

PART-B

Q1. State the modes by which a partner may transfer his interest in the firm in favour of another person under the Indian Partnership Act, 1932. What are the rights of such a transferee?

Sol. 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.

Q2. Whether a minor may be admitted in the business of a partnership firm? Explain the rights of a minor in the partnership firm.

Sol. A minor cannot be bound by a contract because a minor's contract is void and not merely voidable. Therefore, a minor cannot become a partner in a firm because partnership is founded on a contract.

Though a minor cannot be a partner in a firm, he can nonetheless be admitted to the benefits of partnership under Section 30 of the Indian Partnership Act, 1932. In other words, he can be validly given a share in the partnership profits.

When this has been done and it can be done with the consent of all the partners then the rights and liabilities of such a partner will be governed under Section 30 as follows:

Rights:

- (i) A minor partner has a right to his agreed share of the profits and of the firm.
- (ii) He can have access to, inspect and copy the accounts of the firm.
- (iii) He can sue the partners for accounts or for payment of his share but only when severing his connection with the firm, and not otherwise.
- (iv) On attaining majority, he may within 6 months elect to become a partner or not to become a partner. If he elects to become a partner, then he is entitled to the share to which he was entitled as a minor. If he does not, then his share is not liable for any acts of the firm after the date of the public notice served to that effect.

Q3. M/s XYZ & Associates, a partnership firm with X, Y, Z as senior partners were engaged in the business of carpet manufacturing and exporting to foreign countries. On 25th August, 2018, they inducted Mr. G, an expert in the field of carpet manufacturing as their partner. On 10th January 2020, Mr. G was blamed for unauthorized activities and thus expelled from the partnership by united approval of rest of the partners.

Examine whether action by the partners was justified or not?

What should have the factors to be kept in mind prior expelling a partner from the firm by other partners according to the provisions of the Indian Partnership Act, 1932?

Sol.

Provision

Expulsion of a Partner (Section 33 of the Indian Partnership Act, 1932):

A partner may not be expelled from a firm by a majority of partners except in exercise, in good faith, of powers conferred by contract between the partners.

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

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

If a partner is otherwise expelled, the expulsion is null and void.

Analysis and conclusion

- (i) Action by the partners of M/s XYZ & Associates, a partnership firm to expel Mr. G from the partnership was justified as he was expelled by united approval of the

partners exercised in good faith to protect the interest of the partnership against the unauthorized activities charged against Mr. G. A proper notice and opportunity of being heard has to be given to Mr. G.

- (ii) The following are the factors to be kept in mind prior expelling a partner from the firm by other partners:
- the power of expulsion must have existed in a contract between the partners;
 - the power has been exercised by a majority of the partners; and
 - it has been exercised in good faith.

Q4. A, B and C are partners in a firm. As per terms of the partnership deed, A is entitled to 20 percent of the partnership property and profits. A retires from the firm and dies after 15 days. B and C continue business of the firm without settling accounts. Explain the rights of A's legal representatives against the firm under the Indian Partnership Act, 1932?

Sol.

Provision

Section 37 of the Indian Partnership Act, 1932 provides that where a partner dies or otherwise ceases to be a partner and there is no final settlement of account between the legal representatives of the deceased partner or the firms with the property of the firm, then, in the absence of a contract to the contrary, the legal representatives of the deceased partner or the retired partner are entitled to claim either.

- Such shares of the profits earned after the death or retirement of the partner which is attributable to the use of his share in the property of the firm; or
- Interest at the rate of 6 per cent annum on the amount of his share in the property.

Analysis and conclusion

Based on the aforesaid provisions of Section 37 of the Indian Partnership Act, 1932 in the given problem, A's Legal representatives shall be entitled, at their option to:

- the 20% shares of profits (as per the partnership deed); or
- interest at the rate of 6 per cent per annum on the amount of A's share in the property.

Q5. Master X was introduced to the benefits of partnership of M/s ABC & Co. with the consent of all partners. After attaining majority, more than six months elapsed and he failed to give a public notice as to whether he elected to become or not to become a partner in the firm. Later on, Mr. L, a supplier of material to M/s ABC & Co., filed a suit against M/s ABC & Co. for recovery of the debt due.

- In the light of the Indian Partnership Act, 1932, explain:
- To what extent X will be liable if he failed to give public notice after attaining majority?
 - Can Mr. L recover his debt from X?

Sol.

Provision

As per the provisions of Section 30(5) of the Indian Partnership Act, 1932, at any time within six months of his attaining majority, or of his obtaining knowledge that he had been admitted to the benefits of partnership, whichever date is later, such person may give public notice that he has elected to become or that he has elected not to become a partner in the firm, and such notice shall determine his position as regards the firm. However, if he fails to give such notice, he shall become a partner in the firm on the expiry of the said six months.

If the minor becomes a partner by his failure to give the public notice within specified time, his rights and liabilities as given in Section 30(7) are as follows:

- A) He becomes personally liable to third parties for all acts of the firm done since he was admitted to the benefits of partnership.
- B) His share in the property and the profits of the firm remains the same to which he was entitled as a minor.

Analysis and conclusion

- (i) In the instant case, since, X has failed to give a public notice, he shall become a partner in the M/s ABC & Co. and becomes personally liable to Mr. L, a third party.
 - (ii) In the light of the provisions of Section 30(7) read with Section 30(5) of the Indian Partnership Act, 1932, since X has failed to give public notice that he has not elected to not to become a partner within six months, he will be deemed to be a partner after the period of the above six months and therefore, Mr. L can recover his debt from him also in the same way as he can recover from any other partner.
- Q6. Mr. A (transferor) transfer his share in a partnership firm to Mr. B (transferee). Mr. B is not entitled for few rights and privileges as Mr. A (transferor) is entitled therefor. Discuss in brief the points for which Mr. B is not entitled during continuance of partnership?

Sol.

Provision

As per Section 29 of Indian Partnership Act, 1932, a transfer by a partner of his interest in the firm, either absolute or by mortgage, or by the creation by him of a charge on such interest, does not entitle the transferee, during the continuance of the firm, to interfere in the conduct of business, or to require accounts, or to inspect the books of the firm, but entitles the transferee only to receive the share of profits of the transferring partner, and the transferee shall accept the account of profits agreed to by the partners.

Analysis and conclusion

In the given case during the continuance of partnership, such transferee Mr. B is not entitled:

- to interfere with the conduct of the business.
- to require accounts.
- to inspect books of the firm.

However, Mr. B 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.

Q7. *Same* M, N and P were partners in a firm. The firm ordered JR Limited to supply the furniture. P dies, and M and N continues the business in the firm's name. The firm did not give any notice about P's death to the public or the persons dealing with the firm. The furniture was delivered to the firm after P's death, fact about his death was known to them at the time of delivery. Afterwards the firm became insolvent and failed to pay the price of furniture to JR Limited.

