PUNJAB & HARYANA HIGH COURT
CLERK TIER 2 — TYPING TEST SET 2

20 Typing Passages | English | Court & Legal Format

WHAT'S INSIDE THIS SET

- 20 long-form passages in continuous court-record prose (approx. 700-800 words each)
- Dense with dates, case numbers, statutory sections and monetary figures
- Covers Matrimonial, Land Acquisition, Consumer, Arbitration, Company Law, NDPS Bail, Contempt, Trademark, Insolvency, Domestic Violence, Guardianship, Probate, Partnership, Easement, Defamation, Service/Pension, PIL-Environment, Recovery Suit, RTI and Consumer-Builder matters
- Each passage: 10 minutes | Target 30 WPM | Min. accuracy 95%

- PLUS: 10 simple beginner passages (5 min | 20 WPM | 90% accuracy) to build accuracy first

Typing Test 1 of 20

Matrimonial Dispute and Divorce on Ground of Cruelty

Duration: 10 min | Target Speed: 30 WPM | Minimum Accuracy: 95%

In the Hon'ble Court of the District Judge, Family Courts, Civil Suit No. 214 of 2021 was listed for final judgment on 12th February 2027 before the learned Presiding Officer. The petitioner-husband instituted the present petition for dissolution of marriage on 06th May 2021 under Section 13(1)(ia) of the Hindu Marriage Act, 1955, alleging cruelty at the hands of the respondent-wife. The marriage between the parties was solemnised on 24th November 2016 according to Hindu rites and ceremonies at the residence of the petitioner, and one daughter was born out of the wedlock on 15th August 2018. The petitioner pleaded that the respondent, within a few months of the marriage, began levelling false allegations of extra-marital affairs against him before family members and neighbours, and that on 09th March 2019 she left the matrimonial home along with the minor daughter without any justification, taking away household articles and jewellery valued at Rs. 4,20,000/-. It was further averred that despite a written request sent on 18th July 2019 through registered post, the respondent refused to return to the matrimonial home, and that she filed a false complaint under Section 498-A of the Indian Penal Code on 02nd September 2019, which culminated in an acquittal of the petitioner and his family members on 14th October 2022. The petitioner also stated that the respondent had, on 11th December 2020, publicly humiliated him at his place of employment, causing him to face disciplinary proceedings which were later dropped on 19th April 2021. The respondent contested the petition by filing a written statement on 20th September 2021, denying the allegations of cruelty and alleging in turn that the petitioner was an alcoholic who used to beat her regularly, and that she was compelled to leave the matrimonial home on account of the said harassment. She further pleaded that the complaint under Section 498-A was filed in good faith and that the acquittal did not establish malice on her part. The petitioner examined himself as PW-1 on 08th February 2022 and produced 06 documents including the medical certificate of the disciplinary proceedings, the registered notice, and the certified copy of the acquittal order. Two neighbours were examined as PW-2 and PW-3 on 16th May 2022 and 21st July 2022 respectively, who corroborated the petitioner's version regarding the public allegations made by the respondent. The respondent examined herself as RW-1 on 09th November 2022 and produced photographs said to depict injuries, along with a medical prescription dated 22nd August 2019. In cross-examination conducted on 09th November 2022, the respondent admitted that no medico-legal report had ever been prepared in respect of the alleged injuries, and that she had not lodged any complaint of assault contemporaneously. The learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that persistent, unfounded and defamatory allegations levelled by a spouse constitute mental cruelty within the meaning of the statute, and placed reliance upon the settled enunciation of law by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in its pronouncement dated 12th September 2016. The learned counsel for the respondent argued that isolated instances of friction between spouses do not amount to cruelty, and that the acquittal in the criminal complaint was on account of benefit of doubt rather than falsity of the allegation. Upon a careful appreciation of the oral and documentary evidence, the learned Court held that the conduct of the respondent in levelling repeated unsubstantiated allegations, coupled with her failure to establish any contemporaneous record of physical harm, amounted to mental cruelty sufficient to dissolve the marriage. Consequently, the petition was allowed on 12th February 2027, and the marriage between the parties solemnised on 24th November 2016 was dissolved by a decree of divorce, with the petitioner directed to pay permanent alimony of Rs. 8,50,000/- and monthly maintenance of Rs. 12,000/- for the minor daughter until she attains majority, positively commencing from 01st March 2027.

Typing Test 2 of 20

Land Acquisition Reference and Enhancement of Compensation

Duration: 10 min | Target Speed: 30 WPM | Minimum Accuracy: 95%

Before the Hon'ble Court of the Additional District Judge, Land Acquisition Reference No. 63 of 2022 was taken up for final disposal on 05th April 2027 before the learned Presiding Officer. The reference was made under Section 18 of the Land Acquisition Act, 1894, at the instance of the landowner, being dissatisfied with the award passed by the Land Acquisition Collector on 28th January 2022, whereby compensation for acquisition of land measuring 6 acres 3 kanals, comprised in Khasra Numbers falling within the revenue estate of the village concerned, was assessed at Rs. 18,00,000/- per acre. The notification under Section 4 of the Act was issued on 09th June 2020 for a public purpose, namely the construction of a bypass road, and the declaration under Section 6 followed on 22nd December 2020. The landowner contended in the reference petition filed on 24th March 2022 that the compensation awarded by the Collector was grossly inadequate, and that comparable sale instances in the vicinity, particularly a registered sale deed dated 14th March 2019 pertaining to an adjoining parcel, reflected a prevailing market rate of Rs. 42,00,000/- per acre as on the date of the said sale deed. It was further pleaded that the acquired land was situated in close proximity to an existing industrial estate and possessed potential for commercial use, a factor which the Collector had failed to consider while determining the market value. The State contested the reference by filing a written statement on 11th July 2022, contending that the sale instance relied upon by the landowner pertained to a smaller parcel and could not be treated as comparable, and that the compensation awarded by the Collector was just and reasonable having regard to the agricultural character of the acquired land. The landowner examined himself as PW-1 on 19th October 2022 and produced the certified copy of the sale deed dated 14th March 2019, the jamabandi for the year 2019-20, and a site plan showing the proximity of the land to the industrial estate. An approved valuer was examined as PW-2 on 07th December 2022, who prepared a valuation report dated 30th November 2022 assessing the market value at Rs. 39,50,000/- per acre after applying a deduction of 15 percent towards development charges. The State examined the Land Acquisition Collector as RW-1 on 16th February 2023 and the Patwari of the concerned circle as RW-2 on 21st March 2023, who deposed regarding the basis of the original assessment. In the course of cross-examination conducted on 21st March 2023, RW-2 admitted that no independent inquiry had been made regarding comparable sale instances in the vicinity at the time of preparing the award. The learned counsel for the landowner submitted that a bona fide sale transaction proximate in point of time and location furnishes the best evidence of market value, and placed reliance upon the settled principles enunciated by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in its judgments dated 11th May 2011 and 03rd August 2017. The learned counsel for the State argued that a deduction of at least 33 percent ought to be applied towards development charges having regard to the size of the acquired holding. Upon a careful appreciation of the sale instance, the valuation report and the site conditions, the learned Court held that the market value of the acquired land as on the date of the Section 4 notification was liable to be assessed at Rs. 34,00,000/- per acre after applying a deduction of 20 percent. Accordingly, the reference was allowed on 05th April 2027, enhancing the compensation to the said rate along with statutory solatium at 30 percent and additional compensation under Section 23(1-A) of the Act, together with interest at the rate of 9 percent per annum from the date of taking possession, the enhanced amount to be deposited within 60 days, positively by 04th June 2027.

