

ANSWERS OF MODEL TEST PAPER 10

FOUNDATION COURSE

PAPER – 2: BUSINESS LAWS

1. (a) (i) According to Section 69 of the Indian Contract Act, 1872, a person who is interested in the payment of money which another is bound by law to pay, and who therefore pays it, is entitled to be reimbursed by the other.

In the instant case, Mr. M paid the electricity bill to avoid the disconnection that was pending due to Mr. L's failure to fulfil his contractual obligation. Hence, Mr. M is entitled to be reimbursed ₹ 50,000 from Mr. L.

- (ii) In terms of Section 5 of the Indian Contract Act, 1872, a proposal can be revoked at any time before the communication of its acceptance is complete as against the proposer.

Accordingly, an offer may be revoked by the offeror before its acceptance, even though he had originally agreed to hold it open for a definite period of time. So long as it is a mere offer, it can be withdrawn whenever the offeror desires.

In the instant case, B cannot claim damages from A because the offer made by A is a mere offer and it can be withdrawn whenever A desires.

- (iii) The general rule is that an agreement made without consideration is void (Section 25 of the Indian Contract Act, 1872).

However, in the following case, the agreement though made without consideration, will be valid and enforceable.

Charity: If a promisee undertakes the liability on the promise of the person to contribute to charity, there the contract shall be valid.

In the instant case, Mr. A can claim 1.5 lakh from Mr. S.

- (b) (i) As per Rule 3 of the Companies (Incorporation) Rules, 2014:

Only a natural person who is an Indian citizen whether resident in India or otherwise

- (a) shall be eligible to incorporate a One Person Company;
- (b) shall be a nominee for the sole member of a One Person Company.

Here, "resident in India" means a person who has stayed in India for a period of not less than one hundred and twenty days during the immediately preceding financial year.

In the instant case,

- (i) Robert cannot be appointed as a nominee in the OPC by Kamal as his stay in the preceding F/Y 2022-23 is only for 61

days which is less than 120 days.

- (ii) Dinkar can be appointed as a nominee in the OPC by Kamal as he is an Indian Citizen and non-resident in India.

Alternative Answer as follows:

As per Rule 3 of the Companies (Incorporation) Rules, 2014:

Only a natural person who is an Indian citizen whether resident in India or otherwise and has stayed in India for a period of not less than 120 days during the immediately preceding financial year.

- shall be eligible to incorporate a OPC;
- shall be a nominee for the sole member of a OPC.

In the instant case,

- (i) Robert cannot be appointed as a nominee in the OPC by Kamal as his stay in the preceding F/Y 2022-23 is only for 61 days which is less than 120 days.
- (ii) Dinkar cannot be appointed as a nominee in the OPC by Kamal as he has not stayed in the preceding F/Y 2022-23 for a single day.

Procedure for changing the nominee: The member of OPC may at any time change the name of nominee by giving notice to the company and the company shall intimate the same to the Registrar.

Any such change in the name of the person shall not be deemed to be an alteration of the memorandum.

- (ii) According to Section 455 of the Companies Act, 2013, where a company is formed and registered under this Act for a future project or to hold an asset or intellectual property and has no significant accounting transaction, such a company or an inactive company may make an application to the Registrar in such manner as may be prescribed for obtaining the status of a dormant company.

In the instant case, XYZ Ltd. has made a significant accounting transaction (down payment of ₹1 crore for plant and machinery), it does not meet the criteria of a dormant company under Section 455 of the Companies Act, 2013.

Therefore, XYZ Ltd. cannot acquire the status of dormant company.

- (c) (i) If a partner is otherwise expelled, the expulsion is null and void.

According to Section 33 of the Indian Partnership Act, 1932

- (i) the power of expulsion must have existed in a contract between the partners;
- (ii) the power has been exercised by a majority of the partners; and

(iii) it has been exercised in good faith.

If all these conditions are not present, the expulsion is not deemed to be in bona fide interest of the business of the firm.

The test of good faith as required under Section 33(1) includes three things:

- (i) The expulsion must be in the interest of the partnership.
- (ii) The partner to be expelled is served with a notice.
- (iii) He is given an opportunity of being heard.