Explain with reasons:

- (a) Whether P's private estate is liable for the price of furniture purchased by the firm?
- (b) Whether does it make any difference if JR Limited supplied the furniture to the firm believing that all the three partners are alive?

Sol.

Provision

According to Section 35 of the Indian Partnership Act, 1932, where under a contract between the partners the firm is not dissolved by the death of a partner, the estate of a deceased partner is not liable for any act of the firm done after his death.

Further, in order that the estate of the deceased partner may be absolved from liability for the future obligations of the firm, it is not necessary to give any notice either to the public or the persons having dealings with the firm.

Analysis and conclusion

In the given question, JR Limited has supplied furniture to the partnership firm, after P's death. The firm did not give notice about P's death to public or people dealing with the firm. Afterwards, the firm became insolvent and could not pay JR Limited.

In the light of the facts of the case and provisions of law:

- (i) Since the delivery of furniture was made after P's death, his estate would not be liable for the debt of the firm. A suit for goods sold and delivered would not lie against the representatives of the deceased partner. This is because there was no debt due in respect of the goods in P's lifetime.
- (ii) It will not make any difference even if JR Limited supplied furniture to the firm believing that all the three partners are alive, as it is not necessary to give any notice either to the public or the persons having dealings with the firm, so the estate of the deceased partner may be absolved from liability for the future obligations of the firm.

8. Discuss the liability of a partner for the act of the firm and liability of firm for act of a partner to third parties as per Indian Partnership Act, 1932.
11. Liability of a partner for acts of the firm (Section 25 of the Indian Partnership Act, 1932): Every partner is liable, jointly with all the other partners and also severally, for all acts of the firm done while he is a partner.

The partners are jointly and severally responsible to third parties for all acts which come under the scope of their express or implied authority. This is because that all the acts done within the scope of authority are the acts done towards the business of the firm.

The expression 'act of firm' connotes any act or omission by all the partners or by any partner or agent of the firm, which gives rise to a right enforceable by or against the firm. Again in order to bring a case under Section 25, it is necessary that the act of the firm, in respect of which liability is brought to be enforced against a party, must have been done while he was a partner.

Liability of the firm for wrongful acts of a partner and for misapplication by partners (Sections 26 & 27 of the Indian Partnership Act, 1932): Where: by the wrongful act or omission of a partner in the ordinary course of the business of a firm, or with the authority of his partners, loss or injury is caused to any third party, or any penalty is incurred, the firm is liable therefore to the same extent as the partner.

A partner acting within his apparent authority receives money or property from a third party and misapplies it, or a firm in the course of its business receives money or property from a third party, and the money or property is misapplied by any of the partners while it is in the custody of the firm, the firm is liable to make good the loss.

99. Define Implied Authority. In the absence of any usage or custom of trade to the contrary, the implied authority of a partner does not empower him to do certain acts. State the acts which are beyond the implied authority of a partner under the provisions of the Indian Partnership Act, 1932?

Sol. According to Section 19 of the Indian Partnership Act, 1932, subject to the provisions of Section 22, 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".

In the absence of any usage or custom of trade to the contrary, the implied authority of a partner does not empower him to -

- submit a dispute relating to the business of the firm to arbitration;
- open a banking account on behalf of the firm in his own name;
- compromise or relinquish any claim or portion of a claim by the firm;
- withdraw a suit or proceedings filed on behalf of the firm;

- (e) admit any liability in a suit or proceedings against the firm;
- (f) acquire immovable property on behalf of the firm;
- (g) transfer immovable property belonging to the firm; and
- (h) enter into partnership on behalf of the firm.

Q10. Mr. M is one of the four partners in M/s XY Enterprises. He owes a sum of Rs. 6 crore to his friend Mr. Z which he is unable to pay on due time. So, he wants to sell his share in the firm to Mr. Z for settling the amount. In the light of the provisions of the Indian Partnership Act, 1932, discuss each of the following:

- (i) Can Mr. M validly transfer his interest in the firm by way of sale?
- (ii) What would be the rights of the transferee (Mr. Z) in case Mr. M wants to retire from the firm after a period of 6 months from the date of transfer?

Sol.

Provision

According to Section 29 of the Indian Partnership Act, 1932,

- (1) A transfer by a partner of his interest in the firm, either absolute or by mortgage, or by the creation by him of a charge on such interest, does not entitle the transferee, during the continuance of the firm, to interfere in the conduct of business, or to require accounts, or to inspect the books of the firm, but entitles the transferee only to receive the share of profits of the transferring partner, and the transferee shall accept the account of profits agreed to by the partners.
- (2) If the firm is dissolved or if the transferring partner ceases to be a partner, the transferee is entitled as against the remaining partners to receive the share of the assets of the firm to which the transferring partner is entitled, and, for the purpose of ascertaining that share, to an account as from the date of the dissolution.

Analysis and conclusion

In the light of facts of the question and provision of law:

- (i) Yes, Mr. M can validly transfer his interest in the firm by way of sale.
- (ii) On the retirement of the transferring partner (Mr. M), the transferee (Mr. Z) 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.

So, in this case on Mr. M's retirement, Mr. Z would be entitled to receive the value of Mr. M's share to the extent of Rs. 6 crore in the firm's assets.

Q11. Sohan, Rohan and Jay were partners in a firm. The firm is dealer in office furniture. They have regular dealings with M/s AB and Co. for the supply of furniture for their business. On 30th June 2018, one of the partners, Mr. Jay died in a road accident. The firm has ordered M/s AB and Co. to supply the furniture for their business on 25 May 2018, when Jay was also alive. Now Sohan and Rohan continue the business in the firm's name after Jay's death. The firm did not give any notice about Jay's death to the public or the persons dealing with the firm. M/s AB and Co. delivered the furniture to the firm on 25 July 2018. The fact about Jay's death was known to them at the time of delivery of goods. Afterwards the firm became insolvent and failed to pay the price of furniture to M/s AB and Co. Now M/s AB and Co. has filed a case against the firm for recovery of the price of furniture. With reference to the provisions of Indian Partnership Act, 1932, explain whether Jay's private estate is also liable for the price of furniture purchased by the firm?

Sol.

Provision

According to Section 35 of the Indian Partnership Act, 1932, where under a contract between the partners the firm is not dissolved by the death of a partner, the estate of a deceased partner is not liable for any act of the firm done after his death.

Further, in order that the estate of the deceased partner may be absolved from liability for the future obligations of the firm, it is not necessary to give any notice either to the public or the persons having dealings with the firm.

Analysis and conclusion

In the light of the facts of the case and provisions of law, since the delivery of furniture was made after Jay's death, his estate would not be liable for the debt of the firm. A suit for goods sold and delivered would not lie against the representatives of the deceased partner.

This is because there was no debt due in respect of the goods in Jay's lifetime. He was already dead when the delivery of goods was made to the firm and also it is not necessary to give any notice either to the public or the persons having dealings with the firm on a death of a partner (Section 35). So, the estate of the deceased partner may be absolved from liability for the future obligations of the firm.

