

Mock Test Paper - Series II: May, 2024

Date of Paper: 24th May, 2024

Time of Paper: 2 P.M. to 5 P.M.

**MOCK TEST PAPER II
FOUNDATION COURSE
PAPER 2: BUSINESS LAWS
ANSWERS**

1. (a) (i) As per Section 51 of the Indian Contract Act, 1872, when a contract consists of reciprocal promises to be simultaneously performed, no promisor needs to perform his promise unless the promisee is ready and willing to perform his reciprocal promise. Such promises constitute concurrent conditions and the performance of one of the promise is conditional on the performance of the other. If one of the promises is not performed, the other too need not be performed.

Referring to the above provisions, in the given case, Mr. S is not bound to deliver goods to Mr. R since payment was not made by him at the time of delivery of goods.

- (ii) **Promise to pay time-barred debts - Section 25 (3):** Where a promise in writing signed by the person making it or by his authorised agent, is made to pay a debt barred by limitation it is valid without consideration [Section 25(3)].

In the given case, the loan given by Mr. Y to Mr. G has become time barred. Thereafter, Mr. G agreed to make payment of full amount to Mr. Y.

Referring to above provisions of the Indian Contract Act, 1872 contract entered between parties post time barred debt is valid so, Mr. G is bound to pay the agreed amount to Mr. Y provided the above mentioned conditions of section 25 (3) are fulfilled.

- (iii) Where there is a breach of contract for supply of a unique item, mere monetary damages may not be an adequate remedy for the other party. In such a case, the court may give order for specific performance and direct the party in breach to carry out his promise according to the terms of contract. Here, in this case, the court may direct A to supply the item to B because the refusal to supply the agreed unique item cannot be compensated through money.

- (b) (i) Section 2(92) of Companies Act, 2013, provides that an unlimited company means a company not having any limit on the liability of its members. The liability of each member extends to the whole amount of the company's debts and liabilities, but he will be entitled to claim contribution from other members. In case the company has share capital, the Articles of Association must state the amount of share capital and the amount of each share. So long as the company is a going concern the

liability on the shares is the only liability which can be enforced by the company. The creditors can institute proceedings for winding up of the company for their claims. The official liquidator may call the members for their contribution towards the liabilities and debts of the company, which can be unlimited.

On the basis of above, it can be said that Mr. Samuel cannot directly claim his dues against the company from Mr. Innocent, the shareholder of the company even the company is an unlimited company. Mr. Innocent is liable upto his share capital. His unlimited liability will arise when official liquidator calls the members for their contribution towards the liabilities and debts of the company at the time of winding up of company.

- (ii) A company registered under Section 8 of the Companies Act, 2013 is prohibited from the payment of any dividends to its members.

Hence in the given case, the contention of the members to distribute dividend from the profits earned is wrong.

Also, Section 8 company is allowed to call a general meeting by giving 14 days instead of 21 days.

- (c) (i) **Mode of determining existence of partnership (Section 6 of the Indian Partnership Act, 1932):** In determining whether a group of persons is or is not a firm, or whether a person is or not a partner in a firm, regard shall be had to the real relation between the parties, as shown by all relevant facts taken together.

For determining the existence of partnership, it must be proved.

1. There was an **agreement** between all the persons concerned
 2. The agreement was to **share the profits** of a business and
 3. the business was **carried on by all or any of them** acting for all.
1. **Agreement:** Partnership is created by agreement and not by status (Section 5). The relation of partnership arises from contract and not from status; and in particular, the members of a Hindu Undivided family carrying on a family business as such are not partners in such business.
 2. **Sharing of Profit:** Sharing of profit is an essential element to constitute a partnership. But, it is only a *prima facie* evidence and not conclusive evidence, in that regard. The sharing of profits or of gross returns accruing from property by persons holding joint or common interest in the property would not by itself make such persons partners. Although the right to participate in profits is a strong test of partnership, and there may be cases where, upon a simple participation in profits, there is a partnership, yet whether the relation does or does not exist must depend upon the whole contract between the parties.
 3. **Agency:** Existence of Mutual Agency which is the cardinal principle of partnership law, is very much helpful in reaching a conclusion in this regard. Each partner carrying on the business is the principal as

well as an agent of other partners. So, the act of one partner done on behalf of firm, binds all the partners. If the elements of mutual agency relationship exist between the parties constituting a group formed with a view to earn profits by running a business, a partnership may be deemed to exist.

