

Mock Test Paper - Series I: August, 2025

Date of Paper: 12th August, 2025

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

FOUNDATION COURSE

PAPER 2: BUSINESS LAWS

ANSWERS

1. (a) **Bailment:** As per Section 148 of the Indian Contract Act, 1872, bailment is the delivery of goods by one person to another for some purpose, upon a contract, that the goods shall, when the purpose is accomplished, be returned or otherwise disposed of according to the directions of the person delivering them.

Bailor's duty to disclose faults in goods bailed in case of non- gratuitous bailment (Section 150): If the goods are bailed for hire, the bailor is responsible for such damage, whether he was or was not aware of the existence of such faults in the goods bailed.

Duty to pay necessary expenses in case of non-gratuitous bailment [Section 158]: The bailor is liable to pay the extraordinary expenses incurred by the bailee.

Bailor's responsibility to indemnify losses [Section 164]: It is the duty of bailor to indemnify all the losses and expenses, which bailee has to pay on account of defective goods.

In the instant case, Y took a car on lease from X for 10 days for ₹ 50,000. During the journey, Y has to spend ₹ 10,000 for repair of engine and paid ₹ 50,000 for hospital expenses due to accident because of fault in brakes of car. These are the extraordinary expenses and losses and it is the bailor's duty to bear such expenses and losses.

Therefore, the answers are:

- (i) Y can withhold the hire charges of ₹ 50,000 on account of non-payment of damages and claim an additional ₹10,000, from X.
- (ii) X is liable for the full ₹ 60,000 (₹10,000 repair + ₹ 50,000 hospital) as it is the bailor's duty to supply a car fit for the purpose for which it was hired.
- (b) (i) **Section 5(4) and (5) of the Companies Act, 2013 contains the following provisions:**
- Manner of inclusion of the entrenchment provision:** The provisions for entrenchment shall only be made either on formation of a company, or by

an amendment in the articles agreed to by all the members of the company in the case of a private company and by a special resolution in the case of a public company.

Notice to the registrar of the entrenchment provision: Where the articles contain provisions for entrenchment, whether made on formation or by amendment, the company shall give notice to the Registrar of such provisions in such form and manner as may be prescribed.

In the instant case, Evergreen Private Limited can follow the above procedure i.e. with the consent of all the members and notice to the registrar to include the entrenchment provision in its Articles.

Yes, the advice will differ, if the company is public company, since it has to pass Special Resolution and also inform to the registrar.

- (ii) According to Section 2(85) of the Companies Act, 2013, Small company means a company, other than a public company—
- (i) paid-up share capital of which does not exceed four crore rupees or such higher amount as may be prescribed which shall not be more than ten crore rupees; and
 - (ii) turnover of which as per profit and loss account for the immediately preceding financial year does not exceed forty crore rupees or such higher amount as may be prescribed which shall not be more than one hundred crore rupees:

Exceptions: This clause shall not 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.

In the instant case,

1. STS Pvt. Ltd. though is a small company taking into account its turnover and paid up share capital (i.e. ₹ 10 crores and ₹ 1 crore respectively), but since it is the subsidiary company of UV Infratech Pvt. Ltd. (UV Infratech Pvt. Ltd. holds ₹ 60,00,000 equity share capital of STS Pvt. Ltd.), hence STS Pvt. cannot be considered as small company.

2. ZX Ltd. cannot be considered as a small company since it is a public company.

- (c) **Partner by holding out (Section 28 of the Indian Partnership Act, 1932):** 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.

When a person represent himself, or knowingly permits himself, to be represented as a partner in a firm (when in fact he is not) he is liable, like a partner in the firm to anyone who on the faith of such representation has given credit to the firm.

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.

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'.

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.

2. (a) (i) **Rights of lien (Section 47 of the Sale of Goods Act, 1930)**

An unpaid seller has a right of lien on the goods for the price while he is in possession, until the payment or tender of the price of such goods. It is the right to retain the possession of the goods and refusal to deliver them to the buyer until the price due in respect of them is paid or tendered.

Exercise of right of lien: This right can be exercised by him in the following cases only:

- (a) where goods have been sold without any stipulation of credit; (i.e., on cash sale)
- (b) where goods have been sold on credit but the term of credit has expired; or
- (c) where the buyer becomes insolvent.

