

## ETHICS, INTEGRITY AND APTITUDE

Time Allowed: 1.5 hrs.

Max. Marks: 125

Q.	Marks	Instructions to Candidate
1.		<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• There are 6 questions.</li><li>• All questions are compulsory</li><li>• The number of marks carried by a question/part is indicated against it.</li><li>• Content of the answer is more important than its length.</li></ul> <p>Answers must be written in the space provided.</p> <p>Any page or portion of the page left blank in the Question-cum-Answer Booklet must be clearly struck off.</p>
2.		
3.		
4.		
5.		
6.		

1. Invigilator Signature

2. Invigilator Signature

Name Jai kishan

Roll No. \_\_\_\_\_

Mobile No. \_\_\_\_\_

Date 11/07/2017

Signature Jai kishan

In the following questions carefully study the cases presented and then answer the questions that follows:

Q1. When Sheena reaches to one counter of the RTO office for her driving license renewal, the lady in-charge at the counter pass-on one form to fill for the same purpose. She asked Sheena to turn the page and go through it. Back side of the paper there was organ donation consent form which stated: . .

"Organ Donation: Upon my death, I am willing to donate the following - there were then a set of boxes labelled - eyes, liver, kidney, any organ and none, together with a place for her signature."

Sheena asks the lady -"why such things are being pushed at this counter". Lady at the counter explains that this form of camping has been promoted by NGOs for the larger interest for humanity, however it is voluntary and she can escape it if she is not finding it of any worth. Sheena was not sure about giving consent. She was in dilemma whether to do it or not. After a brief thought she denied and moved from that counter.

On the way to back home, her friend Indrani, who was also at the counter, suddenly said, "I did not wanted to say anything inside, but no way I would ever sign that card. If you get into accident and they see that you have agreed for organ donation, they will not even try to save you. There is organ shortage, and the doctors want to grab what they can get. My mom says those organ donation cards are like signing your death warrant."

Later that evening Sheena decided to talk to one of her teacher. When she explained about her anxiety, teacher replied that she should follow her heart in the matter of organ donation.

Answer the following questions based on the above case study:

- From a utilitarian perspective, should Sheena agree to donate her organs? Provide an analysis.
- From a Kantian perspective, would refusing to donate one's organ violate a moral duty?
- Do you think that people ought to donate their organs? Why or why not? (Make sure that the reasons you provide are ethical reasons, not merely prudent or legal). What will you advice to Sheena in case you are in place of her teacher?

(600 Words) (25 Marks)

Remarks

(a) From a utilitarian perspective, Sheena should agree to donate her organ. The utilitarian perspective which is consequential and desires maximum benefit.

In this context, if any unforeseen accident occurs to Sheena and unfortunately if she dies. Her organs - kidney, liver, heart, cornea and even skin can be donated to multiple ailing patients. ~~Her~~ Even her death would make her organs live to at least more than one individual. Her organs and her goodness would thrive in the bodies of ~~the~~ acceptors.

1 1/2

(b) From Kantian perspective, stepping

to donate one's organ won't be a moral duty.

Kant always talk about fixing rule of one's obligations and duties. But

in this case, it is totally voluntary decision. Sheena has ~~the~~ her own

Remarks

It promotes duty of self conservation first.

apprehensions and fears. Of course, organ donation must be welcomed but before making it a moral duty, we should create awareness about it.

2

any N.G.O. coming and requiring anybody to submit her signature for organ donation is unwise and unfair. So here, Shreya's apprehensions and fears are well placed and we should respect that.

(c) Organ donation is one of the most beautiful tribute one can offer to humanity. The reasons are -

# organ donation can save lives of many people who are arling with fatal organ failures like - kidney, liver etc

# A single donor can save lives of many.

However, organ donation must be a

Remarks

voluntary act and there should not be any commercialisation. This is because commercialisation of organ donation would make economically weaker section vulnerable. Although, it seems legal but morally it is wrong. This is because it is like compelling someone to do so because of her weak economic grounds. It is opportunistic and callous.

My advice to Sheena would be -

if she thinks fit to donate organ, she should first check the credibility of the N.O.D. Secondly, if possible she can also approach the government sponsored organisations for help. There are many initiatives taken by government to create awareness about organ donation, she should have look at them.