Typing Test 3 of 20

Consumer Complaint for Deficiency in Insurance Service

Duration: 10 min | Target Speed: 30 WPM | Minimum Accuracy: 95%

Before the Hon'ble State Consumer Disputes Redressal Commission, Consumer Complaint No. 348 of 2022 was listed for final orders on 21st January 2027 before the learned Presiding Member. The complainant instituted the present complaint on 16th August 2022 under Section 35 of the Consumer Protection Act, 2019, against the opposite party insurance company, alleging deficiency in service in respect of a mediclaim policy bearing Policy No. MC-77291, valid from 01st April 2021 to 31st March 2022, for a sum insured of Rs. 5,00,000/-. The complainant pleaded that he was admitted to a multi-speciality hospital on 08th October 2021 for treatment of a cardiac ailment and incurred hospitalisation expenses amounting to Rs. 4,35,000/-, in respect of which a claim was lodged with the opposite party on 25th October 2021 along with all requisite documents including discharge summary, investigation reports and original bills. It was averred that the opposite party, by a letter dated 14th January 2022, repudiated the claim on the ground of alleged non-disclosure of a pre-existing hypertensive condition, contending that the complainant had suppressed material facts at the time of proposing the policy on 20th March 2021. The complainant denied the allegation of suppression and pleaded that he was never diagnosed with hypertension prior to the date of the proposal, and that the sole reference relied upon by the opposite party was an isolated elevated blood pressure reading recorded during a routine check-up on 05th January 2020, which did not amount to a diagnosed ailment requiring disclosure. A legal notice was thereafter issued on 10th February 2022, calling upon the opposite party to settle the claim within 15 days, which evoked no response. The opposite party contested the complaint by filing a written version on 19th October 2022, reiterating that the complainant was under continuous treatment for hypertension since the year 2020 as evidenced by a prescription dated 05th January 2020, and that the repudiation was justified in terms of the policy conditions. The complainant examined himself as CW-1 on 11th January 2023 and produced 14 documents, including the policy schedule, the proposal form, the discharge summary, and the itemised hospital bills. The treating cardiologist was examined as CW-2 on 08th March 2023, who deposed that hypertension, being a common and manageable condition, does not ordinarily require disclosure unless it has resulted in any organ damage or specific treatment, none of which was present in the complainant's case. The opposite party examined its Medical Officer as OPW-1 on 22nd April 2023, who relied upon the prescription dated 05th January 2020 to contend that the condition was pre-existing and ought to have been disclosed. In cross-examination conducted on 22nd April 2023, OPW-1 admitted that the prescription in question did not reflect any follow-up treatment or continued medication thereafter. The learned counsel for the complainant submitted that a solitary, unconfirmed reading without any subsequent treatment cannot be equated with a pre-existing disease, and that repudiation on such a tenuous ground constitutes a clear deficiency in service. The learned counsel for the opposite party argued that the duty of utmost good faith cast upon a proposer is absolute, and that even a probable ailment ought to have been disclosed. Upon a careful appreciation of the medical evidence, the learned Commission held that the isolated reading did not establish a diagnosed pre-existing condition, and that the repudiation of the claim was unjustified and amounted to a deficiency in service. Consequently, the complaint was allowed on 21st January 2027, and the opposite party was directed to pay the sum of Rs. 4,35,000/- towards the hospitalisation expenses along with interest at the rate of 9 percent per annum from the date of repudiation, besides a sum of Rs. 50,000/- as compensation for harassment and Rs. 25,000/- towards litigation costs, the entire amount to be paid within 45 days, positively by 07th March 2027.

Typing Test 4 of 20

Challenge to Arbitral Award under Section 34

Duration: 10 min | Target Speed: 30 WPM | Minimum Accuracy: 95%

In the Hon'ble Court of the District Judge, Commercial Court, Arbitration Case No. 87 of 2023 was taken up for final hearing on 18th May 2027 before the learned Presiding Officer. The petitioner filed the present application on 22nd September 2023 under Section 34 of the Arbitration and Conciliation Act, 1996, challenging the arbitral award dated 30th June 2023 passed by the learned sole Arbitrator in respect of disputes arising out of a works contract dated 14th February 2019 executed between the parties for construction of a commercial complex at a total contract value of Rs. 3,60,00,000/-. The disputes had arisen when the respondent-contractor terminated the contract on 08th November 2020, alleging non-payment of running account bills amounting to Rs. 68,00,000/- despite completion of 72 percent of the work, and invoked the arbitration clause contained in Clause 24 of the agreement by a notice dated 15th December 2020. The learned Arbitrator, upon conclusion of the proceedings in which both parties led oral and documentary evidence between 10th March 2022 and 22nd April 2023, passed the impugned award holding the petitioner liable to pay the respondent a sum of Rs. 74,50,000/- towards outstanding dues and idle labour charges, together with interest at the rate of 12 percent per annum from the date of termination till realisation. The petitioner contended in the present application that the award suffered from patent illegality inasmuch as the learned Arbitrator had failed to consider the counter-claim of the petitioner amounting to Rs. 22,00,000/- towards defective and incomplete work, which was supported by a joint measurement survey conducted on 20th October 2020. It was further pleaded that the finding regarding idle labour charges was based on no evidence whatsoever, since no muster roll or wage register had been produced by the respondent in support thereof. The respondent contested the application by filing a reply on 14th November 2023, contending that the scope of interference under Section 34 is extremely limited, and that the Arbitrator had duly considered the counter-claim and rejected the same for want of supporting documentary proof, a finding which does not warrant interference as it is a plausible view of the evidence. During the course of arguments, the learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that the award of idle labour charges amounting to Rs. 9,50,000/- was wholly unsubstantiated and rendered the award perverse to that extent, while the remaining findings regarding the running account bills were not seriously assailed. The learned counsel for the respondent argued that re-appreciation of evidence is impermissible in proceedings under Section 34, and that the Court cannot sit in appeal over the findings of fact recorded by the Arbitrator, placing reliance upon the pronouncement of the Hon'ble Supreme Court dated 10th April 2019. Upon a careful perusal of the arbitral record, the pleadings before the Arbitrator and the impugned award, the learned Court held that the finding regarding idle labour charges was indeed unsupported by any material on record and hence suffered from patent illegality appearing on the face of the award, while the remaining findings did not call for interference. Accordingly, the application was partly allowed on 18th May 2027, the award was set aside to the limited extent of Rs. 9,50,000/- awarded towards idle labour charges, and the remainder of the award directing payment of Rs. 65,00,000/- along with interest at 12 percent per annum was upheld and made a rule of the Court, to be satisfied within 60 days, positively by 17th July 2027.

Typing Test 5 of 20

Oppression and Mismanagement Petition before the Tribunal

Duration: 10 min | Target Speed: 30 WPM | Minimum Accuracy: 95%

Before the Hon'ble National Company Law Tribunal, Company Petition No. 142 of 2022 was listed for pronouncement of final order on 26th February 2027 before the learned Bench. The petitioners, holding 30 percent of the issued and paid-up share capital of the respondent-company, instituted the present petition on 11th April 2022 under Sections 241 and 242 of the Companies Act, 2013, alleging oppression and mismanagement at the hands of the majority shareholders who also constitute the Board of Directors. The petitioners pleaded that the company, incorporated on 07th June 2008 with an authorised capital of Rs. 2,00,00,000/-, was engaged in the manufacture of packaging materials, and that the respondents, without issuing any notice to the petitioners, convened an extraordinary general meeting on 19th September 2021 and passed a resolution allotting 4,50,000 additional equity shares to themselves at par value, thereby diluting the shareholding of the petitioners from 30 percent to 11 percent. It was further averred that the respondents had, on 05th November 2021, diverted a sum of Rs. 86,00,000/- from the company's accounts to a related entity in which the respondents held a controlling interest, without any corresponding commercial justification, and that the statutory auditors had qualified the accounts for the financial year 2020-21 on account of the said transaction. The petitioners also pleaded that no board meeting had been convened between 14th March 2021 and 19th September 2021 despite repeated written requests dated 02nd June 2021 and 18th July 2021, in violation of Section 173 of the Act. The respondents contested the petition by filing a reply on 20th July 2022, contending that the additional allotment of shares was made to infuse fresh capital necessitated by an urgent business requirement, and that the petitioners had been given an opportunity to subscribe proportionately but had failed to do so within the stipulated period. It was further contended that the transaction with the related entity was a bona fide commercial arrangement for supply of raw material at competitive rates. The petitioners examined one of their number as PW-1 on 09th December 2022 and produced 11 documents, including the minutes of the extraordinary general meeting, the audited financial statements, and copies of the written requests for convening board meetings. The respondents examined the Managing Director as RW-1 on 14th March 2023, who deposed that the allotment notice had been duly despatched to the petitioners on 25th August 2021. In cross-examination conducted on 14th March 2023, RW-1 was unable to produce any postal or courier receipt evidencing despatch of the said notice to the petitioners. The learned counsel for the petitioners submitted that an allotment of shares made with the deliberate object of reducing the minority to an ineffective minority, without proper notice, constitutes an act of oppression, and placed reliance upon the settled principles enunciated by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in its judgment dated 24th February 1981. The learned counsel for the respondents argued that mere dissatisfaction of a minority shareholder with a majority decision does not amount to oppression unless it is shown to be burdensome, harsh or wrongful. Upon a careful appreciation of the pleadings and evidence, the learned Tribunal held that the failure to establish despatch of notice, coupled with the unexplained diversion of funds to a related entity, established a clear pattern of oppressive and prejudicial conduct against the interests of the petitioners. Accordingly, the petition was allowed on 26th February 2027, the impugned allotment of 4,50,000 shares was set aside, the petitioners' original shareholding of 30 percent was restored, and the respondents were directed to refund the diverted sum of Rs. 86,00,000/- with interest at 10 percent per annum to the company's accounts within 90 days, positively by 27th May 2027.