Q12. X, Y and Z are partners in a Partnership Firm. They were carrying their business successfully for the past several years. Spouses of X and Y fought in ladies club on their personal issue and X's wife was hurt badly. X got angry on the incident and he convinced Z to expel Y from their partnership firm. Y was expelled from partnership without any notice from X and Z. Considering the provisions of the Indian Partnership Act, 1932, state whether they can expel a partner from the firm. What are the criteria for test of good faith in such circumstances?

Sol.

Provision

A partner may not be expelled from a firm by a majority of partners except in exercise, in good faith, of powers conferred by contract between the partners. It is, thus, essential that:

- (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 bonafide interest of the business of the firm.

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

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

If a partner is otherwise expelled, the expulsion is null and void.

Analysis and conclusion

Thus, according to the test of good faith as required under Section 33(1), expulsion of Partner Y is not valid.

Q13. What is the provision related to the effect of notice to an acting partner of the firm as per the Indian Partnership Act, 1932?

Sol. Effect of notice to an acting partner of the firm

According to Section 24 of the Indian Partnership Act, 1932, notice to a partner who habitually acts in the business of the firm of any matter relating to the affairs of the firm operates as notice to the firm, except in the case of a fraud on the firm committed by or with the consent of that partner.

Thus, the notice to one is equivalent to the notice to the rest of the partners of the firm, just as a notice to an agent is notice to his principal.

This notice must be actual and not constructive. It must further relate to the firm's business. Only then it would constitute a notice to the firm.

Q14. Discuss the provisions regarding personal profits earned by a partner under the Indian Partnership Act, 1932?

Sol. Personal Profit earned by Partners (Section 16 of the Indian Partnership Act, 1932)

According to section 16, subject to contract between the partners:

- (a) If a partner derives any profit for himself from any transaction of the firm, or from the use of the property or business connection of the firm or the firm name, he shall account for that profit and pay it to the firm;

- (b) If a partner carries on any business of the same nature and competing with that of the firm, he shall account for and pay to the firm all profits made by him in that business.

Q15. "Though a minor cannot be a partner in a firm, he can nonetheless be admitted to the benefits of partnership." Referring to the provisions of the Indian Partnership Act, 1932, state the rights which can be enjoyed by a minor partner.

Sol. Rights which can be enjoyed by a minor partner:

- (i) A minor partner has a right to his agreed share of the profits and of the firm.
- (ii) He can have access to, inspect and copy the accounts of the firm.
- (iii) He can sue the partners for accounts or for payment of his share but only when severing his connection with the firm, and not otherwise.
- (iv) On attaining majority, he may within 6 months elect to become a partner or not to become a partner. If he elects to become a partner, then he is entitled to the share to which he was entitled as a minor.

If he does not, then his share is not liable for any acts of the firm after the date of the public notice served to that effect.

Q16. State the liabilities of a minor partner both:

- (a) Before attaining majority and
- (b) After attaining majority

Sol.

(i) Liabilities of a minor partner before attaining majority:

- (a) The liability of the minor is confined only to the extent of his share in the profits and the property of the firm.
- (b) Minor has no personal liability for the debts of the firm incurred during his minority.
- (c) Minor cannot be declared insolvent, but if the firm is declared insolvent his share in the firm vests in the Official Receiver/ Assignee.

(ii) Liabilities of a minor partner after attaining majority:

Within 6 months of his attaining majority or on his obtaining knowledge that he had been admitted to the benefits of partnership, whichever date is later, the minor partner has to decide whether he shall remain a partner or leave the firm.

Where he has elected not to become partner he may give public notice that he has elected not to become partner and such notice shall determine his position as regards the firm. If he fails to give such notice he shall become a partner in the firm on the expiry of the said six months.

Q17. State the legal position of a minor partner after attaining majority

- (c) When he opts to become a partner of the same firm.
- (d) When he decide not to become a partner.

Sol. When he becomes partner: If the minor becomes a partner on his own willingness or by his failure to give the public notice within specified time, his rights and liabilities are given in Section 30(7) of the Indian Partnership Act, 1932, are as follows

- (a) He becomes personally liable to third parties for all acts of the firm done since he was admitted to the benefits of partnership.
- (b) His share in the property and the profits of the firm remains the same to which he was entitled as a minor.

When he elects not to become a partner:

- (a) His rights and liabilities continue to be those of a minor up to the date of giving public notice.
- (b) His share shall not be liable for any acts of the firm done after the date of the notice.
- (c) He shall be entitled to sue the partners for his share of the property and profits. It may be noted that such minor shall give notice to the Registrar that he has or has not become a partner.

Q18 Mr. M, Mr. N and Mr. P were partners in a firm, which was dealing in refrigerators. On 1st October, 2018, Mr. P retired from partnership, but failed to give public notice of his retirement. After his retirement, Mr. M, Mr. N and Mr. P visited a trade fair and enquired about some refrigerators with latest techniques. Mr. X, who was exhibiting his refrigerators with the new techniques was impressed with the interactions of Mr. P and requested for the visiting card of the firm. The visiting card also included the name of Mr. P as a partner even though he had already retired. Mr. X supplied some refrigerators to the firm and could not recover his dues from the firm. Now, Mr. X wants to recover the dues not only from the firm, but also from Mr. P

Analyse the above case in terms of the provisions of the Indian Partnership Act, 1932 and decide whether Mr. P is liable in this situation.

Sol.

Provision

A retiring partner continues to be liable to third party for acts of the firm after his retirement until public notice of his retirement has been given either by himself or by any other partner. But the retired partner will not be liable to any third party if the latter deals with the firm without knowing that the former was partner.

Also, if the partnership is at will, the partner by giving notice in writing to all the other partners of his intention to retire will be deemed to be relieved as a partner without giving a public notice to this effect.

Also, as per section 28 of the Indian Partnership Act, 1932, where a man holds himself out as a partner, or allows others to do it, he is then stopped from denying the character he has assumed and upon the faith of which creditors may be presumed to have acted.

Analysis and conclusion

In the light of the provisions of the Act and facts of the case, Mr. P is also liable to Mr. X.

19. When the continuing guarantee can be revoked under the Indian Partnership Act, 1932?

Sol. 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.

20. Comment on 'the right to expel partner must be exercised in good faith' under the Indian Partnership Act, 1932.

Sol. A partner may not be expelled from a firm by a majority of partners except in exercise, in good faith, of powers conferred by contract between the partners. It is, thus, essential that:

- (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.

21. P, Q, R and S are the partners in M/S PQRS & Co., a partnership firm which deals in trading of Washing Machines of various brands. Due to the conflict of views between partners, P & Q decided to leave the partnership firm and started competitive business on 31st July, 2019, in the name of M/S PQ & Co. Meanwhile, R & S have continued using the property in the name of M/S PQRS & Co. in which P & Q also has a share.