Then, she can happily make donations without apprehension or fears.

3

Remarks

Q2. You are a senior civil servant. One of your officer friend is hard working, completes her work on time but always demoralizes her subordinates by blaming them for one or the other thing. She keeps everyone on toes. Often she shouts in her office and want to just follow the blue book while working. She also insults junior officers if one fails to get the things done. Her only mantra to work is to "get the things done -whatever it takes." Due to this bossy attitude your friend is not liked by the subordinates and because of her uneven relation with her team members, she fails to portray a good office culture. Most of the colleagues know about this case but no one wants to discuss it because of your proximity with that lady officer. However one day one close friend happens to be your colleague briefed about the problem subordinate officers are facing.

Answer the following questions based on the above case. Bring merits and demerits related to each course of action and discuss the best option.

- (a) Directly talk to subordinate and assure about correcting the things in future.
- (b) Give responsibility to your friend who briefed you about this case.
- (c) Transfer the lady officer as this case may bring sorry figure for you also in future.
- (d) Request the lady officer not to do so as this may hamper their personal relations also.
- (e) Is there any better option available to correct the things other than what mentioned above?

(250 Words) (20 Marks)

(a) Directly talk to subordinate and assure about correcting the things in future.

merit:-

# It would give some relaxation to subordinates

# It would also assure them that their grievances would be heard.

# It would motivate motivate them.

demerit:-

# It would break chain of command.

# If my assurances are believed, I would

Remarks

good

lose my ~~credibility~~ credibility.

(b) Give responsibility to my friend! -  
merit:-

It would be discharged of my obligations and task would be my friend.

demerit:-

It looks to be an "escapist" route. Further, here also chain of command is broken.

It would also affect my personal relation with the accused officer. She may even become assertive because of third party intervention.

It is not a feasible option.

(c) Transfer the lady officer.

merit:-

The subordinates would be happy and it would motivate them. Office culture would be peaceful.

demerit:-

Without giving any chance to reply and transferring would be unfair and unwise. This would motivate subordinates to come with similar.

Remarks

situations in future:

(d) Requesting the lady officer,

demerit:-

Bringing ~~relationship~~ a personal relation in office life is unbecomable. It is not at all a feasible option.

1/2

(e) In order to connect the things both parties must be given an opportunity to put their opinions. After hearing all the facts we can come at conclusion. In such situation negotiation and mediation is possible so that work is not affected.

Not feasible as per the given situation

Remarks



Q3. Suppose you are called as the Chief Guest in an educational institution to address a gathering of youth on the issue of 'cultural transition in India'. You confine your lecture mainly around one of the most apparent pointers of cultural transition taking place in the country, i.e. changing man-woman relationship with the latter being more open, forthcoming and assimilating. But the transition is marred by many sour and ugly events leading to sexual exploitation, honour killings and subjugation and defiance by male dominated office environment. After the lecture there is a question answer session. Answer the following questions that students and teachers posed in front of you:

- (a) Are women outrageous in their liberty with regard to dressing up, breaking silence and asking their share in decision making?
- (b) What should be the "limits of openness" for women in a culturally transitioning India in an era of globalisation?
- (c) Is the institution of family responsible for the aberrant behavior of their male children regarding man-woman relationship?
- (d) What will you do as a Civil Servant to change the attitude of society with respect to women? (250 Words) (20 Marks)

(a) No, women are not outrageous in their liberty with regard to dressing up, breaking silence and asking their share in decision making. In fact, a woman has all her rights for her bodily integrity. Liberty of thoughts, beliefs etc are not confined to any specific gender but beyond. It is this transition which has made women realise that their share of rights, freedom and happiness have been suppressed for long. eg:- of Kangini Bhoomata brigade wants

11/2

Remarks

entry of women in the inner sanctum of sholins, it is her right and let it should be given.

(b) Defining "limits of openness" specifically for women would be like encroaching on the right to Equality.

If there is to draft any "limits of openness", it must be gender neutral, caste neutral and religion neutral.

Of course, we must preserve our rich cultural heritage, but being conservative about it, would make a stagnant society.

Everyone must respect decency and public morality. He should be free to self judge ~~his~~ actions whether it is under defined decency or not.

(c) It is wrong to blame that family is responsible for aberrant behaviour of their male children. It is true that Indian families give more privileges to their male members. However,

Remarks

Then who to be blamed?

