

**MOCK TEST PAPER**  
**FOUNDATION COURSE**  
**PAPER 2A: BUSINESS LAWS**

**ANSWERS**

1. (a) According to Section 11 of the Indian Contract Act, 1872, every person is competent to contract who is of the age of majority according to the law to which he is subject, and who is of sound mind and is not disqualified from contracting by any law to which he is subject.

A person who has completed the age of 18 years is a major and otherwise he will be treated as minor. Thus, Ishaan who is a minor is incompetent to contract and any agreement with him is void [*Mohori Bibi Vs Dharmo Das Ghose 1903*].

Section 68 of the Indian Contract Act, 1872 however, prescribes the liability of a minor for the supply of the things which are the necessities of life to him. It says that though minor is not personally liable to pay the price of necessities supplied to him or money lent for the purpose, the supplier or lender will be entitled to claim the money/price of goods or services which are necessities suited to his condition of life provided that the minor has a property. The liability of minor is only to the extent of the minor's property. Thus, according to the above provision, Vishal will be entitled to recover the amount of loan given to Ishaan for payment of the college fees from the property of the minor.

- (b) The House of Lords in *Salomon Vs. Salomon & Co. Ltd.* laid down that a company is a 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 of the 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 means of avoiding tax and the companies were nothing more than the façade of the assessee himself. Therefore, the whole idea of Mr. Krishna was simply to split his income into three parts with a view to evade tax. No other business was done by 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 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.

- (c) The differences between the sale and agreement to sell is as follows:

Basis of difference	Sale	Agreement to sell
Transfer of property	The property in the goods passes to the buyer immediately.	Property in the goods passes to the buyer on future date or on fulfilment of some condition.

<b>Nature of contract</b>	It is an executed contract. i.e. contract for which consideration has been paid.	It is an executory contract. i.e. contract for which consideration is to be paid at a future date.
<b>Remedies for breach</b>	The seller can sue the buyer for the price of the goods because of the passing of the property therein to the buyer.	The aggrieved party can sue for damages only and not for the price, unless the price was payable at a stated date.
<b>Liability of parties</b>	A subsequent loss or destruction of the goods is the liability of the buyer.	Such loss or destruction is the liability of the seller.
<b>Burden of risk</b>	Risk of loss is that of buyer since risk follows ownership.	Risk of loss is that of seller.
<b>Nature of rights</b>	Creates Jus in rem	Creates Jus in personam
<b>Right of resale</b>	The seller cannot resell the goods.	The seller may sell the goods since ownership is with the seller.

## 2. (a) Discharge of a Contract:

A Contract may be discharged either by an act of parties or by an operation of law which may be enumerated as follows:

- (1) *Discharge by performance* which may be actual performance or attempted performance. Actual performance is said to have taken place, when each of the parties has done what he had agreed to do under the agreement. When the promisor offers to perform his obligation, but the promisee refuses to accept the performance, it amounts to attempted performance or tender.
- (2) *Discharge by mutual agreement*: Section 62 of the Indian Contract Act, 1872 provides that if the parties to a contract agree to substitute a new contract for it or to refund or remit or alter it, the original contract need not to be performed. Novation, Rescission, Alteration and Remission are also the same ground of this nature.
- (3) *Discharge by impossibility of performance*: The impossibility may exist from its initiation. Alternatively, it may be supervening impossibility which may take place owing to (a) unforeseen change in law (b) The destruction of subject matter (c) The non-existence or non-occurrence of particular state of things (d) the declaration of war (Section 56).
- (4) *Discharge by lapse of time*: A contract should be performed within a specific period as prescribed in the Law of Limitation Act., 1963. If it is not performed the party is deprived of remedy at law.
- (5) *Discharge by operation of law*: It may occur by death of the promisor, by insolvency etc.
- (6) *Discharge by breach of contract*: Breach of contract may be actual breach of contract or anticipatory breach of contract. If one party defaults in performing his part of the contract on the due date, he is said to have committed breach thereof. When on the other hand, a person repudiates a contract before the stipulated time for its performance has arrived, he is deemed to have committed anticipatory breach. If one of the parties to a contract breaks the promise the party injured thereby, has not only a right of action for damages but he is also discharged from performing his part of the contract (Section 64).
- (7) A promisee may dispense with or remit, wholly or in part, the performance of the promise made to him, or may extend the time for such performance or may accept instead of it any satisfaction he thinks fit. In other words, a contract may be discharged by remission. (Section 63).

