

ANSWERS OF MODEL TEST PAPER 4

FOUNDATION COURSE

PAPER 2: BUSINESS LAWS

1. (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.

In the light of the above provisions, the manager must return the smart watch to Rahul, since Rahul is entitled to retain the smart watch found against everybody except the true owner.

- (ii) The problem as asked in the question is based on Section 10 of the Indian Contract Act, 1872. This Section says that all agreements are contracts if they are made by the free consent of the parties competent to contract, for a lawful consideration and with a lawful object and are not expressly declared to be void. Further, Section 23 also states that every agreement of which the object is unlawful is void.

Accordingly, one of the essential elements of a valid contract in the light of the said provision is that the agreement entered into must not be which the law declares to be either illegal or void. An illegal agreement is an agreement expressly or impliedly prohibited by law. A void agreement is one without any legal effects.

The given instance is a case of interference with the course of justice and results as opposed to public policy. This can also be called an agreement in restraint of legal proceedings. This agreement restricts one's right to enforce his legal rights. Such an agreement has been expressly declared to be void under section 28 of the Indian Contract Act, 1872. Hence, Mr. Manoj in the given case cannot recover the amount of ₹ 10 lakh promised by Mr. Vikas because it is a void agreement and cannot be enforced by law.

- (b) (i) It was decided by the court in the case of *Gilford Motor Co. Vs. Horne*, that if the company is formed simply as a mere device to evade legal obligations, though this is only in limited and discrete circumstances, courts can pierce the corporate veil. In other words, if the company is a mere sham or cloak, the separate legal entity can be disregarded.

On considering the decision taken in *Gilford Motor Co. Vs. Horne* and facts of the problem given, it is very much clear that Nine Stars

Timbers Private Limited was formed just to evade legal obligations of the agreement between Mr. Samyak and Moonlight Timber Private Limited. Hence, Nine Stars Timbers Private Limited is just a sham or cloak and the separate legal entity between Mr. Samyak and Nine Stars Timbers Private Limited should be disregarded.

- (ii) According to the provisions of Section 2(45) of Companies Act, 2013, Government Company means any company in which not less than 51% of the paid-up share capital is held by-
 - (i) the Central Government, or
 - (ii) by any State Government or Governments, or
 - (iii) partly by the Central Government and partly by one or more State Governments, and the section includes a company which is a subsidiary company of such a Government company.

According to Section 2(87), “subsidiary company” in relation to any other company (that is to say the holding company), means a company in which the holding exercises or controls more than one-half of the total voting power either at its own or together with one or more of its subsidiary companies.

By virtue of provisions of Section 2(87) of Companies Act, 2013, Rama Auto Private Limited is a subsidiary company of Pacific Motors Limited because Pacific Motors Limited is holding more than one-half of the total voting power in Rama Auto Private Limited. Further as per Section 2(45), a subsidiary company of Government Company is also termed as Government Company. Hence, Rama Auto Private Limited, being a subsidiary of Pacific Motors Limited will also be considered as Government Company.

(c) (i) **Revocation of continuing guarantee (Section 38 of the Indian Partnership Act, 1932)**

According to section 38, a continuing guarantee given to a firm or to third party in respect of the transaction of a firm is, in the absence of an agreement to the contrary, revoked as to future transactions from the date of any change in the constitution of the firm. Such change may occur by the death, or retirement of a partner, or by introduction of a new partner.

(ii) **Effects of insolvency of a partner (Section 34 of the Indian Partnership Act, 1932):**

- (i) The insolvent partner cannot be continued as a partner.
- (ii) He will be ceased to be a partner from the very date on which the order of adjudication is made.
- (iii) The estate of the insolvent partner is not liable for the acts of the firm done after the date of order of adjudication.

- (iv) The firm is also not liable for any act of the insolvent partner after the date of the order of adjudication,
- (v) Ordinarily, the insolvency of a partner results in dissolution of a firm; but the partners are competent to agree among themselves that the adjudication of a partner as an insolvent will not give rise to dissolution of the firm.

2. (a) (i) As per the provisions of Sub-Section (2) of Section 17 of the Sale of Goods Act, 1930, in a contract of sale by sample, there is an implied condition that:

- (a) the bulk shall correspond with the sample in quality;
- (b) the buyer shall have a reasonable opportunity of comparing the bulk with the sample.

