

WRAP Exams · wrapexams.com

Prelims PYQ, Mains model answers, and copy evaluation. Write to the desk for this paper, a doubt, or the AI waitlist.

ask@wrapexams.com · +91 85951 84903 · wrapexams.com

UPSC Mains 2018 GS IV

Year-wise PYQ pack · WRAP model answers with canonical links

Official UPSC stems in exam order. Each live answer sits on one WRAP URL; this PDF is the year pack, not a second copy of the article. Open the link under a question for the full page.

<https://wrapexams.com/upsc/mains/gs-4/2018/>

Q1 · 10 marks

(a) State the three basic values, universal in nature, in the context of civil services and bring out their importance. (b) Distinguish between "Code of ethics" and "Code of conduct" with suitable examples.

GS IV · 2018 · Probity in Governance

Revision summary

The three universal civil-service values are integrity, impartiality and objectivity.

Integrity is honest trusteeship; impartiality is equal treatment; objectivity is fact-and-law decisions with recorded reasons.

They matter because public money, **Article 14** equality and a file that can face a court all depend on them.

A code of ethics states values; a code of conduct lists punishable do's and don'ts.

Nolan and the **Second ARC** illustrate ethics; the CCS Conduct Rules, 1964 illustrate conduct.

Introduction

Civil service is other people's power held in trust. Part (a) names three values that travel across countries and creeds. Part (b) separates the inner compass of ethics from the enforceable list of conduct.

Body

(a) Three basic values, universal in civil services

- The three basic values that are universal in civil services are integrity, impartiality and objectivity.
- They appear, in close form, in the Nolan principles of public life in the United Kingdom and in the **Second Administrative Reforms Commission's** report on Ethics in Governance in India.
- **Integrity means the public office is not a private shop:** no bribe, no lie in the file, no use of official knowledge for a family plot.
- Without integrity, every other skill becomes a better tool for theft, as Warren Buffett later warned about intelligence without honesty.

- Impartiality means the same law and the same queue for a friend, a stranger and a rival of the minister.
- **Article 14 of the Constitution of India is impartiality in legal form:** equal protection, not a private caste or party of the officer.
- Objectivity means the decision follows facts, statute and recorded reasons, not rumour, gift or fear of transfer.
- A speaking order is objectivity made visible; a whisper in the corridor is its opposite.
- These three are universal because a tax file in Tokyo, a licence in Nairobi and a ration card in a tehsil all fail in the same way when they are missing.
- **Dedication, empathy and political neutrality support them, but they are not substitutes:** a kind officer who cooks a muster is still a failed trustee.
- **Importance:** integrity keeps public money real; impartiality keeps the republic one; objectivity keeps the file fit for a court and for a citizen who cannot buy a favour.
- Training, asset disclosure, e-procurement and the Central Civil Services (Conduct) Rules, 1964 do not create these values, but they make it harder to live without them.

(b) Code of ethics and code of conduct

- **A code of ethics is a short statement of values and purposes:** what kind of person the service asks you to be.
- A code of conduct is a list of do's and don'ts that can be inquired into and punished.
- Ethics is aspirational and wide. Conduct is specific and justiciable in a departmental sense.
- **Example of ethics:** selflessness, integrity, objectivity, accountability, openness, honesty and leadership in the Nolan list; or the **Second Administrative Reforms Commission's** call for a code of ethics for ministers and civil servants.
- **Example of conduct:** the Central Civil Services (Conduct) Rules, 1964 on gifts, criticism of government, political activity, property returns and conduct unbecoming of a government servant.
- The All India Services (Conduct) Rules, 1968 do the same work for the Indian Administrative Service and allied services.
- A code of ethics would say "do not use inside knowledge for private gain". A code of conduct names the form, the time limit and the disciplinary door.
- Ethics can cover a humiliation that no clause has yet listed. Conduct cannot invent a penalty that the rule does not carry.
- Companies Act, 2013 duties of directors and many professional charters (medical, legal) mix both: a value sentence plus a punishable breach.
- India has been stronger on conduct rules than on a living, taught code of ethics. Both are needed: values without a rule become a speech; rules without values become a hunt for loopholes.
- A sound officer reads the Conduct Rules as the floor and the code of ethics as the ceiling.

Flow diagram

Universal values -> Integrity
Universal values -> Impartiality
Universal values -> Objectivity
Code of ethics -> Aspirational values
Code of conduct -> Enforceable rules
Aspirational values -> Public officer
Enforceable rules -> Public officer

Conclusion

Integrity, impartiality and objectivity are the universal core of civil service, because they make power safe for a stranger. A code of ethics names that character. A code of conduct enforces the floor, as the 1964 and 1968 Conduct Rules do.

Open WRAP page — <https://wrapexams.com/upsc/mains-answers/gs-4/2018/a-state-the-three-basic-values-universal-in-nature-in-the-context-of-civil-services-and-bring-out-their-importance-b-distinguish-between-code-of-et-hics-and-code-of-conduct-with-suitable-examples/>

Q2 · 10 marks

(a) What is meant by public interest? What are the principles and procedures to be followed by the civil servants in public interest?
(b) "The Right to Information Act is not all about citizens' empowerment alone, it essentially redefines the concept of accountability. Discuss.

GS IV · 2018 · Probity in Governance

Revision summary

Public interest is the welfare of the whole community under the Constitution, not popularity or official prestige.

Civil servants serve it through legality, impartiality, proportionality, recorded reasons, published criteria and a preference for the weakest.

Upward reporting is not enough if the file stays secret.

The **RTI Act, 2005** empowers citizens to seek information and redefines accountability as an answer owed to the public.

Suo motu disclosure, time limits and the **Information Commission** make that new accountability real, though exemptions and fear still weaken it.

Introduction

Public interest is the reason a civil servant holds a stamp. Part (a) says what that interest is and how an officer must walk it. Part (b) shows how the Right to Information Act, 2005 changed accountability from a private file to a public answer.

Body

(a) Public interest: meaning, principles and procedures

- Public interest is the welfare of the community as a whole, not the convenience of a minister, a caste, a contractor or the officer's family.
- It is not identical with what is popular this week. A noisy crowd can still demand an illegal demolition.
- It is also not identical with the State's prestige. Hiding a disaster death-count is State interest, not public interest.
- **Principles for a civil servant:** legality under the Constitution; equality and non-discrimination; proportionality; transparency where secrecy is not strictly required; economy of public money; and a preference for the weakest person who will bear the cost.
- **Fiduciary duty:** the officer is a trustee of land, money, data and force. Trustees do not self-deal.
- **Natural justice is a procedure of public interest:** hear the person who will be hurt, give reasons, and do not be a judge in your own cause.
- Recorded reasons and a speaking order let a citizen and a court test whether the public was served or only a patron.
- Consultation and, where the law requires it, environmental and social impact assessment stop a project from treating a silent village as empty land.
- Follow the file, not the oral hint. If an oral instruction is unlawful, ask for it in writing and put your dissent on the note, as service rules expect.

- Use published criteria for licences, relief and tenders. Discretion without a criterion is a market for bribes.
- When interests clash - a road versus a grove, speed versus a hearing - name the clash, weigh it, and choose the option that law and the weakest stakeholder can survive.
- **Review and audit after the act are also public interest:** a dam that was opened without a warning siren has already failed the public even if the file was neat.

