

## CH. 2: SALES OF GOODS ACT, 1930

Q1) Avyukt purchased 100 Kgs of wheat from Bhaskar at ` 30 per kg. Bhaskar says that wheat is in his warehouse in the custody of Kishore, the warehouse keeper. Kishore confirmed Avyukt that he can take the delivery of wheat from him and till then he is holding wheat on Avyukt's behalf. Before Avyukt picks the goods from warehouse, the whole wheat in the warehouse has flowed in flood. Now Avyukt wants his price on the contention that no delivery has been done by seller. Whether Avyukt is right with his views under the Sale of Goods Act, 1930.

**Answer -**

As per the provisions of the Sale of Goods Act, 1930 there are three modes of delivery,

- i) Actual delivery,
- ii) Constructive delivery and
- iii) Symbolic delivery.

When delivery is affected without any change in the custody or actual possession of the things, it is called constructive delivery or delivery by acknowledgement. Constructive delivery takes place when a person in possession of goods belonging to seller acknowledges to the buyer that he is holding the goods on buyer's behalf.

On the basis of above provisions and facts, it is clear that possession of the wheat has been transferred through constructive delivery. Hence, Avyukt is not right. He cannot claim the price back.

Q1A) Classify the following transactions according to the types of goods they are:

- a) A wholesaler of cotton has 100 bales in his godown. He agrees to sell 50 bales and these bales were selected and set aside.

- b) A agrees to sell to B one packet of salt out of the lot of one hundred packets lying in his shop.
- c) T agrees to sell to S all the oranges which will be produced in his garden this year.

**Answer: -**

Provision: [The Sale of Goods Act, 1930]

- a) A wholesaler of cotton has 100 bales in his godown. He agrees to sell 50 bales and these bales were selected and set aside. On selection the goods becomes 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 salt out of the lot of one hundred packets lying in his shop, it is a sale of unascertained goods because it is not known which packet is to be delivered.
- c) T agrees to sell to S all the oranges, which will be produced in his garden this year. It is contract of sale of future goods, amounting to 'an agreement to sell'.

Q2) Mr. Arun contracted to sell his swift car to Mr. Nikhil. Both missed to discuss the price of the said swift car. Later, Mr. Arun refused to sell his swift car to Mr. Nikhil on the ground that the agreement was void, being uncertain about the price. Does Mr. Nikhil have any right against Mr. Arun under the Sale of Goods Act, 1930?

Answer

As per the provisions of Section 2(10) of the Sale of Goods Act, 1930, price is the consideration for sale of goods and therefore is a requirement to make a contract of sale. Section 2(10) is to be read with Section 9 of the Sale of Goods Act, 1930.

According to Section 9 of the Sale of Goods Act, 1930, the price in a contract of sale may be fixed by the contract or may be left to be fixed in a manner thereby agreed or may be determined by the course of dealing between the parties.

Even though both the parties missed discussing the price of the car while making the contract, it will be a valid contract, rather than being uncertain and void; the buyer shall pay a reasonable price in this situation.

In the given case, Mr. Arun and Mr. Nikhil have entered into a contract for the sale of a swift car, but they did not fix the price of the same. Mr. Arun refused to sell the car to Mr. Nikhil on this ground. Mr. Nikhil can legally demand the car from Mr. Arun and Mr. Arun can recover a reasonable price for the car from Mr. Nikhil.

Q3) Simran went to a Jewellery shop and asked the salesgirl to show her diamond bangles with Ruby stones. The Jeweller told her that we have a lot of designs of diamond bangles but with red stones if she chooses for herself any special design of diamond bangle with red stones, they will replace red stones with Ruby stones. But for the Ruby stones they will charge some extra cost. Simran selected a beautiful set of designer bangles and paid for them. She also paid the extra cost of Ruby stones. The Jeweller requested her to come back a week later for delivery of those bangles. When she came after a week to take delivery of bangles, she noticed that due to Ruby stones, the design of bangles has been completely disturbed. Now, she wants to terminate the contract and thus, asked the Jeweller to give her money back, but he refused for the same. Answer the following questions as per the Sale of Goods Act, 1930.

1. State with reasons whether Simran can recover the amount from the Jeweller.
2. What would be your answer if Jeweller says that he can change the design, but he will charge extra cost for the same?

