

	Question & Answer for Practice
Question-1	Sachin bought 1000 Kg rice from Saurabh for Rs.1,50,000 on three months
	credit. For this purpose, Sachin issued a promissory note to Saurabh on the
	same date payable after 3 months. On the date of maturity, the promissory
	note was dishonoured. Saurabh filed suit for the recovery of the amount plus
	fees of advocate paid by him for defending the suit. Referring to the
	provisions of the Negotiable Instruments Act, 1881, what amount could be
	recovered by Saurabh from Sachin? [RTP MAY 2024]
Answer-1	According to 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:
a)	The holder is entitled to the amount due upon the instrument, together with the
	expenses properly incurred in presenting, noting and protesting it.
b)	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.
c)	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.
	On the basis of the above provisions of law and facts of the case, Saurabh has
	right to claim price of rice plus fees of advocate plus interest @18% p.a. from the
	date of payment until tender or realisation thereof.
Question-2	A purchased a watch from B. He issued a promissory note to B which was payable
	on demand but no specific place for payment was mentioned on it. On maturity, B
	did not present the promissory note for payment. As the promissory note was not
	duly presented for payment, whether A would be discharged from liability under
	the provisions of the Negotiable Instruments Act, 1881 ? [RTP MAY 2024]



Answer -2 Section 64 of the Negotiable Instruments Act, 1881 provides, Promit bill of exchange and cheques must be presented for payment to acceptor or drawee thereof respectively, by or on behalf of the hereinafter provided. In default of such presentment, the other para are not liable thereon to such holder. Provided that where a promit payable on demand and is not payable at a specified place, no presentation or necessary in order to charge the maker thereof. On the basis of the above law provisions and facts of the case non-presentment of promissory note for payment results in discharged from liability but the given case is covered under the exception to Hence, A would not be discharged from liability even if the non-presentation of the promissory note was payable on demand and no specific place of was mentioned.	the maker, e holder as rties thereto issory note is esentment is e, although rge of maker o section 64. entment by B
acceptor or drawee thereof respectively, by or on behalf of the hereinafter provided. In default of such presentment, the other parameter are not liable thereon to such holder. Provided that where a promit payable on demand and is not payable at a specified place, no presented in order to charge the maker thereof. On the basis of the above law provisions and facts of the case non-presentment of promissory note for payment results in dischart from liability but the given case is covered under the exception to the Hence, A would not be discharged from liability even if the non-presented as the promissory note was payable on demand and no specific place for the specific place of the promissory note was payable on demand and no specific place for the specific place of the promissory note was payable on demand and no specific place for the specific place of the promissory note was payable on demand and no specific place for the specific place of the promissory note was payable on demand and no specific place for the promissory note was payable on demand and no specific place for the promissory note was payable on demand and no specific place for the promissory note was payable on demand and no specific place for the promissory note was payable on demand and no specific place for the promissory note was payable on demand and no specific place for the promissory note was payable on demand and no specific place for the promissory note was payable on demand and no specific place for the promissory note was payable on demand and no specific place for the promissory note was payable on demand and no specific place for the promissory note was payable on demand and no specific place for the promissory note the promissory note was payable on demand and no specific place for the promissory note the promissory note the promise payable on the promise promise promise payable on the promise pa	e holder as rties thereto issory note is esentment is e, although rge of maker o section 64. entment by B
hereinafter provided. In default of such presentment, the other parare not liable thereon to such holder. Provided that where a promit payable on demand and is not payable at a specified place, no presented in order to charge the maker thereof. On the basis of the above law provisions and facts of the case non-presentment of promissory note for payment results in discharged from liability but the given case is covered under the exception to the Hence, A would not be discharged from liability even if the non-presented as the promissory note was payable on demand and no specific place for the such promissory note was payable on demand and no specific place for the such promissory note was payable on demand and no specific place for the such promissory note was payable on demand and no specific place for the such promissory note was payable on demand and no specific place for the such promissory note was payable on demand and no specific place for the such payable on demand and no specific place for the such provided that where a promise are not payable on demand and no specific place for the such payable on demand and no specific place for the such payable on demand and no specific place for the such payable on demand and no specific place for the such payable on demand and no specific place for the such payable on demand and no specific place for the such payable on demand and no specific place for the such payable on demand and no specific place for the such payable on demand and no specific place for the such payable on demand and no specific place for the such payable on demand and no specific place for the such payable on demand and no specific place for the such payable on demand and no specific place for the such payable on demand and payable on	rties thereto issory note is esentment is e, although rge of maker o section 64.