(ii) 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.

2. (a) 1. According to section 44 of the Sale of Goods Act, 1930, when the seller is ready and willing to deliver the goods and requests the buyer to take delivery, and the buyer does not within a reasonable time after such request take delivery of the goods, he is liable to the seller for any loss occasioned by his neglect or refusal to take delivery and also for a reasonable charge for the care and custody of the goods.

Risk of loss of goods *prima facie* follows the passing of property in goods. Goods remain at the seller's risk unless the property there in is transferred to the buyer, but after transfer of property therein to the buyer, the goods are at the buyer's risk whether delivery has been made or not.

In the given case, since Mr. G has already intimated Mr. H, that he wanted to store some other goods and thus Mr. H should take the delivery of goods kept in the godown of Mr. G, the loss of goods damaged should be borne by Mr. H.

2. If the price of the goods would not have settled in cash and some amount would have been pending then Mr. G will be treated as an unpaid seller and he can enforce the following rights against the goods as well as against the buyer personally:
- (a) Where under a contract of sale, the property in the goods has passed to the buyer and the buyer wrongfully neglects or refuses to pay for the goods according to the terms of the contract, the seller may sue him for the price of the goods. [Section 55(1) of the Sales of Goods Act, 1930]
 - (b) Where under a contract of sale the price is payable on a day certain irrespective of delivery and the buyer wrongfully neglects or refuses to pay such price, the seller may sue him for the price although the property in the goods has not passed and the goods have not been appropriated to the contract. [Section 55(2) of the Sales of Goods Act, 1930].

(b) One Person Company (OPC) [Section 2(62) of the Companies Act, 2013]: The Act defines one person company (OPC) as a company which has only one person as a member.

Rules regarding its membership:

- Only one person as member.
- The memorandum of OPC shall indicate the name of the other person, who shall, in the event of the subscriber's death or his incapacity to contract, become the member of the company.
- The other person whose name is given in the memorandum shall give his prior written consent in prescribed form and the same shall be filed with Registrar of companies at the time of incorporation of the company along with its e-memorandum and e-articles.
- Such other person may be given the right to withdraw his consent.
- The member of OPC may at any time change the name of such other person by giving notice to the company and the company shall intimate the same to the Registrar.
- Any such change in the name of the person shall not be deemed to be an alteration of the memorandum.
- Only a natural person who is an Indian citizen whether resident in India or otherwise and has stayed in India for a period of not less than 120 days during the immediately preceding financial year-
 - shall be eligible to incorporate a OPC;
 - shall be a nominee for the sole member of a OPC.
- No person shall be eligible to incorporate more than one OPC or become nominee in more than one such company.
- No minor shall become member or nominee of the OPC or can hold share with beneficial interest.

OPC cannot be incorporated or converted into a company under section 8 of the Act. Though it may be converted to private or public companies in certain cases.

(c) Distinction between LLP and Limited Liability Company: The points of distinction between a LLP and Limited Liability Company are tabulated as follows:

	Basis	LLP	Limited Liability Company
1.	Regulating Act	The LLP Act, 2008.	The Companies Act, 2013.
2.	Members/Partners	The persons who contribute to LLP are known as partners of the LLP.	The persons who invest the money in the shares are known as members of the company.

3.	Internal governance structure	The internal governance structure of a LLP is governed by contract agreement between the partners.	The internal governance structure of a company is regulated by statute (i.e., Companies Act, 2013).
4.	Name	Name of the LLP to contain the word "Limited Liability partnership" or "LLP" as suffix.	Name of the public company to contain the word "limited" and Pvt. Co. to contain the word "Private limited" as suffix.
5.	No. of members/partners	Minimum – 2 members Maximum – No such limit on the members in the Act. The members of the LLP can be individuals/or body corporate through the nominees.	Private company: Minimum – 2 members Maximum 200 members Public company: Minimum – 7 members Maximum – No such limit on the members. Members can be organizations, trusts, another business form or individuals.
6.	Liability of members/partners	Liability of the partners is limited to the extent of agreed contribution except in case of willful fraud.	Liability of a member is limited to the amount unpaid on the shares held by them.
7.	Management	The business of the company is managed by the partners including the designated partners authorized in the agreement.	The affairs of the company are managed by board of directors elected by the shareholders.
8.	Minimum number of directors/designated partners	Minimum 2 designated partners.	Pvt. Co. – 2 directors Public co. – 3 directors

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

- (1) 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.
- (2) 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)]

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.

