MK GUPTA CA EDUCATION

25 WRITTEN PRACTICE QUESTIONS

CA JYOTI MADAN SAPRA

21

IMPORTANT QUESTIONS FOR WRITTEN PRACTICE

Question 1

Mr. Balwant, an old man, by a registered deed of gift, granted certain landed property to Ms. Reema, his daughter. By the terms of the deed, it was stipulated that an annuity of 20, 000 should be paid every year to Mr. Sawant, who was the brother of Mr. Balwant. On the same day Ms. Reema made a promise to Mr. Sawant and executed in his favour an agreement to give effect to the stipulation. Ms. Reema failed to pay the stipulated sum. In an action against her by Mr. Sawant, she contended that since Mr. Sawant had not furnished any consideration, he has no right of action.

Examining the provisions of the Indian Contract Act, 1872, decide, whether the contention of Ms. Reema is valid?

Answer

In India, consideration may proceed from the promise or any other person who is not a party to the contract. The definition of consideration as given in section 2(d) makes that proposition clear. According to the definition, when at the desire of the promisor, the promisee or any other person does something such an act is consideration. In other words, there can be a stranger to a consideration but not stranger to a contract.

In the given problem, Mr. Balwant has entered into a contract with Ms. Reema, but Mr. Sawant has not given any consideration to Ms. Reema but the consideration did flow from Mr. Balwant to Ms. Reema and such consideration from third party is sufficient to the enforce the promise of Ms. Reema, the daughter, to pay an annuity to Mr. Sawant. Further the deed of gift and the promise made by Ms. Reema to Mr. Sawant to pay the annuity were executed simultaneously and therefore they should be regarded as one transaction and there was sufficient consideration for it.

Thus, a stranger to the contract cannot enforce the contract but a stranger to the consideration may enforce it. Hence, the contention of Ms. Reema is not valid.

Question 2

"Mere silence does not amount to fraud". Discuss.

Answer

Mere silence not amounting to fraud: Mere silence as to facts likely to affect the willingness of a person to enter into a contract is no fraud; but where it is the duty of a person to speak, or his silence is equivalent to speech, silence amounts to fraud.

It is a rule of law that mere silence does not amount to fraud. A contracting party is not duty bound to disclose the whole truth to the other party or to give him the whole information in his possession affecting the subject matter of the contract.

The rule is contained in explanation to Section 17 of the Indian Contract Act, 1872 whichclearly states the position that mere silence as to facts likely to affect the willingness of a person to enter into a contract is not fraud.

Exceptions to this rule:

(i) Where the circumstances of the case are such that, regard being had to them, it is the duty of the person keeping silence to speak. Duty to speak arises when one contracting party reposes trust and confidence in the other or where one party hasto depend upon the good sense of the other (e.g. Insurance Contract).

(ii) Where the silence is, in itself, equivalent to speech.

Question 3

P sells by auction to Q a horse which P knows to be unsound. The horse appears tobe sound but P knows about the unsoundness of the horse. Is this contract valid in the following circumstances:

(a) If P says nothing about the unsoundness of the horse to Q.

(b) If P says nothing about it to Q who is P's daughter who has just come of age.

(c) If Q says to P "If you do not deny it, I shall assume that the horse is sound." P says nothing.

Answer

According to section 17 of the Indian Contract Act, 1872, mere silence as to facts likely to affect the willingness of a person to enter into a contract is not fraud, unless the circumstances of the case are such that, regard being had to them, it is the duty of the person keeping silence to speak, or unless his silence is, in itself, equivalentto speech. Hence, in the instant case,

(a) This contract is valid since as per section 17 mere silence as to the facts likely to affect the willingness of a person to enter into a contract is not fraud. Here,it is not the duty of the seller to disclose defects.

(b) This contract is not valid since as per section 17 it becomes P's duty to tell Q about the unsoundness of the horse because a fiduciary relationship exists between P and his daughter Q. Here, P's silence is equivalent to speech and hence amounts to fraud.

(c) This contract is not valid since as per section 17, P's silence is equivalent to speech and hence amounts to fraud.

Question 4

Comment on the following statements:

(a) Acceptance must be absolute and unqualified.

(b) Acceptance must be in the prescribed mode.

Answer

Acceptance must be absolute and unqualified: As per section 7 of the Indian Contract Act, 1872 acceptance is valid only when it is absolute and unqualified and is also expressed in some usual and reasonable manner unless the proposal prescribes the manner in which it must be accepted. If the proposal prescribes the manner in which it must be accepted, then it must be accepted accordingly.