Answer

As per Section 4(3) of the Sale of Goods Act, 1930, where under a contract of sale, the property in the goods is transferred from the seller to the buyer, the contract is called a sale, but where the transfer of the property in the goods is to take place at a future time or subject to some condition thereafter to be fulfilled, the contract is called an agreement to sell and as per Section 4(4), an agreement to sell becomes a sale when the time elapses or the conditions are fulfilled subject to which the property in the goods is to be transferred.

1. On the basis of above provisions and facts given in the question, it can be said that there is an agreement to sell between Simran and Jeweller and not a sale. Even though the payment was made by Simran, the property in goods can be transferred only after the fulfilment of conditions fixed between the buyer and the seller. As due to Ruby Stones, the original design is disturbed, bangles are not in original position. Hence, Simran has right to avoid the agreement to sell and can recover the price paid.
2. If Jeweller offers to bring the bangles in original position by repairing, he cannot charge extra cost from Simran. Even though he has to bear some expenses for repair; he cannot charge it from Simran.

Q4) Distinguish between a 'Condition' and a 'Warranty' in a contract of sale. When shall a 'breach of condition' be treated as 'breach of warranty' under the provisions of the Sale of Goods Act, 1930? Explain.

**Answer: -**

Provision: [The Sale of Goods Act, 1930]

1. Difference between Condition and Warranty

- a) A condition is a stipulation essential to the main purpose of the contract whereas a warranty is a stipulation collateral to the main purpose of the contract.
- b) Breach of condition gives rise to a right to treat the contract as repudiated whereas in case of breach of warranty, the aggrieved party can claim damage only.
- c) Breach of condition may be treated as breach of warranty whereas a breach of warranty cannot be treated as breach of condition.

2. According to Section 13 of the Sale of Goods Act, 1930 a breach of condition may be treated as breach of warranty in following circumstances:

- a) Where a contract of sale is subject to any condition to be fulfilled by the seller, the buyer may waive the condition.
- b) Where the buyer elects to treat the breach of condition as breach of a warranty.
- c) Where the contract of sale is non-severable and the buyer has accepted the whole goods or any part thereof.
- d) Where the fulfilment of any condition or warranty is excused by law due to impossibility or otherwise.

Q5) Ram consults Shyam, a motorcar dealer for a car suitable for touring purposes to promote the sale of his product. Shyam suggests 'Maruti' and Ram accordingly buys it from Shyam. The car turns out to be unfit for touring purposes. What remedy Ram is having now under the Sale of Goods Act, 1930?

**Answer: -**

Provision: [The Sale of Goods Act, 1930]

1. A stipulation in a contract of sale with reference to goods, which are the subject thereof, may be a condition or a warranty.
2. A condition is a stipulation essential to the main purpose of the contract, the breach of which gives rise to a right to treat the contract as repudiated.
3. A warranty is a stipulation collateral to the main purpose of the contract, the breach of which gives rise to a claim for damages but not to a right to reject the goods and treat the contract as repudiated.
4. Whether a stipulation in a contract of sale is a condition or a warranty depends in each case on the construction of the contract. A stipulation may be a condition, though called a warranty in the contract.

Facts of Case:

In the instant case, the term that the 'car should be suitable for touring purposes' is a condition of the contract. It is so vital that its non-fulfilment defeats the very purpose for which Ram purchases the car.

Conclusion:

Ram is therefore entitled to reject the car and have refund of the price.

Q6) For the purpose of making uniform for the employees, Mr. Yadav bought dark blue coloured cloth from Vivek, but did not disclose to the seller the purpose of said purchase. When uniforms were prepared and used by the employees, the cloth was found unfit. However, there was evidence that the cloth was fit for caps, boots and carriage lining. Advise Mr. Yadav whether he is entitled to have any remedy under the sale of Goods Act, 1930?

**Answer: -**

Provision: [The Sale of Goods Act, 1930]

As per the provision of Section 16(1) of the Sale of Goods Act, 1930, an implied condition in a contract of sale that an article is fit for a particular purpose only arises when the purpose for which the goods are supplied is known to the seller, the buyer relied on the seller's skills or judgement and seller deals in the goods in his usual course of business.