Hence, it is correct to say that, if a partner is otherwise expelled, the expulsion is null and void.

(ii) “The partner who is expelled will cease to be liable to the third party for the act of the firm done after expulsion”

According to Section 32(3) of the Indian Partnership Act, 1932, notwithstanding the expulsion a partner from a firm, he and the partners continue to be liable as partners to third parties for any act done by any of them which would have been an act of the firm if done before the expulsion, until public notice is given of the expulsion.

However, an expelled partner is not liable to any third party who deals with the firm without knowing that he was a partner.

Hence, the statement given is partially correct.

- 2. (a) (i)** According to Section 15 of the Sale of Goods Act, 1930, where there is a contract of sale of goods by description, there is an implied condition that the goods shall correspond with the description. The buyer is not bound to accept and pay for the goods which are not in accordance with the description of goods.

In the instant case, the contract specified that the basmati rice should be grown in Chhattisgarh, packed in pink colour bags of 25 kg each but the seller mistakenly packed 1800 kg of rice from Maharashtra in white bags of 30 kg each, and only 200 kg of rice from Chhattisgarh in the correct pink bags.

Therefore, the buyer has the right to reject the entire quantity of basmati rice supplied by the buyer as the goods do not correspond with the description.

ANSWER TO SECOND PART

In case the buyer has to accept the entire quantity of rice to fulfil his other contracts with other parties, he can claim damages which provides that where the seller wrongfully neglects or refuses to deliver the goods to the buyer, the buyer may sue the seller for damages for non-delivery.

ALTERNATE ANSWER TO SECOND PART

Section 13 of the Sale of the Goods Act, 1930 specifies cases where a breach of condition be treated as a breach of warranty. As a result of which the buyer loses his right to rescind the contract and can claim damages only.

In the following cases, a contract is not avoided even on account of a breach of a condition:

- (i) Where the buyer altogether waives the performance of the condition. A party may for his own benefit, waive a stipulation. It should be a voluntary waiver by buyer.
- (ii) Where the buyer elects to treat the breach of the conditions, as one of a warranty. That is to say, he may claim only damages instead of repudiating the contract. Here, the buyer has not waived the condition but decided to treat it as a warranty.

According to above stated provision, there is a breach of condition, and the buyer can reject the goods. But if the buyer so elects, he may treat it as a breach of warranty, hence he may accept the entire quantity to fulfil his other contracts with other parties and claim damages.

- (ii) Section 10 of the Sale of Goods Act, 1930 provides for the determination of price by a third party.

- 1. Where there is an agreement to sell goods on the terms that price has to be fixed by the third party and he either does not or cannot make such valuation, the agreement will be void.
- 2. In case the third party is prevented by the default of either party from fixing the price, the party at fault will be liable to the damages to the other party who is not at fault.

In the instant case, as Kusum cannot do valuation of laptop due to non-sharing of particulars and configuration by Kartik who was bound by his promise, the agreement will be void.

The other remedy available to Vasant is that he can claim damages from Kartik as he will be liable for the damages to Vasant who is not at fault.

- (b) (i) **"Corporate veil sometimes fails to protect the members of the company from the liability connected to the company's actions."**

The following are the cases where company law disregards the principle of corporate personality or the principle that the company is a legal entity distinct and separate from its shareholders or members:

- (1) **To determine the character of the company i.e. to find out whether co-enemy or friend:** It is true that, unlike a natural person, a company does not have mind or conscience; therefore, it cannot be a friend or foe. It may, however, be

characterised as an enemy company, if its affairs are under the control of people of an enemy country. For this purpose, the Court may examine the character of the persons who are really at the helm of affairs of the company.

