pragmatism → but a clean “from-to” overstates it → concur with reservation

Body flow

1991 liberalisation as hinge → **Raja Mohan + Pant** (economic/strategic interests in a multipolar world) → economic diplomacy: WTO / FTAs / Act East (ASEAN, Japan) → 2008 nuclear deal as symbol of the move → LEMOA / Rafale / Quad → **Kanti Bajpai** (neoliberal position predominates)

Counter-view

not a clean break → S-400 despite US unease → South-South cooperation + egalitarian climate/trade stands → **Saran** (autonomy the guiding principle, only means changed) → **Tellis** (flexible partnerships, no rigid ideology)

Conclusion routes

- R1** concur: moving to a neoliberal outlook, but realist national interest sets the pace → evolution, not rupture
- R2** transition in method, autonomy the constant → not a prisoner to any single stream of thought

Nehruvianism stood for non-alignment, anti-colonialism & peaceful co-existence. Rajiv Sikri views that Nehru sought sovereignty & strategic autonomy while backing global peace & disarmament.

Neoliberalism, by contrast, favours economic openness & interest-driven partnerships. India has moved towards the second, but strategic autonomy remains the thread that qualifies the shift.

C. Raja Mohan & Haresh V. Pant show how India started to prioritise economic & strategic interests in an interconnected, multipolar world. The economic diplomacy through the WTO & multiple FTAs & Act East deepened ties with ASEAN & Japan.

The US-India Civil Nuclear Deal of 2008 became the symbol of the move from a non-aligned posture to a pragmatic strategic partnership.

For Kanti Bajpai, the neoliberal position predominates in India's pragmatic foreign policy.

However, India avoids fully aligning with any power like the S-400 purchase despite US unease shows this. Shyam Saran argues that strategic autonomy remains the guiding principle, though the means have changed. Ashley J. Tellis describes India's approach as flexible, forming partnerships without rigid ideological communities.

India is moving towards a neoliberal outlook, but the realist factors defining its national interest will keep dictating the pace. The change is viewed as evolution, not rupture as India is not a prisoner to any single stream of thought.

PREVIOUS YEAR QUESTION

UPSC 2025 · 20 marks

Critically analyze the different phases of India's foreign policy since independence. How justified, do you think, is S. Jaishankar's classification of the current phase as the phase of 'energetic diplomacy'?

FLOW SNAPSHOT — how the answer moves

Intro routes

- R1** evolution, not rupture → permanent factors (geography/history/culture) continuity vs dynamic factors change → strategic autonomy the constant yardstick
- R2** six named phases = adaptation to circumstance → present phase the one to test → judge it against the constant thread

Body flow

optimistic non-alignment (1946–62, NAM) → realism & discovery (1962–70, 1962 war → Indo-Soviet Treaty) → regional assertion (1971–91, Bangladesh, Pokhran) → strategic autonomy (1991–99, unipolar → US/Israel/ASEAN) → balancing power (2000–2013, India-US nuclear deal, Russia/China) → each answers its moment, core intact → energetic diplomacy (2014–present): leading-power aim → India Way ('transactional bazaar'/'frenemies', interests over idealism) → engage America/manage China/reassure Russia → markers: Global South, Indo-Pacific, BRICS–G20–SCO, Viksit Bharat 2047

Counter-view

label captures activism + risk-taking vs strong continuity of core aims (autonomy/security/development) → hard to categorise, India early in transition → government ahead of Track-II (media/think-tanks/academia)

Conclusion routes

- R1** 'energetic diplomacy' justified as tempo & ambition, not a settled doctrine
- R2** phases show adaptability & pragmatism; strategic autonomy the value that survives every shift

Since independence, India's foreign policy has changed with circumstances, but through evolution, not sharp breaks with the past.

Permanent factors of geography, history & culture give continuity & dynamic factors bring change. Across every phase, strategic autonomy has stayed the defining value.

S. Jaishankar views this journey as six phases. Optimistic non-alignment (1946-62) resisted the dilution of sovereignty & led the founding of NAM. Realism & discovery (1962-70) followed the 1962 war & produced the Indo-Soviet Treaty. The quest for strategic autonomy (1991-99) met a unipolar world by engaging the US, Israel & ASEAN. Balancing power (2000-13) delivered the India-US nuclear deal while deepening ties with Russia & China. Each phase focused on its moment without abandoning the core.

The present phase, energetic diplomacy (2014-present), rests on Indian aspirations & the goal of becoming a leading power. In 'The India Way', Jaishankar treats the world as a 'transactional bazaar' & major powers as 'frenemies'.

Its markers are leadership of the Global South, a refined Indo-Pacific strategy, plurilateral activism through BRICS, the G20 & the SCO and *Viksit Bharat* by 2047.

But the core objectives of autonomy, security & development show strong continuity. The phase is hard to categorise, since India is still early in a transition whose direction is unclear. Government ambition has run ahead of the media, think-tanks & academia.

Energetic diplomacy is therefore a just description of intensity & ambition, though an evolving, contested category, not a settled doctrine.

The phases together show adaptability, with strategic autonomy surviving every shift.

All 10 questions — PDF + handwritten answers

The complete Day 39 set — every PYQ with its Flow Snapshot, and the handwritten model answer for each — in one PDF on the channel. Free.

Download on Telegram

@psirbyamitpratap

560 questions · 50 days · ten years of PYQs — nothing left out

Tomorrow — Day 40. Don't break the chain.



PSIR OPTIONAL · FOR MAINS 2026

ATS 2026

AUGMENTED TEST SERIES

BATCH 4
19 JULY

4 FULL-LENGTH
TESTS

2 OPTIONAL
SIMULATORS

BATCH 5
26 JULY

2 FULL-LENGTH
TESTS

2 OPTIONAL
SIMULATORS

- ◆ PYQ-integrated, UPSC-level difficulty
- ◆ In-depth discussion with Model Answers
- ◆ One-to-one expert evaluation & mentorship

TO ENROL OR FOR GUIDANCE, CALL

93117 40432

AMIT PRATAP SINGH

PSIR FACULTY · FORUMIAS

PSIR OPTIONAL · COHORT 4

TEST SERIES 2027

400+ QUESTIONS · 4 LAYERS OF TESTS

O-AWFG

BALANCED

15 JULY

35 DAILY ANSWER
WRITING TESTS

2 OPTIONAL
SIMULATORS

O-AWFG PRIME

MOST INTENSIVE

15 JULY

35 DAILY ANSWER
WRITING TESTS

8 REVISION
TESTS

2 FULL-LENGTH
TESTS

2 OPTIONAL
SIMULATORS

◆ PSIR DYNAMICS
CLASSES

ATS

EXAM REALISM

19 JULY

4 SECTIONAL
TESTS

6 FULL-LENGTH
TESTS

2 OPTIONAL
SIMULATORS

CONTENT BLUEPRINT ◆ MODEL ANSWERS ◆ EXPERT EVALUATION ◆ PERSONALISED MENTORSHIP

TO ENROL OR FOR GUIDANCE, CALL

93117 40432

AMIT PRATAP SINGH

PSIR FACULTY · FORUMIAS