In the instant case, P is still in possession of the goods and the full price was not paid by Q within the stipulated time i.e. till 31st December 2024. Therefore, P is an unpaid seller and can rightfully exercise lien under Section 47.

Even though the unpaid amount is only ₹ 20,000, P's refusal to deliver the goods is valid. Thus, P is legally justified in exercising right of lien.

- (ii) **Legal Rules of Auction sale:** Section 64 of the Sale of Goods Act, 1930 provides following rules to regulate the sale by auction:

Completion of the contract of sale: The sale is complete when the auctioneer announces its completion by the fall of hammer or in any other customary manner. Until such announcement is made, any bidder may retract from his bid.

In the instant case, the sale of sculpture to L is not complete as only hammer falls but the auctioneer did not announce "you are the highest bidder".

Therefore, L's claim contending that the auctioneer is bound to sell the sculpture to him at the price he bid is not valid as the auction sale was not complete.

- (b) (i) **Separate Legal Entity:** There are distinctive features between different forms of organisations and the most striking feature in the company form of organisation vis-à-vis the other forms of business organisations is that it acquires a unique character of being a separate legal entity. In other words, when a company is registered, it is clothed with a legal personality. It comes to have almost the same rights and powers as a human being. Its existence is distinct and separate from that of its members. A company can own property, have bank account, raise loans, incur liabilities and enter into contracts.

(a) It is at law, a person which is different from the subscribers to the memorandum of association. Its personality is distinct and separate from the personality of those who compose it.

(b) Even members can contract with company, acquire right against it or incur liability to it. For the debts of the company, only its creditors can sue it and not its members.

A company is capable of owning, enjoying and disposing of property in its own name. Although the capital and assets are contributed by the

shareholders, the company becomes the owner of its capital and assets. The shareholders are not the private or joint owners of the company's property.

A member does not even have an insurable interest in the property of the company. The leading case on this point is of *Macaura Vs. Northern Assurance Co. Limited (1925)*:

Fact of the case

Macaura (M) was the holder of nearly all (except one) shares of a timber company. He was also a major creditor of the company. M insured the company's timber in his own name. The timber was lost in a fire. M claimed insurance compensation. Held, the insurance company was not liable to him as no shareholder has any right to any item of property owned by the company, for he has no legal or equitable interest in them. Hence in this case, since the timber was not insured in the company's name, M could not claim the compensation from insurance company.

- (ii) **Perpetual Succession:** Members may die or change, but the company goes on till it is wound up on the grounds specified by the Act. The shares of the company may change hands infinitely but that does not affect the existence of the company. Since a company is an artificial person created by law, law alone can bring an end to its life. Its existence is not affected by the death or insolvency of its members.

(c) **Change of name of LLP (Section 17 of the LLP Act, 2008):**

- (1) Notwithstanding anything contained in sections 15 and 16, if through inadvertence or otherwise, a LLP, on its first registration or on its registration by a new body corporate, its registered name, is registered by a name which is identical with or too nearly resembles to —

- (a) that of any other LLP or a company; or
(b) a registered trade mark of a proprietor under the Trade Marks Act, 1999, as is likely to be mistaken for it,

then on an application of such LLP or proprietor referred to in clauses (a) and (b) respectively or a company,

the Central Government may direct that such LLP to change its name or new name within a period of 3 months from the date of issue of such direction.

It is further provided that an application of the proprietor of the registered trade marks shall be maintainable within a period of 3 years from the date of incorporation or registration or change of name of the LLP under this Act.

- (2) Where a LLP changes its name or obtains a new name under sub-section (1), it shall within a period of 15 days from the date of such change, give notice of the change to Registrar along with the order of the Central Government, who shall carry out necessary changes in the certificate of incorporation and within 30 days of such change in the certificate of incorporation, such LLP shall change its name in the LLP agreement.
- (3) If the LLP is in default in complying with any direction given under sub-section (1), the Central Government shall allot a new name to the LLP in such manner as may be prescribed and the Registrar shall enter the new name in the register of LLP in place of the old name and issue a fresh certificate of incorporation with new name, which the LLP shall use thereafter.

Nothing contained in this sub-section shall prevent a LLP from subsequently changing its name in accordance with the provisions of section 16.