are not liable thereon to such holder. Provided that where a promit payable on demand and is not payable at a specified place, no present necessary in order to charge the maker thereof. On the basis of the above law provisions and facts of the case non-presentment of promissory note for payment results in discharged from liability but the given case is covered under the exception to Hence, A would not be discharged from liability even if the non-present as the promissory note was payable on demand and no specific place for the support of the promissory note was payable on demand and no specific place for the support of the promissory note was payable on demand and no specific place for the support of the promissory note was payable on demand and no specific place for the support of the promissory note was payable on demand and no specific place for the support of the promissory note was payable on demand and no specific place for the support of the payable of the promissory note was payable on demand and no specific place for the payable of the promissory note was payable on demand and no specific place for the payable of the promissory note was payable on demand and no specific place for the payable of the promissory note was payable on demand and no specific place for the payable of the	essory note is essentment is e, although rge of maker o section 64.
payable on demand and is not payable at a specified place, no presented in order to charge the maker thereof. On the basis of the above law provisions and facts of the case non-presentment of promissory note for payment results in discharged from liability but the given case is covered under the exception to Hence, A would not be discharged from liability even if the non-presented as the promissory note was payable on demand and no specific place for the payable of the promissory note was payable on demand and no specific place for the payable of the promissory note was payable on demand and no specific place for the payable of	e, although rge of maker o section 64.
necessary in order to charge the maker thereof. On the basis of the above law provisions and facts of the case non-presentment of promissory note for payment results in dischargement from liability but the given case is covered under the exception to Hence, A would not be discharged from liability even if the non-prese as the promissory note was payable on demand and no specific place for the case is covered under the exception to the case is covered under the case is covered under the case i	e, although rge of maker o section 64. entment by B
On the basis of the above law provisions and facts of the case non-presentment of promissory note for payment results in dischargement from liability but the given case is covered under the exception to Hence, A would not be discharged from liability even if the non-prese as the promissory note was payable on demand and no specific place for the case is covered under the exception to the case is covered under the case is	rge of maker o section 64. entment by B
non-presentment of promissory note for payment results in discharged from liability but the given case is covered under the exception to Hence, A would not be discharged from liability even if the non-prese as the promissory note was payable on demand and no specific place from	rge of maker o section 64. entment by B
from liability but the given case is covered under the exception to Hence, A would not be discharged from liability even if the non-prese as the promissory note was payable on demand and no specific place f	o section 64. entment by B
Hence, A would not be discharged from liability even if the non-prese as the promissory note was payable on demand and no specific place f	entment by B
as the promissory note was payable on demand and no specific place f	•
	or payment
was mentioned.	
Question-3 Manoj owes money to Umesh. Therefore, he makes a promissory n	ote for the
amount in favour of Umesh, for safety of transmission he cuts the r	note in half
and posts one half to Umesh. He then changes his mind and calls upo	on Umesh to
return the half of the note which he had sent. Umesh requires Mo	anoj to send
the other half of the promissory note. Decide how rights of the po	arties are to
be adjusted.	
Give your answer in reference to the Provisions of Negotiable Instr	ruments Act,
1881. [RTP MAY 2019]	
Answer-3 The question arising in this problem is whether the making of promiss	sory note is
complete when one half of the note was delivered to Umesh. Under S	ection 46 of
the Negotiable Instruments Act, 1881, the making of a promis	sory note is
completed by delivery, actual or constructive. Delivery refers to t	the whole of
the instrument and not merely a part of it. Delivery of half instrume	nt cannot be
treated as delivery of the whole. So, the claim of Umesh to have	
the other half of the promissory note sent to him is not maintain	able. Manoj
is justified in demanding the return of the first half sent by	him. He can
change his mind and refuse to send the other half of the pro	missory note.