(b) RTI and a new idea of accountability

- **Older accountability was mostly upward:** the clerk to the officer, the officer to the minister, the minister to the House.
- **The Right to Information Act, 2005 added a sideways and downward door:** the citizen may ask, and the public authority must reply in time or give a lawful exemption.
- **Empowerment is real:** a ration card, a muster roll, a tender and a marksheet can be pulled into the light without a patron.
- The deeper change is the definition of accountability. The officer is now accountable not only to a superior who may share the secret, but to a person who was never in the room.
- **Section 4** of the Act asks for suo motu disclosure, so accountability is not only a reaction to an application; it is a duty to publish.
- The **Information Commission** and penalties for delay make the duty justiciable in an administrative way, which a courtesy circular never was.
- **Accountability after RTI is also documentary:** if it is not on the file, it did not happen. Oral government becomes harder.
- **Limits remain:** **Section 8** exemptions, poor record-keeping, threats to applicants, and a culture that still treats the file as private property.
- RTI does not replace the Comptroller and Auditor General, the legislature or the court. It redefines the first question: "to whom must I explain this file?" The answer is now, in principle, the public.
- Used with social audit and the **Public Records Act, 1993** duties of custody, RTI turns accountability from a confidential annual confidential report into a public conversation.

Flow diagram

Public interest -> Legality and equality
 Public interest -> Hearing reasons audit
 RTI Act 2005 Act 2005 -> Citizen empowerment
 RTI Act 2005 -> Accountability to the public
 Citizen empowerment -> The file must answer
 Accountability to the public -> The file must answer

Conclusion

Public interest is the community's lawful welfare, served by legality, equality, recorded reasons and a bias toward the weakest. RTI empowers the applicant and, more than that, makes the officer answerable to people who do not sit in the secretariat.

Open WRAP page — <https://wrapexams.com/upsc/mains-answers/gs-4/2018/a-what-is-meant-by-public-interest-what-are-the-principles-and-procedures-to-be-followed-by-the-civil-servants-in-public-interest-b-the-right-to-information-act-is-not-all-about-citizens-empowerment-alone-it-essentially/>

Q3 · 10 marks

(a) What is meant by conflict of interest? Illustrate with examples, the difference between the actual and potential conflicts of interest. (b) "In looking for people to hire, you look for three qualities: integrity, intelligence and energy. And if they do not have the first, the other two will kill you." - Warren Buffett What do you understand by this statement in the present-day scenario? Explain.

GS IV · 2018 · Ethics in Public Administration

Revision summary

Conflict of interest is a private interest that can twist a public or fiduciary duty.

Actual conflict is already operating on this decision; potential conflict is reasonably foreseeable even if today's file looks clean.

The cure is disclosure, recusal, divestment and screens, not private hope.

Buffett ranks integrity first because intelligence and energy multiply both service and fraud.

Present-day scams, surveillance tools and mark-worshipping recruitment make that ranking more, not less, urgent.

Introduction

Part (a) names the moment when a public duty and a private stake pull the same person. Part (b) reads Buffett's hiring rule as a warning for governments and firms that still prize clever, tireless people without honesty.

Body

(a) Conflict of interest: actual and potential

- Conflict of interest is a situation in which a public duty, or a fiduciary duty, can be twisted by a private interest of the decision-maker, a relative, or a close associate.
- The private interest may be money, land, a job for a child, a party's win, or even a friendship that expects a return.
- The harm is not only a bribe already taken. The harm is that the public can no longer trust the decision as clean.
- Actual conflict of interest exists when the private stake is already live in the decision that is being taken now.
- **Example of actual conflict:** an officer sits on a tender committee while a sibling's firm is a bidder.
- **Example of actual conflict:** a minister decides an alignment that raises the price of land already bought in a spouse's name.
- **Example of actual conflict:** a doctor refers every patient to a diagnostic centre that the doctor secretly owns, without disclosure.
- Potential conflict of interest exists when the private stake is not yet driving this file, but a reasonable person can see that it soon could.
- **Example of potential conflict:** an officer owns shares in a company that does not yet bid in the district, but is expected to enter the sector next year.

- **Example of potential conflict:** a civil servant's child has taken a job in a regulated firm, and the parent still handles that firm's files, even if today's note is routine.
- **Example of potential conflict:** a retired regulator joining, after a short gap, a firm he used to police - the revolving door is a potential conflict until cooling-off and recusal are real.
- **The ethical response is the same in structure:** disclose, recuse, divest, or put a screen between the person and the file. Hope is not a control.
- The **Companies Act, 2013** and service conduct rules treat related-party and gift situations as conflicts whether or not a court has already named a crime.

(b) Buffett in the present-day scenario

- Buffett is ranking character above talent. Integrity is the first filter; intelligence and energy are multipliers.
- **If the first is missing, the other two "kill you":** they help the dishonest person steal faster, hide better, and work nights on the fraud.
- Present-day public life shows the same arithmetic. A brilliant engineer who falsifies a bridge test, a tireless GST inspector who runs a raid-for-bribe unit, or a coder who builds a leak of personal data for profit, all injure more than a lazy thief.
- Satyam in 2009 looked efficient. Intelligence and energy kept a false cash book standing until it collapsed on workers, investors and the idea of Indian IT governance.
- Banking and securities frauds of the last decade used smart products and long workdays. The missing piece was integrity, not a shortage of MBAs.
- **Social media and surveillance tools raise the stakes:** an energetic, intelligent officer without integrity can target a rival with a leak or a selective raid at scale.
- Recruitment that worships marks, rank and "drive" without integrity tests will keep producing this type.
- The quote is not anti-intelligence. A dull honest person may still fail a complex file. The claim is that honesty is the gate, and talent is the room behind it.
- **For civil services the lesson is selection, mid-career scrutiny, and leadership example:** do not celebrate the officer who "gets things done" by breaking the tender.
- **For private hiring, the same:** a salesperson who lies to the Ministry will later lie to the board.

Flow diagram

Conflict of interest -> Actual: live private stake
 Conflict of interest -> Potential: foreseeable stake
 Actual: live private stake -> Disclose recuse divest
 Potential: foreseeable stake -> Disclose recuse divest
 Intelligence and energy -> Multiplier
 Integrity -> First filter
 Multiplier -> Delivery or disaster
 First filter -> Delivery or disaster

Conclusion

Conflict of interest is a private stake sitting on a public file. Actual conflict is already in the decision; potential conflict is the stake that a reasonable person can see coming. Buffett's line is present tense: talent without integrity is a more efficient disaster.

Open WRAP page — <https://wrapexams.com/upsc/mains-answers/gs-4/2018/a-what-is-meant-by-conflict-of-interest-illustrate-with-examples-the-difference-between-the-actual-and-potential-conflicts-of-interest-b-in-looking-for-people-to-hire-you-look-for-three-qualities-integrity-intelligence/>

WRAP Exams

Q4 · 10 marks

(a) "In doing a good thing, everything is permitted which is not prohibited expressly or by clear implication". Examine the statement with suitable examples in the context of a public servant discharging his/her duties. (b) With regard to the morality of actions, one view is that means is of paramount importance and the other view is that the ends justify the means. Which view do you think is more appropriate? Justify your answer.

GS IV · 2018 · Ethics and Human Interface

Revision summary

Citizens may enjoy residual liberty; public servants may use only granted power.

"Not expressly prohibited" does not authorise extra cess, unlawful detention or a cooked tender for a good cause.

Implied limits include equality, dignity, natural justice and fiduciary duty.

Between means-first ethics and ends-justify-means, public office should treat means as paramount.

Necessity is a narrow, recorded exception, not a daily shortcut.

Introduction

- **Part (a) tests a dangerous comfort:** if the aim is good and no clause says no, the officer may do anything. Part (b) sets Gandhi's care for means against a purely result-based licence.