Example:

'A' enquires from 'B', "Will you purchase my car for ` 2 lakhs?" If 'B' replies "I shall purchase your car for ` 2 lakhs, if you buy my motorcycle for ` 50000/-, here 'B' cannot be considered to have accepted the proposal. If on the other hand 'B' agrees to purchase the car from 'A' as per his proposal subject to availability of valid Registration Certificate / book for the car, then the acceptance is in place though the offer contained no mention of R.C. book. This is because expecting a valid title for the car is not a condition. Therefore, the acceptance in this case is unconditional

Acceptance must be in the prescribed mode:

Where the mode of acceptance is prescribed in the proposal, it must be accepted in that manner. But if the proposer does not insist on the proposal being accepted in the manner prescribed after it has been accepted otherwise, i.e., not in the prescribed manner, the proposer is presumed to have consented to the acceptance.

Example:

If the offeror prescribes acceptance through messenger and offeree sends acceptance by email, there is no acceptance of the offer if the offeror informs the offeree that the acceptance is not according to the mode prescribed. But if the offeror fails to do so, it will be presumed that he has accepted the acceptance and a valid contract will arise.

Question 5

X received certain goods from Y and promised to pay ` 60,000. Later on, X expressed his inability to make payment. Z, who is known to X, pays ` 40,000 to Y on behalf of X. however, X was not aware of the payment. Now Y is intending to sue X for the amount of` 60,000. Can Y do so? Advise.

Answer

As per section 41 of the Indian Contract Act, 1872, when a promisee accepts performance of the promise from a third person, he cannot afterwards enforce it against the promisor. That is, performance by a stranger, accepted by the promisee, produces the result of discharging the promisor, although the latter has neither authorised nor ratified the act of the third party. Therefore, in the instant case, Y can sue X only for the balance amount i.e. ` 20,000 and not for the whole amount.

. Question 6

What is the law relating to determination of compensation, on breach of contract, contained in section 73 of the Indian Contract Act, 1872?

Answer

Compensation on Breach of Contract: Section 73 of the Indian Contract Act, 1872 provides that when a contract has been broken, the party who suffers by such breach is entitled to receive from the party who has broken the contract, compensation for any loss or damage caused to him thereby which naturally arose in the usual course of things from such breach or which the parties knew when they made the contract, to be likely to result from the breach of it. Such compensation is not given for any remote and indirect loss or damage sustained by reason of the breach. The explanation to the section further

provides that in estimating the loss or damage from a breach of contract, the means which existed of remedying the inconvenience caused by the non-performance of the contract must be taken into account.

Question 7

Explain the circumstances in which the person is deemed to be in a position to dominate the will of the other person under the Indian Contract Act, 1872.

Answer

Position to dominate the will: A person is deemed to be in such position in the following circumstances:

(a) **Real and apparent authority:** Where a person holds a real authority over the other as in the case of master and servant, doctor and patient and etc.

(b) **Fiduciary relationship:** where relation of trust and confidence exists between the parties to a contract. Such type of relationship exists between father and son, solicitor and client, husband and wife, creditor and debtor, etc.

(c) **Mental distress:** An undue influence can be used against a person to get his consent on a contract where the mental capacity of the person is temporarily or permanently affected by the reason of mental or bodily distress, illness or of oldage.

(d) **Unconscionable bargains:** Where one of the parties to a contract is in a position to dominate the will of the other and the contract is apparently unconscionable i.e., unfair, it is presumed by law that consent must have been obtained by undue influence. Unconscionable bargains are witnessed mostly in money-lending transactions and in gifts.

Question 8

X, a minor was studying in M.Com. in a college. On 1st July, 2019 he took a loan of 1,00,000 from B for payment of his college fees and to purchase books and agreed to repay by 31st December, 2019. X possesses assets worth `9 lakhs. On due date, X fails to pay back the loan to B. B now wants to recover the loan from X out of his (X's) assets. Referring to the provisions of Indian Contract Act, 1872 decide whether B would succeed.

Answer

Yes, B can proceed against the assets of X. According to section 68 of Indian Contract Act, 1872, if a person, incapable of entering into a contract, or any one whom he is legally bound to support, is supplied by another person with necessaries suited to his condition in life, the person who has furnished such supplies is entitled to be reimbursed from the property of such incapable person.

Since the loan given to X is for the necessaries suited to the conditions in life of the minor, his assets can be sued to reimburse B.

Question 9

Briefly explain the doctrine of "ultravires" under the Companies Act, 2013. What are the consequences of ultravires acts of the company?

Answer

Doctrine of ultra vires: The meaning of the term *ultra vires* is simply "beyond (their) powers". The legal phrase "*ultra vires*" is applicable only to acts done in excess of the legal powers of the doers. This presupposes that the powers in their nature are limited.