Typing Test 6 of 20

Regular Bail Application under the NDPS Act

Duration: 10 min | Target Speed: 30 WPM | Minimum Accuracy: 95%

In the Hon'ble High Court of Judicature, Criminal Miscellaneous Petition No. 6842 of 2024 was taken up for final consideration on 09th December 2026 before the learned Single Judge. The petitioner moved the present application on 30th August 2024 under Section 483 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023, seeking regular bail in connection with First Information Report No. 214 of 2024, registered on 18th June 2024 under Sections 21 and 29 of the Narcotic Drugs and Psychotropic Substances Act, 1985. The prosecution case is that on 17th June 2024 at about 10:45 PM, a police party, acting upon secret information, intercepted a vehicle at a check post and recovered 480 grams of a contraband substance from a concealed cavity beneath the rear seat, in the presence of independent witnesses and after due compliance with the mandatory procedure prescribed under Section 50 of the Act. The petitioner, who was travelling as a co-passenger in the said vehicle, was arrested on the spot along with the driver, and the recovered contraband was sealed into two samples on 18th June 2024 at 01:30 AM, which were sent to the forensic science laboratory on 21st June 2024. The forensic report, received on 14th August 2024, confirmed the contraband nature of the recovered substance and its quantity as being intermediate between small and commercial quantity. The petitioner contended in the bail application that he had no knowledge of the presence of the contraband in the vehicle, that the vehicle belonged to the co-accused driver, and that no recovery whatsoever was effected from his personal possession or from any article carried by him. It was further pleaded that the petitioner had been in judicial custody since 18th June 2024, that the trial was unlikely to conclude in the near future on account of the pendency of 22 other cases before the same trial court, and that the petitioner, aged 26 years, was a first-time offender with no criminal antecedents. The State opposed the application by filing a reply on 25th September 2024, contending that mere absence of personal recovery does not absolve a co-passenger of constructive possession where the contraband was concealed in a manner accessible to all occupants of the vehicle, and that the rigours of Section 37 of the Act, which mandate satisfaction of twin conditions before grant of bail, stood squarely attracted given the quantity involved. The learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that the concealment was effected in a cavity that was not visible or accessible without dismantling part of the vehicle structure, a fact borne out by the site plan prepared on 18th June 2024, and that the presumption of conscious possession could not automatically extend to a co-passenger in such circumstances. The learned Additional Advocate General appearing for the State argued that the compliance with Section 50 was duly established through the testimony of the independent witnesses recorded during investigation, and that the quantity recovered, being intermediate, attracted a rigorous standard for grant of bail. Upon a careful consideration of the case diary, the forensic report and the site plan, the Hon'ble Court observed that while the recovery from the vehicle was not in serious dispute, the material on record did not disclose any specific act or knowledge attributable to the petitioner establishing his conscious possession of the concealed contraband, and that continued incarceration pending a trial unlikely to conclude expeditiously would not serve the ends of justice. Accordingly, the application was allowed on 09th December 2026, and the petitioner was directed to be released on bail upon furnishing a personal bond in the sum of Rs. 50,000/- with two sureties of the like amount, subject to the conditions that he shall not leave the jurisdiction of the trial court without permission, shall report to the investigating officer once every fortnight, and shall not tamper with the prosecution evidence, positively with effect from 09th December 2026.

Typing Test 7 of 20

Contempt Petition for Wilful Disobedience of Court Order

Duration: 10 min | Target Speed: 30 WPM | Minimum Accuracy: 95%

In the Hon'ble High Court of Judicature, Contempt Petition (Civil) No. 318 of 2023 was listed for final hearing on 03rd June 2027 before the learned Division Bench. The petitioner instituted the present petition on 14th November 2023 under the Contempt of Courts Act, 1971, alleging wilful disobedience by the respondent of a direction contained in an order dated 09th August 2022 passed by this Court in Civil Writ Petition No. 4471 of 2021, whereby the respondent-authority had been directed to release the retiral benefits of the petitioner, comprising gratuity, leave encashment and provident fund dues aggregating to Rs. 14,60,000/-, within a period of eight weeks from the date of the said order. The petitioner pleaded that despite the expiry of more than fifteen months from the date of the order and despite service of a certified copy thereof upon the respondent on 22nd August 2022, no part of the retiral dues had been released, and that a representation submitted on 05th December 2022 followed by a reminder dated 10th March 2023 evoked no response whatsoever. It was further averred that the respondent had, in the meantime, released similar retiral benefits to three other similarly situated retired employees during the months of September 2022 and January 2023, thereby demonstrating a deliberate and selective disregard of the Court's direction qua the petitioner. The respondent contested the petition by filing a reply on 18th January 2024, contending that the delay in releasing the dues was attributable to an audit objection raised on 30th September 2022 regarding certain deductions to be made from the petitioner's dues on account of an alleged shortage in government property, and that the matter was under active consideration before the competent authority. The petitioner countered that no such audit objection or shortage had ever been communicated to him at any stage prior to the filing of the contempt petition, and that the plea was a mere afterthought raised to justify the continued non-compliance. During the course of proceedings, this Court, by an interim order dated 12th April 2024, directed the respondent to place on record the original audit objection along with the date of its communication to the petitioner, if any. In compliance therewith, the respondent placed on record a document purporting to be the audit objection, which, upon scrutiny, bore no reference number and no proof of despatch to the petitioner. The learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that a purported audit objection created without contemporaneous communication to the affected employee cannot furnish a justification for non-compliance with a mandatory direction of the Court, and that the conduct of the respondent, when viewed alongside the release of similar benefits to other employees, disclosed a clear and wilful defiance of the order. The learned counsel for the respondent argued that the delay, though regrettable, was not contumacious in nature and was attributable to genuine administrative exigencies, and tendered an unconditional apology on behalf of the respondent-authority. Upon a careful consideration of the record, including the absence of any proof of communication of the alleged audit objection, the Hon'ble Court held that the respondent had failed to establish any bona fide impediment to compliance, and that the selective release of benefits to other employees while withholding the petitioner's dues amounted to wilful and deliberate disobedience of the order dated 09th August 2022. Accordingly, the contempt petition was allowed on 03rd June 2027, and the respondent was directed to release the entire sum of Rs. 14,60,000/- to the petitioner within two weeks along with interest at the rate of 8 percent per annum from the date of the original order, failing which the erring officer shall be liable to undergo simple imprisonment and pay a fine as may be determined, positively by 17th June 2027.

Typing Test 8 of 20

Suit for Trademark Infringement and Passing Off

Duration: 10 min | Target Speed: 30 WPM | Minimum Accuracy: 95%

Before the Hon'ble Commercial Court, Civil Suit No. 76 of 2022 was taken up for final judgment on 14th July 2027 before the learned Presiding Officer. The plaintiff, a partnership concern engaged in the manufacture and sale of ayurvedic health products under the registered trademark bearing Registration No. 3421876 since 12th May 2011, instituted the present suit on 28th March 2022 seeking a decree of permanent injunction restraining the defendant from using an identical or deceptively similar mark, along with rendition of accounts of profits and damages amounting to Rs. 32,00,000/-. The plaintiff pleaded that it had continuously and extensively used the trademark since the year 2009, had achieved an annual turnover exceeding Rs. 8,00,00,000/- for the financial year 2020-21, and had incurred substantial expenditure on advertisement and promotion, thereby acquiring distinctive goodwill and reputation associated exclusively with the said mark. It was further averred that the plaintiff, in the course of a routine market survey conducted on 15th January 2022, discovered that the defendant had commenced marketing similar ayurvedic products under a mark that was visually and phonetically identical to the plaintiff's registered trademark, with a nearly identical packaging colour scheme and label layout, and that the defendant's products were being sold at a lower price point through the same trade channels, thereby causing confusion amongst consumers and dilution of the plaintiff's brand. A cease-and-desist notice was issued to the defendant on 04th February 2022, which was replied to on 21st February 2022 with a denial of any deliberate imitation, the defendant contending that its mark had been independently conceived and adopted since the year 2019. The defendant contested the suit by filing a written statement on 20th June 2022, pleading that its mark was distinct in overall get-up when examined as a whole, and that no instance of actual confusion had been demonstrated by the plaintiff. The plaintiff examined its authorised partner as PW-1 on 09th September 2022 and produced 09 documents including the trademark registration certificate, sample invoices reflecting continuous sales since 2011, and comparative photographs of the competing products. A market surveyor was examined as PW-2 on 17th November 2022, who deposed regarding instances of retailers confusing the two products during the survey conducted on 15th January 2022. The defendant examined its proprietor as DW-1 on 22nd January 2023 and produced design files said to demonstrate independent adoption of the impugned mark in the year 2019, along with sample invoices from that period. In cross-examination conducted on 22nd January 2023, DW-1 was unable to explain the striking similarity in the specific stylisation of the lettering and the particular shade of colour used on the packaging, which closely mirrored the plaintiff's established trade dress. The learned counsel for the plaintiff submitted that in cases involving allied and cognate goods sold to the same class of unwary consumers, even a close resemblance in essential features is sufficient to establish infringement, and placed reliance upon the settled principles enunciated by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in its judgment dated 20th September 2001. The learned counsel for the defendant argued that mere resemblance without proof of dishonest intention or actual confusion cannot sustain a claim of infringement. Upon a careful comparison of the two marks and their overall trade dress, the learned Court held that the essential and distinguishing features of the plaintiff's registered mark had been substantially and deliberately imitated by the defendant, and that the explanation offered regarding independent adoption was unconvincing and afterthought in nature. Accordingly, the suit was decreed on 14th July 2027, a permanent injunction was granted restraining the defendant from using the impugned mark or any mark deceptively similar thereto, and the defendant was directed to render accounts and pay damages assessed at Rs. 18,50,000/- within 60 days, positively by 12th September 2027.