Body

(a) "Everything permitted unless prohibited"

- **The statement is a lawyer's half-truth. Citizens often enjoy residual liberty:** what the law does not forbid, they may do.
- A public servant is not a private citizen at the desk. The officer holds delegated power and may do only what the Constitution, the statute and the rules authorise.
- **Ultra vires is the first limit:** there is no general permission to invent a tax, a detention or a land take because it would be "good".
- Example: collecting extra "development donation" at a tehsil for a real school roof is still illegal extraction if the Act does not allow it.
- Example: locking a suspected thief overnight without process because the colony wants safety is still an unlawful detention.
- Example: leaking a rival bidder's price to help a "better" local firm is still a crime against the tender, however patriotic the speech.
- Express prohibition is not the only brake. Clear implication includes natural justice, Article 14 equality, Article 21 dignity, fiduciary duty, and the doctrine that public power is a trust.
- Discretion, where the statute gives it, is not a blank cheque. It must be exercised for the purpose of the Act, with reasons, and without irrelevant considerations (as administrative law has long held).

- A "good thing" judged only by the officer - a temple, a statue, a favourite NGO - is often a private good wearing a public coat.
- **The safer rule for a public servant:** if the power is not granted, do not assume it. If the power is granted, still refuse cruelty, secrecy and self-dealing that the Constitution will not bear.
- Innovation in delivery (a camp on a holiday, a missing-document help-desk) is permitted when it stays inside the scheme and the budget. That is service, not a licence to rewrite the law.

(b) Means and ends

- **One view, close to Kant and to Gandhi, is that means are paramount:** a lie, a riot, or a fake encounter cannot be washed by a fine result.
- **The other view, a hard utilitarianism, is that ends justify means:** if the village is dry, forge the file; if the terrorist may escape, skip the warrant.
- For a constitutional public servant, means are more appropriate as the governing rule, with a narrow, recorded place for necessity.
- **Reasons:** the officer's tools are force, money and secrecy. If means are free, the republic becomes a successful crime.
- Ends are often claimed and rarely measured. "Development", "order" and "pride" have covered encounter killings and cooked data.
- **Gandhi's talisman and satyagraha treated impure means as a different end:** they produce a different kind of person and State.
- Consequence still matters. A lawful demolition that leaves a child on the street without shelter has used a permitted means toward a cruel end and must be refused or humanised within the law.
- Necessity and lesser evil apply in a landslide, a fire, or an imminent massacre - narrow, time-bound, documented - not as a daily philosophy of shortcuts.
- **Therefore the more appropriate view for public office is:** means first, because they are the only part the officer fully controls; judge ends by rights and the weakest person; never let a slogan buy a crime.

Flow diagram

Claimed good aim -> Is power authorised
 Is power authorised -> Act with reasons and dignity
 Is power authorised -> Do not invent power
 Clean means -> Constitutional office

Conclusion

A public servant may not treat silence in a rule-book as a general yes. Power is granted, not assumed. Means are paramount in a republic that uses force; ends matter as a test of harm, not as a licence to cheat.

Open WRAP page — <https://wrapexams.com/upsc/mains-answers/gs-4/2018/a-in-doing-a-good-thing-everything-is-permitted-which-is-not-prohibited-expressly-or-by-clear-implication-examine-the-statement-with-suitable-examples-in-the-context-of-a-public-servant-discharging-his-her-duties-b-with/>

Q5 · 10 marks

(a) Suppose the Government of India is thinking of constructing a dam in a mountain valley bond by forests and inhabited by ethnic communities. What rational policy should it resort to in dealing with unforeseen contingencies (b) Explain the process of resolving ethical dilemmas in Public Administration.

GS IV · 2018 · Ethics in Public Administration

Revision summary

Unforeseen contingencies at a mountain dam include cloudburst, slope failure, unmapped sacred land and downstream flood.

Rational policy uses precaution, Forest Rights and PESA floors, staged construction, disaster warning, escrow for extra harm, and a real stop trigger.

Hiding safety data is not prudence.

An ethical dilemma is a clash of duties.

Resolve it by facts, values, stakeholders, lawful options, constitutional and weakest-person tests, a speaking order and a review of leftover harm.

Introduction

A high dam in a forested tribal valley is a file of known goods and unknown shocks. Part (a) asks for a rational policy toward those shocks. Part (b) asks how an administrator should untie a clash of values, not only a clash of files.

Body

(a) Rational policy for unforeseen contingencies at the dam

- **Unforeseen contingencies are events the Detailed Project Report did not price:** a cloudburst, a landslide into the reservoir, a sacred grove wrongly mapped, a downstream flush that drowns a hamlet, a seismic surprise, or a protest that turns into a blockade of food.
- Rational policy is not a claim that the future is known. It is a design that expects surprise and keeps human and ecological floors.
- **Precautionary principle:** where harm to forests, slopes and ethnic communities may be grave and hard to reverse, lack of full scientific certainty is not a reason to skip safeguards.
- Free, prior and informed consent in spirit, and the legal floors of the **Forest Rights Act, 2006**, the Panchayats (Extension to the Scheduled Areas) Act, 1996 where it applies, and the Right to Fair Compensation and Transparency in Land Acquisition, **Rehabilitation and Resettlement Act, 2013**, must be treated as risk control, not as delay to be gamed.
- Environmental Impact Assessment and a real public hearing, with downstream States and gram sabhas in the room, should include a disaster scenario, not only a fair-weather power chart.
- **Adaptive management:** staged construction, independent instrumentation of slopes and seismicity, a stop-work trigger, and a published dam-break and flash-flood protocol.
- **Contingency finance:** an escrow for extra rehabilitation, crop loss, and forest restoration so that a surprise is not paid by the poorest household.
- **Institutional readiness under the Disaster Management Act, 2005:** sirens, last-mile warning in local languages, boats, and a named officer who can open gates without waiting for a

festival holiday.

- **No-go screens:** if a contingency study shows a sacred landscape or a fragile slope that cannot be made safe, the rational act is to drop or shrink the dam, not to write a better press note.
- Ethnic communities should have a living grievance path and a share in benefits that survives a change of contractor. Unforeseen harm is otherwise dumped on those who cannot exit.
- **Transparency is part of contingency policy:** hiding a silt or safety reading is how a surprise becomes a massacre.

(b) Process of resolving ethical dilemmas in public administration

- An ethical dilemma is a clash of right with right, or of two duties, where each option leaves a remainder of harm.
- **Step 1:** Name the facts without a convenient story. Who is affected, what is urgent, what is uncertain.
- **Step 2:** Name the values and duties on each side - legality, compassion, equality, efficiency, loyalty, confidentiality, environmental care.
- **Step 3:** Identify stakeholders, especially those who will not be in the meeting.
- **Step 4:** List lawful options, including delay, a lesser act, and asking a competent authority. Illegal heroism is not a solution.
- **Step 5:** Test each option: Constitution and statute; the weakest person; reversibility; publicity (could this speaking order be published?); and your own conflict of interest.
- **Step 6:** Choose, record reasons, and fix a review date. A dilemma resolved only in the head is not an administrative act.
- **Step 7:** Own the remainder: compensate, apologise, or monitor the harm you could not avoid.
- **Tools that help:** conduct rules, codes of ethics, a senior's written order, the Right to Information test, and, in hard cases, refusal.
- **What does not help:** a slogan, a party whip, or "everyone does this".

