



**National Officers Academy**  
**Mock Exams for CSS-2026**  
**December, 2025 (Mock-5)**  
**ENGLISH (PRECIS AND COMPOSITION)**

<b>TIME ALLOWED: THREE HOURS</b>	<b>PART-I (MCQS) MAXIMUM MARKS = 20</b>
<b>PART-I(MCQS): MAXIMUM 30 MINUTES</b>	<b>PART-II MAXIMUM MARKS = 80</b>

**NOTE:**

- i. **Part-II** is to be attempted on the separate **Answer Book**.
- ii. Attempt **ALL** questions from **PART-II**.
- iii. All the parts (if any) of each Question must be attempted at one place instead of at different places.
- iv. Write Q. No. in the Answer Book in accordance with Q. No. in the Q. Paper.

**PART-II**

**Q2: Make a precis of the following text and suggest a suitable title . (15+5=20)**

The classic example of this fallacy is a scene in a British court of law. As the attorney for the defense takes the floor, his partner hands him a note: 'No case. Abuse the plaintiff's attorney.' If you can't shake the argument, abuse the person who advances it, and so discredit it through the back door. Go from facing the issue, which jurists call *ad rem*, to the man, *ad hominem*.

A story is told about Lincoln as a young lawyer. In one of his first jury cases, he showed his political shrewdness by an adroit and quite non-malicious use of *ad hominem*. His opponent was an experienced trial lawyer, who also had most of the fine legal points on his side. The day was warm and Lincoln slumped in his chair as the case went against him. When the orator took off his coat and vest, however, Lincoln sat up with a gleam in his eye. His opponent was wearing one of the new city-slicker shirts of the 1840's, which buttoned up the back.

Lincoln knew the reaction of frontiersmen, who made up the jury. When his turn came, his plea was brief. 'Gentlemen of the jury, because I have justice on my side, I am sure you will not be influenced by this gentleman's pretended knowledge of the law. Why, he doesn't even know which side of his shirt ought to be in front!'

Lincoln's *ad hominem* is said to have won the case.

This fallacy, like over-generalizing, has been around for a long time. The Sophists must have used it freely, and I suspect it goes back to the dawn of the race. The health of President Eisenhower was an important consideration in the nominations of 1956. Was he well enough to serve out another four years in the toughest job in the world? Similarly with Franklin Roosevelt in 1944. But when the enemies of Roosevelt charged that a given government policy was wrong because it originated with 'that cripple in the White House,' they were practicing a particularly vicious kind of *ad hominem*.

**Q. 3: Read the following passage carefully and answer the questions that follow. (20)**

During the 1971 war, Field Marshal Sam Manekshaw led the Indian Army, while Captain Ahsan Malik served in the Pakistan Army. Ahsan Malik was assigned to defend the village of Kamalpur on the East Pakistan border with 140 soldiers from 31 Baluch. They displayed such extraordinary bravery that, after the war, Manekshaw requested his Pakistani counterpart to award Ahsan Malik for his courage. Thus, he was honored with the Sitara-e-Jurat. If Ahsan Malik had not shown such bravery, he might never have received this prestigious recognition. He retired from the army as a Colonel and later joined a government organization, remaining active until 2005.

Similarly, Najja Abud, a soldier in the Iraqi Army during the Iran-Iraq war, was badly wounded in the battle of Khorramshahr. He hid in a bunker filled with dying and injured soldiers. A volunteer named Zahid Haftlang risked his life to save Najja. Had Zahid not intervened, Najja would have surely died. He received medical care and survived. Eighteen years later, they unexpectedly met again in a waiting room in Canada. They laughed, cried, and embraced, proving that courage and humanity can form lifelong bonds even across enemy lines.

On December 20, 1943, American pilot Charles Brown's B-17 was severely damaged by German fighters after bombing Bremen, Germany. Ace pilot Franz Stigler saw the helpless plane. Although he could easily have shot it down, he refrained, recalling his commander's warning: "If you ever shoot at an enemy in a parachute, I will shoot you myself." Stigler considered the Americans as if they were defenseless parachutists. Not only did he spare their lives, but he escorted them safely through German defenses. Forty years later, both pilots reunited, and their friendship lasted until death. If Stigler had followed the common practice of shooting down the enemy, Charles Brown would have died, and their inspiring story would never have existed.

Even Field Marshal Erwin Rommel defied Hitler's cruel orders. After Operation Fortitude, he sent captured British commandos—Lieutenants Ray Wodridge and George Lane—to POW camps instead of executing them. When British Lieutenant Colonel Geoffrey Keys was killed in an assassination attempt on Rommel, he ordered a dignified

## W] Discredit the Opponent by Dehumanizing Him

No. Mock test.

Historically, two prominent methods have been used

**rewrite this sentence**

to counter arguments, especially in the court of law.

The first, ad-rem, is to counter the opponent's reasons; while

the second, ~~used~~ ad-hominem, is to dehumanize the opponent

himself, so that his arguments become undervalued. Ad-hominem  
~~was~~ <sup>and</sup> practiced by sophists, can be used maliciously or non-maliciously.

In a non-malicious manner, a young lawyer used it against

his opponent's shirt, rather countering his legal arguments.

This eventually led to his victory. While in a malicious

intent, it was used against ~~existing~~ while U.S. presidents

on the account of their health. In one incident, the

polices of the U.S. president in 1944 were targeted

on the basis of his physical disabilities.

Words in Paragraph: 346.

Words in Precis: 123.

main idea is picked and discussed  
over all content needs more coherence  
be precis and to the point  
need improvement  
8/20