(ii) 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.

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

(b) Small Company: According to Section 2(85) of the Companies Act, 2013, Small Company means a company, other than a public company,—

- (1) paid-up share capital of which does not exceed fifty lakh rupees or such higher amount as may be prescribed which shall not be more than four crore rupees; and
- (2) turnover of which as per its last profit and loss account does not exceed two crore rupees or such higher amount as may be prescribed which shall not be more than forty crore rupees.

Nothing in this clause shall apply to—

- (A) a holding company or a subsidiary company;
 - (B) a company registered under section 8; or
 - (C) a company or body corporate governed by any special Act.
- (i) In the present case, MNP Private Ltd., a company registered under the Companies Act, 2013 with a paid up share capital of ₹ 5 crores and having turnover of ₹ 35 crore. Since only one criteria of share

capital of ₹ 4 crores is met, but the second criteria of turnover of ₹ 40 crores is not met and the provisions require both the criteria to be met in order to avail the status of a small company, MNP Ltd. cannot avail the status of small company.

- (ii) If the turnover of the company is ₹ 45 crore, then both the criteria will be fulfilled and MNP Ltd. can avail the status of small company.

(c) Definition of Fraud under Section 17 of the Indian Contract Act, 1872:

'Fraud' means and includes any of the following acts committed by a party to a contract, or with his connivance, or by his agent, with an intent to deceive another party thereto or his agent, or to induce him to enter into the contract:

- (1) the suggestion, as a fact, of that which is not true, by one who does not believe it to be true;
- (2) the active concealment of a fact by one having knowledge or belief of the fact;
- (3) a promise made without any intention of performing it;
- (4) any other act fitted to deceive;
- (5) any such act or omission as the law specially declares to be fraudulent.

According to Section 18, there is misrepresentation:

- (1) Statement of fact, which of false, would constitute misrepresentation if the maker believes it to be true but which is not justified by the information he possesses;
- (2) When there is a breach of duty by a person without any intention to deceive which brings an advantage to him;
- (3) When a party causes, even though done innocently, the other party to the agreement to make a mistake as to the subject matter.

Distinction between fraud and misrepresentation:

Basis of difference	Fraud	Misrepresentation
Intention	To deceive the other party by hiding the truth.	There is no such intention to deceive the other party.
Knowledge of truth	The person making the suggestion believes that the statement as untrue.	The person making the statement believes it to be true, although it is not true.
Rescission of the contract and claim for damages	The injured party can repudiate the contract and claim damages.	The injured party is entitled to repudiate the contract or sue for restitution but cannot claim the damages.

Means to discover the truth	The party using the fraudulent act cannot secure or protect himself by saying that the injured party had means to discover the truth.	Party can always plead that the injured party had the means to discover the truth.
------------------------------------	---	--

4. (a) Section 73 of the Indian Contract Act, 1872 provides for consequences of breach of contract. According to it, when a contract has been broken, the party who suffers by such breach is entitled to receive from the party who has broken the contract, compensation for any loss or damage caused to him thereby which naturally arose in the usual course of things from such breach or which the parties knew when they made the contract, to be likely to result from the breach of it. Such compensation is not given for any remote and indirect loss or damage sustained by reason of the breach. It is further provided in the explanation to the section that in estimating the loss or damage from a breach of contract, the means which existed of remedying the inconvenience caused by the non-performance of the contract must be taken into account.

Applying the above principle of law to the given case, M Ltd. is obliged to compensate for the loss of ₹ 1.25 lakh (i.e. ₹ 12.75 minus ₹ 11.50 = ₹ 1.25 lakh) which had naturally arisen due to default in performing the contract by the specified date.

Regarding the amount of compensation which Shanti Traders were compelled to make to Zenith Traders, it depends upon the fact whether M Ltd., knew about the contract of Shanti Traders for supply of the contracted machinery to Zenith Traders on the specified date. If so, M Ltd is also obliged to reimburse the compensation which Shanti Traders had to pay to Zenith Traders for breach of contract. Otherwise, M Ltd is not liable.