Based on the above facts, explain in detail the rights of ~~outgoing partners~~ ^{36 & 37} as per the Indian Partnership Act, 1932 and comment on the following:

- (i) Rights of P & Q to start a competitive business.
- (ii) Rights of P & Q regarding their share in property of M/S PQRS & Co

Sol.

Provision

Rights of outgoing partner to carry on competing business (Section 36 of the Indian Partnership Act, 1932)

Indian Partnership Act, 1932

An outgoing partner may carry on business competing with that of the firm and he may advertise such business, but subject to contract to the contrary, he may not,-

- (a) use the firm name,
- (b) represent himself as carrying on the business of the firm or
- (c) solicit the custom of persons who were dealing with the firm before he ceased to be a partner.

(1) Although this provision has imposed some restrictions on an outgoing partner it effectively permits him to carry on a business competing with that of the firm. However, the partner may agree with his partners that on his ceasing to be so, he will not carry on a business similar to that of the firm within a specified period or within specified local limits. Such an agreement will not be in restraint of trade if the restraint is reasonable [Section 36 (2)]

Analysis and conclusion

From the above, we can infer that P & Q can start competitive business in the name of M/S PQ & Co after following above conditions in the absence of any agreement.

Provision

Right of outgoing partner in certain cases to share subsequent profits (Section 37 of the Indian Partnership Act, 1932)

According to Section 37, 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.

Analysis and conclusion

In the instant case, P & Q can share in property of M/s PQRS & Co. keeping in view of the above provisions.

Q22. Explain in detail the circumstances which lead to liability of firm for misapplication by partners as per provisions of the Indian Partnership Act, 1932.

Sol. Where -

- (a) a partner acting within his apparent authority receives money or property from a third party and misapplies it, or

- (b) a firm in the course of its business receives money or property from a third party, and the money or property is misapplied by any of the partners while it is in the custody of the firm, the firm is liable to make good the loss.

It may be observed that the workings of the two clauses of Section 27 is designed to bring out clearly 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 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 the cases.

Q23. What do you mean by "implied authority" of the partners in a firm? Point out the extent of partner's implied authority in case of emergency, referring to the provisions of the Indian Partnership Act, 1932.

Sol. Implied Authority of Partner as Agent of the Firm (Section 19): Subject to the provisions of section 22, 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.

- (1) The authority of a partner to bind the firm conferred by this section is called his "implied authority".
- (2) In the absence of any usage or custom of trade to the contrary, the implied authority of a partner does not empower him to -
 - (a) Submit a dispute relating to the business of the firm to arbitration;
 - (b) open a banking account on behalf of the firm in his own name;
 - (c) compromise or relinquish any claim or portion of a claim by the firm;
 - (d) withdraw a suit or proceedings filed on behalf of the firm;
 - (e) admit any liability in a suit or proceedings against the firm;
 - (f) acquire immovable property on behalf of the firm;
 - (g) transfer immovable property belonging to the firm; and
 - (h) enter into partnership on behalf of the firm.

Mode Of Doing Act To Bind Firm (Section 22): In order to bind a firm, an act or instrument done or executed by a partner or other person on behalf of the firm shall be done or executed in the firm name, or in any other manner expressing or implying an intention to bind the firm.

Q24. "Partner indeed virtually embraces the character of both a principal and an agent". Describe the said statement keeping in view of the provisions of the Indian Partnership Act, 1932.

Sol. "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.

Q25. Moni and Tony were partners in the firm M/s MOTO & Company. They admitted Sony as partner in the firm and he is actively engaged in day-to-day activities of the firm. There is a tradition in the firm that all active partners will get a monthly remuneration of Rs. 20,000 but no express agreement was there. After admission of Sony in the firm, Moni and Tony were continuing getting salary from the firm but no salary was given to Sony from the firm. Sony claimed his remuneration but denied by existing partners by saying that there was no express agreement for that. Whether under the Indian Partnership Act, 1932, Sony can claim remuneration from the firm?

Sol.

Provision

By virtue of provisions of Section 13(a) of the Indian Partnership Act, 1932 a partner is not entitled to receive remuneration for taking part in the conduct of the business. But this rule can always be varied by an express agreement, or by a course of dealings, in which event the partner will be entitled to remuneration. Thus, a partner can claim remuneration even in the absence of a contract, when such remuneration is payable under the continued usage of the firm. In other words, where it is customary to pay remuneration to a partner for conducting the business of the firm, he can claim it even in the absence of a contract for the payment of the same.

Analysis and conclusion

In the given problem, existing partners are getting regularly a monthly remuneration from firm customarily being working partners of the firm. As Sony also admitted as working partner of the firm, he is entitled to get remuneration like other partners.

Q26. Ram & Co., a firm consists of three partners A, B and C having one third share each in the firm. According to A and B, the activities of C are not in the interest of the partnership and thus want to expel C from the firm. Advise A and B whether they can do so quoting the relevant provisions of the Indian Partnership Act, 1932.

Sol.

Provision

It is not possible for the majority of partners to expel a partner from the firm without satisfying the conditions as laid down in Section 33 of the Indian Partnership Act, 1932. The essential conditions before expulsion can be done are:

- (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.

The test of good faith includes:

- (a) that the expulsion must be in the interest of the partnership;
- (b) that the partner to be expelled is served with a notice; and
- (c) that the partner has been given an opportunity of being heard.

Analysis and conclusion

Thus, in the given case A and B the majority partners can expel the partner only if the above conditions are satisfied and procedure as stated above has been followed.

Q27. State the legal consequences of the following as per the provisions of the Indian Partnership Act, 1932:

- (i) Retirement of a partner 32 — 33 → Expulsion
- (ii) Insolvency of a partner 34

Sol. Retirement of A Partner (Section 32):

- (1) A partner may retire:
 - (a) with the consent of all the other partners;
 - (b) in accordance with an express agreement by the partners; or
 - (c) where the partnership is at will, by giving notice in writing to all the other partners of his intention to retire.
- (2) A retiring partner may be discharged from any liability to any third party for acts of the firm done before his retirement by an agreement made by him with such third party and the partners of the reconstituted firm, and such agreement may be implied by a course of dealing between the third party and the reconstituted firm after he had knowledge of the retirement.

- (3) Notwithstanding the retirement of 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 retirement, until public notice is given of the retirement:

Provided that a retired partner is not liable to any third party who deals with the firm without knowing that he was a partner.

- (4) Notices under sub-section (3) may be given by the retired partner or by any partner of the reconstituted firm.

Insolvency of a partner (Section 34)

- (1) The insolvent partner cannot be continued as a partner.

- (2) He will be ceased to be a partner from the very date on which the order of adjudication is made.

- neither he
liable nor the
firm liable* (3) The estate of the insolvent partner is not liable for the acts of the firm done after the date of order of adjudication.