Flow diagram

Dam in forested valley -> Precaution and consent
 Precaution and consent -> Adaptive safety and warning
 Adaptive safety and warning -> Stop or shrink if unsafe
 Ethical dilemma -> Facts and stakeholders
 Facts and stakeholders -> Lawful options
 Lawful options -> Constitution and weakest person
 Constitution and weakest person -> Record and review

Conclusion

- **A dam in a tribal forest needs a policy that expects surprise:** consent, staged safety, money for harm, and the courage to stop. Ethical dilemmas in administration are resolved by naming values, testing lawful options against the weakest person, and writing the reasons.

Open WRAP page — <https://wrapexams.com/upsc/mains-answers/gs-4/2018/a-suppose-the-government-of-india-is-thinking-of-constructing-a-dam-in-a-mountain-valley-bond-by-forests-and-inhabited-by-ethnic-communities-what-rational-policy-should-it-resort-to-in-dealing-with-unforeseen/>

Q6 · 10 marks

What do each of the following quotations mean to you in the present context? (a) "The true rule, in determining to embrace, or reject anything, is not whether it has any evil in it; but whether it has more evil than good. There are few things wholly evil or wholly good. Almost everything, especially of governmental policy, is an inseparable compound of the two; so that our best judgement of the preponderance between them is continually demanded. "Abraham Lincoln (b) "Anger and intolerance are the enemies of correct understanding." Mahatma Gandhi (c) "Falsehood takes the place of truth when it results in unblemished common good." _ Tirukkural.

GS IV · 2018 · Moral Thinkers and Philosophers

Revision summary

Lincoln teaches that policy is mixed; judge by whether evil outweighs good, without waiting for purity and without washing harm as trivial.

Gandhi teaches that anger and intolerance block correct understanding, which a riot, a troll-storm or a frightened office all prove.

The Tirukkural line seems to allow falsehood for unblemished common good.

That bar is almost never met in ordinary files; cooked data stains the good it claims.

Truth is the default; only a narrow, time-bound rescue lie, later accountable, can even be argued.

Introduction

Lincoln, **Gandhi** and the Kural still sit on an officer's table. One asks for a sober balance of mixed policies. One warns that rage blinds. One tests whether a noble lie may ever stand in for truth.

Body

(a) Lincoln: few things wholly evil or wholly good

- Lincoln is describing public judgement, not private cynicism. Almost every statute mixes help and harm.
- **The rule is not "ignore evil". It is:** refuse a thing when evil outweighs good, and do not wait for a perfect purity that government never has.
- **Present context:** a farm law, a dam, a data Bill, or a lockdown is a compound. Ethics is the work of measuring the preponderance, especially for those who did not lobby.
- A civil servant who will act only when a file is wholly good will freeze. One who treats any harm as trivial will crush the poor as "collateral".
- The quote demands evidence, not slogan. If a policy's good is a press release and its evil is a starved migrant, the preponderance is already known.
- **It also demands revision:** when the balance tips, repeal or repair, as Lincoln's own politics had to do with the costs of war.

- For GS-IV, this is consequential weighing inside a constitutional floor. You may choose a lesser-evil option; you may not choose an unconstitutional one because it "has some good".

(b) **Gandhi: anger and intolerance versus understanding**

- **Gandhi is stating a cognitive ethic:** anger and intolerance do not only hurt the other; they destroy the holder's capacity to see.
- Correct understanding needs listening, doubt and time. Rage shortens all three.
- **Present context:** communal forwards, television shouting, and office humiliation of a junior or a minority applicant are factories of error.
- A District Magistrate who walks into a riot already angry at one community will misread the first stone and the first fire.
- Intolerance of dissent inside a department produces files that only flatter. That is not loyalty; it is blindness on stamp paper.
- The quote does not forbid firmness. **Gandhi** could be stern. It forbids the heat that makes a false rumour feel like a fact.
- **Practical rule:** pause, verify, hear the disliked person, then decide. Understanding is a duty of office, not a soft hobby.

(c) **Tirukkural: falsehood in the place of truth**

- The line, as the paper gives it, seems to licence a lie when the common good is complete and unstained.
- Read strictly, "unblemished common good" is a bar almost no lie can clear. A lie that helps one group usually stains another.
- **Present context:** cooked air-quality numbers, a hidden epidemic count, or a "white lie" to a House committee all claim public good and all stain it.
- Truth-telling is the default of trusteeship. The **Second ARC** and RTI culture treat false records as a species of corruption.
- **Narrow exceptions exist in ethics of rescue:** misleading a riot mob about a hiding place, or operational secrecy in a hostage hour. Those are time-bound, not a governance style.
- **Gandhi** would resist a standing permission to lie. **Kant** would too. A limited utilitarian exception still needs later accountability and a clean archive for the court.
- **My reading:** the Kural is not a daily permit for official falsehood. It is a warning that only an unblemished common good - almost never proved in advance - could even begin to argue with truth. In ordinary administration, falsehood does not take the place of truth; it takes the place of trust.

Flow diagram

Lincoln -> Weigh mixed good and evil
 Gandhi -> Anger off, then understand
 Kural -> Truth default
 Kural -> Narrow rescue exception
 Weigh mixed good and evil -> Public decision
 Anger off, then understand -> Public decision
 Truth default -> Public decision

Conclusion

Lincoln asks for a honest tally of mixed good and harm. Gandhi asks for a mind cool enough to see. The Kural, read with care, does not gift the State a noble lie; it sets a test so high that truth remains the working rule.

Open WRAP page — <https://wrapexams.com/upsc/mains-answers/gs-4/2018/what-do-each-of-the-following-quotations-mean-to-you-in-the-present-context-a-the-true-rule-in-determining-to-embrace-or-reject-anything-is-not-whether-it-has-any-evil-in-it-but-whether-it-has-more-evil-than-good-there/>

WRAP Exams

Q7 · 20 marks

Case study. Edward Snowden, a computer expert, and former CIA administrator, released confidential Government documents to the press about the existence of Government surveillance programmes. According to many legal experts and the US Government, his action violated the Espionage act of 1971, which identified the leak of State secrets as an act of treason. Yet, despite the fact that he broke the law, Snowden argued that he had a moral obligation to act. He gave a justification for his "whistleblowing" by stating that he had a duty "to inform the public as to that which is done in their name and that which is done against them." According to Snowden, the Government's violation of privacy had to be exposed regardless of legality since more substantive issues of social action and public morality were involved here. Many agreed with Snowden. Few argued that he broke the law and compromised national security, for which he should be held accountable. Do you agree that Snowden's actions were ethically justified even if legally prohibited? Why or why not? Make an argument by weighing the competing values in this case. (250 words).

GS IV · 2018 · Ethics Case Studies

Revision summary

Snowden broke secrecy law to expose mass surveillance and claimed a duty to the public.

Stakeholders include the surveilled public, agencies, oversight bodies, journalists and persons exposed in a wider dump.

Values in clash are privacy, security, democratic consent, oath and the rule of law.

A leak is ethically defensible only as last-resort, proportionate, evidence-based disclosure of a grave abuse.

The core surveillance warning can meet that test; an unfiltered spill and unaccountable flight weaken it.

Legality is not the whole of ethics, and ethics is not a free pardon.

Introduction

Snowden exposed secret mass-surveillance programmes and broke United States secrecy law. The case is not a fan debate. It is a clash among privacy, security, democratic consent, loyalty and the rule of law.

Body

Stakeholders

- The public whose communications were collected, including people who were not suspects.
- Snowden as employee, contractor and citizen who took an oath of secrecy.

- Intelligence agencies and the United States government, charged with preventing attacks.
- Other States and persons named or exposed in the wider document dump.
- Courts, Congress and oversight bodies that were meant to watch the programmes.
- Journalists who received and filtered material.
- Allied governments and their publics, whose data rode on the same pipes.