(8) When a promisee neglects or refuses to afford the promisor reasonable facilities for the performance of the promise, the promisor is excused by such neglect or refusal (Section 67).

**(b) Meaning:** 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.

**Steps to incorporate LLP:**

(a) Name reservation

- The first step to incorporate Limited Liability Partnership (LLP) is reservation of name of LLP.
- Applicant has to file e- Form 1, for ascertaining availability and reservation of the name of a LLP business.

(b) Incorporate LLP

- After reserving a name, user has to file e- Form 2 for incorporating a new Limited Liability Partnership (LLP).
- e-Form 2 contains the details of LLP proposed to be incorporated, partners'/ designated partners' details and consent of the partners/ designated partners to act as partners/ designated partners.

(c) LLP Agreement

- Execution of LLP Agreement is mandatory as per Section 23 of the Act.
- LLP Agreement is required to be filed with the registrar in e- Form 3 within 30 days of incorporation of LLP.

3. (a) Section 29 of the Indian Partnership Act, 1932 provides that a share in a partnership is transferable like any other property, but as the partnership relationship is based on mutual confidence, the assignee of a partner's interest by sale, mortgage or otherwise cannot enjoy the same rights and privileges as the original partner.

The rights of such a transferee are as follows:

(1) During the continuance of partnership, such transferee is not entitled

- (a) to interfere with the conduct of the business,
- (b) to require accounts, or
- (c) to inspect books of the firm.

He is only entitled to receive the share of the profits of the transferring partner and he is bound to accept the profits as agreed to by the partners, i.e., he cannot challenge the accounts.

(2) On the dissolution of the firm or on the retirement of the transferring partner, the transferee will be entitled, against the remaining partners:

- (a) to receive the share of the assets of the firm to which the transferring partner was entitled, and
- (b) for the purpose of ascertaining the share,

he is entitled to an account as from the date of the dissolution.

By virtue of Section 31, no person can be introduced as a partner in a firm without the consent of all the partners. A partner cannot by transferring his own interest, make anybody else a partner in his place, unless the other partners agree to accept that person as a partner. At the

same time, a partner is not debarred from transferring his interest. A partner's interest in the partnership can be regarded as an existing interest and tangible property which can be assigned.

- (b) **BREACH OF CONTRACT- DAMAGES:** Section 73 of the Indian Contract Act, 1872 lays down 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.

The leading case on this point is "*Hadley v. Baxendale*" in which it was decided by the Court that the special circumstances under which the contract was actually made were communicated by the plaintiff to the defendant, and thus known to both the parties to the contract, the damages resulting from the breach of such contract which they would reasonably contemplate, would be the amount of injury which would ordinarily follow from the breach of contract under these special circumstances so known and communicated.

The problem asked in this question is based on the provisions of Section 73 of the Indian Contract Act, 1872. In the instant case 'X' had intimated to 'Z' that he was purchasing water bottles from him for the purpose of performing his contract with 'Y'. Thus, 'Z' had the knowledge of the special circumstances. Therefore, 'X' is entitled to claim from 'Z' ₹ 500/- at the rate of 0.50 paise i.e. 1000 water bottles x 0.50 paise (difference between the procuring price of water bottles and contracted selling price to 'Y') being the amount of profit 'X' would have made by the performance of his contract with 'Y'.