Typing Test 9 of 20

Corporate Insolvency Resolution Process before the Tribunal

Duration: 10 min | Target Speed: 30 WPM | Minimum Accuracy: 95%

Before the Hon'ble National Company Law Tribunal, Company Petition (IB) No. 211 of 2023 was listed for final orders on 08th October 2026 before the learned Bench. The petition was filed by an operational creditor on 19th July 2023 under Section 9 of the Insolvency and Bankruptcy Code, 2016, seeking initiation of the Corporate Insolvency Resolution Process against the corporate debtor for default in payment of an operational debt amounting to Rs. 2,14,00,000/- towards supply of raw materials effected between 01st April 2019 and 31st March 2021 pursuant to a running supply agreement dated 12th January 2019. The petitioner pleaded that invoices raised during the said period remained unpaid despite periodic follow-ups, that a reconciliation of accounts conducted on 15th September 2021 confirmed the outstanding liability, and that a demand notice under Section 8 of the Code, along with a copy of the unpaid invoices, was despatched to the corporate debtor on 05th April 2023 through the prescribed mode, calling upon it to make payment within 10 days or to bring to notice the existence of any dispute. The petitioner further averred that no reply disputing the debt or the invoices was received from the corporate debtor within the statutory period of 10 days, and that the petition was accordingly filed along with a certificate from the financial institution maintaining the petitioner's accounts confirming the non-receipt of the disputed amount. The corporate debtor contested the petition by filing a reply on 21st August 2023, contending that a pre-existing dispute regarding the quality of the raw materials supplied had been communicated to the petitioner much prior to the issuance of the demand notice, specifically through an email dated 18th November 2021 alleging that a consignment supplied on 10th October 2021 was substandard and had caused production losses amounting to Rs. 46,00,000/-. The petitioner countered that the said email pertained to a wholly different and subsequent consignment which had already been separately adjusted, and did not relate to the invoices forming the subject matter of the present petition. The petitioner examined its authorised representative as PW-1 on 12th December 2023 and produced 16 documents, including the supply agreement, the unpaid invoices, the reconciliation statement, the demand notice and the postal tracking report. The corporate debtor examined its Finance Manager as RW-1 on 09th February 2024, who relied upon the email dated 18th November 2021 to substantiate the plea of pre-existing dispute. In cross-examination conducted on 09th February 2024, RW-1 admitted that the invoices referred to in the said email bore dates subsequent to October 2021, whereas all the invoices forming the subject matter of the present petition were dated prior to 31st March 2021. The learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that a dispute relating to an entirely different and later transaction cannot be treated as a pre-existing dispute in relation to the debt claimed in the petition, and placed reliance upon the settled principles enunciated by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in its judgment dated 21st September 2017. The learned counsel for the corporate debtor argued that the Tribunal, at the threshold stage, is required only to ascertain the existence of a plausible dispute and not to adjudicate upon its merits. Upon a careful examination of the dates and particulars of the invoices vis-a-vis the email relied upon, the learned Tribunal held that the alleged dispute did not relate to the debt claimed in the present petition and did not constitute a pre-existing dispute within the meaning of the Code. Accordingly, the petition was admitted on 08th October 2026, the Corporate Insolvency Resolution Process was initiated against the corporate debtor, a moratorium under Section 14 of the Code was declared, and an Interim Resolution Professional was appointed with a direction to make a public announcement within three days, positively by 11th October 2026.

Typing Test 10 of 20

Application for Protection Order under the Domestic Violence Act

Duration: 10 min | Target Speed: 30 WPM | Minimum Accuracy: 95%

Before the Hon'ble Court of the Judicial Magistrate First Class, Miscellaneous Application No. 156 of 2022 was listed for final orders on 30th September 2026 before the learned Presiding Officer. The applicant instituted the present application on 09th June 2022 under Sections 12, 18, 19 and 20 of the Protection of Women from Domestic Violence Act, 2005, against her husband and parents-in-law, seeking a protection order, a residence order and monetary relief. The applicant pleaded that she was married to respondent No. 1 on 03rd February 2015, and that soon after the marriage, the respondents began subjecting her to persistent harassment on account of insufficient dowry, demanding an additional sum of Rs. 3,00,000/- and a four-wheeler vehicle. It was averred that on 18th November 2021, the applicant was physically assaulted by respondent No. 1 in the presence of respondent Nos. 2 and 3, and was thereafter forcibly removed from the matrimonial home along with her minor son, being denied access to her personal belongings including jewellery and educational certificates. A medico-legal examination conducted on 19th November 2021 recorded contusions on the applicant's person. The applicant further pleaded that she was residing since then at her parental home without any means of independent income, and that respondent No. 1, who was employed as a private sector executive drawing a monthly salary, had failed to provide any maintenance despite a legal notice dated

05th December 2021. The respondents contested the application by filing a reply on 22nd August 2022, denying the allegations of dowry demand and assault, and contending that the applicant had voluntarily left the matrimonial home on account of temperamental incompatibility with the family, and that no such incident as alleged had occurred on 18th November 2021. The applicant examined herself as PW-1 on 14th November 2022 and produced 07 documents, including the medico-legal report, the marriage certificate, and the legal notice along with its postal acknowledgment. Her father was examined as PW-2 on 20th January 2023, who deposed regarding the condition in which the applicant had returned to the parental home on the night of 18th November 2021. Respondent No. 1 examined himself as RW-1 on 16th March 2023 and denied the allegations, while asserting that he was willing to take the applicant back subject to certain conditions regarding her conduct towards his parents. In cross-examination conducted on 16th March 2023, RW-1 was unable to offer any explanation for the injuries recorded in the medico-legal report dated 19th November 2021, nor could he account for the applicant's sudden departure from the matrimonial home on that specific date. The learned counsel for the applicant submitted that the contemporaneous medico-legal report, read together with the corroborative testimony of the applicant's father, sufficiently established the incident of domestic violence, and that the respondents' bald denial without any plausible alternative explanation could not be accepted. The learned counsel for the respondents argued that domestic discord alone, without proof of a specific act falling within the statutory definition of domestic violence, cannot justify the grant of the reliefs sought. Upon a careful appreciation of the evidence, the learned Court held that the medico-legal report and the surrounding circumstances sufficiently established an act of domestic violence, and that the applicant was entitled to the protection and residence orders sought, along with monetary relief. Accordingly, the application was allowed on 30th September 2026, a protection order was passed restraining the respondents from committing any act of domestic violence or dispossessing the applicant, a residence order was passed permitting the applicant to reside in a portion of the shared household, and respondent No. 1 was directed to pay monthly maintenance of Rs. 15,000/- along with a lump sum compensation of Rs. 1,00,000/-, commencing from 01st November 2026.

Typing Test 11 of 20

Guardianship and Custody of Minor Child

Duration: 10 min | Target Speed: 30 WPM | Minimum Accuracy: 95%

Before the Hon'ble Court of the Guardian Judge, Guardianship Case No. 92 of 2021 was listed for final disposal on 11th March 2027 before the learned Presiding Officer. The petitioner-mother instituted the present petition on 24th May 2021 under Section 25 of the Guardians and Wards Act, 1890, seeking custody of her minor son, aged 9 years, from the respondent-father, contending that she was the natural and most suitable guardian for the welfare of the child. The parties, married on 15th December 2013, had been living separately since 06th January 2020 on account of matrimonial discord, and the minor child had been residing with the respondent since the date of separation on account of the petitioner having temporarily relocated to another city for employment reasons. The petitioner pleaded that she had since secured stable employment and suitable accommodation, and that the respondent, being a long-haul commercial driver frequently away from home for extended periods, was leaving the child under the care of domestic help, thereby depriving him of proper parental supervision, emotional support and continuity in his schooling, as reflected in the child's declining academic performance evidenced by his report cards for the sessions 2020-21 and 2021-22. The respondent contested the petition by filing a reply on 18th August 2021, contending that he had made adequate arrangements for the child's care through his own mother, who resided with him, and that the child was well settled in his current school and had developed a close bond with his paternal grandmother, and that any change of custody would be disruptive and contrary to the child's welfare. The Court, by an order dated 09th September 2021, directed a social welfare officer to submit a home study report in respect of both households. The said report, submitted on 14th December 2021, recorded that the petitioner's residence was suitable and that she had made adequate arrangements for the child's schooling and after-school care, while also noting that the respondent's household, though caring, involved the child spending significant unsupervised time due to the respondent's travel schedule. The petitioner examined herself as PW-1 on 20th February 2022 and produced 06 documents, including her employment contract, the lease deed of her residence, and the child's academic records. The respondent examined himself as RW-1 on 16th May 2022 and his mother as RW-2 on 09th July 2022, who deposed regarding the daily routine followed for the child's care. This Court also interacted with the minor child in chambers on 21st September 2022, wherein the child expressed a wish to spend more time with his mother while also wanting to continue meeting his grandmother regularly. The learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that the welfare of the child, being the paramount consideration under the Act, would be best served by granting custody to the mother who could provide consistent parental presence, while ensuring adequate visitation to the father and grandmother. The learned counsel for the respondent argued that continuity and stability in the child's existing environment ought not to be disturbed absent compelling reasons. Upon a careful consideration of the home study report, the interaction with the child, and the evidence on record, the learned Court held that while both parties were capable and caring, the welfare of the child would be better served by granting custody to the petitioner, subject to ensuring continued and meaningful contact with the respondent and the paternal grandmother. Accordingly, the petition was allowed on 11th March 2027, custody of the minor child was granted to the petitioner with effect from the commencement of the next academic session, and the respondent was granted visitation rights on alternate weekends and half of all school vacations, along with a direction to pay child support of Rs. 10,000/- per month, positively commencing from 01st April 2027.