- (2) **To protect revenue/tax:** In certain matters concerning the law of taxes, duties and stamps particularly where question of the controlling interest is in issue.
 - (i) Where corporate entity is used to evade or circumvent tax, the Court can disregard the corporate entity.
 - (ii) Where the company was not a genuine company at all but merely the assessee himself disguised under the legal entity of a limited company.
- (3) **To avoid a legal obligation:** Where it was found that the sole purpose for the formation of the company was to use it as a device to reduce the amount to be paid by way of bonus to workmen, the Supreme Court upheld the piercing of the veil to look at the real transaction (*The Workmen Employed in Associated Rubber Industries Limited, Bhavnagar vs. The Associated Rubber Industries Ltd., Bhavnagar and another*).
- (4) **Formation of subsidiaries to act as agents:** A company may sometimes be regarded as an agent or trustee of its members, or of another company, and may therefore be deemed to have lost its individuality in favour of its principal. Here the principal will be held liable for the acts of that company.
- (5) **Company formed for fraud/improper conduct or to defeat law:** Where the device of incorporation is adopted for some illegal or improper purpose, e.g., to defeat or circumvent law, to defraud creditors or to avoid legal obligations.
- (ii) **Effect of Memorandum and Articles:** As per Section 10 of the Companies Act, 2013, where the memorandum and articles when registered, shall bind the company and the members thereof to the same extent as if they respectively had been signed by the company and by each member, and an agreement to observe all the provisions of the memorandum and of the articles.

All monies payable by any member to the company under the memorandum or articles shall be a debt due from him to the company.

(c) (i) **Change of name of LLP (Section 17 of Limited Liability Partnership Act, 2008):**

- (1) Notwithstanding anything contained in sections 15 and 16, if through inadvertence or otherwise, a LLP, on its first registration or on its registration by a new body corporate, its registered name, is registered by a name which is identical with or too nearly resembles to —

- (a) that of any other LLP or a company; or
- (b) a registered trade mark of a proprietor under the Trade Marks Act, 1999, as is likely to be mistaken for it,

then on an application of such LLP or proprietor referred to in clauses (a) and (b) respectively or a company,

the Central Government may direct that such LLP to change its name or new name within a period of 3 months from the date of issue of such direction.

- (2) Where a LLP changes its name or obtains a new name under sub-section (1), it shall within a period of 15 days from the date of such change, give notice of the change to Registrar along with the order of the Central Government, who shall carry out necessary changes in the certificate of incorporation and within 30 days of such change in the certificate of incorporation, such LLP shall change its name in the LLP agreement.
- (3) If the LLP is in default in complying with any direction given under sub-section (1), the Central Government shall allot a new name to the LLP in such manner as may be prescribed and the Registrar shall enter the new name in the register of LLP in place of the old name and issue a fresh certificate of incorporation with new name, which the LLP shall use thereafter.

Nothing contained in this sub-section shall prevent a LLP from subsequently changing its name in accordance with the provisions of section 16.

(ii) Small Limited Liability Partnership [Section 2(1)(ta) of the Limited Liability Partnership Act, 2008]: It means a limited liability partnership—

- (i) the contribution of which, does not exceed twenty-five lakh rupees or such higher amount, not exceeding five crore rupees, as may be prescribed; and
- (ii) the turnover of which, as per the Statement of Accounts and Solvency for the immediately preceding financial year, does not exceed forty lakh rupees or such higher amount, not exceeding fifty crore rupees, as may be prescribed; or
- (iii) which meets such other requirements as may be prescribed, and fulfils such terms and conditions as may be prescribed.

3. (a) (i) Partner by holding out (Section 28 of the Indian Partnership Act, 1932):

Anyone who by words spoken or written or by conduct represents himself, or knowingly permits himself to be represented, to be a partner in a firm, is liable as a partner in that firm to anyone who has on the faith of any such representation given credit to the firm, whether the person representing himself or represented to

be a partner does or does not know that the representation has reached the person so giving credit.

In the instant case, since Gopal allowed himself to be represented as a partner to the RS & Co. and third parties acted based on this belief and therefore, Gopal is held liable to Sundar as he represented himself by his act to be a partner to the RS & Co.

However, Gopal is not liable to Madhav for the liabilities incurred by the firm. Information of Gopal being a partner to the firm was shared by the Sundar (Supplier to the firm) which is not falling within the ambit of doctrine of holding out.

Hence Gopal is liable to Sundar and not to Madhav for the liability of the Firm.