- (4) The firm is also not liable for any act of the insolvent partner after the date of the order of adjudication.

- (5) Ordinarily but not invariably, 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

Q28 A, B and C are partners of a partnership firm carrying on the business of construction of apartments. B who himself was a wholesale dealer of iron bars was entrusted with the work of selection of iron bars after examining its quality. As a wholesaler, B is well aware of the market conditions. Current market price of iron bar for construction is Rs. 350 per Kilogram. B already had 1000 Kg of iron bars in stock which he had purchased before price hike in the market for Rs. 200 per Kg. He supplied iron bars to the firm without the firm realising the purchase cost. Is B liable to pay the firm the extra money he made, or he doesn't have to inform the firm as it is his own business and he has not taken any amount more than the current prevailing market price of Rs. 350? Assume there is no contract between the partners regarding the above.

MTP-1

June-24

Ques-16

Sol.

[Personal Profit earned by partners]

Provision

According to section 16 of the Indian Partnership Act, 1932, subject to contract between partners:

- (a) if a partner derives any profit for himself from any transaction of the firm, or from the use of the property or business connection of the firm or the firm name, he shall account for that profit and pay it to the firm;
- (b) if a partner carries on any business of the same nature as and competing with that of the firm, he shall account for and pay to the firm all profits made by him in that business.

Analysis and conclusion

In the given scenario, Mr. B had sold iron bar to the firm at the current prevailing market rate of Rs. 350 per Kg though he had stock with him which he bought for Rs. 200 per Kg. Hence, he made an extra profit of Rs. 150 per Kg. This is arising purely out of transactions with the firm. Hence, Mr. B is accountable to the firm for the extra profit earned thereby

Q29. Mr. A (transferor) transfers his share in a partnership firm to Mr. B (transferee). Mr. B felt that the book of accounts was displaying only a small amount as profit inspite of a huge turnover. He wanted to inspect the book of accounts of the firm arguing that it is his entitlement as a transferee. However, the other partners were of the opinion that Mr. B cannot challenge the books of accounts. As an advisor, help them solve the issue applying the necessary provisions from the Indian Partnership Act, 1932.

Sol.

Provision

As per Section 29 of the Indian Partnership Act, 1932, during the continuance of the business, a transferee is not entitled

- To interfere with the conduct of the business
- To require the accounts
- To inspect the books of the firm He is only entitled to his share of profit.

Analysis and conclusion

Keeping the above points, in the given case, since the partnership business is in continuance, Mr. B is bound to accept the profits as agreed to by the partners. He cannot challenge the accounts. He is only entitled to receive the share of profits of Mr. A (transferring partner).

Q30. A, B and C are partners in a firm called ABC Firm. A, with the intention of deceiving D, a supplier of office stationery, buys certain stationery on behalf of the ABC Firm. The stationery is of use in the ordinary course of the firm's business. A does not give the stationery to the firm, instead brings it to his own use. The supplier D, who is unaware of the private use of stationery by A, claims the price from the firm. The firm refuses to pay for the price, on the ground that the stationery was never received by it (firm). Referring to the provisions of the Indian Partnership Act, 1932 decide:

Whether the Firm's contention shall be tenable?

What would be your answer if a part of the stationery so purchased by A was delivered to the firm by him, and the rest of the stationery was used by him for private use, about which neither the firm nor the supplier D was aware?

Sol.

Provision

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.

Analysis and conclusion

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.

Q.31. A, B, and C are partners of a partnership firm ABC & Co. The firm is a dealer in office furniture. A was in charge of purchase and sale, B was in charge of maintenance of accounts of the firm and C was in charge of handling all legal matters. Recently through an agreement among them, it was decided that A will be in charge of maintenance of accounts and B will be in charge of purchase and sale. Being ignorant about such agreement, M, a supplier supplied some furniture to A, who ultimately sold them to a third party. Referring to the provisions of the Partnership Act, 1932, advise whether M can recover money from the firm.

What will be your advice in case M was having knowledge about the agreement?

Provision

According to Section 20 of the Indian Partnership Act, 1932, the partners in a firm may, by contract between the partners, extend or restrict implied authority of any partners.

Not with standing any such restriction, any act done by a partner on behalf of the firm which falls within his implied authority binds the firm, unless the person with whom he is dealing knows of the restriction or does not know or believe that partner to be a partner.

The implied authority of a partner may be extended or restricted by contract between the partners. Under the following conditions, the restrictions imposed on the implied authority of a partner by agreement shall be effective against a third party:

1. The third party knows about the restrictions, and
2. The third party does not know that he is dealing with a partner in a firm.

Analysis and conclusion

Now referring to the case given in the question, M supplied furniture to A, who ultimately sold them to a third party and M was also ignorant about the agreement entered into by the partners about the change in their role. M also is not aware that he is dealing with a partner in a firm. Therefore, M on the basis of knowledge of implied authority of A, can recover money from the firm.

But in the second situation, if M was having knowledge about the agreement, he cannot recover money from the firm.

Q32. X, Y and Z are partners in a Partnership Firm. They were carrying their business successfully for the past several years. Due to expansion of business, they planned to hire another partner Mr. A. Now the firm has 4 partners X, Y, Z and A. The business was continuing at normal pace. In one of formal business meeting, it was observed that Mr. Y misbehaved with Mrs. A (wife of Mr. A). Mr. Y was badly drunk and also spoke rudely with Mrs. A. Mrs. A felt very embarrassed and told her husband Mr. A about the entire incident. Mr. A got angry on the incident and started arguing and fighting with Mr. Y in the meeting place itself. Next day, in the office Mr. A convinced X and Z that they should expel Y from their partnership firm. Y was expelled from partnership without any notice from X, A and Z.

Considering the provisions of the Indian Partnership Act, 1932, state whether they can expel a partner from the firm. What are the criteria for test of good faith in such circumstances?

Sol.

Provision

According to Section 33 of Indian Partnership Act, 1932, a partner may not be expelled from a firm by a majority of partners except in exercise, in good faith, of powers conferred by contract between the partners. It is, thus, essential that:

- (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 bonafide interest of the business of the firm.

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

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

If a partner is otherwise expelled, the expulsion is null and void.

Analysis and conclusion

According to the test of good faith as required under Section 33(1), expulsion of Partner Y is not valid as he was not served any notice and also he was not given an opportunity of being heard. Also the matter of fight between A and Y was on personal reasons, hence not satisfying the test of good faith in the interest of partnership. Since the conditions given under above provisions are not satisfied, the expulsion stands null and void.

Q3. Mahesh, Suresh and Dinesh are partners in a trading firm. Mahesh, without the knowledge or consent of Suresh and Dinesh borrows himself Rs. 50,000 from Ramesh, a customer of the firm, in the name of the firm. Mahesh, then buys some goods for his personal use with that borrowed money. Can Mr. Ramesh hold Mr. Suresh & Mr. Dinesh liable for the loan? Explain the relevant provisions of the Indian Partnership Act, 1932.

