

- I. Read the following passage and make a Précis of it in **90-100** words : (10 marks)

Viruses need a living cell to reproduce. As a result, how viruses reproduce is quite different from other organisms or microbes. This is because viruses themselves are only alive when they inhabit the cells of living organisms. Thus, a virus cannot reproduce on its own without a living cell. This is different from other microbes such as bacteria and archaea that can reproduce by themselves by separating their body into two new bodies.

These microbes duplicate their genetic material and then divide into two parts in a process known as cytokinesis. Then, each new organism receives one copy of DNA – for viruses it's quite different as they depend on other living cells. Hence, for viruses to be alive or reproduce they need a host cell. This host cell could be cells of humans, animals, plants, or even bacteria. It is true that there are some viruses that infect microbes like bacteria and archaea. Such viruses are called bacteriophages.

Viruses are seen as parasites as they depend solely on living cells. They are capable of fastening onto a host cell and hijacking the cell for their replication. The replication of themselves in a cell is what produces other new viruses. Hence, reproduction in viruses is asexual. How viruses reproduce asexually is basically just them taking control of the cell of a living organism to generate more viruses. They have adopted a mechanism that enables them to produce new virions. These new viruses then leave in search of other living cells to infect and reproduce in. This is how they gradually hijack the whole cellular system of an organism. Thus, they frequently cause disease.

- II.** Read the following passage and answer the questions given in **not more than three sentences** each. **(2 × 10 = 20 marks)**

Criminal law tries to strike a balance between the rights of those who feel their lives may be threatened, and the rights of those who are – or who may be mistakenly perceived as – a threat. A key component of this difficult balancing act is the doctrine of self-defence. Related issues include battered spouse syndrome, the duty to retreat, and police use of deadly force.

Self-defence has a long history in law. As the doctrine is traditionally defined, a person is legally allowed to use force – including deadly force – when he reasonably believes that he, or another person, is in imminent danger of death or serious bodily injury from an assailant. The person claiming the right to self-defence must not be the initial aggressor, and the amount of force used must not be excessive.

The doctrine of self-defence is usually based on what a person reasonably believes. This means that it's possible to act legally in self-defence even if you are mistaken about the threat, as long as your mistake is reasonable. If you kill another person because you honestly but unreasonably thought the person was trying to kill you, that's still criminal homicide, but your charge might be reduced from murder to manslaughter.

The doctrine of self-defence can be used in defence not only of yourself, but also of others. The law has long taken the position that you're never allowed to take another person's life on the ground of necessity. This means that even if killing one person will save another person's life – or 10 lives, or 100 lives – you can't do it. But if one person is actually trying to kill another person, you can kill the first person to save the second person's life.

The traditional definition of self-defence requires that the perceived threat be imminent. This means you can't act in self-defence prematurely, killing someone because you believe they're likely to attack you in the future. Nor can you act in self-defence belatedly, killing them after the attack is over and you're no longer in any immediate danger.

1. Why is the 'balancing act' mentioned in the beginning of the passage a difficult one?

2. Can the concept of self-defence be considered archaic?

3. What kind of force may be used by a person against a burglar who breaks into his house at night?

4. Is pre-emptive action in self-defence permitted?

5. Would you agree that manslaughter is a more serious charge than murder? Why / why not?

6. Could self-defence include the defence of a group of people apart from, or in addition to oneself?

7. Is the law clear on the 'necessity' of killing a person to save others?

8. Is belated self-defence permitted? Why/why not?

9. Explain the term 'battered spouses.'

10. What do you understand by 'the duty to retreat'?

**III.** Choose **two** of the topics given and write short essays of around **150 words** on each.  
(15 × 2 = 30 marks)

- (i) The effect of the pandemic on the judicial process.
- (ii) Hybrid learning
- (iii) Trial by media

Qn. No. -----