- (ii) **Rights and liabilities of new partner:** The new firm, including the new partner who joins it, may agree to assume liability for the existing debts of the old firm, and creditors may agree to accept the new firm as their debtor and discharge the old partners. The creditor's consent is necessary in every case to make the transaction operative. Novation is the technical term in a contract for substituted liability, of course, not confined only to case of partnership.

But a mere agreement amongst partners cannot operate as Novation. Thus, an agreement between the partners and the incoming partner that he shall be liable for existing debts will not ipso facto give creditors of the firm any right against him.

In the instant case, Amar will not be liable in a suit filed by the creditor against the firm and all existing partners for recovery of the old debt of the firm.

- (iii) **According to section 37 of the Indian Partnership Act, 1932,**

- Where any member of a firm has died or otherwise ceased to be partner, and the surviving or continuing partners
- carry on the business of the firm with the property of the firm without any final settlement of accounts as between them and the outgoing partner or his estate, then, in the absence of a contract to the contrary,
- the outgoing partner or his estate is entitled at the option of himself or his representatives
- to such share of the profits made since he ceased to be a partner as may be attributable to the use of his share of the property of the firm or
- to interest at the rate of six per cent per annum on the amount of his share in the property of the firm.

In the instant case, Suman is entitled to claim either interest on her share in the property i.e. ₹ 1,20,000 (6% of ₹ 20 Lakh) or a

share of the profits i.e. ₹ 1 Lakh (10% of ₹ 10 Lakh) from the firm for the use of her share in the property.

Therefore, claim of Suman of ₹ 3 Lakh is not valid.

- (b) (i) **Doctrine of ultra vires:** The meaning of the term ultra vires is simply “beyond (their) powers”. It is a fundamental rule of Company Law that 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.

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”, it is open to public inspection. Therefore, when one deals with a company one is deemed to 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.

In the instant case, borrowing more than ₹1 crore was clearly beyond JV Limited’s powers as per its MoA, making the loan transaction ultra vires to the extent of the excess amount over ₹1 crore.

Hence, the decision of the company denying the repayment of the loan being ultra virus the company shall be valid for ₹ 4 crore.

If the funds have been applied for legitimate business purposes (such as repaying lawful debts), the lender steps into the shoes of the debtor paid off and consequently he would be entitled to recover his loan to that extent from the company.

Therefore, JV Limited cannot deny repayment of ₹3 crore, as it was utilised for lawful purposes, despite the ultra vires nature of the loan.

Ultimately, the company has no remedy available to recover the balance amount of loan of ₹ 1 crore as the spending thereof is not traceable.

- (ii) The documents which need to be authenticated by a common seal will be required to be so done, only if the company opts to have a common seal.

In case a company does not have a common seal, the authorization shall be made by two directors or by a director and the Company Secretary, wherever the company has appointed a Company Secretary.

In the instant case, the objection of Sumati is not valid as the share certificate was signed by two directors Amit and Sumit as the company secretary was not appointed.

If the company had a company secretary, then the share certificate has to be signed by a director and the Company secretary.

Hence, yes, the answer will be different.

- (c) (i) **Ordinary damages:** 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.

Special damages: Where a party to a contract receives a notice of special circumstances affecting the contract, he will be liable not only for damages arising naturally and directly from the breach but also for special damages.

Liquidated damage is a genuine pre-estimate of compensation of damages for certain anticipated breach of contract. This estimate is agreed to between parties to avoid at a later date detailed calculation and the necessity to convince outside parties.

- (ii) (A) **Agreement made based on natural love and affection:** Conditions to be fulfilled under section 25(1) of the Indian Contract Act, 1872

- (i) It must be made out of natural love and affection between the parties.
- (ii) Parties must stand in near relationship to each other.
- (iii) It must be in writing.
- (iv) It must also be registered under the law.

A written and registered agreement based on natural love and affection between the parties standing in near relation (e.g., husband and wife) to each other is enforceable even without consideration.

- (B) **Promise to pay time barred debts:** Where a promise in writing signed by the person making it or by his authorised agent, is made to pay a debt barred by limitation it is valid without consideration [Section 25(3)].