It is a fundamental rule of Company Law that the objects of a company as stated in its memorandum can be departed from only to the extent permitted by the Act, thus far and no further. In consequence, any act done or a contract made by the company which travels beyond the powers not only of the directors but also of the company is wholly void and inoperative in law and is therefore not binding on the company. On this account, a company can be restrained from employing its fund for purposes other than thosesanctioned by the memorandum. Likewise, it can be restrained from carrying on a trade different from the one it is authorised to carry on.

The impact of the doctrine of *ultra vires* is that a company can neither be sued on an *ultra vires* transaction, nor can it sue on it. Since the memorandum is a "public document", itis open to public inspection. Therefore, when one deals with a company one is deemedto know about the powers of the company. If in spite of this you enter into a transaction which is *ultra vires* the company, you cannot enforce it against the company.

An act which is *ultra vires* the company being void, cannot be ratified by the shareholders of the company. Sometimes, act which is *ultra vires* can be regularised by ratifying it subsequently.

Question 10

Explain clearly the doctrine of 'Indoor Management' as applicable in cases of companies registered under the Companies Act, 1956. Explain the circumstances in which an outsider dealing with the company cannot claim any relief on the ground of 'Indoor Management'.

Answer

Doctrine of Indoor Management (Companies Act, 2013): According to the "doctrine of indoor management" the outsiders, dealing with the company though are supposed to have satisfied themselves regarding the competence of the company to enter into the proposed contracts are also entitled to assume that as far as the internal compliance to procedures and regulations by the company is concerned, everything has been done properly. They are bound to examine the registered documents of the company and ensure that the proposed dealing is not inconsistent therewith, but they are not bound todo more. They are fully entitled to presume regularity and compliance by the company with the internal procedures as required by the Memorandum and the Articles. This doctrine is a limitation of the doctrine of "constructive notice" and popularly known as the rule laid down in the celebrated case of *Royal British Bank v. Turquand*. Thus, the doctrine of indoor management aims to protect outsiders against the company.

The above mentioned doctrine of Indoor Management or Turquand Rule has limitations of its own. That is to say, it is inapplicable to the following cases, namely:

(a) Actual or constructive knowledge of irregularity: The rule does not protect any person when the person dealing with the company has notice, whether actual or constructive, of the irregularity.

In ***Howard vs. Patent Ivory Manufacturing Co.*** where the directors could not defend the issue of debentures to themselves because they should have known thatthe extent to which they were lending money to the company required the assent of the general meeting which they had not obtained.

Likewise, in ***Morris v Kansseen,*** a director could not defend an allotment of shares to him as he participated in the meeting, which made the allotment. His appointment as a director also fell through because none of the directors appointed him was validly in office.

(b) Suspicion of Irregularity: The doctrine in no way, rewards those who behave negligently. Where the person dealing with the company is put upon an inquiry, for example, where the transaction is unusual or not in the ordinary course of business,it is the duty of the outsider to make the necessary enquiry.

The protection of the "Turquand Rule" is also not available where the circumstances surrounding the contract are suspicious and therefore invite inquiry. Suspicion should arise, for example, from the fact that an officer is purporting to act in matter, which is apparently outside the scope of his authority. Where, for example, as in the case of ***Anand Bihari Lal vs. Dinshaw & Co.*** the plaintiff accepted a transfer of a company's property from its accountant, the transfer was held void. The plaintiff could not have supposed, in absence of a power of attorney that the accountant had authority to effect transfer of the company's property.

Similarly, in the case of ***Haughton & Co. v. Nothard, Lowe & Wills Ltd.*** where a person holding directorship in two companies agreed to apply the money of one company in payment of the debt to other, the court said that it was something so unusual "that the plaintiff were put upon inquiry to ascertain whether the persons making the contract had any authority in fact to make it." Any other rule would "place limited companies without any sufficient reasons for so doing, at the mercy of any servant or agent who should purport to contract on their behalf."

(c) Forgery: The doctrine of indoor management applies only to irregularities which might otherwise affect a transaction but it cannot apply to forgery which must be regarded as nullity.

Forgery may in circumstances exclude the '***Turquand Rule'***. The only clear illustration is found in the ***Ruben v Great Fingall Consolidated***. In this case the plaintiff was the transferee of a share certificate issued under the seal of the defendant's company. The company's secretary, who had affixed the seal of the company and forged the signature of the two directors, issued the certificate.

The plaintiff contended that whether the signature were genuine or forged was apart of the internal management, and therefore, the company should be estopped from denying genuineness of the document. But it was held, that the rule has never been extended to cover such a complete forgery.

