

**J.K. SHAH<sup>®</sup>**

**TEST  
SERIES**



**SUGGESTED SOLUTION**

**CA FOUNDATION**

**SUBJECT- BUSINESS LAWS**

**Test Code – JMU 2408**

**BRANCH - () (Date :)**

**Head Office : Shraddha, 3<sup>rd</sup> Floor, Near Chinai College, Andheri (E), Mumbai – 69.**

**Tel : (022) 26836666**

**ANSWER : 1****Discharge of Surety by Revocation:**

As per section 130 of the Indian Contract Act, 1872, a continuing guarantee may, at any time, be revoked by the surety, as to future transactions, by notice to the creditor, but the surety remains liable for transactions already entered into.

As per the above provisions, liability of Manoj is discharged with relation to all subsequent credit supplies made by Sharma after revocation of guarantee, because it is a case of continuing guarantee.

However, liability of Manoj for previous transactions (before revocation) i.e. for Rs. 40,000 remains. He is liable for payment of Rs. 40,000 to Sharma because the transaction was already entered into before revocation of guarantee.

**(6 MARKS)****ANSWER :2**

(i) According to section 202 of the Indian Contract Act, 1872, where the agent has himself an interest in the property which forms the subject matter of the agency, the agency cannot, in the absence of an express contract, be terminated to the prejudice of such interest.

In other words, when the agent is personally interested in a subject matter of agency, the agency becomes irrevocable.

In the given question, A gives authority to B to sell A's land, and to pay himself, out of the proceeds, the debts due to him from A.

As per the fact of the question and provision of law, A cannot revoke this authority, nor it can be terminated by his insanity.

(ii) According to section 191 of the Indian Contract Act, 1872, a "Sub-agent" is a person employed by and acting under the control of the original agent in the business of the agency.

Section 210 provides that, the termination of the authority of an agent causes the termination of the authority of all sub agents appointed by him.

In the given question, B is the agent of A, and C is the agent of B. Hence, C becomes a sub-agent.

Thus, when A revoke the authority of B (agent), it results in termination of authority of sub-agent appointed by B i.e. C (sub-agent).

**(6 MARKS)**

**ANSWER :3(i)**

According to section 157 of the Contract Act, 1872, if the bailee, without the consent of the bailor, mixes the goods of the bailor with his own goods, in such a manner that it is impossible to separate the goods bailed from the other goods and deliver them back, the bailor is entitled to be compensated by the bailee for the loss of the goods.

In the given question, Srijith's employee mixed high quality sugar bailed by Amar and then packaged it for sale. The sugars when mixed cannot be separated. As Srijith's employee has mixed the two kinds of sugar, he (Srijith) must compensate Amar for the loss of his sugar.

**(5 MARKS)**

**ANSWER: 3(ii)**

The statement is correct. Normally, a sub-agent is not appointed, since it is a delegation of power by an agent given to him by his principal. The governing principle is, a delegate cannot delegate'. (Latin version of this principle is, "**delegates non potest delegare**"). However, there are certain circumstances where an agent can appoint sub-agent.

In case of proper appointment of a sub-agent, by virtue of Section 192 of the Indian Contract Act, 1872 the principal is bound by and is held responsible for the acts of the sub-agent. Their relationship is treated to be as if the sub-agent is appointed by the principal himself.

However, if a sub-agent is not properly appointed, the principal shall not be bound by the acts of the sub-agent. Under the circumstances the agent appointing the sub-agent shall be bound by these acts and he (the agent) shall be bound to the principal for the acts of the sub-agent.

**(6 MARKS)**

**ANSWER: 4(i)**

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. These include:

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

**(4 MARKS)**

**ANSWER: 4(ii)**

Surety's right to benefit of creditor's securities: According to section 141 of the Indian Contract Act, 1872, a surety is entitled to the benefit of every security which the creditor has against the principal debtor at the time when the contract of suretyship is entered into, whether the surety knows of the existence of such security or not; and, if the creditor loses, or, without the consent of the surety, parts with such security, the surety is discharged to the extent of the value of the security.

In the instant case, C advances to B, Rs. 2,00,000 rupees on the guarantee of A. C has also taken a further security for Rs. 2,00,000 by mortgage of B's furniture without knowledge of A. C cancels the mortgage. B becomes insolvent, and C sues A on his guarantee. A is discharged from liability to the amount of the value of the furniture i.e. Rs. 80,000 and will remain liable for balance Rs. 1,20,000.

**(3 MARKS)**

**ANSWER : 5**

As per the provisions of Section 133 of the Indian Contract Act, 1872, if the creditor makes any variance (i.e. change in terms) without the consent of the surety, then surety is discharged as to the transactions subsequent to the change.

In the instant case, Mr. Pawan is liable as a surety for the loss suffered by ABC Constructions company due to misappropriation of cash by Mr. Chetan during the first six months but not for misappropriations committed after the reduction in salary.

Hence, Mr. Pawan, will be liable as a surety for the act of Mr. Chetan before the change in the terms of the contract i.e., during the first six months. Variation in the terms of the contract (as to the reduction of salary) without consent of Mr. Pawan, will discharge Mr. Pawan from all the liabilities towards the act of the Mr. Chetan after such variation..

**(6 MARKS)**

**ANSWER : 6**

The position of husband and wife is special and significant case of implied authority. According to the Indian Contract Act 1872, where the husband and wife are living together in a domestic establishment of their own, the wife shall have an implied authority to pledge the credit of her husband for necessaries. However, the implied authority can be challenged by the husband only in the following circumstances.

- (1) The husband has expressly forbidden the wife from borrowing money or buying goods on credit.
- (2) The articles purchased did not constitute necessities.
- (3) Husband had given sufficient funds to the wife for purchasing the articles she needed to the knowledge of the seller.
- (4) The creditor had been expressly told not to give credit to the wife.

Further, where the wife lives apart from husband without any of her fault, she shall have an implied authority to bind the husband for necessaries, if he does not provide for her maintenance.

Since, none of the above criteria is being fulfilled; Nalli would be successful in recovering its money.

**(5 MARKS)**

**ANSWER: 7**

Section 148 of Indian Contract Act 1872 defines 'Bailment' as 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 direction of the person delivering them.

According to Section 149 of the Indian Contract Act, 1872, the delivery to the bailee may be made by doing anything which has the effect of putting the goods in the possession of the intended bailee or of any person authorised to hold them on his behalf. Thus, delivery is necessary to constitute bailment.

Thus, the mere keeping of the box at Y's shop, when A herself took away the key cannot amount to delivery as per the meaning of delivery given in the provision in section 149. Therefore, in this case there is no contract of bailment as Mrs. A did not deliver the complete possession of the good by keeping the keys with herself.

**(5 MARKS)**

**ANSWER: 8**

As per Section 148 of the Act, bailment is the delivery of goods by one person to another for some purpose, upon a contract, that the goods shall, when the purpose is accomplished, be returned or

otherwise disposed of according to the directions of the person delivering them.

For a bailment to exist the bailor must give possession of the bailed property and the bailee must accept it. There must be a transfer in ownership of the goods.

(i) No. Mere custody of goods does not mean possession. In the given case, since the keys of the car are with V, Section 148, of the Indian Contract Act, 1872 shall not be applicable.

(ii) Yes, the possession of the goods is transferred to the custom authorities. Therefore, bailment exists and section 148 is applicable

**(4 MARKS)**