4. (a) (i) **Responsibility of finder of goods (Section 71 of the Indian Contract Act, 1872):** A person who finds goods belonging to another and takes them into his custody is subject to same responsibility as if he were a bailee.

Thus, a finder of lost goods has:

- (i) to take proper care of the property as man of ordinary prudence would take
- (ii) no right to appropriate the goods and

(iii) to restore the goods if the owner is found.

The right of finder of lost goods- may sue for specific reward offered [Section 168]: The finder of goods has no right to sue the owner for compensation for trouble and expense voluntarily incurred by him in finding the owner and preserving the goods found. But he has a right to retain the goods against the owner until he receives such compensation.

When finder of thing commonly on sale may sell it [Section 169]: When a thing which is commonly the subject of sale is lost, if the owner cannot with reasonable diligence be found, or if he refuses, upon demand, to pay the lawful charges of the finder, the finder may sell it—

- (1) when the thing is in danger of perishing or of losing the greater part of its value, or
- (2) when the lawful charges of the finder in respect of the thing found amount to two-thirds of its value.

Hence, the answers are:

- (A) **Gifting the wristwatch to his son Mahesh is unlawful.** Raghav had no ownership rights over the watch and could not legally transfer it to someone else.
 - (B) **Warning Madhav to Sue for Recovery of Lawful Expenses:** Raghav has no right to sue Madhav for the expenses voluntarily incurred by Raghav in finding the owner.
 - (C) **Retaining Possession of the Wristwatch Until Recovery of Lawful Expenses:** Raghav's action of retaining the wristwatch until Madhav reimburses him for lawful expenses is valid.
 - (D) **Selling of Wristwatch for Recovery of Expenses:** the watch is not perishable, and the expenses claimed (₹ 20,000) are far below two-thirds of the value of the watch (₹ 1,00,000). Therefore, Raghav does not have the right to sell the watch under these circumstances, and selling the watch would be unlawful.
- (ii) According to section 55 of the Indian Contract Act, 1872, when a party to a contract promises to do certain thing at or before the specified time, and fails to do any such thing at or before the specified time, the contract, or so much of it as has not been performed, becomes voidable at the option of the promisee, if the intention of the parties was that time should be of essence of the contract.

Effect of acceptance of performance at time other than agreed upon -

If, in case of a contract voidable on account of the promisor's failure to perform his promise at the time agreed, the promisee accepts performance of such promise at any time other than agreed, the promisee cannot claim compensation for any loss occasioned by the non-performance of the promise at the time agreed, unless, at the time of acceptance, he gives notice to the promisor of his intention to do so.

In the instant case,

- (A) Woollen Garments Limited is legally entitled to reject the goods due to the failure to meet the delivery deadline, as time was a crucial term of the contract.
 - (B) The company cannot accept the total supply on the request of woman group but only when the company i.e. buyer elects to do so. In that case, the company cannot claim compensation for any loss occasioned by the non-performance of the promise (i.e. delay in supply) at the time agreed.
- (b) (i) According to Section 138 of the Negotiable Instruments Act, 1881, where any cheque drawn by a person on an account maintained by him with a banker—
- for payment of any amount of money
 - to another person from that account
 - for the discharge, in whole or in part, of any debt or other liability, [A cheque given as gift or donation, or as a security or in discharge of a mere moral obligation, or for an illegal consideration, would be outside the purview of this section]
 - is returned by the bank unpaid,
 - either because of the—
 - o amount of money standing to the credit of that account is insufficient to honor the cheque, or
 - o that it exceeds the amount arranged to be paid from that account by an agreement made with that bank,

such person shall be deemed to have committed an offence and shall, be punished with imprisonment for a term which may extend to two years, or with fine which may extend to twice the amount of the cheque, or with both.

When section 138 shall not apply: unless the below given conditions are complied with—

- (a) **Cheque presented within validity period:** The cheque has been presented to the bank within a period of three months from the date on which it is drawn or within the period of its

validity, whichever is earlier.