Sol.

Provision

Implied authority of a partner

As per sections 19 and 22 of the Indian Partnership Act, 1932 unless otherwise provided in the partnership deed, every partner has an implied authority to bind every other partner for acts done in the name of the firm, provided the same falls within the ordinary course of business and is done in a usual manner.

Analysis and conclusion

Mahesh has a right to borrow the money of Rs. 50,000/- from Ramesh on behalf of his firm in the usual manner. Since, Ramesh has no knowledge that the amount was borrowed by Mahesh without the consent of the other two partners, Mr. Suresh and Mr. Dinesh, he can hold both of them (Suresh and Dinesh) liable for the re-payment of the loan.

□□□

Registration and Dissolution of a Firm

PART-A



Steps for Registration of Firm (Section 58 & 59)

- Files statement with RoF in the prescribed form with prescribed Fees
- RoF of the area in which any place of business is situated
- Statement need to be signed by all the partners

RoF issues Certificate of Registration after


- Satisfying all the provisions are being complied with
- Recording an entry in the register of firms

Effective Date of Registration :

Registration is deemed to be completed as soon as an application in the prescribed form with the prescribed fee and necessary details concerning the particulars of partnership is delivered to the Registrar

Registered Firm shall use the bracket & word (Registered) immediately after its name



Content of Statement



Firm name shall not contain following words:


- Crown X
- Emperor X
- Empire X
- Imperial X
- King X
- Queen X
- Royal X
- Govt linked X

State Govt can give approval to use firm name linked with govt. by order in writing



Note: Insolvent Partner, Property of deceased partner and dormant partner are not liable to third party even if no public notice is given

Note: After dissolution, each partner has the authority which is necessary to wind up the affairs of the firm



Consequences of Non-Registration (Section 69)	Exceptions: Non-Registration of firm does not, however the following rights
1. No suit in civil court by firm or other co-partners against third party	1. Right of third parties to sue the firm or any partner
2. No relief to firm or partner for set-off of claim	2. right of partners to sue for the dissolution of the firm or for the settlement of the accounts of a dissolved firm, or for realization of the property of a dissolved firm.
3. Aggrieved partner cannot partner legal action against firm or other partners	3. The power of an Official Assignees, Receiver of Court to release the property of the insolvent partner and to bring an action
4. Third party can sue both registered or unregistered firm	4. The right to sue or claim a set-off if the value of suit does not exceed Rs. 100 in value
	5. The right to suit and proceeding instituted by legal representatives or heirs of the deceased partner of a firm for account s of the firm or to realise the property of the firm

Modes of Dissolution of Firm

Without Court Intervention

Dissolution by Agreement (Section 40)

Dissolution by notice (in partnership at will) (Section 43)

Compulsory dissolution of firm (Section 41)

Dissolution on happening of certain contingencies (Section 42)

1. After expiry of fixed term of partnership
2. Completion of adventure/undertaking
3. Death of a partner
4. Adjudication of partner as insolvent

With Court Intervention (Section 44)

Insanity / Unsound Mind

Permanent Incapacity

Persistent Breach of agreement

Transfer of Interest

Continuous Losses / Perpetual Losses

Just & equitable grounds

1. Deadlock in Management
2. Partners are not in talking terms
3. Loss of substratum
4. Gambling by partner on a stock exchange

Q. What is the procedure of registration of a partnership firm under the Indian Partnership Act, 1932?

(2) (SECTION 58): (1) The registration of a firm may be effected at any time by sending by post or delivering to the Registrar of the area in which any place of business of the firm is situated or proposed to be situated, a statement in the prescribed form and accompanied by the prescribed fee, stating-

- (a) The firm's name
- (b) The place or principal place of business of the firm,
- (c) The names of any other places where the firm carries on business,
- (d) the date when each partner joined the firm,
- (e) the names in full and permanent addresses of the partners, and
- (f) the duration of the firm.

2: The statement shall be signed by all the partners, or by their agents specially authorised in this behalf.

3: Each person signing the statement shall also verify it in the manner prescribed.

4: A firm name shall not contain any of the following words, namely:

Note: 'Crown', 'Emperor', 'Empress', 'Empire', 'Imperial', 'King', 'Queen', 'Royal', or words expressing or implying the sanction, approval or patronage of Government except when the State Government signifies its consent to the use of such words as part of the firm-name by order in writing

Q. When does dissolution of a partnership firm take place under the provisions of the Indian Partnership Act, 1932? Explain.

Dissolution of Firm: The Dissolution of Firm means the discontinuation of the jural relation existing between all the partners of the Firm. But when only one of the partners retires or becomes incapacitated from acting as a partner due to death, insolvency or insanity, the partnership, i.e., the relationship between such a partner and other is dissolved, but the rest may decide to continue.

* In such cases, there is in practice, no dissolution of the firm. The particular partner goes out, but the remaining partners carry on the business of the Firm.

* In the case of dissolution of the firm, on the other hand, the whole firm is dissolved. The partnership terminates as between each and every partner of the firm.

Dissolution of a Firm may take place (Section 39 - 44)

- (a) as a result of any agreement between all the partners (i.e., dissolution by agreement);
- (b) by the adjudication of all the partners, or of all the partners but one, as insolvent (i.e., compulsory dissolution);
- (c) by the business of the Firm becoming unlawful (i.e., compulsory dissolution);
- (d) subject to agreement between the parties, on the happening of certain contingencies, such as:
 - (i) effluence of time;
 - (ii) completion of the venture for which it was entered into;
 - (iii) death of a partner;
 - (iv) insolvency of a partner.
- (e) by a partner giving notice of his intention to dissolve the firm, in case of partnership at will and the firm being dissolved as from the date mentioned in the notice, or if no date is mentioned, as from the date of the communication of the notice; and
- (f) by intervention of court in case of:
 - (i) a partner becoming the unsound mind;
 - (ii) permanent incapacity of a partner to perform his duties as such;
 - (iii) Misconduct of a partner affecting the business;
 - (iv) willful or persistent breach of agreement by a partner;
 - (v) transfer or sale of the whole interest of a partner;
 - (vi) improbability of the business being carried on save at a loss;
- (g) the court being satisfied on other equitable grounds that the firm should be dissolved.

Q3. "Indian Partnership Act does not make the registration of firms compulsory nor does it impose any penalty for non-registration." In light of the given statement, discuss the consequences of non-registration of the partnership firms in India?

Or

"Indian Partnership Act does not make the registration of firms compulsory nor does it impose any penalty for non-registration." Explain. Discuss the various disabilities or disadvantages that a non-registered partnership firm can face in brief?