Question 11

Can a non-profit organization be registered as a company under the Companies Act, 2013? If so, what procedure does it have to adopt?

Answer

Yes, a non-profit organization be registered as a company under the Companies Act, 2013 by following the provisions of section 8 of the Companies Act, 2013. Section 8 of the Companies Act, 2013 deals with the formation of companies which are formed to

- promote the charitable objects of commerce, art, science, sports, education, research, social welfare, religion, charity, protection of environment etc.

Such company intends to apply its profit in

- promoting its objects and
- prohibiting the payment of any dividend to its members.

The Central Government has the power to issue license for registering a section 8 company.

(i) Section 8 allows the Central Government to register such person or association of persons as a company with limited liability without the addition of words 'Limited' or 'Private limited' to its name, by issuing licence on such conditions as it deems fit.

(ii) The registrar shall on application register such person or association of persons as a company under this section.

(iii) On registration the company shall enjoy same privileges and obligations as ofa limited company.

Question 12

F, an assessee, was a wealthy man earning huge income by way of dividend and interest. He formed three Private Companies and agreed with each to hold a bloc of investment as an agent for them. The dividend and interest income received by the companies was handed back to F as a pretended loan. This way, F divided his income into three parts in a bid to reduce his tax liability.

Decide, for what purpose the three companies were established? Whether the legal personality of all the three companies may be disregarded.

Answer

The House of Lords in *Salomon Vs Salomon & Co. Ltd.* laid down that a company isa person distinct and separate from its members, and therefore, has an independent separate legal existence from its members who have constituted the company. But under certain circumstances the separate entity of the company may be ignored by the courts. When that happens, the courts ignore the corporate entity of the company

and look behind the corporate façade and hold the persons in control ofthe management of its affairs liable for the acts of the company. Where a company is incorporated and formed by certain persons only for the purpose of evading taxes, the courts have discretion to disregard the corporate entity and tax the income in the hands of the appropriate assessee.

(1) The problem asked in the question is based upon the aforesaid facts. The three companies were formed by the assessee purely and simply as a meansof avoiding tax and the companies were nothing more than the façade of the assessee himself. Therefore the whole idea of Mr. F was simply to split his income into three parts with a view to evade tax. No other business was doneby the company.

(2) The legal personality of the three private companies may be disregarded because the companies were formed only to avoid tax liability. It carried on no other business, but was created simply as a legal entity to ostensibly receive the dividend and interest and to hand them over to the assessee as pretended loans. The same was upheld in *Re Sir DinshawManeckji Petit* AIR 1927 Bom.371 and *Juggilal vs. Commissioner of Income Tax* AIR (1969) SC (932).

Question 13

State the essential elements to incorporate a LLP?

Answer

Essential elements to incorporate LLP - Under the LLP Act, 2008, the followingelements are very essential to form a LLP in India:

(i) To complete and submit incorporation document in the form prescribed with the Registrar electronically;

(ii) To have at least two partners for incorporation of LLP [Individual or body corporate];

(iii) To have registered office in India to which all communications will be made and received;

(iv) To appoint minimum two individuals as designated partners who will be responsible for number of duties including doing of all acts, matters and things as are requiredto be done by the LLP. Atleast one of them should be resident in India.

(v) A person or nominee of body corporate intending to be appointed as designated partner of LLP should hold a Designated Partner Identification Number (DPIN) allotted by MCA.

(vi) To execute a partnership agreement between the partners *inter se* or between the LLP and its partners. In the absence of any agreement the provisions as set out in First Schedule of LLP Act, 2008 will be applied.

(vii) LLP Name.

Question 14

What are the effects of registration of LLP?

Answer

Effect of registration (Section 14 of Limited Liability Partnership Act, 2008):

On registration, a LLP shall, by its name, be capable of—

(a) suing and being sued;

(b) acquiring, owning, holding and developing or disposing of property, whether movable or immovable, tangible or intangible;

(c) having a common seal, if it decides to have one; and

(d) doing and suffering such other acts and things as bodies corporate may lawfully doand suffer.

Question 15

What is the meaning of the Limited Liability Partnership? State the various characteristicsof it?

Answer

Meaning of Limited Liability Partnership (LLP): A LLP is a new form of legal business entity with limited liability. It is an alternative corporate business vehicle that not only gives the benefits of limited liability at low compliance cost but allows its partners the flexibility of organising their internal structure as a traditional partnership. The LLP is a separate legal entity and, while the LLP itself will be liable for the full extent of its assets, the liability of the partners will be limited.

LLP is an alternative corporate business form that gives the benefits of limited liability ofa company and the flexibility of a partnership.

Since LLP contains elements of both 'a corporate structure' as well as 'a partnership firm structure' LLP is called a hybrid between a company and a partnership.