Typing Test 12 of 20

Probate Petition in Respect of a Registered Will

Duration: 10 min | Target Speed: 30 WPM | Minimum Accuracy: 95%

Before the Hon'ble Court of the District Judge, Probate Case No. 44 of 2021 was listed for final orders on 07th July 2026 before the learned Presiding Officer. The petitioner, being the sole executor named in the last Will and testament of the deceased testator, instituted the present petition on 12th October 2021 under Section 276 of the Indian Succession Act, 1925, seeking grant of probate in respect of the Will dated 09th March 2019, duly registered before the Sub-Registrar on 11th March 2019 at Serial No. 2246 of Book No. 3. The testator, who passed away on 28th August 2021 at the age of 78 years, was survived by two sons and one daughter, all of whom were cited as respondents in the proceedings. Under the terms of the Will, the testator bequeathed his residential house to the petitioner, being the elder son, while directing that agricultural land measuring 9 acres be divided equally between the younger son and the daughter, and that a fixed deposit amounting to Rs. 22,00,000/- standing in his name be utilised for the marriage expenses of a grandchild. Respondent No. 2, being the younger son, filed objections on 18th January 2022, contending that the Will was shrouded in suspicious circumstances inasmuch as the testator, at the time of its execution, was under treatment for age-related cognitive decline, and that the disposition unfairly favoured the petitioner by allotting him the most valuable asset, namely the residential house valued at approximately Rs. 65,00,000/-, as against agricultural land of comparatively lower market value allotted to the objector. It was further pleaded that one of the two attesting witnesses to the Will was an employee of the petitioner, raising doubts regarding the genuineness of the execution. The petitioner examined himself as PW-1 on 09th May 2022 and produced the registered Will, the death certificate of the testator, and a medical fitness certificate dated 05th March 2019 issued by the testator's treating physician just four days prior to execution of the Will, certifying that the testator was mentally alert and capable of understanding the nature of his actions. The surviving attesting witness was examined as PW-2 on 21st July 2022, who deposed in detail regarding the circumstances of execution, stating that the testator had read out the contents of the Will himself before signing it in the presence of both witnesses and the Sub-Registrar. Respondent No. 2 examined himself as RW-1 on 14th October 2022, but was unable to produce any medical record contemporaneous to March 2019 substantiating the alleged cognitive decline, the only medical documents produced pertaining to a period commencing from June 2020, well after the execution of the Will. The learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that a registered Will executed in the presence of independent witnesses, accompanied by a contemporaneous certificate of mental fitness, carries a strong presumption of genuineness which the objector had failed to dislodge. The learned counsel for respondent No. 2 argued that unequal distribution of assets amongst natural heirs itself constitutes a suspicious circumstance requiring the propounder to offer a cogent explanation. Upon a careful appreciation of the evidence, the learned Court held that mere disparity in the value of bequeathed assets, without more, does not constitute a suspicious circumstance where the testator has furnished intelligible reasons in the body of the Will itself, and that the contemporaneous fitness certificate sufficiently established testamentary capacity. Consequently, the petition was allowed on 07th July 2026, and probate of the Will dated 09th March 2019 was granted in favour of the petitioner, subject to filing of an administration bond in the sum of Rs. 20,00,000/- within 30 days, positively by 06th August 2026.

Typing Test 13 of 20

Dissolution of Partnership and Rendition of Accounts

Duration: 10 min | Target Speed: 30 WPM | Minimum Accuracy: 95%

Before the Hon'ble Court of the Additional Civil Judge, Senior Division, Civil Suit No. 361 of 2020 was listed for final judgment on 25th August 2026 before the learned Presiding Officer. The plaintiff instituted the present suit on 14th July 2020 seeking dissolution of a partnership firm engaged in the wholesale trade of construction hardware, constituted under a partnership deed dated 06th April 2015 between the plaintiff and the defendant with equal profit-sharing ratio, along with rendition of accounts and recovery of the plaintiff's share of the firm's assets. The plaintiff pleaded that the partnership, which commenced business with an initial capital contribution of Rs. 18,00,000/- from each partner, had been profitably run until the defendant, who was entrusted with the day-to-day management and maintenance of accounts, began excluding the plaintiff from all business decisions with effect from 10th January 2019, denying him access to the firm's bank accounts and financial records despite repeated requests made on 22nd March 2019 and 15th June 2019. It was further averred that the defendant had, without the plaintiff's knowledge or consent, opened a separate current account in the name of the firm on 08th February 2019 and had been routing substantial business transactions through the said undisclosed account, thereby depriving the plaintiff of his rightful share of the profits. A notice of dissolution was issued by the plaintiff on 20th August 2019 under Section 43 of the Indian Partnership Act, 1932, on the ground of the partnership being at will, which was replied to by the defendant on 10th September 2019 denying the allegations and asserting that the plaintiff had himself become inactive in the business since the year 2018. The defendant contested the suit by filing a written statement on 19th November 2020, contending that the undisclosed account was opened purely as a matter of business convenience and that all transactions therein were duly reflected, albeit belatedly, in the firm's consolidated books maintained for the financial year 2019-20. The plaintiff examined himself as PW-1 on 16th February 2021 and produced 12 documents, including the partnership deed, the notice of dissolution, and bank statements of the firm's disclosed account showing a marked decline in turnover from the month of February 2019 onwards. A chartered accountant was examined as PW-2 on 09th May 2021, who had conducted a preliminary audit and opined that transactions amounting to approximately Rs. 41,00,000/- appeared to have been routed through channels outside the firm's disclosed books during the relevant period. The defendant examined himself as DW-1 on 21st July 2021 and produced the consolidated books of account for 2019-20, but was unable to satisfactorily explain the delay of over a year in reflecting the transactions of the undisclosed account. The learned counsel for the plaintiff submitted that a partner who conceals firm transactions and diverts business through an undisclosed account is liable to render a full and true account of all such dealings, and that the burden lies squarely upon the managing partner to establish the correctness and completeness of the accounts rendered. The learned counsel for the defendant argued that mere delay in book-keeping does not amount to fraudulent concealment. Upon a careful appreciation of the evidence, the learned Court held that the unexplained operation of an undisclosed account for over a year, coupled with the marked decline in the disclosed turnover during the corresponding period, established a strong probability of diversion of firm business, warranting a detailed inquiry into accounts. Accordingly, the suit was decreed on 25th August 2026, the partnership was declared dissolved with effect from 20th August 2019, and a Local Commissioner was appointed to examine the books of both accounts and submit a report determining the plaintiff's share within a period of 90 days, positively by 23rd November 2026.