3. (a) The given question is based on the Section 18 read with sections 25 & 26 of the Indian Partnership Act, 1932. Section 18 deals with the Partner to be an agent of the firm. This means that a partner is the agent of the firm for the purpose of the business of the firm.

The partner indeed virtually holds the character of both a principal and an agent. So as far as he acts for himself and in his own interest in the common concern of the partnership, he may properly be deemed a principal and so far as he acts for his partners, he may properly be deemed as an agent.

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.

According to section 25, the partners are jointly and severally responsible to third parties for all acts which come under the scope of their express or implied authority. "Act of firm" connotes any act or omission by all the partners or by any partner or agent of the firm, which gives rise to a right enforceable by or against the firm.

As per section 26, the firm is liable to the same extent as the partner for any loss or injury caused to a third party by the wrongful acts of a partner, if they are done by the partner while acting:

- (a) in the ordinary course of the business of the firm
- (b) with the authority of the partners.

According to the facts given in the questions, P, a partner to PQR Associates, buys cement on behalf of the firm from D in the ordinary course of the firm's business. P uses the cement for his personal purposes. D, the supplier was unaware of the private use of cement by P and claims price from the firm. Firm refuses to pay the price on the ground that the cement was never received by it.

Referring to the stated provisions of the Indian Partnership Act, 1932, following are the answers:

- (i) Said Section is applicable only to the act done by partners for the purpose of the business of the firm. In such case, partner act as the agent of the firm for the purpose of the business of the firm. Since in the given case, P, buys cement on behalf of the firm from D in the ordinary course of the firm's business.

Therefore, in the given case, firms' contention of refusal to pay the price on the ground that the cement was never received by it, is not tenable.

- (ii) Further for commission of the wrongful act by the partner, the firm is liable to the same extent as the partner for any loss or injury caused to a third party by the wrongful acts of a partner, if they are done by the partner while acting:
 - (a) in the ordinary course of the business of the firm
 - (b) with the authority of the partners.

In the given case, part of the cement so purchased by P was delivered to the firm by him and the rest of the cement was used by him for his private use, was not known to the firm and the supplier. Since the act of the P to purchase the cement was in the ordinary course of business with the authority of the partner, however wrongful use by the partner will make the firm liable to the same extent as the partner for loss or injury caused to D.

However, PQR Associates can take action against P, the partner.

- (b) (i) It is a fundamental rule of Company Law that the objects of a company as stated in its memorandum can be departed from only to the extent

permitted by the Act, thus far and no further. In consequence, any act done or a contract made by the company which travels beyond the powers not only of the directors but also of the company is wholly void and inoperative in law and is therefore not binding on the company.

On this account, a company can be restrained from employing its fund for purposes other than those sanctioned by the memorandum. Likewise, it can be restrained from carrying on a trade different from the one it is authorised to carry on.

The impact of the doctrine of ultra vires is that a company can neither be sued on an ultra vires transaction, nor can it sue on it.

Since the memorandum is a “public document”, it is open to public inspection. Therefore, when one deals with a company one is deemed to know about the powers of the company. If in spite of this you enter into a transaction which is ultra vires the company, you cannot enforce it against the company.

In the instant case, ABC Pvt. Ltd. was authorised to trade in property only, so taking loan for construction business was ultra vires the power of the company.

Therefore, Magnum Finance Ltd. cannot enforce against ABC Pvt. Ltd. for recovery of the loan. But,

- (a) It can recover the money to the extent it has been utilised in meeting lawful debt of the company, then it steps into shoes of the debtor paid off and consequently it would be entitled to recover the loan to that extent from the company.
- (b) if the money is not spent, it may stop ABC Pvt. Ltd. from spending by means of injunction and recover the unspent amount.

(ii) **Formation of companies with charitable objects etc. (Section 8 company):** Section 8 of the Companies Act, 2013 deals with the formation of companies which are formed to

- promote the charitable objects of commerce, art, science, sports, education, research, social welfare, religion, charity, protection of environment etc.
- Such company intends to apply its profit in promoting its objects and
- prohibiting the payment of any dividend to its members.

In the instant case, SNM Ltd. cannot declare dividend @10% to equity shareholders for the year ending 31st March, 2025 as it is a Section 8 company which are specifically prohibited from paying dividend. The profits of a section 8 company must be applied towards promoting its objects. Therefore, the special resolution passed in the EGM to declare a dividend is invalid.