Question-4	'Anjum' drew a cheque for Rs. 20,000 payable to 'Babloo' and delivered it to him.
	'Babloo' indorsed the cheque in favour of 'Rehansh' but kept it in his table drawer.
	Subsequently, 'Babloo' died, and cheque was found by 'Rehansh' in 'Babloo's table
	drawer. 'Rehansh' filed the suit for the recovery of cheque. Whether 'Rehansh'
	can recover cheque under the provisions of the Negotiable Instrument Act 1881?
	[RTP MAY 2022]
Answer -4	According to section 48 of the Negotiable Instrument Act 1881, a promissory
	note, bill of exchange or cheque payable to order, is negotiable by the holder by
	indorsement and delivery thereof.
	The contract on a negotiable instrument until delivery remains incomplete and
	revocable. The 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.
	In the given case, cheque was indorsed properly but not delivered to indorsee
	i.e.'Rehansh', Therefore, 'Rehansh' is not eligible to claim the payment of
	cheque.



Question-5	Explain the meaning of 'Negotiation by delivery' with the help of an example.
	Give your answer as per the provisions of the Negotiable Instruments Act,
	1881. [MTP MAY 2019]
Answer -5	Negotiation by delivery: According to section 47 of the Negotiable
	Instruments Act, 1881, subject to the provisions of section 58, a promissory
	note, bill of exchange or cheque payable to bearer is negotiable by delivery
	thereof.
	Exception: A promissory note, bill of exchange or cheque delivered on
	condition that it is not to take effect except in a certain event is not
	negotiable (except in the hands of a holder for value without notice of the
	condition) unless such event happens.
	Example: A, the holder of a negotiable instrument payable to bearer,
	delivers it to B's agent to keep for B. The instrument has been negotiated.



Question-6	Mina owes money to Nina. Therefore, she makes a promissory note for the amoun
	in favor of Nina, for safety of transmission she cuts the note in half and posts
	one half to Nina. She then changes her mind and calls upon Nina to return the
	half of the note which she had sent. Nina requires Mina to send the other half
	of the promissory note. Decide how rights of the parties are to be adjusted
	Give your answer with respect to the provisions of the Negotiable
	Instruments Act, 1881. [MTP MAY 2021]
Answer -6	The question arising in this problem is whether the making of promissory note
	is complete when one half of the note was delivered to Nina. Under Section 46
	of the Negotiable Instruments Act, 1881, the making of a promissory note is
	completed by delivery, actual or constructive. Delivery refers to the whole of
	the instrument and not merely a part of it. Delivery of half instrument cannot
	be treated as constructive delivery of the whole. So, the claim of Nina to have
	the other half of the promissory note sent to her is not maintainable. Mina is
	justified in demanding the return of the first half sent by her. She can change
	her mind and refuse to send the other half of the promissory note.
Question-7	What are the essential characteristics of Negotiable Instruments. [MTP NOV
	2021]
Answer -7	Essential Characteristics of Negotiable Instruments
i	It is necessarily in writing.
ii	It should be signed.
iii	It is freely transferable from one person to another.
iv	Holder's title is free from defects.



	How are wall??
V	It can be transferred any number of times till its satisfaction.
vi	Every negotiable instrument must contain an unconditional promise or order
	to pay money. The promise or order to pay must consist of money only.
viii	The sum payable, the time of payment, the payee, must be certain.
viii	The instrument should be delivered. Mere drawing of instrument does not
	create liability.
	or ears maximy.
0 1: 0	W
Question-8	What are the parties to a bill of exchange. [MTP NOV 2021]
Answer -8	The parties to a bill of exchange are
1.	Drawer: The maker of a bill of exchange
2.	Drawee: The person directed by the drawer to pay is called the 'drawee'. He is
	the person on whom the bill is drawn. On acceptance of the bill, he is called an
	acceptor and is liable for the payment of the bill. His liability is primary and
	unconditional.
3.	Payee: The person named in the instrument, to whom or to whose order the
	money is, by the instrument, directed to be paid.
	7