In this case, the cloth supplied is capable of being applied to a variety of purposes, the buyer should have told the seller the specific purpose for which he required the goods. But he did not do so.

**Conclusion:**

Therefore, the implied condition as to the fitness for the purpose does not apply. Hence, the buyer will not succeed in getting any remedy from the seller under the Sale of Goods Act, 1930.

Q6A) Priyansh orders an iron window to an Iron Merchant for his new house. Iron merchant sends his technician to take the size of windows. The technician comes at the site and takes size of area where window to be fitted. Afterwards, Iron merchant on discussion with his technician intimates Priyansh that cost of the window will be ` 5,000 and he will take ` 1,000 as advance. Priyansh gives ` 1,000 as advance and rest after fitting of window. After three days when technician try to fit the window made by him at the site of Priyansh, it was noticed that the size of window was not proper. Priyansh requests the Iron merchant either to remove the defect or return his advance. Iron merchant replies that the window was specifically made for his site and the defect cannot be removed nor can it be of other use. So, he will not refund the advance money rather Priyansh should give him the balance of ` 4,000. State with reason under the provisions of the Sale of Goods Act, 1930, whether Priyansh can take his advance back?

***Answer -***

By virtue of provisions of Section 16 of the Sale of Goods Act, 1930, there is an implied condition that the goods should be in merchantable position at the time of transfer of property.

Sometimes, the purpose for which the goods are required may be ascertained from the facts and conduct of the parties to the sale, or from the nature of description of the article purchased. In such a case, the buyer need not tell the seller the purpose for which he buys the goods.

On the basis of above provisions and facts given in the question, it is clear that as window size was not proper, window was not in merchantable condition. Hence, the implied condition as to merchantability was not fulfilled and Priyansh has the right to avoid the contract and recover his advance money back.

Note - condition as to fitness & quality can also be answer

Q7) J the owner of a Fiat car wants to sell his car. For this purpose he hand over the car to P, a mercantile agent for sale at a price not less than Rs 50, 000. The agent sells the car for Rs 40, 000 to A, who buys the car in good faith and without notice of any fraud. P misappropriated the money also. J sues A to recover the Car. Decide given reasons whether J would succeed.

**Answer: -**

Provision: [The Sale of Goods Act, 1930]

1. The problem in this case is based on the provisions of the Sale of Goods Act, 1930 contained in the proviso to Section 27. The proviso provides that a mercantile agent is one who in the customary course of his business, has, as such agent, authority either to sell goods, or to consign goods, for the purpose of sale, or to buy goods, or to raise money on the security of goods [Section 2(9)].
2. The buyer of goods from a mercantile agent, who has no authority from the principal to sell, gets a good title to the goods if the following conditions are satisfied:
  - a) The agent should be in possession of the goods or documents of title to the goods with the consent of the owner.
  - b) The agent should sell the goods while acting in the ordinary course of business of a mercantile agent.

- c) The buyer should act in good faith.
- d) The buyer should not have at the time of the contract of sale notice that the agent has no authority to sell.

Facts of Case:

In the given case J was the owner of Fiat Car, which he wants to sell for this he appointed P and mercantile agent putting one condition that price should not be less than Rs.50, 000. However, P sells the car for Rs. 40, 000 to A who buys the car in good faith without having any knowledge of fraud. P misappropriated the money received from sell of that car.

Conclusion:

In the instant case, P, the agent, was in the possession of the car with J's consent for the purpose of sale. A, the buyer, therefore obtained a good title to the car. Hence, J in this case, cannot recover the car from A.

Q8) Prakash reaches a sweet shop and asks for 1 Kg of 'Burfi' if the sweets are fresh. Seller replies 'Sir, my all sweets are fresh and of good quality.' Prakash agrees to buy on the condition that first he tastes one piece of 'Burfi' to check the quality.

The seller gives him one piece to taste. Prakash, on finding the quality is good, ask the seller to pack. On reaching the house, Prakash finds that 'Burfi' is stale not fresh while the piece tasted was fresh. Now Prakash wants to avoid the contract and return the 'Burfi' to the seller.

- a. State with reason whether Prakash can avoid the contract under the Sale of Goods Act, 1930?
- b. Will your answer be different if Prakash does not taste the sweets?