(c) By Whom a Contract may be Performed (Section 40, 41 and 42 of the Indian Contract Act, 1872)

The promise under a contract may be performed, as the circumstances may permit, by the promisor himself, or by his agent or his legal representative.

1. **Promisor himself:** If there is something in the contract to show that it was the intention of the parties that the promise should be performed by the promisor himself, such promise must be performed by the promisor. This means contracts which involve the exercise of personal skill or diligence, or which are founded on personal confidence between the parties must be performed by the promisor himself.
2. **Agent:** Where personal consideration is not the foundation of a contract, the promisor or his representative may employ a competent person to perform it.
3. **Legal Representatives:** A contract which involves the use of personal skill or is founded on personal consideration comes to an end on the death of the promisor. As regards any other contract the legal representatives of the deceased promisor are bound to perform it unless a contrary intention appears from the contract (Section 37, para 2). But their liability under a contract is limited to the value of the property they inherit from the deceased.
4. **Third persons: Effect of accepting performance from third person (Section 41):** When a promisee accepts performance of the promise from a third person, he cannot afterwards enforce it against the promisor. That is, performance by a stranger, if accepted by the promisee, this results in discharging the promisor, although the latter has neither authorised nor ratified the act of the third party.
5. **Joint promisors (Section 42):** When two or more persons have made a joint promise, then unless a contrary intention appears by the contract, all such persons must jointly fulfil the promise. If any of them dies, his legal representatives must, jointly with the surviving promisors, fulfil the

promise. If all of them die, the legal representatives of all of them must fulfil the promise jointly.

4. (a) (i) Under Section 10 of the Indian Contract Act, 1872, a valid contract requires free consent, lawful consideration, and a lawful object.

In the instant case, the agreement to pay ₹ 10,000 in exchange for a service (providing information about prospective grooms) is lawful.

Hence, the agreement is valid.

- (ii) According to section 20, where both the parties to an agreement are under a mistake as to a matter of fact essential to the agreement, there is a bilateral mistake. In such a case, the agreement is void.

In the instant case, the bull's death (unknown to both parties) constitutes a bilateral mistake regarding the subject matter of the contract.

Hence, the agreement is void.

- (iii) Under Section 27, agreements in restraint of trade are void. However, an exception is provided for contracts involving the sale of goodwill. The local limits within which the seller of the goodwill agrees not to carry on similar business must be reasonable.

In the instant case, the restriction is limited to the local area and does not extend indefinitely.

Hence, the agreement is valid.

- (iv) According to section 12, a contract by a person who is not of sound mind is void.

In the instant case, a property worth ₹ 2,00,000 was agreed to be sold for just ₹ 25,000 by a person of unsound mind.

Hence, the agreement is void.

- (b) **Presentment for acceptance [Section 61 of the Negotiable Instruments Act, 1881]:** A bill of exchange payable after sight must [if no time or place is specified therein for presentment] be presented to the drawee thereof for acceptance [if he can, after reasonable search, be found] by a person entitled to demand acceptance, within a reasonable time after it is drawn, and in business hours on a business day.

In default of such presentment, no party thereto is liable thereon to the person making such default. If the drawee cannot, after reasonable search, be found, the bill is dishonoured.

If the bill is directed to the drawee at a particular place, it must be presented at that place, and if at the due date for presentment he cannot, after reasonable search, be found there, the bill is dishonoured.

Where authorised by agreement or usage, a presentment through the post office by means of a registered letter is sufficient.

Presentment of promissory note for sight [Section 62]: A promissory note, payable at a certain period after sight, must be presented to the maker thereof for sight (if he can after reasonable search be found) by a person entitled to demand payment, within a reasonable time after it is made and in business hours on a business day.

In default of such presentment, no party thereto is liable thereon to the person making such default.

- (c) **The Process of Making a Law:** When a law is proposed in parliament it is called a Bill. After discussion and debate, the law is passed in Lok Sabha. Thereafter, it has to be passed in Rajya Sabha. It then has to obtain the assent of the President of India. Finally, the law will be notified by the Government in the publication called the Official Gazette of India. The law will become applicable from the date mentioned in the notification as the effective date. Once it is notified and effective, it is called an Act of Parliament.