- (b) **Demand for the payment through the notice:** the payee or the holder in due course of the cheque, as the case may be, makes a demand for the payment of the said amount of money by giving a notice, in writing, to the drawer of the cheque, within 30 days of the receipt of information by him from the bank regarding the return of the cheque as unpaid, and
 - (c) **Failure of drawer to make payment:** the drawer of such cheque fails to make the payment of the said amount of money to the payee or, as the case may be, to the holder in due course of the cheque, within fifteen days of the receipt of the said notice.
- (ii) (A) According to the definition of cheque under section 6 of the Negotiable Instruments Act, 1881, a cheque is a species of bill of exchange. Thus, it should fulfil all the essential characteristics of a bill of exchange.

The following two features distinguish a cheque from bill

- (a) Must be drawn on a specified banker
- (b) It must be payable on demand

Thus, all cheques are bills while all bills are not cheques.

- (B) **Ambiguous Instrument:** Section 17 of the Act, reads as: "Where an instrument may be construed either as a promissory note or bill of exchange, the holder may at his election treat it as either, and the instrument shall be thenceforward treated accordingly."

Thus, an instrument which is vague and cannot be clearly identified either as a bill of exchange, or as a promissory note, is an ambiguous instrument.

- (c) The laws in the Indian legal system could be broadly classified as follows:

Criminal Law

Criminal law is concerned with laws pertaining to violations of the rule of law or public wrongs and punishment of the same. Criminal Law is governed under the Indian Penal Code, 1860, and the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973 (CrPC). The Indian Penal Code, 1860, defines the crime, its nature, and punishments whereas the Criminal Procedure Code, 1973, defines exhaustive procedure for executing the punishments of the crimes.

Murder, rape, theft, fraud, cheating and assault are some examples of criminal offences under the law.

Civil Law

Matters of disputes between individuals or organisations are dealt with under Civil Law. Civil courts enforce the violation of certain rights and

obligations through the institution of a civil suit. Civil law primarily focuses on dispute resolution rather than punishment. The act of process and the administration of civil law are governed by the Code of Civil Procedure, 1908 (CPC). Civil law can be further classified into Law of Contract, Family Law, Property Law, and Law of Tort.

Some examples of civil offences are breach of contract, non-delivery of goods, non-payment of dues to lender or seller defamation, breach of contract, and disputes between landlord and tenant.

Common Law

A judicial precedent or a case law is common law. A judgment delivered by the Supreme Court will be binding upon the courts within the territory of India under Article 141 of the Indian Constitution. The doctrine of *Stare Decisis* is the principle supporting common law. It is a Latin phrase that means “to stand by that which is decided.” The doctrine of *Stare Decisis* reinforces the obligation of courts to follow the same principle or judgement established by previous decisions while ruling a case where the facts are similar or “on all four legs” with the earlier decision.

Principles of Natural Justice

Natural justice, often known as *Jus Natural* deals with certain fundamental principles of justice going beyond written law. *Nemo judex in causa sua* (Literally meaning “No one should be made a judge in his own cause, and it’s a Rule against Prejudice), *audi alteram partem* (Literally meaning “hear the other party or give the other party a fair hearing), and reasoned decision are the rules of Natural Justice. A judgement can override or alter a common law, but it cannot override or change the statute.

5. (a) (i) As per the provisions of section 24 of the Sale of Goods Act, 1930, when goods are delivered to the buyer on approval or “on sale or return” or other similar terms, the property therein passes to the buyer when he does something to the good which is equivalent to accepting the goods e.g. he pledges or sells the goods.

Referring to the above provisions, we can analyse the situation given in the question.

Since, Mangesh, who had taken delivery of the camera on Sale or Return basis and delivers the same to Rahul on sale for cash only or return, has attracted the third condition that he has done something to the good which is equivalent to accepting the goods e.g. he pledges or sells the goods. Therefore, the property therein (Camera) passes to Mangesh.

Now, Rahul delivered it to Vishal on a sale or return without paying cash to Mangesh.

Since Rahul did not pay cash and had not exercised the option to purchase, ownership of the camera did not pass to Rahul.

Therefore, Rahul is not liable to pay the price of the camera either.

Since Vishal did not accept the goods and the camera was lost by theft (despite his due care), Vishal is not liable for the price of the camera as ownership had not passed to him.