**Answer**

By virtue of provisions of **Section 17** of the Sale of Goods Act, 1930, in the case of a contract for sale by sample there is an implied condition that the **bulk shall**

correspond with the sample in quality and the buyer shall have a reasonable opportunity of comparing the bulk with the sample.

According to Section 15, where there is a contract for the sale of goods by description, there is an implied condition that the goods shall correspond with the description. If the goods do not correspond with implied condition, the buyer can avoid the contract and reject the goods purchased.

- A. In the instant case, the sale of sweet is sale by sample and the quality of bulk does not correspond with quality of sample. Hence, Prakash can return the sweets and avoid the contract.
- B. In the other case, the sale of sweet is the case of sale by description and the quality of goods does not correspond with description made by seller. Hence, answer will be same. Prakash can return the sweets and avoid the contract.

Q9) Certain goods were sold by sample by J to K, who in turn sold the same goods by sample to L and L by sample sold the same goods to M. M found that the goods were not according to the sample and rejected the goods and gave a notice to L. L sued K and K sued J. Can M reject the goods? Also advise K and L as per the provisions of the Sale of Goods Act, 1930.

Answer

As per the provisions of Sub-Section (2) of Section 17 of the Sale of Goods Act, 1930, in a contract of sale by sample, there is an implied condition that:

1. the bulk shall correspond with the sample in quality;
2. the buyer shall have a reasonable opportunity of comparing the bulk with the sample.

In this case, M received the goods by sample from L but since the goods were not according to the sample, M can reject the goods and can sue L.

With regard to K and L, L can recover damages from K and K can recover damages from J. But, for both K and L, it will not be treated as a breach of implied condition as to sample as they have accepted and sold the goods according to Section 13(2) of the Sale of Goods Act, 1930.

Q9A) Sohan is a trader in selling of wheat. Binod comes to his shop and ask Sohan to show him some good quality wheat. Binod is satisfied with the quality of wheat. Sohan agrees to sell 100 bags of wheat to Binod on 10th June 2021.

The delivery of wheat and the payment was to be made in next three months i.e. by 10th September 2021 by Binod. Before the goods are delivered to Binod, Sohan gets another customer Vikram in his shop who is ready to pay higher price for the wheat. Sohan sells the goods of Binod (which were already lying in his possession even after sale) to Vikram. Vikram has no knowledge that Sohan is not the owner of goods. With reference to Sale of Goods Act, 1930, discuss if such a sale made by Sohan to Vikram is a valid sale?

Answers

The given question deals with the rule related to transfer of title of goods. Section 27 of the Sale of Goods Act, 1930 specifies the general rule "No man can sell the goods and give a good title unless he is the owner of the goods". The latin maxim "NEMO DET QUOD NON HABET". However, there are certain exceptions to this rule. One of the exceptions is given in Section 30 (1) of Sale of Goods Act, 1930 wherein the sale by seller in possession of goods even after sale is made, is held to be valid. If the following conditions are satisfied, then it amounts to a valid sale although the seller is no more the owner of goods after sale.

1. A seller has possession of goods after sale
2. with the consent of the other party (i.e. buyer)
3. the seller sells goods (already sold) to a new buyer
4. the new buyer acts in good faith
5. The new buyer has no knowledge that the seller has no authority to sell.

In the given question, the seller Sohan has agreed to sell the goods to Binod, but delivery of the goods is still pending. Hence Sohan is in possession of the goods and this is with the consent of buyer i.e. Binod. Now Sohan sell those goods to Vikram, the new buyer. Vikram is buying the goods in good faith and also has no knowledge that Sohan is no longer the owner of goods.

Since all the above conditions given under Section 30 (1) of Sale of Goods Act, 1930 are satisfied, therefore the sale made by Sohan to Vikram is a valid sale even if Sohan is no longer the owner of goods.

Q10) Mr. Samuel agreed to purchase 100 bales of cotton from Mr. Varun, out of his large stock and sent his men to take delivery of the goods. They could pack only 60 bales. Later on, there was an accidental fire and the entire stock was destroyed including 60 bales that were already packed. Referring to the provisions of the Sale of Goods Act, 1930 explain as to who will bear the loss and to what extent?