Typing Test 14 of 20

Suit for Declaration of Easementary Right of Way

Duration: 10 min | Target Speed: 30 WPM | Minimum Accuracy: 95%

Before the Hon'ble Court of the Civil Judge, Junior Division, Civil Suit No. 219 of 2021 was listed for final judgment on 16th April 2027 before the learned Presiding Officer. The plaintiff instituted the present suit on 05th March 2021 seeking a declaration that he was entitled to a right of way, by way of an easement of necessity as well as by prescription, over a passage measuring 8 feet in width running along the eastern boundary of the defendant's property, for ingress and egress to his own residential house situated at the rear, which had no other independent access to the public road. The plaintiff pleaded that his house had been constructed by his predecessor-in-interest in the year 1985, at which time the passage in question was the only means of access, and that the said passage had been openly, continuously and without interruption used by the plaintiff and his predecessors for a period exceeding 20 years, as evidenced by the consistent pattern of use reflected in electricity connection records showing the address accessed exclusively through the said passage since the year 1990. It was further averred that the defendant, who had purchased the adjoining property on 14th June 2020, had, without any justification, raised a boundary wall on 18th December 2020 obstructing the said passage, thereby completely cutting off the plaintiff's access to the public road and compelling him to use a circuitous route through a neighbour's field with the latter's sufferance. A notice calling upon the defendant to remove the obstruction was issued on 05th January 2021, which evoked a reply on 20th January 2021 denying the existence of any right of way and asserting that the passage had merely been used with the permissive licence of the defendant's predecessor. The defendant contested the suit by filing a written statement on 22nd June 2021, pleading that the use of the passage, if any, was permissive in nature and could be revoked at will, and that in any event the plaintiff had access to an alternative route through the neighbouring field which, though longer, was adequate. The plaintiff examined himself as PW-1 on 11th October 2021 and produced 08 documents, including the sale deed of his property, electricity bills spanning three decades, and photographs of the boundary wall obstructing the passage. Two elderly residents of the locality were examined as PW-2 and PW-3 on 14th January 2022 and 09th March 2022 respectively, who deposed regarding the continuous and open use of the passage by the plaintiff's family since the 1980s without any interruption or objection. The defendant examined himself as DW-1 on 20th May 2022, but was unable to produce any document or witness supporting the plea that the use of the passage was ever permissive rather than as of right. The learned counsel for the plaintiff submitted that continuous, open and uninterrupted use of a passage for over twenty years as of right, without permission being sought or granted at any stage, gives rise to an easement by prescription under Section 15 of the Indian Easements Act, 1882, and that the complete absence of any alternative reasonable access independently establishes an easement of necessity. The learned counsel for the defendant argued that the mere absence of objection over the years does not by itself establish user as of right rather than permissive user. Upon a careful appreciation of the evidence, the learned Court held that the long, open and unchallenged user of the passage, coupled with the absence of any credible alternative access, sufficiently established the plaintiff's easementary right both by necessity and by prescription. Accordingly, the suit was decreed on 16th April 2027, and the defendant was directed to remove the obstructing boundary wall and restore the passage to its original width within 30 days, positively by 16th May 2027, failing which the plaintiff was granted liberty to have the obstruction removed through the process of the Court at the defendant's cost.

Typing Test 15 of 20

Suit for Damages in Defamation

Duration: 10 min | Target Speed: 30 WPM | Minimum Accuracy: 95%

Before the Hon'ble Court of the Additional District Judge, Civil Suit No. 128 of 2022 was listed for final judgment on 22nd September 2027 before the learned Presiding Officer. The plaintiff, a practising medical professional running a private clinic, instituted the present suit on 09th May 2022 seeking damages amounting to Rs. 25,00,000/- against the defendant on account of defamatory statements published on a social media platform on 14th February 2022, alleging that the plaintiff had administered a wrong medication to the defendant's relative resulting in serious complications, and describing the plaintiff in the said post as a negligent and unqualified practitioner unfit to run a clinic. The plaintiff pleaded that the said post, which remained accessible for a period of eleven days before being taken down on 25th February 2022, was widely circulated and viewed by several thousand persons within the locality, including existing and prospective patients, resulting in a marked decline in patient footfall at the clinic, evidenced by a comparison of appointment registers for the months of January 2022 and March 2022 showing a reduction of nearly 40 percent. It was further averred that the allegations were entirely false, that the relative in question had in fact been treated in strict accordance with the prescribed protocol as reflected in the contemporaneous case sheet maintained on 10th February 2022, and that a legal notice calling upon the defendant to retract the statement and tender an apology, issued on 28th February 2022, was met with a defiant reply on 15th March 2022 reiterating the allegations. The defendant contested the suit by filing a written statement on 20th August 2022, pleading truth as a complete defence, and contending that the relative had indeed suffered an adverse reaction following treatment at the plaintiff's clinic, and that the statement was made in good faith to caution other prospective patients, thereby falling within the exception of fair comment on a matter of public interest. The plaintiff examined himself as PW-1 on 16th November 2022 and produced 10 documents, including the case sheet, treatment records, prescription charts, and a certified transcript of the impugned social media post along with its viewership statistics obtained from the platform. A senior consultant from a tertiary care hospital was examined as PW-2 on 21st January 2023, who, upon examining the treatment records, opined that the medication administered was entirely appropriate for the diagnosed condition and that the complication which arose was a recognised and rare side effect unconnected with any negligence. The defendant examined the relative concerned as DW-1 on 14th March 2023, who deposed regarding the adverse reaction but admitted in cross-examination that no independent medical opinion had ever been obtained prior to making the public post, and that no complaint had been lodged with any medical regulatory body. The learned counsel for the plaintiff submitted that a false imputation touching upon the professional competence of a medical practitioner, published to a wide audience without verification, constitutes defamation per se, causing presumed damage to professional reputation. The learned counsel for the defendant argued that the statement, being an honest expression of a genuinely held grievance regarding a medical outcome, was protected as fair comment. Upon a careful appreciation of the medical evidence and the surrounding circumstances, the learned Court held that the impugned statement went beyond a mere expression of grievance and constituted a false and unverified imputation of professional negligence and incompetence, causing demonstrable harm to the plaintiff's reputation and practice. Accordingly, the suit was decreed on 22nd September 2027, and the defendant was directed to pay damages assessed at Rs. 9,00,000/- along with interest at the rate of 6 percent per annum from the date of institution of the suit, besides being directed to publish a retraction and apology on the same platform within 15 days, positively by 07th October 2027.

Typing Test 16 of 20

Service Matter concerning Pension and Gratuity Dues

Duration: 10 min | Target Speed: 30 WPM | Minimum Accuracy: 95%

In the Hon'ble High Court of Judicature, Civil Writ Petition No. 9214 of 2023 was listed for final hearing on 04th May 2027 before the learned Single Judge. The petitioner, a retired employee of a State Government undertaking, invoked the writ jurisdiction of the Court on 21st March 2023, seeking a direction to the respondents to release his pensionary benefits, gratuity and leave encashment, which had been withheld pursuant to a departmental proceeding initiated against him shortly before his superannuation on 31st October 2022. The petitioner pleaded that he had rendered unblemished service for a period of 34 years, and that on 08th September 2022, barely seven weeks prior to his retirement, a memorandum of charges was issued against him alleging irregularities in the sanctioning of certain purchase orders during the years 2017 to 2019, without any preliminary inquiry having been conducted at any point during the intervening period despite the alleged irregularities being detectable from routine audit. It was further averred that upon superannuation, the respondents, by an order dated 15th November 2022, withheld 100 percent of the petitioner's gratuity and 75 percent of his pension pending conclusion of the departmental inquiry, purportedly in exercise of powers under the relevant pension rules, and that the inquiry itself had made negligible progress, with only a single hearing having been held on 20th January 2023 in over five months. The petitioner contended that withholding of the entire retiral benefits, without formation of any provisional assessment of the extent of alleged loss to the department, was wholly disproportionate and violative of the principles governing withholding of pension pending inquiry. The respondents contested the petition by filing a reply on 19th June 2023, contending that the alleged irregularities involved a suspected loss to the department amounting to Rs. 38,00,000/-, and that withholding of the benefits was a protective measure pending final determination of liability, fully permissible under the applicable rules which allow withholding of pension in cases of pending disciplinary proceedings sanctioned prior to retirement. The petitioner countered that the rules themselves required withholding to be proportionate to the provisionally assessed loss and required periodic review, neither of which had been undertaken by the respondents. During the pendency of the writ petition, this Court, by an interim order dated 14th August 2023, directed the respondents to release 50 percent of the gratuity forthwith and to expedite the departmental inquiry, in compliance of which a sum of Rs. 6,00,000/- was released to the petitioner on 02nd September 2023. The learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that continued withholding of the remaining benefits for a prolonged and indefinite period, without demonstrable progress in the inquiry, amounted to an unreasonable and punitive deprivation of a retired employee's rightful dues, particularly having regard to his long and otherwise unblemished service record. The learned counsel for the respondents argued that the inquiry, though delayed, was proceeding and that premature release of the entire dues could prejudice recovery in the event of an adverse finding. Upon a careful consideration of the record, including the disproportionately slow progress of the inquiry over more than a year since its initiation, the Hon'ble Court held that the continued blanket withholding of the balance dues was not justified, and that the respondents ought to release the remaining benefits subject to an appropriate proportionate retention linked to the provisionally assessed loss. Accordingly, the writ petition was allowed on 04th May 2027, and the respondents were directed to release the balance gratuity and 90 percent of the withheld pension within four weeks, retaining only 10 percent pending final outcome of the inquiry, which was directed to be concluded within four months, positively by 04th September 2027.