Therefore, Mangesh is solely liable to pay the price of the camera to Ashok, as he accepted the camera on a "sale or return" basis and did not return it within a reasonable time.

- (ii) According to Section 51 of the Sale of Goods Act, 1930, when the carrier wrongfully refuses to deliver the goods to buyer, the right of stoppage in transit is lost and transit comes to an end.

On the other hand, according to section 57 of the Sale of Goods Act, 1930, where buyer suffers losses due to non-delivery, he can sue seller for damages on account of non-delivery.

In the instant case, the transit came to an end when Chetan wrongfully refused to deliver the goods to Baburam, and he suffered a huge loss due to non-delivery. Hence, Ansari cannot exercise the right of stoppage of goods in transit as the transit has already come to an end.

Baburam can claim loss suffered due to non-delivery from Ansari.

- (b) **DISSOLUTION BY THE COURT (SECTION 44 of the Indian Partnership Act, 1932):** 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.
- (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 due by the partner, 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.

(c) (i) **Suit by bailor & bailee against wrong doers [Section 180 of the Indian Contract Act, 1872]:** If a third person wrongfully deprives the bailee of the use or possession of the goods bailed, or does them any injury, the bailee is entitled to use such remedies as the owner might have used in the like case if no bailment had been made; and either the bailor or the bailee may bring a suit against a third person for such deprivation or injury.

(ii) **Duties of the Pawnee**

Pawnee has the following duties:

- a. Duty to take reasonable care of the pledged goods.
- b. Duty not to make unauthorized use of pledged goods.
- c. Duty to return the goods when the debt has been repaid or the promise has been performed.
- d. Duty not to mix his own goods with goods pledged.
- e. Duty not to do any act which is inconsistent with the terms of the pledge.
- f. Duty to return accretion to the goods, if any.

6. (a) (i) Importance of Delivery in Negotiation [Section 46 of the Negotiable Instruments Act, 1881]

Delivery of an instrument is essential whether the instrument is payable to bearer or order for effecting the negotiation. The delivery must be voluntary, and the object of delivery should be to pass the property in the instrument to the person to whom it is delivered. The delivery can be, actual or constructive. Actual delivery takes place when the instrument changes hand physically. Constructive delivery takes place when the instrument is delivered to the agent, clerk or servant of the indorsee on his behalf or when the indorser, after indorsement, holds the instrument as an agent of the indorsee.

Section 46 also lays down that when an instrument is conditionally or for a special purpose only, the property in it does not pass to the transferee, even though it is indorsed to him, unless the instrument is negotiated to a holder in due course.

The contract on a negotiable instrument until delivery remains incomplete and revocable. Delivery is essential not only at the time of negotiation but also at the time of making or drawing of negotiable instrument. The rights in the instrument are not transferred to the indorsee unless after the indorsement the same has been delivered. If a person makes the indorsement of instrument but before the same could be delivered to the indorsee, the indorser dies, the legal representatives of the deceased person cannot negotiate the same by mere delivery thereof. (Section 57).

In the instant case, Ankit the only son of Gagan delivered the bill to Akash on the next day as intended by his deceased father (Gagan) which is not valid.

Hence, Akash cannot enforce the payment of the bill against Baban or the previous parties.

(ii) As per section 11 of the Negotiable Instruments Act, 1881, a promissory note, bill of exchange or cheque drawn or made in India and made payable in, or drawn upon any person resident in India shall be deemed to be an inland instrument.

In the instant case, the bill of exchange was:

- Drawn in India (since it was drawn by Reliable Limited, an Indian company).
- Accepted in India (Manish, a resident of Mumbai, accepted the bill in Mumbai).
- Payable outside India, in Los Angeles, USA.

The bill of exchange in this case is an inland instrument because it was drawn in India and accepted by a person resident in India, even though it is payable outside India (Los Angeles, USA).

- (b) (i) Agent cannot personally enforce, nor be bound by, contracts on behalf of principal.