In the instant case, in the light of the provisions of Sub-Clause (b) of Sub-Section (2) of Section 17 of the Act, Mrs. Seema will not be successful as she casually examined the sample of rice (which exactly corresponded to the entire lot) without noticing the fact that even though the sample was that of Basmati Rice but it contained a mix of long and short grains.

(ii) **Sale by Sample (Section 17 of the Sale of Goods Act, 1930):** As per the provisions of Sub-Section (1) of section 17 of the Sale of Goods Act, 1930, a contract of sale is a contract for sale by sample where there is a term in the contract, express or implied, to that effect.

As per the provisions of Sub-Section (2) of section 17 of the Sale of Goods Act, 1930, in a contract of sale by sample, there is an implied condition that:

- (a) that the bulk shall correspond with the sample in quality;
- (b) that the buyer shall have a reasonable opportunity of comparing the bulk with the sample.
- (c) that the goods shall be free from any defect, rendering them unmerchantable, which would not be apparent on reasonable examination of the sample.

(iii) In case Mrs. Seema specified her exact requirement as to length of rice, then there is an implied condition that the goods shall correspond with the description. If it is not so, the seller will be held liable.

(b) (i) **Listed company:** As per the definition given in the section 2(52) of the Companies Act, 2013, it is a company which has any of its securities listed on any recognised stock exchange.

Provided that such class of companies, which have listed or intend to list such class of securities, as may be prescribed in consultation with the Securities and Exchange Board, shall not be considered as listed companies.

Whereas the word securities as per section 2(81) of the Companies Act, 2013 has been assigned the same meaning as defined in clause (h) of section 2 of the Securities Contracts (Regulation) Act, 1956.

Unlisted company means company other than listed company.

(ii) In line with the Companies Act, 2013, following are the classification of the Companies on the basis of control:

(a) Holding and subsidiary companies: ‘Holding and subsidiary’ companies are relative terms.

A company is a holding company in relation to one or more other companies, means a company of which such companies are subsidiary companies. [Section 2(46)]

For the purposes of this clause, the expression “company” includes any body corporate.

Whereas section 2(87) defines “subsidiary company” in relation to any other company (that is to say the holding company), means a company in which the holding company—

- (i) controls the composition of the Board of Directors; or
- (ii) exercises or controls more than one-half of the total voting power either at its own or together with one or more of its subsidiary companies:

Provided that such class or classes of holding companies as may be prescribed shall not have layers of subsidiaries beyond such numbers as may be prescribed.

(b) Associate company [Section 2(6)]: In relation to another company, means a company in which that other company has a significant influence, but which is not a subsidiary company of the company having such influence and includes a joint venture company.

Explanation. — For the purpose of this clause —

- (i) the expression “significant influence” means control of at least twenty per cent of total voting power, or control of or participation in business decisions under an agreement;
- (ii) the expression “joint venture” means a joint arrangement whereby the parties that have joint control of the arrangement have rights to the net assets of the arrangement.

(c) (i) Partners (Section 5 of Limited Liability Partnership Act, 2008): Any individual or body corporate may be a partner in a LLP.

However, an individual shall not be capable of becoming a partner of a LLP, if—

- (a) he has been found to be of unsound mind by a Court of competent jurisdiction and the finding is in force;
- (b) he is an undischarged insolvent; or
- (c) he has applied to be adjudicated as an insolvent and his application is pending.

(ii) 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 do and suffer.

3. (a) (i) According to Section 4 of the Indian Partnership Act, 1932, "Partnership" is the relation between persons who have agreed to share the profits of a business carried on by all or any of them acting for all. Therefore, for determining the existence of partnership, it must be proved that:

1. There must be an agreement between all the persons concerned;
2. The agreement must be to carry on some business;
3. The agreement must be to share the profits of a business and
4. The business was carried on by all or any of them acting for all.

On the basis of above provisions and facts provided in the question, Mr. Ram and Mr. Raheem cannot be said under partnership as they are teachers in a school and just purchased a flat jointly.

By merely giving the flat on rent, they are not doing business. They are just earning the income from the property under their co-ownership. Hence, there is no partnership between them. Therefore, Mr. Ram is liable to pay his share only i.e. ₹ 1500. Mr. John has to claim the rest of ₹ 1500 from Mr. Raheem.

(ii) Liability of Firm for Misapplication by Partners (Section 27 of Indian Partnership Act, 1932):

The two clauses of Section 27 bring out an important point of distinction between the two categories of cases of misapplication of money by partners.