Enforcing the Law: After a law is passed in parliament it has to be enforced. Somebody should monitor whether the law is being followed. This is the job of the executive. Depending on whether a law is a Central law or a State law the Central or State Government will be the enforcing authority. For this purpose government functions are distributed to various ministries. Some of the popular Ministries are the Ministry of Finance, the Ministry of Corporate Affairs, the Ministry of Home Affairs, the Ministry of Law and Justice and so on. These Ministries are headed by a minister and run by officers of the Indian administrative and other services.

The Government of India exercises its executive authority through a number of Government Ministries or Departments of State. A Ministry is composed of employed officials, known as civil servants, and is politically accountable through a minister. Most major Ministries are headed by a Cabinet Minister, who sits in the Union Council of Ministers, and is typically supported by a team of junior ministers called the Ministers of State.

5. (a) (i) According to Section 18 of the Sale of Goods Act, 1930, where there is a contract of sale for unascertained goods, the property in goods cannot pass to the buyer unless and until the goods are ascertained. The buyer can get the ownership right on the goods only when the goods are specific and ascertained.

According to section 20 of the Sale of Goods Act, 1930, where there is an unconditional contract for sale of specific goods in deliverable state, the property in the goods passes to the buyer when the contract is made, and it is immaterial whether the time of payment of price or the time of delivery of the goods, or both, is postponed. Here, the condition is goods must be ready for delivery.

In the instant case, since the microchips were specifically identified and were in a deliverable state when the contract was formed on August 1, 2023, ownership (and risk) likely passed to PQR Enterprises on August 1, 2023.

Therefore, PQR Enterprises will suffer the loss.

Goods are not specifically identified and ascertained: If the microchips were not specifically identified and marked for PQR Enterprises at the time of the contract, MNO Limited will suffer the loss, as the risk would not have transferred to PQR Enterprises.

- (ii) As per Section 27 of the Sale of Goods Act, 1930, “no one can transfer a better title than they themselves have.” This means that a person who is not the owner of goods cannot convey ownership unless authorized by the true owner.

Also, Section 14(a) imposes an implied condition in every contract of sale that the seller has the right to sell the goods means he should be the real owner. If the seller’s title turns out to be defective, the buyer must return the goods to the true owner and recover the price from the seller.

In the instant case, A will succeed in his action against B for the return of the price, as B had no title to sell the stolen motorcycle, and the sale was in breach of the implied condition.

- (b) **Dissolution By the Court (Section 44 of the Indian Partnership Act, 1932):** Court may, at the suit of the partner, dissolve a firm on any of the following ground:

- (a) **Insanity/unsound mind:** Where a partner (not a sleeping partner) has become of unsound mind, the court may dissolve the firm on a suit of the

other partners or by the next friend of the insane partner. Temporary sickness is no ground for dissolution of firm.

- (b) **Permanent incapacity:** When a partner, other than the partner suing, has become in any way permanently incapable of performing his duties as partner, then the court may dissolve the firm. Such permanent incapacity may result from physical disability or illness etc.
- (c) **Misconduct:** Where a partner, other than the partner suing, is guilty of conduct which is likely to affect prejudicially the carrying on of business, the court may order for dissolution of the firm, by giving regard to the nature of business. It is not necessary that misconduct must relate to the conduct of the business. The important point is the adverse effect of misconduct on the business. In each case nature of business will decide whether an act is misconduct or not.
- (d) **Persistent breach of agreement:** Where a partner other than the partner suing, wilfully or persistently commits breach of agreements relating to the management of the affairs of the firm or the conduct of its business, or otherwise so conduct himself in matters relating to the business that it is not reasonably practicable for other partners to carry on the business in partnership with him, then the court may dissolve the firm at the instance of any of the partners. Following comes in to category of breach of contract:
 - Embezzlement,
 - Keeping erroneous accounts
 - Holding more cash than allowed
 - Refusal to show accounts despite repeated request etc.
- (e) **Transfer of interest:** Where a partner other than the partner suing, has transferred the whole of his interest in the firm to a third party or has allowed his share to be charged or sold by the court, in the recovery of arrears of land revenue due by the partner, the court may dissolve the firm at the instance of any other partner.
- (f) **Continuous/Perpetual losses:** Where the business of the firm cannot be carried on except at a loss in future also, the court may order for its dissolution.
- (g) **Just and equitable grounds:** Where the court considers any other ground to be just and equitable for the dissolution of the firm, it may

dissolve a firm. The following are the cases for the just and equitable grounds-

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

- (c) **Agent's authority in an emergency [Section 189 of the Indian Contract Act, 1872]:** An agent has authority, in an emergency, to do all such acts for the purpose of protecting his principal from loss as would be done by a person of ordinary prudence, in his own case, under similar circumstances.