Ethical issues and competing values

- **Privacy and dignity:** secret bulk collection treats a population as a haystack, which sits badly with a free society's idea of the person.
- **National security and non-maleficence:** methods, partners and ongoing operations can be harmed if disclosure is crude.
- **Democratic accountability:** a programme done "in the people's name" without a meaningful public or even legislative grasp lacks consent.
- **Rule of law:** the Espionage Act forbids the leak. Conscience does not, by itself, repeal a statute.
- **Fidelity and oath:** a cleared insider is not a freelance philosopher; the job is built on confidentiality.
- **Proportionality and last resort:** whistle-blowing ethics asks whether internal inspectors, committees and courts were tried, whether the disclosure was limited to the abuse, and whether the person accepts legal risk rather than a private bargain with a rival State.
- **Integrity of information:** dumping more than the abuse, if that occurred, mixes public interest with collateral harm.

Options

- **Option 1:** Treat any leak of classified material as ethically forbidden.
- **Merit:** protects sources, methods and a professional secret service.
- **Demerit:** leaves no moral language for a secret that has become a system of suspicion against the innocent, with captured oversight.
- **Option 2:** Treat Snowden as simply a hero and ignore legality and collateral.
- **Merit:** names the privacy harm.
- **Demerit:** erases oath, allied harm, and the difference between a filtered public-interest leak and a data spill.
- **Option 3:** Weigh justification as last-resort, proportionate disclosure to the public through serious journalism, while still facing legal process.
- **Merit:** holds both privacy and law in view.
- **Demerit:** reasonable people will still disagree on whether his actual path met the test.

Values, action and judgement

- I do not treat legality as the whole of ethics. Unjust secret programmes can create a moral remainder.
- I also do not treat every illegal leak as a virtue. Whistle-blowing is justified only when the wrong is grave, evidence is real, internal and legislative paths are blocked or captured, disclosure is minimised to the abuse, and the whistle-blower does not sell the rest to an enemy service.
- **On privacy versus security:** security is a public good; bulk suspicion without adequate law and oversight is a different good, closer to domination.

- **On Snowden:** the core revelation of bulk collection served a public that could not consent to what it did not know. That part has a strong ethical claim, later echoed in court and legislative argument in several democracies.
- The claim weakens where the dump risked operations or persons beyond the abuse, and where asylum politics mixed with the moral story.
- Ethically, a justified whistle-blower still stands trial or a public legal process; flight can be understood as fear, but it is not a full substitute for accountability.
- Therefore: legally prohibited, partly ethically defensible as a last-resort warning about mass surveillance; not a blank cheque for every classified taking; competing values are not solved by a flag or by a prison slogan alone.

What a similar officer in India should do

- Use the **Whistle Blowers Protection Act, 2014** channels, the competent committee, and, where rights are at stake, courts.
- Do not dump an unfiltered archive on the internet.
- If every door is captured, a narrow disclosure to a responsible forum remains the ethical last step, with a file of failed internal attempts.

Flow diagram

Secret bulk surveillance -> Privacy versus security
Privacy versus security -> Internal oversight
Internal oversight -> Captured or blind oversight
Captured or blind oversight -> Narrow public-interest leak
Unfiltered dump -> Collateral harm
Espionage statute -> Legal cost remains

Conclusion

Privacy, security, consent and law all have weight. Snowden's core warning about bulk surveillance can be ethically defended as last-resort speech to a public that had not consented. The same defence does not cover careless spill or a cult of the leaker. Law-breaking remains a cost, not a costume.

Open WRAP page — <https://wrapexams.com/upsc/mains-answers/gs-4/2018/case-study-edward-snowden-a-computer-expert-and-former-cia-administrator-released-confidential-government-documents-to-the-press-about-the-existence-of-government-surveillance-programmes-according-to-many-legal-experts/>

Q8 · 20 marks

Case study. Rakesh is a responsible district-level officer, who enjoys the trust of his higher officials. Knowing his honesty, the government entrusted him with the responsibility of identifying the beneficiaries under a health care scheme meant for senior citizens. The criteria to be a beneficiary are the following: (a) 60 years of age or above. (b) Belonging to a reserved community. (c) Family income of less than 1 Lakh rupees per annum. (d) Post-treatment prognosis is likely to be high to make a positive difference to the quality of life of the beneficiary. One day, an old couple visited Rakesh's office with their application. They have been the residents of a village in his district since their birth. The old man is diagnosed with a rare condition that causes obstruction in the large intestine. As a consequence, he has severe abdominal pain frequently that prevents him from doing any physical labour. The couple has no children to support them. The expert surgeon whom they contacted is willing to do the surgery without charging any fee. However, the couple will have to bear the cost of incidental charges, such as medicines, hospitalization, etc., to the tune of rupees one lakh. The couple fulfills all the criteria except criterion 'b'. However, any financial aid would certainly make a significant difference in their quality of life. How should Rakesh respond to the situation? (250 words).

GS IV · 2018 · Ethics Case Studies

Revision summary

The couple meet age, poverty and prognosis tests but not reserved-community status.

Faking criterion (b) is injustice to eligible persons and a breach of integrity.

Cold rejection without a second path fails compassion.

Rakesh should explain the bar, keep the scheme clean, and route them to lawful health cover, relief funds and hospital charity.

He may recommend a future hardship window to government, not invent one on the file.

Introduction

Rakesh is trusted to apply a closed list of criteria. The couple are poor, local, old and medically deserving, yet they are not from a reserved community. Compassion is real. Forging criterion (b) is not.

Body**Stakeholders**

- The old man, the spouse, and their remaining years of pain and work.

- Other eligible persons on the waitlist who meet all four criteria, including reserved-community applicants.
- Rakesh, his seniors, and the government that wrote the scheme.
- The surgeon willing to waive the professional fee.
- The district public, whose trust in a "honest officer" is at stake.

Ethical issues and values

- **Compassion and human dignity:** untreated obstruction of the intestine is not a paperwork inconvenience.
- **Rule of law and equality:** stretching "reserved community" for a couple Rakesh pities is a fraud on the scheme and on those for whom reservation was written.
- **Justice toward absentees:** a silent eligible patient loses if this file jumps the wall.
- Integrity versus the temptation to be a local god who rewrites eligibility.
- Empathy must find a lawful door, not a false caste or tribe certificate.

Options

- **Option 1:** Reject them at the counter and close the file.
- **Merit:** literal legality.
- **Demerit:** zero compassion; an officer who only recites criteria has not yet done the whole duty of a district.
- **Option 2:** Record them as reserved by "interpretation" or a backdated certificate.
- **Merit:** the surgery fund might move.
- **Demerit:** forgery, a stain on reservation, and a habit that will return as a scandal. Rejected.
- **Option 3:** Pay from Rakesh's pocket or run a private collection as the main path.
- **Merit:** kind.
- **Demerit:** not scalable, creates patronage, and may breach conduct rules if it becomes a public show tied to office.
- **Option 4:** Refuse the scheme lie; keep the couple as a humanitarian case on a lawful second track: other schemes, CM/PM relief, hospital poor fund, and documented recommendation.
- **Merit:** integrity plus care.
- **Demerit:** funds may still fall short; that remainder must be chased, not used as an excuse to fake criterion (b).