Characteristic/Salient Features of LLP

1. **LLP is a body corporate:** Section 2(1)(d) of the LLP Act, 2008 provides that a LLP is a body corporate formed and incorporated under this Act and is a legal entity separate from that of its partners and shall have perpetual succession. Therefore, any change in the partners of a LLP shall not affect the existence, rights or liabilities of the LLP.

   Section 3 of LLP Act provides that a LLP is a body corporate formed and incorporated under this Act and is a legal entity separate from that of its partners.

2. **Perpetual Succession:**The LLP can continue its existence irrespective of changes in partners. Death, insanity, retirement or insolvency of partners has no impact on the existence of LLP. It is capable of entering into contracts and holding property in its own name.

3. **Separate Legal Entity:** The LLP is a separate legal entity, is liable to the full extent of its assets but liability of the partners is limited to their agreed contribution in the LLP. In other words, creditors of LLP shall be the creditors of LLP alone.

4. **Mutual Agency:** Further, no partner is liable on account of the independent or un-

authorized actions of other partners, thus individual partners are shielded from joint liability created by another partner's wrongful business decisions or misconduct. In other words, all partners will be the agents of the LLP alone. No one partner canbind the other partner by his acts.

5. **LLP Agreement:** Mutual rights and duties of the partners within a LLP are governed by an agreement between the partners. The LLP Act, 2008 provides flexibility to partner to devise the agreement as per their choice. In the absence of any such agreement, the mutual rights and duties shall be governed by the provisions of the LLP Act, 2008.
6. **Artificial Legal Person:** A LLP is an artificial legal person because it is created by a legal process and is clothed with all rights of an individual. It can do everything which any natural person can do, except of course that, it cannot be sent to jail, cannot take an oath, cannot marry or get divorce nor can it practice a learned profession like CA or Medicine. A LLP is invisible, intangible, immortal (it can be dissolved by law alone) but not fictitious because it really exists.
7. **Common Seal:** A LLP being an artificial person can act through its partners and designated partners. LLP may have a common seal, if it decides to have one [Section 14(c)]. Thus, it is not mandatory for a LLP to have a common seal. It shall remain under the custody of some responsible official and it shall be affixed in the presence of at least 2 designated partners of the LLP.
8. **Limited Liability:** Every partner of a LLP is, for the purpose of the business of LLP, the agent of the LLP, but not of other partners (Section 26). The liability of the partners will be limited to their agreed contribution in the LLP. Such contribution may be of tangible or intangible nature or both.
9. **Management of Business:** The partners in the LLP are entitled to manage the business of LLP. But only the designated partners are responsible for legal compliances.
10. **Minimum and Maximum number of Partners:** Every LLP shall have least two partners and shall also have at least 2 individuals as designated partners, of whom at least one shall be resident in India. There is no maximum limit on the partners in LLP.
11. **Business for Profit Only:** The essential requirement for forming LLP is carrying on a lawful business with a view to earn profit. Thus, LLP cannot be formed for charitable or non-economic purpose.
12. **Investigation:** The Central Government shall have powers to investigate the affairs of an LLP by appointment of competence authority for the purpose.
13. **Compromise or Arrangement:** Any compromise or agreements including merger and amalgamation of LLPs shall be in accordance with the provisions of the LLP |Act, 2008.
14. **Conversion into LLP:** A firm, private company or an unlisted public company would be allowed to be converted into LLP in accordance with the provisions of LLP Act, 2008.

Question 16

What is the procedure for changing the name of Limited Liability Partnership (LLP) under the LLP Act, 2008?

Answer

Change of name of LLP (Section 17 of LLP Act, 2008):

(1) Notwithstanding anything contained in sections 15 and 16, where the Central Government is satisfied that a LLP has been registered (whether through inadvertence or otherwise and whether originally or by a change of name) under a name which —

(a) is a name referred to in sub-section (*2*) of section 15; or

(b) is identical with or too nearly resembles the name of any other LLP or body corporate or other name as to be likely to be mistaken for it,

the Central Government may direct such LLP to change its name, and the LLP shall comply with the said direction within 3 months after the date of the direction or such longer period as the Central Government may allow.

(2) (i) Any LLP which fails to comply with a direction given under sub-section (*1*) shall be punishable with fine which shall not be less than ` 10,000 but which may extend to `5 Lakhs.

(ii) The designated partner of such LLP shall be punishable with fine which shall not be less than `10,000 but which may extend to `1 Lakh.

Question 17

State the grounds on which a firm may be dissolved by the Court under the Indian Partnership Act, 1932?