If 'X' had not informed 'Z' of 'Y's contract, then the amount of damages would have been the difference between the contract price and the market price on the day of default. In other words, the amount of damages would be ₹ 750/- (i.e. 1000 water bottles x 0.75 paise).

4. (a) The following are implied conditions in a contract of sale by sample in accordance with Section 17 of the Sale of Goods Act, 1930;
- that the bulk shall correspond with the sample in quality;
  - that the buyer shall have a reasonable opportunity of comparing the bulk with the sample.
  - that the goods shall be free from any defect, rendering them unmerchantable, which would not be apparent on a reasonable examination of the sample.

**Implied Warrants:**

- Warranty as to undisturbed possession [Section 14(b)]:* An implied warranty that the buyer shall have and enjoy quiet possession of the goods. That is to say, if the buyer having got possession of the goods, is later on disturbed in his possession, he is entitled to sue the seller for the breach of the warranty.
  - Warranty as to non-existence of encumbrances [Section 14(c)]:* An implied warranty that the goods shall be free from any charge or encumbrance in favour of any third party not declared or known to the buyer before or at the time the contract is entered into.
  - Warranty as to quality or fitness by usage of trade [Section 16(3)].* An implied warranty as to quality or fitness for a particular purpose may be annexed by the usage of trade.
  - Warranty to disclose dangerous nature of goods:* Where a person sells goods, knowing that the goods are inherently dangerous or they are likely to be dangerous to the buyer and that the buyer is ignorant of the danger, he must warn the buyer of the probable danger, otherwise he will be liable in damages.
- (b) The problem in the question is based on the 'Implied Authority' of a partner provided in Section 19 of the Indian Partnership Act, 1932. The section provides that subject to the provisions of Section 22 of the Act, 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. The authority of a partner to bind the firm conferred by this section is called his 'Implied Authority' [Sub-Section (1) of section 19]. Furthermore, every partner is in contemplation of law the general and accredited agent of the partnership and may consequently bind all the other partners by his acts in all matters which are within the scope and object of the partnership. Hence, if the partnership is of a general commercial nature, he may buy goods on account of the partnership.

Considering the above provisions and explanation, the questions as asked in the problem may be answered as under:

- (i) The firm's contention is not tenable, for the reason that the partner, in the usual course of the business on behalf of the firm has an implied authority to bind the firm. The firm is, therefore, liable for the price of the goods.
- (ii) In the second case also, the answer would be the same as above, i.e. the implied authority of the partner binds the firm.

In both the cases, however, the firm ABC can take action against A, the partner but it has to pay the price of stationery to the supplier D.

5. (a) 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 provides 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 goods of 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 assent of 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. Samuel 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.

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

In this case, the property in 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. Samuel. As regards 40 bales, the loss would be borne by Mr. Varun, since the goods have not been identified and appropriated.

- (b) **Where the bales have not been selected with the consent of buyer's representatives.**

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

- (b) **Meaning of Guarantee Company:** Section 2(21) of the Companies Act, 2013 defines a Company Limited by Guarantee as a company having the liability of its members limited by the memorandum to such amount as the members may respectively undertake to contribute to the assets of the company in the event of its being wound up. Thus, the liability of the members of a guarantee company is limited to a stipulated amount in terms of individual guarantees given by members and mentioned in the memorandum. The members cannot be called upon to contribute more than such stipulated amount for which each member has given a guarantee in the memorandum of association.

**Similarities and dis-similarities between the Guarantee Company and the Company limited by shares:** The common features between a "guarantee company" and the "company limited

share” are legal entity and limited liability. In case of a company limited by shares, the liability of its members is limited to the amount remaining unpaid on the shares held by them. Both these type of companies have to state this fact in their memorandum that the members’ liability is limited.