To constitute a valid agency in an emergency, following conditions must be satisfied:

- (i) Agent should not be in a position or have any opportunity to communicate with his principal within the time available.
- (ii) There should have been actual and definite commercial necessity for the agent to act promptly.
- (iii) the agent should have acted bonafide and for the benefit of the principal.
- (iv) the agent should have adopted the most reasonable and practicable course under the circumstances, and
- (v) the agent must have been in possession of the goods belonging to his principal and which are the subject of contract.

6. (a) **“Inland instrument” and “Foreign instrument” [Sections 11 & 12 of the Negotiable Instruments Act, 1881]**

“Inland instrument”: A promissory note, bill of exchange or cheque drawn or made in India and made payable in or drawn upon any person resident in India shall be deemed to be an inland instrument.

“Foreign instrument”: A foreign instrument is one which is not an inland instrument.

In the instant case,

- (i) A promissory note made in Kolkata and payable in Mumbai is an Inland instrument
- (ii) A bill drawn in Varanasi on a person resident in Jodhpur (although it is stated to be payable in Singapore) is an Inland instrument

- (iii) A, a resident of Agra, drew (i.e., made) a bill of exchange in Agra on B, a merchant in New York. And B accepted the bill of exchange as payable in Delhi. In this case, the bill of exchange was drawn in India and also payable in India. Hence, it is an inland instrument.
 - (iv) A promissory note is made in New York by A, a resident of New York, and made payable to B in Delhi, India. It is a Foreign instrument as it is Drawn outside India, payable in India.
 - (v) A bill of exchange is drawn in London on a person residing in Dubai, and it is payable in Dubai. It is a Foreign instrument as it is Drawn outside India, on a person residing outside India, payable outside India.
- (b) (i) **Quasi- Contracts:** A quasi-contract is not an actual contract, but it resembles a contract. It is created by law under certain circumstances. The law creates and enforces legal rights and obligations when no real contract exists. Such obligations are known as quasi-contracts. In other words, it is a contract in which there is no intention on part of either party to make a contract but law imposes a contract upon the parties.

Salient features of quasi contracts:

- (a) In the first place, such a right is always a right to money and generally, though not always, to a liquidated sum of money.
 - (b) Secondly, it does not arise from any agreement of the parties concerned, but is imposed by the law; and
 - (c) Thirdly, it is a right which is available not against all the world, but against a particular person or persons only, so that in this respect it resembles a contractual right.
- (ii) **Responsibility of finder of goods:** As per section 71 of the Indian Contract Act, 1872, 'A person who finds goods belonging to another and takes them into his custody is subject to same responsibility as if he were a bailee'.

Thus, a finder of lost goods has:

- (i) to take proper care of the property as man of ordinary prudence would take
- (ii) no right to appropriate the goods and
- (iii) to restore the goods if the owner is found.

- (c) (i) (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 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 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.
- (ii) Section 13 of the Sale of Goods Act, 1930, specifies cases where a breach of condition be treated as a breach of warranty. As a result of which the buyer loses his right to rescind the contract and can claim damages only.

In the following cases, a contract is not avoided even on account of a breach of a condition:

- (i) Where the buyer altogether waives the performance of the condition. A party may for his own benefit, waive a stipulation. It should be a voluntary waiver by buyer.
- (ii) Where the buyer elects to treat the breach of the conditions, as one of a warranty. That is to say, he may claim only damages instead of repudiating the contract. Here, the buyer has not waived the condition but decided to treat it as a warranty.
- (iii) Where the contract is non-severable and the buyer has accepted either the whole goods or any part thereof.
- (iv) Where the fulfilment of any condition or warranty is excused by law by reason of impossibility or otherwise.