Answer

DISSOLUTION BY THE COURT (SECTION 44): Court may, at the suit of the partner, dissolve a firm on any of the following ground:

(a) *Insanity/unsound mind*: Where a partner (not a sleeping partner) has become of unsound mind, the court may dissolve the firm on a suit of the other partners or by the next friend of the insane partner. Temporary sickness is no ground for dissolution of firm.

(b) *Permanent incapacity*: When a partner, other than the partner suing, has become in any way permanently incapable of performing his duties as partner, then the court may dissolve the firm. Such permanent incapacity may result from physical disability or illness etc.

(c) *Misconduct:* Where a partner, other than the partner suing, is guilty of conduct which is likely to affect prejudicially the carrying on of business, the court may order for dissolution of the firm, by giving regard to the nature of business. It is not necessary that misconduct must relate to the conduct of the business. The important point is the adverse effect of misconduct on the business. In each case nature of business will decide whether an act is misconduct or not.

(d) *Persistent breach of agreement:* Where a partner other than the partner suing, wilfully

or persistently commits breach of agreements relating to the management of the affairs of the firm or the conduct of its business, or otherwise so conduct himself in matters relating to the business that it is not reasonably practicable for other partners to carry on the business in partnership with him, then the court may dissolve the firm at the instance of any of the partners. Following comes in to category of breach of contract:

- Embezzlement,
- Keeping erroneous accounts
- Holding more cash than allowed
- Refusal to show accounts despite repeated request etc.

(e) *Transfer of interest:* Where a partner other than the partner suing, has transferred the whole of his interest in the firm to a third party or has allowed his share to be charged or sold by the court, in the recovery of arrears of land revenue, the court may dissolve the firm at the instance of any other partner.

(f) *Continuous/Perpetual losses:* Where the business of the firm cannot be carried on except at a loss in future also, the court may order for its dissolution.

(g) *Just and equitable grounds:* Where the court considers any other ground to be just and equitable for the dissolution of the firm, it may dissolve a firm. The following are the cases for the just and equitable grounds-

(i) Deadlock in the management.

(ii) Where the partners are not in talking terms between them.

(iii) Loss of substratum.

(iv) Gambling by a partner on a stock exchange.

Question 18

X and Y are partners in a partnership firm. X introduced A, a manager, as his partner to Z. A remained silent. Z, a trader believing A as partner supplied 100 T.V sets to the firm on credit. After expiry of credit period, Z did not get amount of T.V sets sold to the partnership firm. Z filed a suit against X and A for the recovery of price. Advice Z whether he can recover the amount from X and A under the Indian Partnership Act, 1932.

Answer

In the given case, along with X, the Manager (A) is also liable for the price because he becomes a partner by holding out (Section 28, Indian Partnership Act, 1932).

Partner by holding out (Section 28): Partnership by holding out is also known as partnership by estoppel. Where a man holds himself out as a partner, or allows others to do it, he is then stopped from denying the character he has assumed and upon the faithof which creditors may be presumed to have acted.

It is only the person to whom the representation has been made and who has acted thereon that has right to enforce liability arising out of 'holding out'.

You must also note that for the purpose of fixing liability on a person who has, by representation, led another to act, it is not necessary to show that he was actuated by a fraudulent intention.

he rule given in Section 28 is also applicable to a former partner who has retired from the firm without giving proper public notice of his retirement. In such cases, a person who, even subsequent to the retirement, give credit to the firm on the belief that he was a partner, will be entitled to hold him liable.

Question 19

Ram, Mohan and Gopal were partners in a firm. During the course of partnership, the firm ordered Sunrise Ltd. to supply a machine to the firm. Before the machine was delivered, Ram expired. The machine, however, was later delivered to the firm. Thereafter, the remaining partners became insolvent and the firm failed to pay the price of machine to Sunrise Ltd.

Explain with reasons:

(i) Whether Ram's private estate is liable for the price of the machine purchased by the firm?

(ii) Against whom can the creditor obtain a decree for the recovery of the price?

Answer

Partnership Liability: The problem in question is based on the provisions of the Indian Partnership Act, 1932 contained in Section 35. The Section provides that where under a contract between the partners the firm is not dissolved by the death of a partner, the estate of a deceased partner is not liable for any act of the firm done after his death. Therefore, considering the above provisions, the problem may be answered as follows:

(i) Ram's estate in this case will not be liable for the price of the Machinery purchased.

(ii) The creditors in this case can have only a personal decree against the surviving partners and decree against the partnership assets in the hands of those partners. However, since the surviving partners are already insolvent, no suit for recovery of the debt would lie against them. A suit for goods sold and delivered would not lie against the representative of the deceased partner.

This is because there was not debt due in respect of the goods in Ram's lifetime.