Action Rakesh should take

- **Explain in clear language why this scheme cannot pay:** criterion (b) is not met, and he will not cook it.
- Do not humiliate them for being outside reservation. Poverty is not a moral failure.
- **Same day, open lawful alternatives:** Ayushman Bharat - Pradhan Mantri Jan Arogya Yojana if eligible; State health insurance; Chief Minister's relief fund; district Red Cross; hospital samaritan or poor-patient fund; any senior-citizen or disability scheme that actually fits.
- Write to the surgeon and the hospital asking for the incidental cost to be billed through charity or instalments, since the professional fee is already waived.
- Put a factual note to the government proposing a hardship window or a separate destitute-senior fund, without quietly amending this scheme at the desk.
- If a waitlist exists, do not bump ineligible names ahead of eligible reserved families.
- Recuse from any private gift that looks like a fee for a favour.

- Follow up until a number is tied to medicines and the bed, because a referral letter that dies in a drawer is theatre.

Flow diagram

Couple miss reserved criterion -> Do not fake criterion b

Do not fake criterion b -> PM-JAY CM relief hospital fund

False reserved tag -> Fraud on scheme and waitlist

PM-JAY CM relief hospital fund -> Surgery incidentals

Conclusion

Rakesh should not rewrite reservation to look kind. He should refuse the false fit, and he should work the same day on PM-JAY, relief funds and hospital charity so that the couple are not abandoned at the gate.

Open WRAP page — <https://wrapexams.com/upsc/mains-answers/gs-4/2018/case-study-rakesh-is-a-responsible-district-level-officer-who-enjoys-the-trust-of-his-higher-officials-knowing-his-honesty-the-government-entrusted-him-with-the-responsibility-of-identifying-the-beneficiaries-under-a/>

Q9 · 20 marks

Case study. It is a State where prohibition is in force. You are recently appointed as the Superintendent of Police of a district notorious for illicit distillation of liquor. The illicit liquor leads to many death, reported and unreported, and causes a major problem for the district authorities. The approach till now had been to view it as a law and order problem and tackle it accordingly. Raids, arrests, police cases, and criminal trials - all these had only limited impact. The problem remains as serious as ever. Your inspections show that the parts of the district where the distillation flourishes are economically, industrially, and educationally backward. Agriculture is badly affected by poor irrigation facilities. Frequent clashes among communities gave a boost to illicit distillation. No major initiatives had taken place in the past either from the government's side or from social organizations to improve a lot of the people. Which new approach will you adopt to bring the problem under control? (250 words).

GS IV · 2018 · Ethics Case Studies

Revision summary

Raids failed because the belt is poor, dry and feud-ridden.

A new SP should not unofficially legalise poison and should not only hit harder.

The approach is mapped health data, strikes on methanol supply, livelihood and irrigation with the Collector, de-addiction, and impartial policing.

Police integrity is part of the cure; protection money is part of the disease.

Success is fewer deaths, not more cases.

Introduction

Illicit liquor in this district is a public-health massacre wearing a law-and-order mask. Raids alone have already been tried. The new approach must dry the economic swamp, not only fill the lock-up.

Body

Stakeholders

- Drinkers, their families, and people who die from methanol and other poisons.
- Poor distillers, including women who may have no other cash.
- Communities in clash, who use liquor money and liquor gangs as muscle.
- Police, excise, health, agriculture and panchayat officers.
- Honest dry-law supporters and those who want a quiet bribe economy to continue.

Ethical issues and values

- **Sanctity of life:** unreported deaths are still deaths.

- **Justice:** punishing only the small cooker while the solvent supply lives is theatre.
- **Empathy:** a dry law that ignores hunger will be broken every night.
- **Impartiality:** raids that visit only one community will feed the next clash.
- **Integrity:** police who tax the still cannot lead a new approach.

Why the old approach failed

- Distillation here is livelihood, irrigation failure, and a feud economy, not only a hobby of crime.
- Cases without conviction, and convictions without an alternative wage, recycle the same families.
- Fear without services pushes the still further into the forest and the death rate stays.

Options

- **Option 1:** Harsher raids only.
- **Merit:** some fear.
- **Demerit:** already failed; invites fake encounters and communal targeting.
- **Option 2:** Ignore prohibition and unofficially "regulate" the stills.
- **Merit:** less police theatre.
- **Demerit:** you become a partner in poison and you break the law you swore to.
- **Option 3:** A whole-of-district plan: enforcement on supply of poison, livelihood and irrigation, health, and peace work.
- **Merit:** matches the causes named in the stem.
- **Demerit:** slower, needs other departments; still the right course.

Action: the new approach

- Map deaths, stills, solvent routes and community fault-lines with health data, not only FIR counts. Publish what can be published so the problem is not a police secret.
- **Split the crime:** hunt methanol and organised supply with excise and financial intelligence; treat the hungry small cooker as a person who needs an exit, not only a boot.
- **Clean the force:** rotate compromised posts, use independent raids, and invite complaints against protection money.
- **Sit with the Collector, agriculture, rural development and women-and-child officers:** irrigation repair, MGNREGA and skill work in the belt, so the still is not the only wage.
- **De-addiction and emergency medicine:** primary health centres stocked for poisoning, an ambulance that actually moves, and counselling that does not wait for a fatal batch.
- **Community peace:** liquor often funds feud. Use credible local peace committees, equal enforcement, and keep festivals from becoming revenge markets.
- Women's groups and youth clubs as monitors, not as unpaid spies of one caste.
- Schools and adult literacy so the next cohort is not trapped in the same cash-from-poison story.
- Ask the State, with evidence, whether prohibition without livelihood is producing methanol death; policy change is the legislature's, but the SP may not fake success.
- Measure success as fewer deaths and fewer hospitalised children, not as a taller pile of seized matkas.

Flow diagram

Illicit liquor deaths -> Raids only

Raids only -> Problem unchanged

Illicit liquor deaths -> Supply plus livelihood plus health

Supply plus livelihood plus health -> Map poison and poverty

Supply plus livelihood plus health -> Irrigation jobs de-addiction

Supply plus livelihood plus health -> Clean police and equal raids

Conclusion

Keep the law, but stop pretending the still is only a lathi problem. Cut poison supply, exit poor distillers into wages and water, treat the dying, and police both communities without a protection racket.

Open WRAP page — <https://wrapexams.com/upsc/mains-answers/gs-4/2018/case-study-it-is-a-state-where-prohibition-is-in-force-you-are-recently-appointed-as-the-superintendent-of-police-of-a-district-notorious-for-illicit-distillation-of-liquor-the-illicit-liquor-leads-to-many-death-reported/>

Q10 · 20 marks

Case study. A big corporate house is engaged in manufacturing industrial chemicals on a large scale. It proposes to set up an additional unit. Many states rejected its proposal due to its detrimental effect on the environment. But one state government acceded to the request and permitted the unit close to a city, brushing aside all opposition. The unit was set up 10 years ago and was in full swing till recently. The pollution caused by the industrial effluents was affecting the land, water, and crops in the area. It was also causing serious health problems to human beings and animals. This gave rise to a series of agitations demanding the closure of the plant. In a recent agitation, thousands of people took part, creating a law and order problem necessitating stern police action. Following the public outcry, the State government ordered the closure of the factory. The closure of the factory resulted in the unemployment of not only those workers who were engaged in the factory but also those who were working in the ancillary units. It also very badly affected those industries which depended on the chemicals manufactured by it. As a senior officer entrusted with the responsibility of handling these issues, how are you going to address it? (250 words).

GS IV · 2018 · Ethics Case Studies

Revision summary

The case joins ten years of pollution, a forced closure and sudden unemployment.

Reopening without cleanup repeats the original wrong; closure without worker and site plans creates a second wrong.

The officer should run health and water relief, polluter-pays remediation, labour dues, and lawful help for ancillary firms.