However, the dissimilarities between a ‘guarantee company’ and ‘company limited by shares’ is that in the former case the members will be called upon to discharge their liability only after commencement of the winding up of the company and only to the extent of amounts guaranteed by them respectively; whereas in the case of a company limited by shares, the members may be called upon to discharge their liability at any time, either during the life of the company or during the course of its winding up.

6. (a) **No consideration, no contract:** Every agreement, to be enforceable by law must be supported by valid consideration. An agreement made without any consideration is void. No consideration, no contract is a general rule. However, Section 25 of the Indian Contract Act, 1872 provides some exceptions to this rule, where an agreement without consideration will be valid and binding. These exceptions are as follows:
- (i) **Agreement made on account of natural love and affection:** Section 25 (1) provides that if an agreement is (i) in writing (ii) registered under the law and (iii) made on account of natural love and affection (iv) between the parties standing in a near relation to each other, it will be enforceable at law even if there is no consideration. Thus, where A, for natural love and affection, promises to give his son, B, ₹ 1,00,000 in writing and registers it. This is a valid contract.
  - (ii) **Compensation for past voluntary services:** Section 25(2) provides that a promise to compensate, wholly or in part, a person who has already voluntarily done something for the promisor, is enforceable. Thus, when A finds B's purse and gives it to him and B promises to give A ₹ 5,000, this is a valid contract.
  - (ii) **Promise to pay time-barred debts (Section 25 (3)):** Where there is an agreement, made in writing and signed by the debtor or by his agent, to pay wholly or in part a time barred debt, the agreement is valid and binding even though there is no consideration. If A owes B ₹ 1,00,000 but the debt is lapsed due to time-bar and A further makes a written promise to pay ₹ 50,000 on account of this debt, it constitutes a valid contract.
  - (iv) **Contract of agency (Section 185):** No consideration is necessary to create an agency.
  - (v) **Completed gift (Explanation 1 to Section 25):** A completed gift needs no consideration. Thus, if a person transfers some property by a duly written and registered deed as a gift he cannot claim back the property subsequently on the ground of lack of consideration.

**Or**

**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 which clearly 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:**

- (a) 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 has to depend upon the good sense of the other (e.g. Insurance Contract).

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

**(b) Partnership Deed**

Partnership is the result of an agreement. No particular formalities are required for an agreement of partnership. It may be in writing or formed verbally. But it is desirable to have the partnership agreement in writing to avoid future disputes. The document in writing containing the various terms and conditions as to the relationship of the partners to each other is called the 'partnership deed'. It should be drafted with care and be stamped according to the provisions of the Stamp Act, 1899. Where the partnership comprises immovable property, the instrument of partnership must be in writing, stamped and registered under the Registration Act.

**Partnership deed may contain the following information:-**

1. Name of the partnership firm.
2. Names of all the partners.
3. Nature and place of the business of the firm.
4. Date of commencement of partnership.
5. Duration of the partnership firm.
6. Capital contribution of each partner.
7. Profit Sharing ratio of the partners.
8. Admission and Retirement of a partner.
9. Rates of interest on Capital, Drawings and loans.
10. Provisions for settlement of accounts in the case of dissolution of the firm.
11. Provisions for Salaries or commissions, payable to the partners, if any.
12. Provisions for expulsion of a partner in case of gross breach of duty or fraud.

A partnership firm may add or delete any provision according to the needs of the firm.

- (c) (i) **Correct:** Section 3 of the Companies Act, 2013 deals with the basic requirement with respect to the constitution of the company. In the case of a public company, any 7 or more persons can form a company for any lawful purpose by subscribing their names to memorandum and complying with the requirements of this Act in respect of registration. In exactly the same way, 2 or more persons can form a private company.
- (ii) **Incorrect:** The common seal is a seal used by a corporation as the symbol of its incorporation. The Companies (Amendment) Act, 2015 has made the common seal optional by omitting the words "and a common seal" from Section 9 so as to provide an alternative mode of authorization for companies who opt not to have a common seal. This amendment provides that 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.