Clause (a) covers the case where a partner acts within his authority and due to his authority as a partner, he receives money or property belonging to a third party and misapplies that money or property. For this provision to be attracted, it is not necessary that the money should have actually come into the custody of the firm.

On the other hand, the provision of clause (b) would be attracted when such money or property has come into the custody of the firm, and it is misapplied by any of the partners.

The firm would be liable in both cases.

(b) (i) Fate of the suit and the liability of Mr. R towards the company:

Doctrine of the Indoor Management

According to the Doctrine of Indoor Management, the outsiders are not deemed to have notice of the internal affairs of the company. They are entitled to assume that the acts of the directors or other officers of the company are validly performed, if they are within the scope of their apparent authority. So long as an act is valid under the articles, if done in a particular manner, an outsider dealing with the company is entitled to assume that it has been done in the manner required. This is the indoor management rule, that the company's indoor affairs are the company's problem. This rule has been laid down in the landmark case-the *Royal British Bank vs. Turquand*. (Known as "Turquand Rule")

In the instant case, Mr. R is not liable to pay the amount of ₹ 1,50,000 to MNO Private Limited as he had genuine reasons to trust Mr. C, an employee of the company who had issued him a signed and sealed receipt.

(ii) Liability of Mr. R in case no receipt is issued by Mr. C:

Exceptions to doctrine of indoor management: Suspicion of irregularity is an exception to the doctrine of indoor management. The doctrine of indoor management in no way rewards those who behave negligently. It is the duty of the outsider to make the necessary enquiry, if the transaction is not in the ordinary course of business.

If a receipt under the company seal was not issued by Mr. C after receiving payment, Mr. R is liable to pay the said amount as this will be deemed to be a negligence on the part of Mr. R and it is his duty to make the necessary enquiry to check that whether Mr. C is eligible to take the payment or not.

(c) Consideration [Section 2(d) of the Indian Contract Act, 1872]: When at the desire of the promisor, the promisee or any other person has done or abstained from doing, or does or abstains from doing or promises to do or abstain from doing something, such an act or abstinence or promise is called consideration for the promise.

Legal Rules Regarding Consideration

- (i) **Consideration must move at the desire of the promisor:** Consideration must be offered by the promisee or the third party at the desire or request of the promisor. This implies “return” element of consideration.
 - (ii) **Consideration may move from promisee or any other person:** In India, consideration may proceed from the promisee or any other person who is not a party to the contract. In other words, there can be a stranger to a consideration but not stranger to a contract.
 - (iii) **Executed and executory consideration:** A consideration which consists in the performance of an act is said to be executed. When it consists in a promise, it is said to be executory. The promise by one party may be the consideration for an act by some other party, and vice versa.
 - (iv) **Consideration may be past, present or future:** It is a general principle that consideration is given and accepted in exchange for the promise. The consideration, if past, may be the motive but cannot be the real consideration of a subsequent promise. But in the event of the services being rendered in the past at the request or the desire of the promisor, the subsequent promise is regarded as an admission that the past consideration was not gratuitous.
 - (v) **Consideration need not be adequate:** Consideration need not be of any particular value. It need not be approximately of equal value with the promise for which it is exchanged but it must be something which the law would regard as having some value.
 - (vi) **Performance of what one is legally bound to perform:** The performance of an act by a person who is legally bound to perform the same cannot be consideration for a contract. Hence, a promise to pay money to a witness is void, for it is without consideration. Hence, such a contract is void for want of consideration.
 - (vii) **Consideration must be real and not illusory:** Consideration must be real and must not be illusory. It must be something to which the law attaches some value. If it is legally or physically impossible it is not considered valid consideration.
 - (viii) **Consideration must not be unlawful, immoral, or opposed to public policy:** Only presence of consideration is not sufficient it must be lawful. Anything which is immoral or opposed to public policy also cannot be valued as valid consideration.
4. (a) (i) According to section 16 of the Indian Contract Act, 1872, a contract is said to be induced by ‘undue influence’ where the relations subsisting between the parties are such that one of the parties is in a position to dominate the will of the other and he uses that position to obtain an unfair advantage over the other.

When consent to an agreement is caused by undue influence, the contract is voidable at the option of the party, whose consent was so caused.

Hence, the contract between Mr. A and Mr. B is voidable at the option of Mr. B as it was induced by undue influence by Mr. A and therefore Mr. B can sue Mr. A.

- (ii) The parties to a contract must either perform, or offer to perform, their respective promises, unless such performance is dispensed with or excused under the provisions of this Act, or of any other law.