Won't  
limitless  
liberty  
lead  
to  
anarchy?

12

there are other factors as well like - peer groups, internet, movies etc which are source of abstractions. However, it solely depends on the person's choice - whether he likes to learn immoral acts or moral ones from them.

Ex:- From a same family, not all ~~men~~ male members are abstrants.

(d) To change the attitude of society with respect to women:-

# First, respect women ~~of~~ of your family. - Gives her full rights and liberty.

# Educate the women because her education would make her realize her rights.

# Take help of voluntary organisations and in "Nabad Nafas" we can show how prejudiced we are with women rights. eg - these nafas would show the grievances of women.

# Involve women organisations to find out their grievances.

Remarks

You should try to begin it from yourself.

1

1/2

Q4. You are a no-nonsense police officer. There is a day light murder of a politician in your area. One of your senior police officer is close relative of that murdered politician. After much investigation, you come to know that Naxalites have killed him as he was involved in land grabbing case in remote area. Local people hated that politician. After few days you managed to arrest one naxalite who was involved in this case. He was involved in some other gruesome murder cases also. In an ambush more than 50 security personnels were also killed and his name was also surfaced in that case.

Your senior officer is putting pressure on you to kill that criminal as often these type of cases take much time due to the lack of eyewitness, as they enjoy local support and also villagers have fear.

Home Minister of your state also wants to do the same as it will send a message in the public about handling of law and order problem with iron hands. Thus send filler through one officer that 'if you do the same, you will get the full support of ruling party in future also'.

Answer the following questions:

- In the above case which ethical dilemmas will you face and why will you call it ethical dilemma?
- Will you follow the order of your senior officer and Home Minister? Evaluate your decision from the ethical and legal point of view.
- Which factors will guide you in this case? (250 Words) (20 Marks)

(a) In the above case, the ethical dilemma is → to meet my obligations as an officer to follow my senior's orders but at the same time, killing of the person would be illegal. In this case, it ~~would~~ is not a pure case of ethical dilemma. This is because, here killing of the

Remarks

criminal is clearly an illegal as well as an immoral act. The accused must be given chance for a fair trial which is his ~~basic~~ right.

1 1/2

(b) ~~I would not follow the~~ I would not kill an undertrial illegally. This is because my inner conscious would not permit me to do so. Secondly, this act would be illegal act, clearly violation of the law and the constitution. Thirdly, if any investigations are constituted against the death of the Naxalite in future, in all likelihood I would be caught. This would not only make me morally handicapped but also ruin my career.

2

Hence, in this case my pistol attempt would be to influence my senior and the Home Ministry not to force me to take such steps.

Remarks

You should better segregate ethical & legal approach.

I would advise them to constitute  
 a panel of experts to bring in the  
 justice.

(1) There are three factors which  
 guide me:

(1) My obligations and my legality.

(2) Morality and inner consciousness:-

being an undertrial would not make

me blame and proud officer.

(3) My career:- At the end of the

day if any investigations are sought

my career would be ruined.



These  
 need  
 to be  
 discussed  
 in  
 brief

Remarks

Q5. You are professor as well as a social activist. There is an educated and well employed couple in your vicinity who often fight on their personal issues. One day they started fighting as usual, starting from arguments, turning loud, slamming doors and finally the male partner resorting to physical violence, the cry of wife and children started coming out. People come out, but do not dare to go to them citing that it is their personal matter, so any interference would be unethical and uncalled for. Answer the following questions based on the above case;

- Would you agree to be a bystander on the advice of the people that it is a personal matter of the couple? Give reasons.
- Suppose you go to the flat of the couple and enquire what is wrong but the male member insists that they be left on their own as it is their personal matter and you should mind your own business. What would be your reaction?
- Can police help in curbing this social malady by using legal authority and provisions?
- What is your moral and ethical locus standi on intervention of neighbours to stop the domestic violence?

(250 Words) (20 Marks)

Q) No, I would not be a bystander on the advice of the people that it is a personal matter of the couple. This is because:-

(i) physical violence on spouse and children can never be justified on the pretext that it is personal.

(ii) If the whole society looks as a bystander, how would women get their rights.