**Answer: -**

Provision: [The Sale of Goods Act, 1930]

1. Section 26 of the Sale of Goods Act, 1930 provides that unless otherwise agreed, the goods remain at the seller's risk until the property therein is transferred to the buyer, but when the property therein is transferred to the buyer, the goods are at buyer's risk whether delivery has been made or not.
2. Further Section 18 read with Section 23 of the Act provides that in a contract for the sale of unascertained goods, no property in the goods is transferred to the buyer, unless and until the goods are ascertained and where there is contract for the sale of unascertained or future goods by description, and goods of that description and in a deliverable state are unconditionally appropriated to the contract, either by the seller with the assent of the buyer or by the buyer with the assent of the seller, the property in the goods thereupon passes to the buyer.
3. Such assent may be express or implied. Applying the aforesaid law to the facts of the case in hand, it is clear that Mr. Samuel has the right to select the good out of the bulk and he has sent his men for same purpose.

Facts of Case:

1. Mr. Samuel agreed to purchase 100 bales from Mr. Varun and sent his men to take delivery of the same. Mr. Varun were able to pack only 60 bales.
2. Later on, there was accidental fire in Varun's place, due to which all the stock including those 60 bales to be delivered to Mr. Samuel was destroyed.

**Answer:**

Hence the problem can be answered based on the following two assumptions and the answer will vary accordingly.

- a) Where the bales have been selected with the consent of the buyer's representatives: In this case, the property in the 60 bales has been transferred to the buyer and goods have been appropriated to the contract. Thus, loss arising due to fire in case of 60 bales would be borne by Mr. Samuel. As regards 40 bales, the loss would be borne by Mr. Varun, since the goods have not been identified and appropriated.

Where the bales have not been selected with the consent of buyer's representatives. In this case the property in the goods has not been transferred at all and hence the loss of 100 bales would be borne by Mr. Varun completely.

Q11) Mr. G sold some goods to Mr. H for certain price by issue of an invoice, but payment in respect of the same was not received on that day. The goods were packed and lying in the godown of Mr. G. The goods were inspected by H's agent and were found to be in order. Later on, the dues of the goods were settled in cash. Just after receiving cash, Mr. G asked Mr. H that goods should be taken away from his godown to enable him to store other goods purchased by him. After one day, since Mr. H did not take delivery of the goods, Mr. G kept the goods out of the godown in an open space. Due to rain, some goods were damaged.

Referring to the provisions of the Sale of Goods Act, 1930, analyze the above situation and decide who will be held responsible for the above damage. Will your answer be different, if the dues were not settled in cash and are still pending?

**Answer: -**

Provision: [The Sale of Goods Act, 1930]

1. According to section 44 of the Sales of Goods Act, 1932, 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.
2. The property in the goods or beneficial right in the goods passes to the buyer at appoint of time depending upon ascertainment, appropriation and delivery of goods
3. 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.

Facts of case:

In given question Mr. G sold some goods to Mr. H but payment of the same was not received that day. Goods were packed & lying in godown of Mr. G. agent of Mr. H inspected the goods and later on payment was made in cash. Just after receiving cash. Mr. G asked Mr. H to take away goods so he can store his other goods at such place but Mr. H did not take delivery. Mr. G kept the goods out of the godown in an open place and due to rain some of the goods were damaged.

Conclusion:

1. 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. Payment of price is not stipulation of contract

Q12) Akansh purchased a Television set from Arvind, the owner of Gada Electronics on the condition that first three days he check its quality and if satisfied he will pay for that otherwise he will return the Television set. On the second day, the Television set was spoiled due to an

earthquake. Arvind demands the price of a Television set from Akansh. Whether Akansh is liable to pay the price under the Sale of Goods Act, 1930? Who will ultimately bear the loss?

Answer

According to Section 24 of the Sale of Goods Act, 1930, "When the goods are delivered to the buyer on approval or on sale or return or other similar terms the property passes to the buyer:

- when he signifies his approval or acceptance to the seller,
- when he does any other act adopting the transaction, and
- if he does not signify his approval or acceptance to the seller but retains goods beyond a reasonable time".