Promises to bind the representatives of the promisors in case of the death of such promisors before performance, unless a contrary intention appears from the contract. (Section 37 of the Indian Contract Act, 1872).

As per the provisions of Section 40 of the Indian Contract Act, 1872, if it appears from the nature of the case that it was the intention of the parties to any contract that any promise contained in it should be performed by the promisor himself, such promise must be performed by the promisor. In other cases, the promisor or his representative may employ a competent person to perform it.

In terms of the provisions of Section 40 stated above, in case where Mr. S has to paint a family picture for Mr. M, Mr. M cannot ask the legal representative of Mr. S to complete the painting work on Mr. S's death, since painting involves the use of personal skill.

In terms of the provisions of Section 37 stated above, in case where Mr. S had promised to deliver some photographs to Mr. M, the legal representatives of Mr. S shall be bound to deliver the photographs in this situation.

- (b) As per section 117 of the Negotiable Instruments Act, 1881, the compensation payable in case of dishonour of promissory note, bill of exchange or cheque, by any party liable to the holder or any endorsee, shall be determined by the following rules:
 - (i) the holder is entitled to the amount due upon the instrument, together with the expenses properly incurred in presenting, noting and protesting it;
 - (ii) when the person charged resides at a place different from that at which the instrument was payable, the holder is entitled to receive such sum at the current rate of exchange between the two places;
 - (iii) an endorser who, being liable, has paid the amount due on the same is entitled to the amount so paid with interest at 18% per annum from the date of payment until tender or realisation thereof, together with all expenses caused by the dishonour and payment;
 - (iv) when the person charged and such endorser reside at different places, the endorser is entitled to receive such sum at the current rate of exchange between the two places;

- (v) the party entitled to compensation may draw a bill upon the party liable to compensate him, payable at sight or on demand, for the amount due to him, together with all expenses properly incurred by him. Such bill must be accompanied by the instrument dishonoured and the protest thereof (if any). If such bill is dishonoured, the party dishonouring the same is liable to make compensation thereof in the same manner as in the case of the original bill.
- (c) (i) **Ministry of Corporate Affairs (MCA):** MCA is an Indian Government Ministry which primarily concerned with administration of the Companies Act, 2013, the Companies Act, 1956, the Limited Liability Partnership Act, 2008, and the Insolvency and Bankruptcy Code, 2016. It is responsible mainly for the regulation of Indian enterprises in the industrial and services sector.
- The Ministry is mostly run by civil servants of the ICLS cadre. These officers are elected through the Civil Services Examination conducted by Union Public Service Commission.
- The highest post, Director General of Corporate Affairs (DGCoA), is fixed at Apex Scale for the ICLS.
- (ii) **Ministry of Home Affairs:** It is a ministry of the Government of India. As an interior ministry of India, it is mainly responsible for the maintenance of internal security and domestic policy. The Home Ministry is headed by Union Minister of Home Affairs.
5. (a) (i) By virtue of provisions of Section 64 of the Sale of Goods Act, 1930, in case of auction sale, the sale is complete when the auctioneer announces its completion by the fall of the hammer or in some other customary manner.
- In the instant case, Deepa gives the highest bid in the auction for the sale of an antic wall clock arranged by Rachit. While announcing the completion of sale by fall of hammer on the table, hammer brakes and damages the clock.
- On the basis of the above provisions, it can be concluded that the sale by auction cannot be completed until hammer comes in its normal position after falling on table. Hence, in the given problem, sale is not completed. Deepa will not be liable for loss and can avoid the contract.
- (ii) Payment of the price by the buyer is an important ingredient of a contract of sale. If the parties totally ignore the question of price while making the contract, it will not become an uncertain and invalid agreement. It will rather be a valid contract and the buyer shall pay a reasonable price. (Section 9 and section 10 of the Sale of Goods Act, 1930)
- In the given case, X and Y have entered into a contract for sale of car but they did not fix the price of the car. X refused to sell the car to Y on this ground. Y can legally demand the car from X and X can recover a reasonable price of the car from Y.

- (b) **“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.