A restart, if any, needs a new environmental process away from the city's water.

Police excess and environmental crime are two files, both to be tried.

Introduction

The plant bought time with a political yes and paid in poisoned land, water, bodies and a riot. Closure without a second plan now poisons livelihoods. The job is to hold both harms in one file.

Body**Stakeholders**

- Residents, farmers and animals living with effluent, and those injured in the agitation.
- Permanent and contract workers of the unit and of ancillary shops.
- Downstream industries that used the chemicals.

- The company, its directors, and lenders.
- The State government that permitted and then closed the unit.
- Pollution Control Board, health and labour departments, and you as the coordinating officer.
- Future investors, who will read whether the State is lawless, captured, or merely chaotic.

Ethical issues and values

- Right to health and a decent environment (**Article 21** as interpreted in environmental cases) versus the right to livelihood.
- **Polluter-pays and inter-generational justice:** ten years of gain cannot exit as a private profit and a public ruin.
- **Non-violence and police ethics:** stern action in a crowd does not erase the duty to find who poisoned the water.
- **Legal certainty:** a permission that ignored other States' environmental no is a past wrong; a sudden closure that dumps workers is a present wrong.
- **Integrity:** do not reopen the tap as a favour, and do not use "jobs" as a shield for ongoing toxin.

Options

- **Option 1:** Immediate silent reopening to calm unemployment.
- **Merit:** wages restart.
- **Demerit:** repeats the original capture; more disease. Rejected until compliance is real.
- **Option 2:** Permanent lock, no remediation, no worker plan.
- **Merit:** looks green.
- **Demerit:** leaves a toxic site and a hungry ring of towns; anger will return.
- **Option 3:** Closure stays for unsafe processes; time-bound remediation; worker protection; lawful relocation or clean restart only after independent clearance.
- **Merit:** both life and livelihood.
- **Demerit:** costs money and political patience.

Action

- **Health first:** survey, treatment camps, safe water tankers, and a public register of illness without intimidating complainants.
- **Environment:** independent sampling of soil, aquifers and crops; a remediation order on the company under polluter-pays, with bank guarantees, not a taxpayer-only clean-up.
- **Liability:** preserve evidence for the National Green Tribunal and criminal provisions where they apply; directors do not hide behind a padlock.
- **Labour:** enforce closure compensation, provident fund and gratuity; notify all units; run a placement cell with skills that match the district, not a pamphlet.
- **Ancillary and downstream firms:** a time-bound input-substitution plan, lawful import windows if essential, and credit support through existing MSME instruments - not a secret permission to dump again.
- If a clean technology restart is scientifically possible far from the aquifer and the city, it must pass a fresh environmental process, not a ministerial phone call.
- **Police:** inquire excess in the agitation separately from the environmental crime so that neither file kills the other.

- **Communication:** publish timelines. Silence is how rumours of both "sell-out" and "job murder" grow.
- **Lesson to government:** site clearance is not a competitive gift to the one State willing to look away.

Flow diagram

Pollution and closure -> Treat people and water
Pollution and closure -> Polluter pays remediation
Pollution and closure -> Compensation and reskilling
Silent reopen -> Repeat harm
Fresh independent clearance -> Possible clean restart

Conclusion

Keep the unsafe plant closed. Make the polluter pay to heal land and bodies. Pay and re-skill workers. Allow a restart only through a clean, distant, independently cleared process. Jobs are not a solvent for toxin.

Open WRAP page — <https://wrapexams.com/upsc/mains-answers/gs-4/2018/case-study-a-big-corporate-house-is-engaged-in-manufacturing-industrial-chemicals-on-a-large-scale-it-proposes-to-set-up-an-additional-unit-many-states-rejected-its-proposal-due-to-its-detrimental-effect-on-the/>

Q11 · 20 marks

Case study. Dr. X is a leading medical practitioner in a city. He has set up a charitable trust through which he plans to establish a super-specialty hospital in the city to cater to the medical needs of all sections of society. Incidentally, that part of the State had been neglected over the years. The proposed hospital would be a boon for the region. You are heading the tax investigation agency of that region. During an inspection of the doctor's clinic, your officers have found out some major irregularities. A few of them are substantial which had resulted in considerable withholding of tax that should be paid by him now. The doctor is cooperative. He undertakes to pay the tax immediately. However, there are certain other deficiencies in his tax compliance that are purely technical in nature. If these technical defaults are pursued by the agency, considerable time and energy of the doctor will be diverted to issues that are not so serious, urgent, or even helpful to the tax collection process. Further, in all probability, it will hamper the prospects of the hospital coming up. There are two options before you: Taking a broader view, ensuring substantial tax compliance, and ignoring defaults that are merely technical in nature. Pursue the matter strictly and proceed on all fronts, whether substantial or merely technical. As the head of the tax agency, which course of action will you opt for and why? (250 words).

GS IV · 2018 · Ethics Case Studies

Revision summary

Substantial withheld tax must be paid with statutory interest and penalty; the hospital does not cancel it.

- **Purely technical defaults should be handled with proportionality:** condonation or compounding where the law allows.

Ignoring all faults is unequal. Pursuing every technicality as punishment wastes the region's healthcare.

No private deal of silence for a hospital.

The same classification must be available to a non-famous taxpayer.

Introduction

Dr X will pay the real tax. The hospital would serve a neglected region. Technical defaults remain. The trap is to sell the law for a good building, or to crush a public good for a clerk's perfect file.

Body

Stakeholders

- The Union or State fisc, and honest taxpayers who did not wait for a raid.
- Dr X, his clinic staff, and patients of the planned hospital.
- Residents of the neglected region.
- Your officers, who need a consistent standard.
- Courts, which will read whether tax administration is equal.

Ethical issues and values

- **Integrity of tax:** substantial withholding is not a "social worker's privilege".
- **Proportionality and public interest:** a technical default that yields little tax but kills a hospital is a bad use of scarce investigative time.
- **Equality:** a celebrity doctor cannot buy a waiver that a small trader would never get.
- **Compassion and beneficence:** the hospital is a real good, not a public-relations sticker, if it actually serves all sections as claimed.
- **Conflict of interest:** do not take a future board seat, a named ward, or a family job in that trust.

Options

- **Option 1:** Ignore both substantial and technical faults because of the hospital.
- **Merit:** speed for the trust.
- **Demerit:** open discrimination and a market for "good cause" tax holidays. Rejected.
- **Option 2:** Prosecute every technical defect to the last footnote, after the tax is paid, as a show of steel.
- **Merit:** fear.
- **Demerit:** little revenue, delayed care, and a use of process as punishment. Poor proportionality.
- **Option 3:** Collect the substantial tax with interest and penalty as the statute requires; compound or close technical defaults where the law allows; keep a written, reviewable standard that would apply to a non-famous assessee.
- **Merit:** revenue, equality of principle, and space for the hospital.
- **Demerit:** critics may shout "softness"; the note must show the same softness is available to similarly placed files.

Action I would take

- **Secure the substantial tax now:** payment, interest, and penalty as prescribed. Cooperation reduces concealment; it does not erase the principal.
- **Classify defects:** revenue-bearing versus purely technical (form, timing, a rectifiable return error with no tax effect).
- Where the Income-tax Act or allied rules allow condonation, compounding or a rectification, use that door and record reasons.
- Where a technical breach still needs a notice, issue it in a way that does not freeze the trust's entire working year - time-bound, scoped, and not a fishing raid.
- **Do not sign a private bargain:** "hospital in exchange for silence". The hospital is not a consideration the tax code recognises.