Further, as per Section 8, where there is an agreement to sell specific goods, and subsequently the goods without any fault on the part of the seller or buyer perish or become so damaged as no longer to answer to their description in the agreement before the risk passes to the buyer, the agreement is thereby avoided.

According to the above provisions and fact, the property is not passed to Akansh i.e. buyer as no condition of Section 24 is satisfied. Hence, risk has not passed to buyer and the agreement is thereby avoided. Akansh is not liable to pay the price. The loss finally should be borne by Seller, Mr. Arvind.

Q13) Rachit arranges an auction to sale an antic wall clock. Deepa, being one of the bidders, gives the highest bid. For announcing the completion of sale, the auctioneer falls the hammer on table but suddenly hammer brakes and damages the watch. Deepa wants to avoid the contract. Can she do so under the provisions of the Sale of Goods Act, 1930?

Answer

By virtue of provisions of Section 64 of the Sale of Goods Act, 1930, in case of auction sale, the sale is complete when the auctioneer announces its completion by the fall of the hammer or in some other customary manner.

In the instant case, Deepa gives the highest bid in the auction for the sale of an antic wall clock arranged by Rachit. While announcing the completion of sale by fall of hammer on the table, hammer brakes and damages the clock.

On the basis of the above provisions, it can be concluded that the sale by auction cannot be completed until hammer comes in its normal position after falling on table. Hence, in the given problem, sale is not completed. Deepa will not be liable for loss and can avoid the contract.

Q13A) A non-owner can convey better title to the bonafide purchaser of goods for value." Discuss the cases when a person other than the owner can transfer title in goods as per the provisions of the Sales of Goods Act, 1930

**Answer: -**

Provision: [The Sale of Goods Act, 1930]

In the following cases, a non-owner can convey better title to the bona fide purchaser of goods for value:

1. Sale by a Mercantile Agent:

A sale made by a mercantile agent of the goods for document of title to goods would pass a good title to the buyer in the following circumstances; namely;

- a) If he was in possession of the goods or documents with the consent of the owner;
- b) If the sale was made by him when acting in the ordinary course of business as a mercantile agent; and

If the buyer had acted in good faith and has at the time of the contract of sale, no notice of the fact that the seller had no authority to sell (Proviso to Section 27 of the Sale of Goods Act, 1930). Sale by one of the joint owners (Section 28):

If one of several joint owners of goods has the sole possession of them by permission of the co-owners, the property in the goods is transferred to any person who buys them of such joint owner in good faith and has not at the time of the contract of sale notice that the seller has no authority to sell.

3. Sale by a person in possession under voidable contract:

A buyer would acquire a good title to the goods sold to him by a seller who had obtained possession of the goods under a contract voidable on the ground of coercion, fraud, misrepresentation or undue influence provided that the contract had not been rescinded until the time of the sale (Section 29).

4. Sale by one who has already sold the goods but continues in possession thereof:

If a person has sold goods but continues to be in possession of them or of the documents of title to them, he may sell them to a third person, and if such person obtains the delivery thereof in good faith and without notice

of the previous sale, he would have good title to them, although the property in the goods had passed to the first buyer earlier. [Section 30(1)]

5. Sale by buyer obtaining possession before the property in the goods has vested in him:

Where a buyer with the consent of the seller obtains possession of the goods before the property in them has passed to him, he may sell, pledge or otherwise dispose of the goods to a third person, and if such person obtains delivery of the goods in good faith and without notice of the lien or other right of the original seller in respect of the goods, he would get a good title to them [Section 30(2)].

6. Effect of Estoppel:

Where the owner is estopped by the conduct from denying the seller's authority to sell, the transferee will get a good title as against the true owner. But before a good title by estoppel can be made, it must be shown that the true owner had actively suffered or held out the other person in question as the true owner or as a person authorized to sell the goods.

7. Sale by an unpaid seller:

Where an unpaid seller who had exercised his right of lien or stoppage in transit resells the goods, the buyer acquires a good title to the goods as against the original buyer [Section 54]

8. Sale under the provisions of other Acts:

- a) Sale by an Official Receiver or Liquidator of the Company will give the purchaser a valid title.
- b) Purchase of goods from a finder of goods will get a valid title under circumstances [Section 169 of the Indian Contract Act, 1872]
- c) A sale by pawnee can convey a good title to the buyer [Section 176 of the Indian Contract Act, 1872]

Q14) What are the rights of an unpaid seller against goods under the Sale of Goods Act, 1930?