- (b) **Inchoate Instrument:** It means an instrument that is incomplete in certain respects. The drawer/ maker/ acceptor/ indorser of a negotiable instrument may sign and deliver the instrument to another person in his capacity leaving the instrument, either wholly blank or having written on it the word incomplete. Such an instrument is called an inchoate instrument and this gives the power to its holder to make it complete by writing any amount either within limits specified therein or within the limits specified by the stamp's affixed on it. The principle of this rule of an inchoate instrument is based on the principle of estoppel.

Ambiguous Instrument: According to Section 17 of the Negotiable Instruments Act, 1881, where an instrument may be construed either as a promissory note or bill of exchange, the holder may at his election treat it as either, and the instrument shall be thenceforward treated accordingly.

Thus, an instrument which is vague and cannot be clearly identified either as a bill of exchange, or as a promissory note, is an ambiguous instrument. In other words, such an instrument may be construed either as a

promissory note, or as a bill of exchange. Section 17 provides that the holder may, at his discretion, treat it as either and the instrument shall thereafter be treated accordingly.

(c) (i) Supreme Court

The Supreme Court is the apex body of the judiciary. It was established on 26th January 1950. The Chief Justice of India is the highest authority appointed under Article 126. The principal bench of the Supreme Court consists of seven members including the Chief Justice of India. Presently, the number has increased to 34 including the Chief Justice of India due to the rise in the number of cases and workload. An individual can seek relief in the Supreme Court by filing a writ petition under Article 32.

(ii) High Court

The highest court of appeal in each state and union territory is the High Court. Article 214 of the Indian Constitution states that there must be a High Court in each state. The High Court has appellate, original jurisdiction, and Supervisory jurisdiction. However, Article 227 of the Indian Constitution limits a High Court's supervisory power. In India, there are twenty-five High Courts, one for each state and union territory, and one for each state and union territory. Six states share a single High Court. An individual can seek remedies against violation of fundamental rights in High Court by filing a writ under Article 226.

5. (a) (i) Right of stoppage of goods in transit: The problem is based on section 50 of the Sale of Goods Act, 1930 dealing with the right of stoppage of the goods in transit available to an unpaid seller. The section states that the right is exercisable by the seller only if the following conditions are fulfilled.

- (A) The seller must be unpaid
- (B) He must have parted with the possession of goods
- (C) The goods must be in transit
- (D) The buyer must have become insolvent
- (E) The right is subject to the provisions of the Act.

Applying the provisions to the given case, Ram being still unpaid, can stop the 100 bales of cloth sent by railway as these goods are still in transit.

- (ii) (A)** A wholesaler of cotton has 100 bales in his godown. So, the goods are existing goods. He agrees to sell 50 bales and these bales were selected and set aside. On selection, the goods become ascertained. In this case, the contract is for the sale of ascertained goods, as the cotton bales to be sold are identified and agreed after the formation of the contract.
- (B)** If A agrees to sell to B one packet of sugar out of the lot of one hundred packets lying in his shop, it is a sale of existing but unascertained goods because it is not known which packet is to be delivered.

(C) T agrees to sell to S all the apples which will be produced in his garden this year. It is a contract of sale of future goods, amounting to 'an agreement to sell.'

(b) DISSOLUTION BY THE COURT (SECTION 44): 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.
- (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, 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.

- (c) (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 the 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 facts 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 (subject to the rules regarding the termination of an agent's authority) 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 revokes the authority of B (agent), it results in termination of authority of sub-agent appointed by B i.e. C (sub-agent).

- 6. (a) (i)** Section 64 of the Negotiable Instruments Act, 1881 provides, Promissory notes, bill of exchange and cheques must be presented for payment to the maker, acceptor or drawee thereof respectively, by or on behalf of the holder as hereinafter provided. In default of such presentment, the other parties thereto are not liable thereon to such holder. However, where a promissory note is payable on demand and is not payable at a specified place, no presentment is necessary in order to charge the maker thereof.

In the instant case, Advik issued a promissory note to Bhanu payable on demand without mentioning any specific place for payment. On maturity, the promissory note was not presented by Bhanu for payment.