- (c) **Essential elements of a contract of bailment:** Section 148 of the Indian Contract Act, 1872 defines the term ‘Bailment’. A ‘bailment’ is the delivery of goods by one person to another for some purpose upon a contract that they shall, when the purpose is accomplished, be returned or otherwise disposed of according to the directions of the person delivering them. The essential elements of the contract of the bailment are:

- (i) *Contract:* Bailment is based upon a contract. The contract may be express or implied. No consideration is necessary to create a valid contract of bailment.
- (ii) *Delivery of goods:* It involves the delivery of goods from one person to another for some purposes. Bailment is only for moveable goods and never for immovable goods or money.
- (iii) *Purpose:* The goods are delivered for some purpose. The purpose may be express or implied.
- (iv) *Possession:* In bailment, possession of goods changes. Change of possession can happen by physical delivery or by any action which has the effect of placing the goods in the possession of bailee. The change of possession does not lead to change of ownership. In bailment, bailor continues to be the owner of goods.

(v) *Return of goods*: Bailee is obliged to return the goods physically to the bailor. The goods should be returned in the same form as given or may be altered as per bailor's direction.

6. (a) As per the facts stated in the question, Shankar (drawer) after having issued the cheque, informs Surendar (drawee) not to present the cheque for payment and also gave a stop payment request to the bank in respect of the cheque issued to Surendar.

Section 138 of the Negotiable Instruments Act, 1881, is a penal provision in the sense that once a cheque is drawn on an account maintained by the drawer with his banker for payment of any amount of money to another person out of that account for the discharge in whole or in part of any debt or liability, is informed by the bank unpaid either because of insufficiency of funds to honour the cheques or the amount exceeding the arrangement made with the bank, such a person shall be deemed to have committed an offence.

Once a cheque is issued by the drawer, a presumption under Section 139 of the Negotiable Instruments Act, 1881 follows and merely because the drawer issues a notice thereafter to the drawee or to the bank for stoppage of payment, it will not preclude an action under Section 138.

Also, Section 140 of the Negotiable Instruments Act, 1881, specifies absolute liability of the drawer of the cheque for commission of an offence under section 138 of the Act. Section 140 states that it shall not be a defence in a prosecution for an offence under section 138 that the drawer had no reason to believe when he issued the cheque that the cheque may be dishonoured on presentment for the reasons stated in that section.

Accordingly, the act of Shankar, i.e., his request to stop payment constitutes an offence under the provisions of the Negotiable Instruments Act, 1881.

- (b) Section 124 of the Indian Contract Act, 1872 states that "A contract by which one party promises to save the other from loss caused to him by the conduct of the promisor himself, or the conduct of any person", is called a "contract of indemnity".

Section 126 of the Indian Contract Act, 1872 states that "A contract to perform the promise made or discharge liability incurred by a third person in case of his default" is called a "contract of guarantee".

The conditions under which the guarantee is invalid, or void is provided in section 142, 143 and 144 of the Indian Contract Act, 1872. These include:

- (i) Guarantee obtained by means of misrepresentation.
- (ii) Guarantee obtained by means of keeping silence as to material circumstances.

- (iii) When a contract of guarantee is entered into on the condition that the creditor shall not act upon it until another person has joined in it as co-surety and that other party fails to join as such.
- (c) (i) **Sale of unascertained goods and Appropriation (Section 23 of the Sale of Goods Act, 1930):** Appropriation of goods involves selection of goods with the intention of using them in performance of the contract and with the mutual consent of the seller and the buyer.
- The essentials are:
- (a) There is a contract for the sale of unascertained or future goods.
 - (b) The goods should conform to the description and quality stated in the contract.
 - (c) The goods must be in a deliverable state.
 - (d) The goods must be unconditionally appropriated to the contract either by delivery to the buyer or his agent or the carrier.
 - (e) The appropriation must be made by:
 - (i) the seller with the assent of the buyer; or
 - (ii) the buyer with the assent of the seller.
 - (f) The assent may be express or implied.
 - (g) The assent may be given either before or after appropriation.
- (ii) (A) **Goods perishing before making of Contract (Section 7 of the Sale of Goods Act, 1930):** In accordance with the provisions of the Sale of Goods Act, 1930 as contained in Section 7, a contract for the sale of specific goods is void, if at the time when the contract was made; the goods without the knowledge of the seller, perished or become so damaged as no longer to answer to their description in the contract, then the contract is void ab initio.
- (B) **Goods perishing before sale but after agreement to sell (Section 8 of the Sale of Goods Act, 1930):** Where there is an agreement to sell specific goods, and subsequently the goods without any fault on the part of the seller or buyer perish or become so damaged as no longer to answer to their description in the agreement before the risk passes to the buyer, the agreement is thereby avoided or becomes void.