Typing Test 17 of 20

Public Interest Litigation concerning Pollution of a Water Body

Duration: 10 min | Target Speed: 30 WPM | Minimum Accuracy: 95%

In the Hon'ble High Court of Judicature, Civil Writ Petition No. 3187 of 2022, filed in the nature of a Public Interest Litigation, was listed for final orders on 19th January 2027 before the learned Division Bench. The petitioner, a registered environmental welfare society, invoked the writ jurisdiction of this Court on 06th April 2022, seeking directions against the respondent-authorities and a cluster of dyeing units for discharging untreated industrial effluent into a natural water channel flowing through several villages, thereby causing severe contamination and rendering the water unfit for irrigation and domestic use. The petitioner pleaded that a scientific study conducted by an accredited laboratory on 14th December 2021, at the instance of the petitioner-society, had detected concentrations of heavy metals and other pollutants in the water channel far exceeding the permissible limits prescribed under the applicable environmental standards, and that villagers residing along the channel had reported a marked increase in skin ailments and crop damage over the preceding three years. It was further averred that the respondent Pollution Control Board had, on 09th March 2019, issued closure directions against 14 of the offending units for operating without functional effluent treatment plants, but that the said directions had never been effectively enforced, and that the units continued to operate and discharge untreated effluent unabated. The petitioner also placed on record photographs and video recordings dated 20th February 2022 depicting effluent being discharged directly into the channel through concealed pipelines during night hours. The respondent-Board contested the petition by filing a reply on 25th July 2022, contending that periodic inspections had been conducted and that show-cause notices had been issued to the defaulting units on multiple occasions, the latest being on 11th January 2022, but that enforcement was hampered by resource constraints and pending litigation initiated by some of the units challenging the closure directions before other forums. This Court, by an order dated 18th August 2022, constituted a joint inspection committee comprising officials of the Pollution Control Board, the District Administration and an independent technical expert, to conduct a fresh inspection and submit a report. The said report, submitted on 30th November 2022, confirmed that out of the 14 units against which closure directions had earlier been issued, 9 units continued to operate without functional effluent treatment plants, and recommended immediate disconnection of their electricity and water supply pending compliance. The learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that the respondent-authorities had exhibited a persistent pattern of issuing directions without follow-up enforcement, resulting in continued and irreversible degradation of the water body affecting the health and livelihood of thousands of residents, and urged that time-bound and monitored compliance mechanisms be put in place. The learned counsel appearing for the respondent-Board submitted that immediate closure of all defaulting units would result in loss of livelihood for a large number of workers, and sought a reasonable transition period for installation of effluent treatment plants. Upon a careful consideration of the inspection report and the material on record, the Hon'ble Court held that the continued operation of units without functional effluent treatment plants, despite closure directions issued as far back as 2019, could not be permitted to continue any further, and that the right to a clean and healthy environment could not be subordinated to considerations of administrative convenience. Accordingly, the petition was disposed of on 19th January 2027, with directions that the 9 defaulting units be disconnected from electricity and water supply within two weeks, that the remaining units be granted a final period of three months to install functional effluent treatment plants failing which similar action shall follow, and that the joint inspection committee shall continue to monitor compliance and submit periodic reports to this Court every two months, commencing from 19th March 2027.

Typing Test 18 of 20

Suit for Recovery of Money on the Basis of a Promissory Note

Duration: 10 min | Target Speed: 30 WPM | Minimum Accuracy: 95%

Before the Hon'ble Court of the Civil Judge, Senior Division, Civil Suit No. 402 of 2021 was listed for final judgment on 13th October 2026 before the learned Presiding Officer. The plaintiff instituted the present suit on 18th December 2021 for recovery of Rs. 24,50,000/- along with interest, on the basis of a promissory note dated 06th July 2019 executed by the defendant in favour of the plaintiff, promising to repay the said sum, advanced as a friendly loan, within a period of one year along with interest at the rate of 12 percent per annum. The plaintiff pleaded that he had advanced the said sum to the defendant on 06th July 2019 through banking channels, as reflected in his bank statement of that date, to enable the defendant to meet urgent business requirements, and that the promissory note had been duly executed and signed by the defendant in the presence of an attesting witness at the time of receipt of the amount. It was further averred that despite the expiry of the stipulated period on 05th July 2020, and despite repeated oral requests followed by a legal notice dated 20th September 2021 demanding repayment along with accrued interest, the defendant had failed to repay any part of the principal amount or the interest due thereon. The defendant contested the suit by filing a written statement on 25th February 2022, admitting his signature on the promissory note but contending that the document had been obtained from him as a security for a lesser sum of Rs. 10,00,000/- actually advanced, and that he had already repaid the said lesser sum in three instalments of cash payments made on 14th November 2019, 22nd January 2020 and 18th April 2020, none of which had been acknowledged in writing by the plaintiff. The plaintiff denied having received any such payments and asserted that the full sum of Rs. 24,50,000/- as stated in the promissory note had indeed been advanced and remained wholly unpaid. The plaintiff examined himself as PW-1 on 11th May 2022 and produced 05 documents, including the promissory note, his bank statement reflecting the withdrawal of the sum on 06th July 2019, and the legal notice along with its postal acknowledgment. The attesting witness to the promissory note was examined as PW-2 on 20th July 2022, who corroborated the execution of the document for the full amount stated therein. The defendant examined himself as DW-1 on 16th September 2022 but was unable to produce any receipt, bank withdrawal record, or other contemporaneous document evidencing the alleged cash payments said to have been made towards repayment. The learned counsel for the plaintiff submitted that under Section 118 of the Negotiable Instruments Act, 1881, there exists a statutory presumption that a promissory note was made for consideration in the amount and on the terms stated therein, and that the burden lay squarely upon the defendant to rebut the said presumption with cogent evidence, which he had failed to discharge. The learned counsel for the defendant argued that the promissory note, having been admittedly executed as a security document, did not reflect the true nature of the underlying transaction, and that oral evidence was permissible to establish the real arrangement between friends. Upon a careful appreciation of the evidence, the learned Court held that the defendant, having admitted his signature on the promissory note, had failed to produce any contemporaneous or corroborative material to displace the statutory presumption of consideration, and that the plea of partial repayment remained wholly unsubstantiated. Accordingly, the suit was decreed on 13th October 2026, and the defendant was directed to pay the sum of Rs. 24,50,000/- along with interest at the rate of 12 percent per annum from 06th July 2019 till realisation, within 60 days, positively by 12th December 2026.

Typing Test 19 of 20

Second Appeal under the Right to Information Act

Duration: 10 min | Target Speed: 30 WPM | Minimum Accuracy: 95%

Before the Hon'ble State Information Commission, Second Appeal No. 671 of 2022 was listed for final orders on 27th November 2026 before the learned Information Commissioner. The appellant filed an application on 04th February 2022 under Section 6 of the Right to Information Act, 2005, before the Public Information Officer of a municipal corporation, seeking certified copies of the sanctioned building plan, the completion certificate, and the inspection reports pertaining to a commercial complex constructed in his neighbourhood, along with details of any complaints received regarding deviations from the sanctioned plan. The Public Information Officer, by a reply dated 04th March 2022, furnished a copy of the sanctioned building plan but declined to provide the completion certificate and inspection reports, citing that the said documents were exempt from disclosure under Section 8(1)(j) of the Act on the ground that they pertained to personal information having no relationship to any public activity. Aggrieved thereby, the appellant preferred a first appeal before the appellate authority on 22nd March 2022, contending that the completion certificate and inspection reports of a commercial building, being documents generated in discharge of a statutory regulatory function, could not be equated with personal information, and that there existed an overriding public interest in disclosure given the appellant's specific grievance regarding illegal construction beyond the sanctioned height. The appellate authority, by an order dated 18th May 2022, upheld the decision of the Public Information Officer without recording any independent reasoning, observing merely that the exemption claimed appeared justified. The appellant thereafter preferred the present second appeal before the Commission on 09th June 2022, reiterating his contentions and additionally placing on record a photograph dated 28th April 2022 depicting the commercial complex, which appeared to have an additional floor beyond what was reflected in the sanctioned plan already furnished to him. The respondent-corporation, in its reply filed on 14th September 2022, contended that the inspection reports contained observations regarding individual officers' assessments and could not be disclosed without following the third-party procedure prescribed under Section 11 of the Act, since disclosure could adversely affect the interests of the builder. During the hearing held on 19th October 2022, the learned counsel for the appellant submitted that a completion certificate and statutory inspection reports concerning a commercial structure are quintessentially public documents relating to a regulatory function, wholly unconnected with any personal privacy consideration, and that even assuming third-party interest was involved, the corporation had failed to follow the mandatory procedure of issuing notice to the builder as required under the Act. The respondent's representative conceded during the hearing that no notice under Section 11 had in fact been issued to the builder at any stage. The learned Information Commissioner observed that the exemption under Section 8(1)(j) is available only in respect of information which is personal in nature and bears no relationship to a public activity, and that records generated in the course of statutory building approval and compliance inspection do not fall within such exemption, particularly where a specific and substantiated public interest in disclosure, namely verification of illegal construction, has been demonstrated. It was further observed that even if third-party interest were genuinely involved, the failure to follow the mandatory procedure under Section 11 vitiated the rejection. Accordingly, the second appeal was allowed on 27th November 2026, and the Public Information Officer was directed to furnish certified copies of the completion certificate and the inspection reports to the appellant within 15 days, positively by 12th December 2026, along with a nominal cost of Rs. 5,000/- for the delay and denial of information without valid justification.