Ans

Provision: [The Sale of Goods Act, 1930]

1. As per the provisions of Section 46 of the Sale of Goods Act, 1930, notwithstanding that the property in the goods may have passed to the buyer, the unpaid seller of goods, as such, has by implication of law-
  - a) a lien on the goods for the price while he is in possession of them;
  - b) in case of the insolvency of the buyer, a right of stopping the goods in transit after he has parted with the possession of them;
  - c) a right of re-sale as limited by this Act. [Sub-section (1)]
2. Where the property in goods has not passed to the buyer, the unpaid seller has, in addition to his other remedies, a right of withholding delivery similar to and co-extensive with his rights of lien and stoppage in transit where the property has passed to the buyer. [Sub-section (2)]
3. These rights can be exercised by the unpaid seller in the following circumstances:
  - a) Right of lien (Section 47):

According to sub-section (1), the unpaid seller of goods who is in possession of them is entitled to retain possession of them until payment or tender of the price in the following cases, namely: -

    - i. where the goods have been sold without any stipulation as to credit;
    - ii. where the goods have been sold on credit, but the term of credit has expired;
    - iii. where the buyer becomes insolvent.
  - b) Right of stoppage in transit (Section 50):

When the buyer of goods becomes insolvent, the unpaid seller who has parted with the possession of the goods has the right of stopping them in transit, that is to say, he may resume possession of the goods as long as they are in transit, and may retain them until paid or tendered price of the goods. Right to re-sell the goods (Section 54):

c) The unpaid seller can exercise the right to re-sell the goods under the following conditions:

- i. Where the goods are of a perishable nature
- ii. Where he gives notice to the buyer of his intention to re-sell the goods
- iii. Where an unpaid seller who has exercised his right of lien or stoppage in transit resells the goods
- iv. A re-sale by the seller where a right of re-sale is expressly reserved in a contract of sale
- v. Where the property in goods has not passed to the buyer

Q15) What are the rights of buyer against the seller, if the seller commits a breach of contract under the Sale of Goods Act, 1930?

**Answer: -**

Provision: [The Sale of Goods Act, 1930]

If the seller commits a breach of contract, the buyer gets the following rights against the seller:

1. Damages for non-delivery [Section 57]:  
Where the seller wrongfully neglects or refuses to deliver the goods to the buyer, the buyer may sue the seller for damages for non-delivery.
2. Suit for specific performance (Section 58):  
Where the seller commits a breach of the contract of sale, the buyer can appeal to the court for specific performance. The court can order for specific performance only when the goods are ascertained or specific.
3. Suit for breach of warranty (section 59):
  - a) Where there is breach of warranty on the part of the seller, or where the buyer elects to treat breach of condition as breach of warranty, the buyer is not entitled to reject the goods only on the basis of such breach of warranty. But he may - set up against the seller the breach of warranty in diminution or extinction of the price; or

b) sue the seller for damages for breach of warranty.

1. Repudiation of contract before due date (Section 60):

Where either party to a contract of sale repudiates the contract before the date of delivery, the other may either treat the contract as subsisting and wait till the date of delivery, or he may treat the contract as rescinded and sue for damages for the breach.

2. Suit for interest:

Nothing in this Act shall affect the right of the seller or the buyer to recover interest or special damages, in any case whereby law interest or special damages may be recoverable, or to recover the money paid where the consideration for the payment of it has failed.

In the absence of a contract to the contrary, the court may award interest at such rate as it thinks fit on the amount of the price to the buyer in a suit by him for the refund of the price in a case of a breach of the contract on the part of the seller from the date on which the payment was made.

Q16) AB sold 500 bags of wheat to CD. Each bag contains 50 Kilograms of wheat. AB sent 450 bags by road transport and CD himself took remaining 50 bags. Before CD receives delivery of 450 bags sent by road transport, he becomes bankrupt. AB being still unpaid, stops the bags in transit. The official receiver, on CD's insolvency claims the bags. Decide the case with reference to the provisions of the Sale of Goods Act, 1930.