Question-9	State with reasons whether each of the following instruments is an Inland
	Instrument or a Foreign Instrument as per The Negotiable Instruments Act,
	1881:
i.	Ram draws a Bill of Exchange in Delhi upon Shyam a resident of Jaipur and
	accepted to be payable in Thailand after 90 days of acceptance.
ii.	Ramesh draws a Bill of Exchange in Mumbai upon Suresh a resident of
	Australia and accepted to be payable in Chennai after 30 days of sight.
iii.	Ajay draws a Bill of Exchange in California upon Vijay a resident of Jodhpur
	and accepted to be payable in Kanpur after 6 months of acceptance.
iv.	Mukesh draws a Bill of Exchange in Lucknow upon Dinesh a resident of China
	and accepted to be payable in China after 45 days of acceptance. [NOV 2020,4
	Marks]
Answer -9	"Inland instrument" and "Foreign instrument" [Sections 11 & 12 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.
	Any such instrument not so drawn, made or made payable shall be deemed to be
	foreign instrument.
	Following are the answers as to the nature of the Instruments:
i.	In first case, Bill is drawn in Delhi by Ram on a person (Shyam), a resident of
	Jaipur (though accepted to be payable in Thailand after 90 days) is an Inland
	instrument.
ii.	In second case, Ramesh draws a bill in Mumbai on Suresh resident of Australia
	and accepted to be payable in Chennai after 30 days of sight, is an Inland
	instrument.
iii.	In third case, Ajay draws a bill in California (which is situated outside India) and



	How are wall??
	accepted to be payable in India (Kanpur), drawn upon Vijay, a person resident in
	India (Jodhpur), therefore the Instrument is a Foreign instrument.
iv.	In fourth case, the said instrument is a Foreign instrument as the bill is
	drawn in India by Mukesh upon Dinesh, the person resident outside India (China)
	and also payable outside India (China) after 45 days of acceptance.
Question-10	(i) Are the following instruments signed by Mr. Honest is valid promissory Notes?
	Give the reasons
a.	I promise to pay D's son Rs.10000 for value received (D has two sons).
b.	I promise to pay Rs.5000/- on demand at my convenience
	Your answers shall be in accordance with the provisions of the Negotiable
	Instruments Act, 1881. [NOV 2020,3 Marks]
Answer-10	(i) Promissory Note: As per the provisions of Section 4 of the Negotiable
	Instruments Act, 1881, a promissory note is an instrument in writing (not being a
	bank-note or a currency note) containing an unconditional undertaking, signed
	by the maker, to paya certain sum of money to or to the order of a certain
	person, or to the bearer of the instruments.
a.	This is not a valid promissory note as D has two sons and it is not specified in the
	promissory note that which son of D is the payee.
b.	This is not a valid promissory note as details of the payee are not mentioned in it
	and it is not an unconditional undertaking.



Question-11	M drew a cheque amounting to ₹2 lakh payable to N and subsequently delivered
	to him. After receipt of cheque N indorsed the same to C but kept it in his safe
	locker. After sometime, N died, and P found the cheque in N's safe locker. Does
	this amount to Indorsement under the Negotiable Instruments Act, 1881?
	[Study Mat]
	No, P does not become the holder of the cheque as the negotiation was not
	completed by delivery of the cheque to him. (Section 48, the Negotiable
	Instruments Act, 1881)



Question-12	M owes money to N. Therefore, he makes a promissory note for the amount in
	favor of N, for safety of transmission he cuts the note in half and posts one half
	to N. He then changes his mind and calls upon N to return the half of the note
	which he had sent. N requires M to send the other half of the promissory note.
	Decide how rights of the parties are to be adjusted. [Study Mat]
Answer-12	The question arising in this problem is whether the making of promissory note is
	complete when one half of the note was delivered to N. Under Section 46 of the
	N.I. Act, 1881, the making of a Promissory Note (P/N) is completed by delivery,
	actual or constructive. Delivery refers to the whole of the instrument and not
	merely a part of it. Delivery of half instrument cannot be treated as constructive
	delivery of the whole. So, the claim of N to have the other half of the P/N sent
	to him is not maintainable M is justified in demanding the return of the first
	half sent by him. He can change his mind and refuse to send the other half of
	the P/N.