Sol. Under the English Law, the registration of firms is compulsory. Therefore, there is a penalty for non-registration of firms. But the Indian Partnership Act does not make the registration of firms compulsory nor does it impose any penalty for non-registration. However, under Section 69, non-registration of partnership gives rise to a number of disabilities which we shall presently discuss. Although registration of firms is not

compulsory, yet the consequences or disabilities of non-registration have a persuasive pressure for their registration. These disabilities briefly are as follows:

- (i) **No suit in a civil court by firm or other co-partners against third party:** The firm or any other person on its behalf cannot bring an action against the third party for breach of contract entered into by the firm, unless the firm is registered and the persons suing are or have been shown in the register of firms as partners in the firm.
In other words, a registered firm can only file a suit against a third party and the persons suing have been in the register of firms as partners in the firm.
- (ii) **No relief to partners for set-off of claim:** If an action is brought against the firm by a third party, then neither the firm nor the partner can claim any set-off, if the suit be valued for more than Rs. 100 or pursue other proceedings to enforce the rights arising from any contract.
- (iii) **Aggrieved partner cannot bring legal action against other partner or the firm:** A partner of an unregistered firm (or any other person on his behalf) is precluded from bringing legal action against the firm or any person alleged to be or to have been a partner in the firm. But, such a person may sue for dissolution of the firm or for accounts and realization of his share in the firm's property where the firm is dissolved.
- (iv) **Third party can sue the firm:** In case of an unregistered firm, an action can be brought against the firm by a third party.

4. Subject to agreement by partners, state the rules that should be observed by the partners in settling the accounts of the firm after dissolution under the provisions of the Indian Partnership Act, 1932.

5. Mode of Settlement of partnership accounts: As per Section 48 of the Indian Partnership Act, 1932, in settling the accounts of a firm after dissolution, the following rules shall, subject to agreement by the partners, be observed:

- (i) Losses, including deficiencies of capital, shall be paid first out of profits, next out of capital, and, lastly, if necessary, by the partners individually in the proportions in which they were entitled to share profits;
- (ii) The assets of the firm, including any sums contributed by the partners to make up deficiencies of capital, must be applied in the following manner and order:
 - (a) in paying the debts of the firm to third parties;
 - (b) in paying to each partner rateably what is due to him from capital;
 - (c) in paying to each partner rateably what is due to him on account of capital; and
 - (d) the residue, if any, shall be divided among the partners in the proportions in which they were entitled to share profits.

Q5. Distinguish between dissolution of firm and dissolution of partnership.

Or

“Dissolution of a firm is different from dissolution of Partnership”. Discuss.

Sol.

S. No.	Basis of Difference	Dissolution of Firm	Dissolution of Partnership
1.	Continuation of business	It involves discontinuation of business in partnership.	It does not affect continuation of business. It involves only reconstitution of the firm.
2.	Winding up	It involves winding up of the firm and requires realization of assets and settlement of liabilities.	It involves only reconstitution and requires only revaluation of assets and liabilities of the firm.
3.	Order of court	A firm may be dissolved by the order of the court.	Dissolution of partnership is not ordered by the court.
4.	Scope	It necessarily involves dissolution of partnership.	It may or may not involve dissolution of firm.
5.	Final closure of books	It involves final closure of books of the firm.	It does not involve final closure of the books of the firm.

Q6. Mr. A, Mr. B and Mr. C were partners in a partnership firm M/s ABC & Co., which is engaged in the business of trading of branded furniture. The name of the partners was clearly written along with the firm name in front of the head office of the firm as well as on letter-head of the firm. On 1st October, 2018, Mr. C passed away. His name was neither removed from the list of partners as stated in front of the head office nor from the letter-heads of the firm. As per the terms of partnership, the firm continued its operations with Mr. A and Mr. B as partners. The accounts of the firm were settled and the amount due to the legal heirs of Mr. C was also determined on 10th October, 2018. But the same was not paid to the legal heirs of Mr. C. On 16th October, 2018, Mr. X, a supplier supplied furniture worth Rs. 20,00,000 to M/s ABC & Co. M/s ABC & Co. could not repay the amount due to heavy losses. Mr. X wants to recover the amount not only from M/s ABC & Co., but also from the legal heirs of Mr. C.

Analyses the above situation in terms of the provisions of the Indian Partnership Act, 1932 and decide whether the legal heirs of Mr. C can also be held liable for the dues towards Mr. X.

Sol.

Provisic

Generally, the effect of the death of a partner is the dissolution of the partnership. but the rule in regard to the dissolution of the partnership, by death of partner, is

subject to a contract between the parties and the partners are competent to agree that the death of one will not have the effect of dissolving the partnership as regards the surviving partners unless the firm consists of only two partners. In order that the estate of the deceased partner may be absolved from liability for the future obligations of the firm, it is not necessary to give any notice either to the public or the persons having dealings with the firm.

Analysis and conclusion

In the light of the provisions of the Act and the facts of the question, Mr. X (creditor) can have only a personal decree against the surviving partners (Mr. A and Mr. B) and a decree against the partnership assets in the hands of those partners. A suit for goods sold and delivered would not lie against the representatives of the deceased partner. Hence, the legal heirs of Mr. C cannot be held liable for the dues towards Mr. X.

Ram, Mohan and Gopal were partners in a firm. During the course of partnership, the firm ordered Sunrise Ltd. to supply a machine to the firm. Before the machine was delivered, Ram expired. The machine, however, was later delivered to the firm. Thereafter, the remaining partners became insolvent and the firm failed to pay the price of machine to Sunrise Ltd.

Explain with reasons:

- (i) Whether Ram's private estate is liable for the price of the machine purchased by the firm?
- (ii) Against whom can the creditor obtain a decree for the recovery of the price?

Provision

Partnership Liability: The problem in question is based on the provisions of the Indian Partnership Act, 1932 contained in Section 35. The Section provides that where under a contract between the partners the firm is not dissolved by the death of a partner, the estate of a deceased partner is not liable for any act of the firm done after his death.

Analysis and conclusion

Therefore, considering the above provisions, the problem may be answered as follows:

- (i) Ram's estate in this case will not be liable for the price of the Machinery purchased. This is because there was not debt due in respect of the goods in Ram's life time.
- (ii) The creditors in this case can have only a personal decree against the surviving partners and decree against the partnership assets in the hands of those partners.

However, since the surviving partners are already insolvent, no suit for recovery of the debt would lie against them. A suit for goods sold and delivered would not lie against the representative of the deceased partner.

Q8. State the grounds on which Court may dissolve a partnership firm in case any partner files a suit for the same.

Or

What are the various grounds under the Indian Partnership Act, 1932, on which the Court may, at the suit of the partner, dissolve a firm?

Sol. 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.

It is not necessary that misconduct must relate to the conduct of the business. The important point is the adverse effect of misconduct on the business. In each case nature of business will decide whether an act is misconduct or not.

(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.

Example If one of the partners keeps erroneous accounts and omits to enter receipts or if there is continued quarrels between the partners or there is such a state of things that destroys the mutual confidence of partners, the court may order for dissolution of the firm.