- Apply the same classification to similarly placed cases so that Dr X is not a special caste.
- Recuse if you or your family would gain from the hospital, and still do not leave the substantial tax uncollected.
- After payment, a lawful charitable hospital is welcome. Tax ethics is not hostility to medicine; it is refusal to let medicine become a shield.

Flow diagram

Irregularities found -> Collect substantial tax now

Irregularities found -> Technical defaults

Technical defaults -> Condone or compound if law allows

Waive all for hospital -> Unequal tax

Maximal technical war -> Hospital stalled for little revenue

Conclusion

I would take the broader view only after the substantial tax is in. Technical defaults get a proportionate, lawful closure, not a celebrity waiver and not a vengeful marathon. The neglected region's patients should not pay for either vanity or vendetta.

Open WRAP page — <https://wrapexams.com/upsc/mains-answers/gs-4/2018/case-study-dr-x-is-a-leading-medical-practitioner-in-a-city-he-has-set-up-a-charitable-trust-through-which-he-plans-to-establish-a-super-specialty-hospital-in-the-city-to-cater-to-the-medical-needs-of-all-sections-of/>

Q12 · 20 marks

Case study. As a senior officer in the Ministry, you have access to important policy decisions and upcoming big announcements such as road construction projects before they are notified in the public domain. The Ministry is about to announce a mega road project for which the drawings are already in place. Sufficient care was taken by the planners to make use of the government land with the minimum land acquisition from private parties. The compensation rate for private parties was also finalized as per government rules. Care was also taken to minimize deforestation. Once the project is announced, it is expected that there will be a huge spurt in real estate prices in and around that area. Meanwhile, the Minister concerned insists that you realign the road in such a way that it comes closer to his 20 acres farmhouse. He also suggests that he would facilitate the purchase of a big plot of land in your wife's name at the prevailing rate which is very nominal, in and around the proposed mega road project. He also tries to convince you by saying that there is no harm in it as he is buying the land legally. He even promises to supplement your savings in case you do not have sufficient funds to buy the land. However, by the act of realignment, a lot of agricultural lands have to be acquired, thereby causing a considerable financial burden on the government, and also the displacement of the farmers. As if this is not enough, it will involve cutting down of a large number of trees denuding the area of its green cover. Faced with this situation, what will you do? Critically examine various conflicts of interest and explain what your responsibilities are as a public servant. (250 words).

GS IV · 2018 · Ethics Case Studies

Revision summary

- **The Minister's request is an actual conflict:** public alignment bent to a farmhouse.

The plot in your wife's name is insider gain dressed as a legal sale.

Realigning "without the plot" still spends extra farms, money and trees on a private end.

Duty is to keep the engineered line, refuse the bargain in writing, and report the offer.

Conduct rules treat a spouse's holding as the officer's integrity problem, not a clever screen.

Introduction

The Minister wants a road to his farmhouse and a plot for your wife before the announcement. That is not a real-estate tip. It is a capture of a public alignment and of a public servant.

Body

Stakeholders

- Farmers who would lose extra land under the new line.
- The public exchequer that would pay extra compensation.
- Downstream ecology and the trees the original plan spared.
- Your spouse, who would hold a tainted plot.
- The Minister, the Ministry, and honest colleagues on the drawing.
- Future users of the road, who need a line designed for traffic and safety, not for a farmhouse gate.

Conflicts of interest

- **Actual conflict:** the Minister's land value will rise if the road kisses his farmhouse. He is using public power for a private estate.
- **Actual conflict offered to you:** a plot in your wife's name at today's price is insider dealing in all but name. You would gain from the announcement you help shape.
- The "I am buying legally" line is false ethics. Legality of a sale deed does not clean the use of unpublished official information, nor the abuse of alignment.
- **Potential conflict:** even if you refuse the plot, fear of transfer can start to bend the file. Name that fear so it does not drive the pen.
- **Familial conflict:** a spouse's name is not a curtain. Conduct rules treat family holdings as the officer's concern.
- **Loyalty conflict:** the Minister is the political executive; the Constitution and the road's public purpose outrank his farmhouse.

Options

- **Option 1:** Realign and buy the plot.
- **Merit:** career comfort and private gain.
- **Demerit:** corruption, extra displacement, extra trees down, and a file that will not survive a later inquiry. Rejected.
- **Option 2:** Realign but refuse the plot, to "save the job".
- **Merit:** you keep your hands off the land.
- **Demerit:** you still gift public money and farmers to a private house. Still rejected.
- **Option 3:** Informal oral refusal, no record.
- **Merit:** less scene.
- **Demerit:** the next meeting repeats the pressure; you have no protection and the alignment may still move through another hand.
- **Option 4:** Written refusal of realignment and of the plot; restore the engineered line; report the offer to the competent authority.
- **Merit:** integrity, environment, farmers, and a record.
- **Demerit:** transfer risk. That is the cost of the oath.

Duties and action

- **Duty of legality:** alignments follow the approved technical plan and acquisition law, not an oral farmhouse wish.

- Duty of integrity under the Central Civil Services (Conduct) Rules, 1964 and, if you are AIS, the 1968 rules: no gift, no extra savings, no speculative land on insider knowledge.
- **Duty of environmental care already built into the original design:** you may not volunteer extra deforestation.
- **Duty to farmers:** minimise acquisition, as the planners did. Extra taking for a private convenience fails public purpose.
- **Duty of courage:** put the Minister's instruction on the file if it is insisted upon, and record your dissent. Ask for written orders.
- **Duty of reporting:** inform the Secretary / Chief Vigilance Officer / competent anti-corruption channel about the plot offer. Keep a contemporaneous note.
- Do not tip friends to buy land along the official corridor either. The information is still official.
- Recuse from any remaining decision if your family already bought land nearby, and still report.
- If victimised by transfer, use the lawful representation route; do not leak drawings as revenge.

Flow diagram

Minister farmhouse line -> Private gain on public road
Plot in spouse name -> Insider conflict
Private gain on public road -> Refuse on file
Insider conflict -> Refuse on file
Refuse on file -> Report to competent authority
Refuse on file -> Keep original alignment

Conclusion

Refuse the realignment, refuse the plot, refuse the extra cash, and write it down. The Minister's farmhouse is a private interest. Your duty is a cheaper, greener, fairer public road and a clean name in your wife's records.

Open WRAP page — <https://wrapexams.com/upsc/mains-answers/gs-4/2018/case-study-as-a-senior-officer-in-the-ministry-you-have-access-to-important-policy-decisions-and-upcoming-big-announcements-such-as-road-construction-projects-before-they-are-notified-in-the-public-domain-the-ministry-is/>

Compiled answer key

Last pages of this pack. Each question links to the WRAP model answer on wrapexams.com.

ask@wrapexams.com · wrapexams.com

Q1 10 marks	Q2 10 marks	Q3 10 marks	Q4 10 marks
Q5 10 marks	Q6 10 marks	Q7 20 marks	Q8 20 marks
Q9 20 marks	Q10 20 marks	Q11 20 marks	Q12 20 marks

Question-wise key

Q1 · 10 marks Solution

Q2 · 10 marks Solution

Q3 · 10 marks Solution

Q4 · 10 marks Solution

Q5 · 10 marks Solution

Q6 · 10 marks Solution

Q7 · 20 marks Solution

Q8 · 20 marks Solution

Q9 · 20 marks Solution

Q10 · 20 marks Solution

Q11 · 20 marks Solution

Q12 · 20 marks Solution

WRAP Exams · Write. Read. Analyse. Practice. · <https://wrapexams.com/upsc/mains/gs-4/2018/> · ask@wrapexams.com · wrapexams.com