Question 20

What do you mean by "implied authority" of the partners in a firm? Point out the extent of partner's implied authority in case of emergency, referring to the provisions of the Indian Partnership Act, 1932.

Answer

Implied Authority of Partner as Agent of the Firm (Section 19): Subject to the provisions of section 22, the act of a partner which is done to carry on, in the usual way, business of the kind carried on by the firm, binds the firm.

(1) The authority of a partner to bind the firm conferred by this section is called his "implied authority".

(2) In the absence of any usage or custom of trade to the contrary, the implied authority of a partner does not empower him to-

(a) Submit a dispute relating to the business of the firm to arbitration;

(b) open a banking account on behalf of the firm in his own name;

(c) compromise or relinquish any claim or portion of a claim by the firm;

(d) withdraw a suit or proceedings filed on behalf of the firm;

(e) admit any liability in a suit or proceedings against the firm;

(f) acquire immovable property on behalf of the firm;

(g) transfer immovable property belonging to the firm; and

(h) enter into partnership on behalf of the firm.

Mode Of Doing Act To Bind Firm (Section 22): In order to bind a firm, an act or instrument done or executed by a partner or other person on behalf of the firm shall be done or executed in the firm name, or in any other manner expressing or implying an intention to bind the firm.

Question 21

"Partner indeed virtually embraces the character of both a principal and an agent". Describe the said statement keeping in view of the provisions of the Indian Partnership Act, 1932.

Answer

"Partner indeed virtually embraces the character of both a principal and an agent": Subject to the provisions of section 18 of the Indian Partnership Act, 1932, a partner is the agent of the firm for the purposes of the business of the firm.

A partnership is the relationship between the partners who have agreed to share the profits of the business carried on by all or any of them acting for all (Section 4). This definition suggests that any of the partners can be the agent of the others.

Section 18 clarifies this position by providing that, subject to the provisions of the Act, a partner is the agent of the firm for the purpose of the business of the firm. **The partner indeed virtually embraces the character of both a principal and an agent.** So far as he acts for himself and in his own interest in the common concern of the partnership, he may properly be deemed as a principal and so far as he acts for his partners, he may properly be deemed as an agent.

The principal distinction between him and a mere agent is that he has a community of interest with other partners in the whole property and business and liabilities of partnership, whereas an agent as such has no interest in either.

The rule that a partner is the agent of the firm for the purpose of the business of the firm cannot be applied to all transactions and dealings between the partners themselves. It is applicable only to the act done by partners for the purpose of the business of the firm.

Question 22

(i) Ram consults Shyam, a motor-car dealer for a car suitable for touring purposes to promote the sale of his product. Shyam suggests 'Maruti' and Ram accordingly buys it from Shyam. The car turns out to be unfit for touring purposes. What remedy Ram is having now under the Sale of Goods Act, 1930?

(ii) Referring to the provisions of the Sale of Goods Act, 1930, state the rules provided to regulate the "Sale by Auction."

Answer

(i) Condition and warranty (Section 12): A stipulation in a contract of sale with reference to goods which are the subject thereof may be a condition or a warranty. [Sub-section (1)]

"A condition is a stipulation essential to the main purpose of the contract, the breach of which gives rise to a right to treat the contract as repudiated". [Sub-section (2)]

"A warranty is a stipulation collateral to the main purpose of the contract, the breach of which gives rise to a claim for damages but not to a right to reject the goods and treat the contract as repudiated". [Sub-section (3)]

Whether a stipulation in a contract of sale is a condition or a warranty depends in each case on the construction of the contract. A stipulation may be a condition, though calleda warranty in the contract. [Sub-section (4)]

In the instant case, the term that the 'car should be suitable for touring purposes' is a condition of the contract. It is so vital that its non-fulfilment defeats the very purpose for which Ram purchases the car.

Ram is therefore entitled to reject the car and have refund of the price.

(ii) Rules of Auction sale: Section 64 of the Sale of Goods Act, 1930 provides following rules to regulate the sale by auction:

(a) **Where goods are sold in lots:** Where goods are put up for sale in lots, each lot is *prima facie* deemed to be subject of a separate contract of sale.

(b) **Completion of the contract of sale:** The sale is complete when the auctioneer announces its completion by the fall of hammer or in any other customary manner and until such announcement is made, any bidder may retract from his bid.

(c) **Right to bid may be reserved:** Right to bid may be reserved expressly by or on behalf of the seller and where such a right is expressly reserved, but not otherwise,the seller or any one person on his behalf may bid at the auction.