Typing Test 20 of 20

Consumer Complaint for Delay in Delivery of Possession by Builder

Duration: 10 min | Target Speed: 30 WPM | Minimum Accuracy: 95%

Before the Hon'ble State Consumer Disputes Redressal Commission, Consumer Complaint No. 512 of 2021 was listed for final orders on 15th December 2026 before the learned Presiding Member. The complainants, a husband and wife, instituted the present complaint on 20th September 2021 against the opposite party builder, alleging deficiency in service and unfair trade practice in respect of a residential flat booked under a builder-buyer agreement dated 11th April 2016, for a total sale consideration of Rs. 68,00,000/-, against which the complainants had paid a sum of Rs. 61,20,000/- in instalments linked to the stage of construction, the last payment having been made on 09th February 2020. Under Clause 14 of the agreement, the opposite party had committed to deliver possession of the flat by 30th June 2019, with a grace period of six months, that is, by 31st December 2019. The complainants pleaded that despite the said commitment and despite having paid nearly 90 percent of the total consideration, possession had not been delivered even as on the date of filing the complaint, and that the construction, upon physical inspection carried out on 05th August 2021, was found to be barely 70 percent complete, with several essential amenities including the lift, the sewage treatment plant and the boundary wall yet to be constructed. It was further averred that a legal notice issued on 12th May 2021 demanding either immediate possession with compensation for delay, or in the alternative, refund of the entire amount paid along with interest, was not responded to by the opposite party. The opposite party contested the complaint by filing a written version on 18th January 2022, contending that the delay was attributable to force majeure circumstances, including a temporary suspension of construction activity due to regulatory restrictions during the years 2020 and 2021, and pleaded that possession would be handed over within the following twelve months. The complainants countered that the project had already fallen significantly behind schedule even prior to the onset of the said restrictions, as evidenced by the progress reports uploaded on the regulatory authority's portal for the quarters ending September 2019 and December 2019, both of which reflected a physical progress rate far slower than what would be required to meet the committed timeline. The complainants examined the husband as CW-1 on 09th April 2022 and produced 09 documents, including the builder-buyer agreement, the payment receipts, the legal notice, and printouts of the quarterly progress reports filed by the opposite party with the regulatory authority. The opposite party examined its project manager as OPW-1 on 21st June 2022, who conceded in cross-examination conducted on the same date that the progress reports for the quarters preceding the onset of the regulatory restrictions already reflected a delay of over eight months against the committed schedule. The learned counsel for the complainants submitted that where a builder fails to deliver possession within the committed period, the allottee is entitled, at his option, to seek either possession with compensation for the delay or a full refund with interest, regardless of subsequent events, particularly where the delay had already commenced prior to any intervening force majeure circumstance. The learned counsel for the opposite party argued that the complainants ought to be granted a reasonable extension of time rather than a refund, given the advanced stage of construction. Upon a careful appreciation of the progress reports and the admission made by OPW-1, the learned Commission held that the delay was substantially attributable to the opposite party's own default rather than to any force majeure event, and that the complainants, having lost confidence in the opposite party's ability to complete the project within a reasonable time, were entitled to a refund. Accordingly, the complaint was allowed on 15th December 2026, and the opposite party was directed to refund the entire sum of Rs. 61,20,000/- paid by the complainants along with interest at the rate of 10.5 percent per annum from the respective dates of payment till realisation, besides a sum of Rs. 50,000/- towards compensation for mental agony and Rs. 25,000/- towards litigation costs, the entire amount to be paid within 60 days, positively by 13th February 2027.

BEGINNER TYPING PRACTICE

10 Simple Passages | Everyday English | Build Accuracy First

Beginner Test 1 of 10

Morning Walk

Duration: 5 min | Target Speed: 20 WPM | Minimum Accuracy: 90%

Every morning, I wake up early and go for a walk in the park near my house. The air is fresh and cool at that time. Birds sing on the trees and a few people jog along the path. I like to walk for about thirty minutes before the sun gets too hot. Walking daily keeps my body active and my mind calm. After the walk, I return home, drink a glass of water, and get ready for the rest of the day. A simple morning routine like this can make a big difference to our health and mood.

Beginner Test 2 of 10

My Favourite Season

Duration: 5 min | Target Speed: 20 WPM | Minimum Accuracy: 90%

Among all the seasons, I like winter the most. The weather turns cool and pleasant, and the mornings feel fresh. I enjoy wearing warm clothes and sitting near a bonfire with my family in the evening. Winter also brings festivals that fill the house with joy and sweets. Hot tea and soup taste even better during this season. Although the days are shorter, the cool breeze and clear skies make winter special for me. Many people also find it easier to sleep well when the weather is cool and comfortable.

Beginner Test 3 of 10

Importance of Reading Books

Duration: 5 min | Target Speed: 20 WPM | Minimum Accuracy: 90%

Reading books is a wonderful habit that helps us learn new things every day. Books can take us to different places and times without leaving our room. Some books teach us facts about the world, while others tell us exciting stories. Reading also improves our vocabulary and helps us write better. Many successful people read regularly because it keeps their mind sharp and creative. Even reading for just fifteen minutes a day can bring a positive change over time. Libraries and mobile applications now make it easy to find good books to read.

Beginner Test 4 of 10

A Visit to the Market

Duration: 5 min | Target Speed: 20 WPM | Minimum Accuracy: 90%

Yesterday, I went to the local market to buy some fruits and vegetables. The market was crowded with people buying items for the week. I bought apples, bananas, tomatoes, and fresh green vegetables from different shops. The vendors were friendly and helped me choose the best quality items. I also bought a few household items on the way back home. Visiting the market gave me a chance to walk around and enjoy the fresh air. It is always nice to support local shopkeepers by buying from them directly.

Beginner Test 5 of 10

My Daily Routine

Duration: 5 min | Target Speed: 20 WPM | Minimum Accuracy: 90%

I follow a simple daily routine to manage my time well. I wake up at six in the morning and start my day with light exercise. After breakfast, I study for a few hours and take short breaks in between. In the afternoon, I help with household work and spend some time with my family. Evenings are usually for relaxing, reading, or watching something interesting. Before going to bed, I plan my tasks for the next day. Following a routine helps me stay organised and reduces stress in daily life.

Beginner Test 6 of 10

Benefits of Drinking Water

Duration: 5 min | Target Speed: 20 WPM | Minimum Accuracy: 90%

Drinking enough water every day is very important for good health. Water helps our body digest food, keeps our skin healthy, and removes waste from the body. Doctors suggest drinking at least eight glasses of water daily. Many people forget to drink water while working and feel tired later in the day. Keeping a water bottle nearby can help us remember to drink water regularly. Drinking water before meals can also help control hunger. A well-hydrated body works better and feels more energetic throughout the day.

Beginner Test 7 of 10

Use of Mobile Phones

Duration: 5 min | Target Speed: 20 WPM | Minimum Accuracy: 90%

Mobile phones have become an important part of our daily lives. We use them to talk, send messages, take photographs, and browse the internet. Students use mobile phones to study and attend online classes. Many people also use them for shopping and paying bills. However, using a mobile phone too much can affect our eyes and sleep. It is important to use mobile phones wisely and take breaks between long usage. When used properly, mobile phones can make our daily tasks easier and faster.

Beginner Test 8 of 10

A Rainy Day

Duration: 5 min | Target Speed: 20 WPM | Minimum Accuracy: 90%

It started raining suddenly in the afternoon, and everyone rushed to find shelter. The streets became wet, and the air smelled fresh after the rain. Children enjoyed playing outside and jumping in small puddles of water. I sat near the window with a cup of tea and watched the raindrops fall. The sound of rain always makes me feel calm and relaxed. Farmers were happy to see the rain because their crops needed water badly. A rainy day, though sometimes inconvenient, brings its own kind of beauty and peace.

Beginner Test 9 of 10

My School Days

Duration: 5 min | Target Speed: 20 WPM | Minimum Accuracy: 90%

I still remember my school days with great happiness. I used to wake up early, wear my uniform, and walk to school with my friends. Our teachers taught us many subjects and also guided us on how to behave properly. During recess, we played games and shared our lunch with each other. Annual functions and sports day were the most exciting events of the year. Those simple and joyful days taught me important lessons about friendship and discipline. I often think about those memories whenever I meet my old classmates.

Beginner Test 10 of 10

Keeping Our Surroundings Clean

Duration: 5 min | Target Speed: 20 WPM | Minimum Accuracy: 90%

Keeping our surroundings clean is the responsibility of every citizen. A clean environment keeps us healthy and free from diseases. We should throw waste only in dustbins and avoid littering on the roads. Planting trees and using less plastic can also help protect our environment. Many schools and communities now organise cleanliness drives to spread awareness among people. Small habits like these, when followed by everyone, can bring a big positive change to our surroundings. A clean neighbourhood also makes a place more pleasant to live in.