**Answer**

Right of stoppage in transit (Section 50 of the Sale of Goods Act, 1930): Subject to the provisions of this Act, when the buyer of goods becomes insolvent, the unpaid seller who has parted with the possession of the goods has the right of stopping them in transit, that is to say, he may resume possession of the goods as long as they are in the course of transit, and may retain them until paid or tendered price of the goods.

When the unpaid seller has parted with the goods to a carrier and the buyer has become insolvent, he can exercise this right of asking the carrier to return the goods back, or not to deliver the goods to the buyer.

In the instant case, CD, the buyer becomes insolvent and 450 bags are in transit. AB, the seller, can stop the goods in transit by giving a notice of it to CD.

The official receiver, on CD's insolvency cannot claim the bags.

Q17) PTC Hotels in Bombay decided to sell their furniture by auction sale. For this purpose, they appointed RN & Associates as auctioneer. They invited top ten renowned Architects in Bombay for bidding. A right to bid was not notified by them. Furniture was put up in lots for sale. It was decided that for every lot of furniture there will be a reserve price. On 25th Feb 2024, Auction sale was started at 10.am in the lawn of PTC Hotels Bombay. For a special lot of furniture three parties came for bidding Mr. Neel, Mr. Raj and Mr. Dev on behalf of their respective companies. Bidding was as follows:

- Mr. Neel 5.70 Lakhs
- Mr. Raj 4.85 Lakhs
- Mr. Dev 6.10 Lakhs

The sale was completed in favour of Mr. Neel by RN & Associates by fall of hammer. Mr. Dev's Bid was rejected on ground that Right to bid was reserved and company of Mr. Dev was not invited to bid.

For another bid of Italian Furniture was made by two parties as follows:

- |   |             |
|---|-------------|
| • Mr. Dheer                                 | 15 Lakhs    |
| • Mr. Madhu (on behalf of R N & Associates) | 15.20 Lakhs |

Sale was completed in favour of Mr. Dheer instead of Mr. Madhu.

Mr. Dev and Mr. Madhu argued that auction sale was not lawful. Give your opinion with reference to provisions of the Sale of Goods Act, 1930 whether Auction Sale will be considered lawful or not?

Answer

An 'Auction Sale' is a mode of selling property by inviting bids publicly and the property is sold to the highest bidder. Section 64 of the Sale of Goods Act, 1930 regulates the legal requirements for the sale by auction.

In terms of the provisions of the above Section, following are some of the requirements, which inter alia are required to be complied with for conduct of a valid auction sale-

1. Where the goods are sold in lots: Where the goods are put up for sale in lots, each lot is prima facie deemed to be subject of a separate contract of sale.

2. Right to bid may be reserved: Right to bid may be reserved expressly by or on behalf of the seller and where such a right is expressly reserved, but not otherwise, the seller or any one person on his behalf may bid at the auction.
3. Where the sale is not notified by the seller: Where the sale is not notified to be subject to a right to bid on behalf of the seller, it shall not be lawful for the seller to bid himself or to employ any person to bid at such sale, or for the auctioneer knowingly to take any bid from the seller or any such person; and any sale contravening this rule may be treated as fraudulent by the buyer.
4. Reserved price: The sale may be notified to be subject to a reserve or upset price;

In the first Auction sale, the rejection of Mr. Dev's bidding was not justified since the information as to the right to bid was not expressly given. Therefore, this auction sale was unlawful.

In auction sale of lot 2, since right to bid was not notified, it shall not be lawful for the seller to bid himself or to employ any person to bid at such sale. Therefore, auction made in favour of Mr. Dheer will be considered lawful.

- CA Indresh Gandhi Teaches CA Foundation Law + CA Inter Law on [ultimateca.com](https://ultimateca.com)
- Question Bank ( Unitwise Question & Answer ) & Chart Book - available at [IGSIR.IN](https://igsir.in) in both form Hard Copy & Soft Copy ( pdf on App – CA Indresh Gandhi )
- All Free Youtube sessions at one place – Visit [igsir.in](https://igsir.in) & then check [Free Resources Tab](#)
- Telegram Channel for all Updates - <https://t.me/caindreshgandhi> ( Click link )