EXCEPTIONS: In the following exceptional cases, the agent is presumed to have agreed to be personally bound:

- (1) **Where the contract is made by an agent for the sale or purchase of goods for a merchant resident abroad/foreign principal:** – When an agent has entered into a contract for the sale or purchase of goods on behalf of a principal resident abroad, the presumption is that the agent undertakes to be personally liable for the performances of such contract.
 - (2) **Where the agent does not disclose the name of his principal or undisclosed principal;** (Principal unnamed): when the agent does not disclose the name of the principal then there arises a presumption that he himself undertakes to be personally liable.
 - (3) **Non-existent or incompetent principal:** Where the principal, though disclosed, cannot be sued, the agent is presumed to be personally liable.
 - (4) **Pretended agent** – if the agent pretends but is not an actual agent, and the principal does not rectify the act but disowns it, the pretended agent will be himself liable.
 - (5) **When agent exceeds authority-** When the agent exceeds his authority, misleads the third person in believing that the agent he has the requisite authority in doing the act, then the agent can be made liable personally for the breach of warranty of authority.
- (ii) **Rights of Indemnity-holder when sued (Section 125 of the Indian Contract Act, 1872):** The promisee in a contract of indemnity, acting within the scope of his authority, is entitled to recover from the promisor/indemnifier—
- (a) all damages which he may be compelled to pay in any suit
 - (b) all costs which he may have been compelled to pay in bringing/ defending the suit and
 - (c) all sums which he may have paid under the terms of any compromise of suit.

OR

- (b) (i) **Distinction between a Contract of Indemnity and a Contract of Guarantee**

Point of distinction	Contract of Indemnity	Contract of Guarantee
Number of party/ parties to the contract	There are only two parties namely the indemnifier [promisor] and the indemnified [promisee]	There are three parties- creditor, principal debtor and surety.

Nature of liability	The liability of the indemnifier is primary and unconditional.	The liability of the surety is secondary and conditional as the primary liability is that of the principal debtor.
Time of liability	The liability of the indemnifier arises only on the happening of a contingency.	The liability arises only on the non-performance of an existing promise or non-payment of an existing debt.
Time to Act	The indemnifier need not act at the request of indemnity holder.	The surety acts at the request of principal debtor.
Right to sue third party	Indemnifier cannot sue a third party for loss in his own name as there is no privity of contract. Such a right would arise only if there is an assignment in his favour.	Surety can proceed against principal debtor in his own right because he gets all the right of a creditor after discharging the debts.
Purpose	Reimbursement of loss	For the security of the creditor
Competency to contract	All parties must be competent to contract.	In the case of a contract of guarantee, where a minor is a principal debtor, the contract is still valid.

(ii) Whether the threat to commit suicide is coercion?

Suicide though forbidden by Indian Penal Code is not punishable, as a dead man cannot be punished. But Section 15 of the Indian Contract Act, 1872 declares that committing or threatening to commit any act forbidden by Indian Penal Code is coercion. Hence, a threat to commit suicide will be regarded as coercion.

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

(A) Bid with notification: 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.

Bid by seller without notification: 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.

- (B) **Bidder to retract from his bid:** The sale is complete when the auctioneer announces its completion by the fall of hammer or in any other customary manner. Until such announcement is made, any bidder may retract from his bid.
- (C) **Effect of pretending bidding:** If the seller makes use of pretended bidding to raise the price, the sale is voidable at the option of the buyer.
- (ii) **Delivery of wrong quantity [Section 37 of the Sale of Goods Act, 1930]:** Where the seller delivers to the buyer a quantity of goods less than he contracted to sell, the buyer may reject them, but if the buyer accepts the goods so delivered he shall pay for them at the contract rate. [Sub-section (1)]

Where the seller delivers to the buyer a quantity of goods larger than he contracted to sell, the buyer may accept the goods included in the contract and reject the rest, or he may reject the whole. If the buyer accepts the whole of the goods so delivered, he shall pay for them at the contract rate. [Sub-section (2)]

Where the seller delivers to the buyer the goods he contracted to sell mixed with goods of a different description not included in the contract, the buyer may accept the goods which are in accordance with the contract and reject, or may reject the whole. [Sub-section (3)]

The provisions of this section are subject to any usage of trade, special agreement or course of dealing between the parties. [Sub-section (4)]