On the basis of the above provisions and facts of the case, although non-presentment of promissory note for payment results in discharge of maker from liability but the given case is covered under the exception to section 64. Hence, Advik would not be discharged from liability even the non-presentment by Bhanu as the promissory note was payable on demand and no specific place for payment was mentioned.

- (ii)** Section 138 of the Negotiable Instruments Act, 1881 provides where any cheque drawn by a person for the discharge, in whole or in part, of any debt or other liability, is returned by the bank unpaid due to

insufficiency of fund, the drawer is punishable with imprisonment upto 2 years or fine upto 2 times the amount of cheque or Both. In other words, the liability under section 138 arises only if the drawer had issued the cheque to discharge a legally enforceable debt or other liability. Thus, where the drawer issues a cheque as a gift or charity, he is not liable under section 138 even if cheque is dishonoured.

In the instant case, Shiva gifted a cheque of Rs. 21,000 to his sister. Afterwards, Shiva informed his sister not to present the cheque for payment and also informed the bank to stop the payment.

On the basis of above, as the cheque was given as gift, provisions of section 138 will not be applicable on Shiva.

(b) Quantum Meruit: Where one person has rendered service to another in circumstances which indicate an understanding between them that it is to be paid for although no particular remuneration has been fixed, the law will infer a promise to pay. *Quantum Meruit* i.e. as much as the party doing the service has deserved. It covers a case where the party injured by the breach had at the time of breach done part but not all of the work which he is bound to do under the contract and seeks to be compensated for the value of the work done. For the application of this doctrine, two conditions must be fulfilled:

- (1) It is only available if the original contract has been discharged.
- (2) The claim must be brought by a party not in default.

The object of allowing a claim on *quantum meruit* is to recompensate the party or person for value of work which he has done. Damages are compensatory in nature while quantum meruit is restitutory. It is but reasonable compensation awarded on implication of a contract to remunerate.

The claim for quantum meruit arises in the following cases:

- (a) When an agreement is discovered to be void or when a contract becomes void.
 - (b) When something is done without any intention to do so gratuitously.
 - (c) Where there is an express or implied contract to render services but there is no agreement as to remuneration.
 - (d) When one party abandons or refuses to perform the contract.
 - (e) Where a contract is divisible and the party not in default has enjoyed the benefit of part performance.
 - (f) When an indivisible contract for a lump sum is completely performed but badly the person who has performed the contract can claim the lump sum, but the other party can make a deduction for bad work.
- (c) The doctrine of Caveat Emptor given under the Sale of Goods Act, 1930 is subject to the following exceptions:**
1. **Fitness as to quality or use:** Where the buyer makes known to the seller the particular purpose for which the goods are required, it is the

duty of the seller to supply such goods as are reasonably fit for that purpose [Section 16 (1)].

2. **Goods purchased under patent or brand name:** In case where the goods are purchased under its patent name or brand name, there is no implied condition that the goods shall be fit for any particular purpose [Section 16(1)].
3. **Goods sold by description:** Where the goods are sold by description there is an implied condition that the goods shall correspond with the description [Section 15]. If it is not so, then seller is responsible.
4. **Goods of Merchantable Quality:** Where the goods are bought by description from a seller who deals in goods of that description there is an implied condition that the goods shall be of merchantable quality. The rule of Caveat Emptor is not applicable. [Section 16(2)].
5. **Sale by sample:** Where the goods are bought by sample, this rule of Caveat Emptor does not apply if the bulk does not correspond with the sample [Section 17].
6. **Goods by sample as well as description:** Where the goods are bought by sample as well as description, the rule of Caveat Emptor is not applicable in case the goods do not correspond with both the sample and description or either of the condition [Section 15].
7. **Trade Usage:** An implied warranty or condition as to quality or fitness for a particular purpose may be annexed by the usage of trade and if the seller deviates from that, this rule of Caveat Emptor is not applicable [Section 16(3)].
8. **Seller actively conceals a defect or is guilty of fraud:** Where the seller sells the goods by making some misrepresentation or fraud and the buyer relies on it or when the seller actively conceals some defect in the goods so that the same could not be discovered by the buyer on a reasonable examination, then the rule of Caveat Emptor will not apply.