

**THE INDIAN
PARTNERSHIP ACT,
1932**

MAY-19

Q.1. (i) P, 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?

(ii) 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?

ANSWER. (i) 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.

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

(ii) the suit must be instituted by or on behalf of the firm which had been registered.

(ii) 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. 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.

(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.

This is because there was not debt due in respect of the goods in Ram's life time.

Q.2. (i) What is the procedure of registration of a partnership firm under the Indian Partnership Act, 1932?

(ii) 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.

ANSWER (I)APPLICATION FOR REGISTRATION (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.
- The statement shall be signed by all the partners, or by their agents specially authorised in this behalf.

(2) Each person signing the statement shall also verify it in the manner prescribed.

(3) A firm name shall not contain any of the following words, namely:- '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.

(ii) 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.

NOVEMBER - 18

Q.1.(i) 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.

(ii) What is Partnership Deed? What are the particulars that the partnership deed may contain?

ANSWER:(i) 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:

- 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. The test of good faith includes:

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

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.

Partnership Deed: Partnership is the result of an agreement. No particular formalities are required for an agreement of partnership. It may be in writing or formed verbally. But it is desirable to have the partnership agreement in writing to avoid future disputes. The document in writing containing the various terms and conditions as to the relationship of the partners to each other is called the 'partnership deed'. It should be drafted with care and be stamped according to the provisions of the Stamp Act, 1899. Where the partnership comprises immovable property, the instrument of partnership must be in writing, stamped and registered under the Registration Act.

Partnership deed may contain the following information:

- Name of the partnership firm.
- Names of all the partners.
- Nature and place of the business of the firm.
- Date of commencement of partnership.

- Date of commencement of partnership.
- Duration of the partnership firm.
- Capital contribution of each partner.
- Profit Sharing ratio of the partners.
- Admission and Retirement of a partner.
- Rates of interest on Capital, Drawings and loans.
- Provisions for settlement of accounts in the case of dissolution of the firm.
- Provisions for Salaries or commissions, payable to the partners, if any.
- Provisions for expulsion of a partner in case of gross breach of duty or fraud.

A partnership firm may add or delete any provision according to the needs of the firm.

Q.2. (i) 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?

(ii) State the grounds on which a firm may be dissolved by the Court under the Indian Partnership Act, 1932?

ANSWER:(i) 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.

DISSOLUTION BY THE COURT (SECTION 44): Court may, at the suit of the partner, dissolve a firm on any of the following ground:

• ***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.

• ***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.

• ***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.

- *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.

- ***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.

- ***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.

• ***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-

- Deadlock in the management.
- Where the partners are not in talking terms between them.
- Loss of substratum.
- Gambling by a partner on a stock exchange.

NOVEMBER - 19

Q.1. State the legal consequences of the following as per the provisions of the Indian Partnership Act, 1932:

(a) Retirement of a partner

(b) Insolvency of a partner

- **ANSWER (i) RETIREMENT OF A PARTNER (SECTION 32):**
- A partner may retire:
 - with the consent of all the other partners;
 - in accordance with an express agreement by the partners; or
 - where the partnership is at will, by giving notice in writing to all the other partners of his intention to retire.
- 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.

- 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.

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

(ii) Insolvency of a partner (Section 34)

- The insolvent partner cannot be continued as a partner.
- He will be ceased to be a partner from the very date on which the order of adjudication is made.
- The estate of the insolvent partner is not liable for the acts of the firm done after the date of order of adjudication.
- The firm is also not liable for any act of the insolvent partner after the date of the order of adjudication,
- 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

Q.2. X and Y are partners in a partnership firm. X introduced A, a manager, as his partner to Z. A remained silent. Z, a trader believing A as partner supplied 100 T .V sets to the firm on credit. After expiry of credit period, Z did not get amount of T .V sets sold to the partnership firm. Z filed a suit against X and A for the recovery of price. Advice Z whether he can recover the amount from X and A under the Indian Partnership Act, 1932.