(d) **Where the sale is not notified by the seller**: Where the sale is not notified to be subject to a right to bid on behalf of the seller, it shall not be lawful for the seller to bid himself or to employ any person to bid at such sale, or for the auctioneer knowingly to take any bid from the seller or any such person; and any sale contravening this rule may be treated as fraudulent by the buyer.

(e) **Reserved price:** The sale may be notified to be subject to a reserve or upset price;and

(f) **Pretended bidding:** If the seller makes use of pretended bidding to raise the price,the sale is voidable at the option of the buyer.

Question 23

J the owner of a car wants to sell his car. For this purpose, he hand over the car to P, amercantile agent for sale at a price not less than ` 50,000. The agent sells the car for 40, 000 to A, who buys the car in good faith and without notice of any fraud. P misappropriated the money also. J sues A to recover the Car. Decide given reasonswhether J would succeed.

Answer

The problem in this case is based on the provisions of the Sale of Goods Act, 1930 contained in the proviso to Section 27. The proviso provides that a mercantile agent is one who in the customary course of his business, has, as such agent, authority ei ther to sell goods, or to consign goods, for the purpose of sale, or to buy goods, or to raise money on the security of goods [Section 2(9)]. The buyer of goods form a mercantile agent, who has no authority from the principal to sell, gets a good title to the goods if the following conditions are satisfied:

(1) The agent should be in possession of the goods or documents of title to the goodswith the consent of the owner.

(2) The agent should sell the goods while acting in the ordinary course of business of amercantile agent.

(3) The buyer should act in good faith.

(4) The buyer should not have at the time of the contract of sale notice that the agenthas no authority to sell.

In the instant case, P, the agent, was in the possession of the car with J's consent for the purpose of sale. A, the buyer, therefore obtained a good title to the car. Hence, J in this case, cannot recover the car from A.

Question 24

Mr. S agreed to purchase 100 bales of cotton from V, out of his large stock and sent his men to take delivery of the goods. They could pack only 60 bales. Later on, there wasan accidental fire and the entire stock was destroyed including 60 bales that were already packed. Referring to the provisions of the Sale of Goods Act, 1930 explain as to who will bear the loss and to what extent?

Answer

Section 26 of the Sale of Goods Act, 1930 provides that unless otherwise agreed, the goods remain at the seller's risk until the property therein is transferred to the buyer, but when the property therein is transferred to the buyer, the goods are at buyer's risk whether delivery has been made or not. Further Section 18 read with Section 23 of the Act provide that in a contract for the sale of unascertained goods, no property in the goods is transferred to the buyer, unless and until the goods are ascertained and where there is contract for the sale of unascertained or future goods by description, and goodsof that description and in a deliverable state are unconditionally appropriated to the contract, either by the seller with the assent of the buyer or by the buyer with the assentof the seller, the property in the goods thereupon passes to the buyer. Such assent may be express or implied.

Applying the aforesaid law to the facts of the case in hand, it is clear that Mr. S has the right to select the good out of the bulk and he has sent his men for same purpose.

Hence the problem can be answered based on the following two assumptions and the answer will vary accordingly.

(i) **Where the bales have been selected with the consent of the buyer's representatives:**

In this case the 60 bales has been transferred to the buyer and goods have been appropriated to the contract. Thus, loss arising due to fire in case of 60 bales would be borne by Mr. S. As regards 40 bales, the loss would be borne by Mr. V, since the goods have not been identified and appropriated.

(ii) **Where the bales have not been selected with the consent of buyer's representatives:**

In this case, the goods has not been transferred at all and hence the loss of 100 bales would be borne by Mr. V completely.

Question 25

Distinguish between a 'Condition' and a 'Warranty' in a contract of sale. When shalla 'breach of condition' be treated as 'breach of warranty' under the provisions of the Sale of Goods Act, 1930? Explain.

Answer

Difference between Condition and Warranty

(i) A condition is a stipulation essential to the main purpose of the contract whereas a warranty is a stipulation collateral to the main purpose of the contract.

(ii) Breach of condition gives rise to a right to treat the contract as repudiated whereas in case of breach of warranty, the aggrieved party can claim damage only.

(iii) Breach of condition may be treated as breach of warranty whereas a breach of warranty cannot be treated as breach of condition.

According to Section 13 of the Sale of Goods Act, 1930 a breach of condition may be treated as breach of warranty in following circumstances:

(i) Where a contract of sale is subject to any condition to be fulfilled by the seller, the buyer may waive the condition,

(ii) Where the buyer elects to treat the breach of condition as breach of awarranty.

(iii) Where the contract of sale is non-severable and the buyer has accepted thewhole goods or any part thereof.

(iv) Where the fulfillment of any condition or warranty is excused by law by reasonof impossibility or otherwise.