- (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.

6. Referring to the Provisions of the Indian Partnership Act, 1932, answer the following:

- (i) What are the consequences of Non-Registration of Partnership firm?
- (ii) What are the rights which won't be affected by Non-Registration of Partnership firm?

1. Consequences of Non-registration of partnership firm:

Under Section 69 of the Indian Partnership Act, 1932 non-registration of partnership gives rise to a number of disabilities.

Though registration of firms is not compulsory, yet the consequences or disabilities of non-registration have a persuasive pressure for their registration. Following are the consequences:

- (a) **No suit in a civil court by firm or other co-partners against third party:** The firm or any other person on its behalf cannot bring an action against the third party for breach of contract entered into by the firm.
- (b) **No relief to partners for set-off of claim:** If an action is brought against the firm by a third party, then neither the firm nor the partner can claim any set-off, if the suit be valued for more than Rs. 100 or pursue other proceedings to enforce the rights arising from any contract.
- (c) **Aggrieved partner cannot bring legal action against other partner or the firm:** A partner of an unregistered firm (or any other person on his behalf) is precluded from bringing legal action against the firm or any person alleged to be or to have been a partner in the firm.
- (d) **Third-party can sue the firm:** In case of an unregistered firm, an action can be brought against the firm by a third party.

Non-registration of a firm does not, however, affect the following rights.

1. The right of third parties to sue the firm or any partner.
2. The right of partners to sue for the dissolution of the firm or for the settlement of the accounts of a dissolved firm, or for realization of the property of a dissolved firm.
3. The power of an Official Assignees, Receiver of Court to release the property of the insolvent partner and to bring an action.
4. The right to sue or claim a set-off if the value of suit does not exceed Rs. 100 in value.

Q10. A & Co. is registered as a partnership firm in 2015 with A, B and C partners. In 2016, A dies. In 2017, B and C sue X in the name and on behalf of A & Co., without fresh registration. Decide whether the suit is maintainable. Whether your answer would be same if in 2017 B and C had taken a new partner D and then filed a suit against X without fresh registration?

Sol.

Provision

As regards the question whether in the case of a registered firm (whose business was carried on after its dissolution by death of one of the partners), a suit can be filed by the remaining partners in respect of any subsequent dealings or transactions without notifying to the Registrar of Firms, the changes in the constitution of the firm, it was decided that the remaining partners should sue in respect of such subsequent dealings or transactions even though the firm was not registered again after such dissolution and no notice of the partner was given to the Registrar.

Analysis and conclusion

The test applied in these cases was whether the plaintiff satisfied the only two requirements of Section 69 (2) of the Act namely,

- (a) the suit must be instituted by or on behalf of the firm which had been registered.
- (b) the person suing had been shown as partner in the register of firms. In view of this position of law, the suit is in the case by B and C against X in the name and on behalf of A & Co. is maintainable.

Now, in 2017, B and C had taken a new partner, D, and then filed a suit against X without fresh registration. Where a new partner is introduced, the fact is to be notified to Registrar who shall make a record of the notice in the entry relating to the firm in the Register of firms. Therefore, the firm cannot sue as D's (new partner's) name has not been entered in the register of firms. It was pointed out that in the second requirement, the phrase "person suing" means persons in the sense of individuals whose names appear in the register as partners and who must be all partners in the firm at the date of the suit.

11. X, Y and Z are partners in a registered firm A & Co. X died and P retired. Y and Z filed a suit against W in the name and on behalf of firm without notifying to the Registrar of firms about the changes in the constitution of the firm. Is the suit maintainable?

Provision

As regards the question whether in the case of a registered firm (whose business was carried on after its dissolution by death of one of the partners), a suit can be filed by the remaining partners in respect of any subsequent dealings or transactions without notifying to the Registrar of Firms, the changes in the constitution of the firm, it was decided that the remaining partners should sue in respect of such subsequent dealings and no notice of the partner was given to the Registrar.

The test applied in these cases was whether the plaintiff satisfied the only two requirements of Section 69 (2) of the Act namely,

- (i) the suit must be instituted by or on behalf of the firm which had been registered;
- (ii) the person suing had been shown as partner in the register of firms.

Analysis and conclusion

In view of this position of law, the suit in the case is maintainable.

12. M/s XYZ & Company is a partnership firm. The firm is an unregistered firm. The firm has purchased some iron rods from another partnership firm M/s LMN & Company which is also an unregistered firm. M/s XYZ & Company could not pay the price within the time as decided. M/s LMN & Company has filed the suit against M/s XYZ & Company for recovery of price. State under the provisions of the Indian Partnership Act, 1932;

- (a) Whether M/s LMN & Company can file the suit against M/s XYZ & Company? cannot
- (b) What would be your answer, in case M/s XYZ & Company is a registered firm while M/s LMN & Company is an unregistered firm? cannot
- (c) What would be your answer, in case M/s XYZ & Company is an unregistered firm while M/s LMN & Company is a registered firm? can

Provision

According to provisions of Section 69 of the Indian Partnership Act, 1932 an unregistered firm cannot file a suit against a third party to enforce any right arising from contract, e.g., for the recovery of the price of goods supplied. But this section does not prohibit a third party to file suit against the unregistered firm or its partners.

Analysis and conclusion

- (a) On the basis of above, M/s LMN & Company cannot file the suit against M/s XYZ & Company as M/s LMN & Company is an unregistered firm.

- (b) In case M/s XYZ & Company is a registered firm while M/s LMN & Company is an unregistered firm, the answer would remain same as in point a) above.
- (c) In case M/s LMN & Company is a registered firm, it can file the suit against M/s XYZ & Company.

Q13. MN partnership firm has two different lines of manufacturing business. One line of business is the manufacturing of Ajinomoto, a popular seasoning & taste enhancer for food. Another line of business is the manufacture of paper plates & cups. One fine day, a law is passed by the Government banning Ajinomoto' use in food and to stop its manufacturing making it an unlawful business because it is injurious to health. Should the firm compulsorily dissolve under the Indian Partnership Act, 1932? How will its other line of business (paper plates & cups) be affected?

Sol.

Provision

According to Section 41 of the Indian Partnership Act, 1932, a firm is compulsorily dissolved;

- (a) by the adjudication of all the partners or of all the partners but one as insolvent, or
- (b) by the happening of any event which makes it unlawful for the business of the firm to be carried on or for the partners to carry it on in partnership.

However, where more than one separate adventure or undertaking is carried on by the firm, the illegality of one or more shall not of itself cause the dissolution of the firm in respect of its lawful adventures and undertakings.

Analysis and conclusion

Here, MN has to compulsorily dissolve due to happening of law which bans the usage of ajinomoto. Else the business of the firm shall be treated as unlawful.

However, the illegality of ajinomoto business will in no way affect the legality or dissolution of the other line of business (paper plates & cups). MN can continue with paper plates and cup manufacture.