- **ANSWER :** In the given case, along with X, the Manager (A) is also liable for the price because he becomes a partner by holding out (Section 28, Indian Partnership Act, 1932).
- **Partner by holding out (Section 28):** Partnership by holding out is also known as partnership by estoppel. 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.

It is only the person to whom the representation has been made and who has acted thereon that has right to enforce liability arising out of 'holding out'. You must also note that for the purpose of fixing liability on a person who has, by representation, led another to act, it is not necessary to show that he was actuated by a fraudulent intention.

The rule given in Section 28 is also applicable to a former partner who has retired from the firm without giving proper public notice of his retirement. In such cases, a person who, even subsequent to the retirement, give credit to the firm on the belief that he was a partner, will be entitled to hold him liable.

Q.1. When does dissolution of a partnership firm take place under the provisions of the Indian Partnership Act, 1932? Explain.

ANSWER : 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)**
- as a result of any agreement between all the partners (i.e., dissolution by agreement);

- by the adjudication of all the partners, or of all the partners but one, as insolvent (i.e., compulsory dissolution);
- by the business of the Firm becoming unlawful (i.e., compulsory dissolution);
- 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.
- 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
- 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 breaches 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; (vii) the court being satisfied on other equitable grounds that the firm should be dissolved.

**THE INDIAN
PARTNERSHIP ACT,
1932**

MAY 2020

Explain the following kinds of partnership under the Indian Partnership Act, 1932:

(i) Partnership at will (ii) Particular partnership

Partnership at will: According to Section 7 of the Indian Partnership Act, 1932, partnership at will is a partnership when: 1. no fixed period has been agreed upon for the duration of the partnership; and 2.

there is no provision made as to the determination of the partnership. These two conditions must be satisfied before a partnership can be regarded as a partnership at will. But, where there is an agreement between the partners either for the duration of the partnership or for the determination of the partnership, the partnership is not partnership at will. Where a partnership entered into for a fixed term is continued after the expiry of such term, it is to be treated as having become a partnership at will. A partnership at will may be dissolved by any partner by giving notice in writing to all the other partners of his intention to dissolve the same.

(ii) Particular partnership: A partnership may be organized for the prosecution of a single adventure as well as for the conduct of a continuous business. Where a person becomes a partner with another person in any particular adventure or undertaking the partnership is called 'particular partnership'. A partnership, constituted for a single adventure or undertaking is, subject to any agreement, dissolved by the completion of the adventure or undertaking.

“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.

“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.

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. What are the rights of A's legal representatives against the firm under the Indian Partnership Act, 1932?

Retirement / Death of Partner: 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.

- (i) 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
- (ii) Interest at the rate of 6 per cent annum on the amount of his share in the property.

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

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

**THE INDIAN
PARTNERSHIP ACT,
1932**

NOV 2020

Explain the provisions of the Indian Partnership Act, 1932 relating to the creation of Partnership by holding out.

Partnership by holding out is also known as partnership by estoppel. 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.

A person may himself, by his words or conduct have induced others to believe that he is a partner or he may have allowed others to represent him as a partner. The result in both the cases is identical.

Example: X and Y are partners in a partnership firm. X introduced A, a manager, as his partner to Z. A remained silent. Z, a trader believing A as partner supplied 100 T.V sets to the firm on credit. After expiry of credit period, Z did not get amount of T.V sets sold to the partnership firm. Z filed a suit against X and A for the recovery of price. Here, in the given case, A, the Manager is also liable for the price because he becomes a partner by holding out (Section 28, Indian Partnership Act, 1932).

It is only the person to whom the representation has been made and who has acted thereon that has right to enforce liability arising out of 'holding out'.

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:

- (i) To what extent X will be liable if he failed to give public notice after attaining majority?
- (ii) Can Mr. L recover his debt from X?

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.

(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.