(iii) At the end of the day, I too have sisters and mother. If similar incident happens with them and no one intervenes

1 1/2

Remarks:

You should be aware of it that domestic violence has been committed in this case which is a crime & crime is against public at large.

~~Q~~ I would never appreciate that neutrality.

b) If I go to the flat of the couple... and enquire what is wrong but the male member insists that they be left on their own as it is their personal matter. In first instance,

~~I would like to persuade both to have negotiations. This would not only~~

~~I would come back~~ But when the tension melts, the couple should be persuaded to live happily and peacefully. This would also make the life of their children happy. If possible, the family members of both the couple should be informed because personal problems are well settled and mediated by the family members.

I would also suggest them to visit family counsellors.

He needs to be pacified.

Remarks



(c) Police can only punish the perpetrators. In this case, the male member could be punished for his actions (violence) against the lady.

However, such social malady cannot be solved in toto. In fact, punishing the husband would make the relationship more fragile.

In this case, more than police intervention from →

- # Family members
  - # Family counsellors
- would help.

It should not be used as first possible option in such case

(d) Minor disputes are part of relationship. But if disputes become major one involving violence then the neighbourhood should intervene. It is about protecting the rights of victims. If a woman is being beaten by her husband and we keep our eyes shut, it amounts to immorality. Ethically, society may believe that they are being neutral, but the

Remarks hottest place is reserved ~~for~~ in the hell for those who maintain neutrality.

1/2

1

Q6. You are a Superintendent of Police and a huge protest is going on in front of your office. These protesters are Human Right activists. Protest is because of two consecutive incidents happened in your district.

Case one: City SP has received intelligence input that bombs have been planted in various places in the city. SP asked his team for massive search operation. After putting in strenuous hard work, police team raided a house where two people with 2 kg of explosives and IED devices were found; Police team immediately arrested them and brought them to the police station. Police started interrogating them related to the whereabouts of the bombs and their plans. When they failed to take out information from them; one of the Police Officer adopted third degree. Torture in case of new criminals often works. But one of the person died during the process, as he failed to bear the pain of torture. Death in police custody became a big issue.

Case two: Recently communal riots occurred held in your area and few police constables got surrounded by a group, viewing the grave situation and possible threat on life, one of the constable picked a man as a human shield. They found it as easy way to escape as that could also save the life of other police constables. But while they were trying to escape, people started stone pelting and the person who was used as human shield got badly injured. However, he was saved later by proper treatment.

Answer the following questions:

- Analyse the ethical dilemmas you will face as SP in both the stated situations.
- Human Rights Activists are demanding action against official involved in both the cases. What will be your course of action?
- Police Chief of State reaches to you and asks for not taking any action, as it will bring down the morals of the police force. What will be your course of action?
- Can you justify the use of torture technique in any given circumstances?
- Would you justify the use of human shield to save the lives of your colleagues? Give reasons. What are the moral and ethical issues involved in using human shield as the method of action against agitating mob?

(250 Words) (20 Marks)

(a) In case I, the ethical dilemma is choosing the right against torture of the arrested people ~~and~~ vis-a-vis saving the human lives who are endangered because of bomb blast.

Remarks

In case B, it is the right <sup>to</sup> life of the constable. ~~the~~ right of the person who was used as human shield.

1

(b) In both cases, the circumstances compelled the officers to take an extreme step. In such a case, punishing the officers would demoralize the force. The Human rights activists must be explained to the situation why such actions are taken.

1/2

You cannot subvert death of person in custody.

(c) In this case, the police chief's orders would be heeded. This is not only to keep the motivation of the force high but also to find the bomb and save lives. In many cases, third degree has helped. In my opinion, using it sparingly is evil necessary. What about due process of law?

1/2

(d) Torture technique is surely inhuman. It cannot be applied in

Remarks

any given situation, but in few cases involving the issue of terrorism, national security it can be applied. Since the detainees were arrested with IED and explosives, it was certain that they were terrorists. In order to save mass genocide, such action was taken. Principle of double effect can be discussed.

(e) My colleagues had no other option but to adopt human shield. Although here, rights of the victims were flouted but at the same time it saved the lives of my colleagues.

Moral issues involved:-

# Rights of the human shield who was injured.

# obligation of the police force -

they are protectors of people but

in this case they used human shield

Remarks

to protect themselves.

*Remarks*

