

Indian Partnership Act, 1932

Case Study 1. *X, Y and Z are partners in a Partnership Firm. They were carrying their business successfully for the past several years. Spouses of X and Y fought in ladies club on their personal issue and X's wife was hurt badly. X got angry on the incident and he convinced Z to expel Y from their partnership firm. Y was expelled from partnership without any notice from X and Z. Considering the provisions of the Indian Partnership Act, 1932, state whether they can expel a partner from the firm. What are the criteria for test of good faith in such circumstances?* **(May 2018, MTP May 2021) (6 marks)**

Answer:

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

- (i) the power of expulsion must have existed in a contract between the partners;
- (ii) the power has been exercised by a majority of the partners; and
- (iii) it has been exercised in good faith.

If all these conditions are not present, the expulsion is not deemed to be in bonafide interest of the business of the firm.

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

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

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

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

Case Study 2. *Mr. A, Mr. B and Mr. C were partners in a partnership firm M/s ABC & Co., which is engaged in the business of trading of branded furniture. The name of the partners was clearly written along with the firm name in front of the head office of the firm as well as on letter-head of the firm. On 1st October, 2018, Mr. C passed away. His name was neither removed from the list of partners as stated in front of the head office nor from the letter-heads of the firm. As per the terms of partnership, the firm continued its operations with Mr. A and Mr. B as partners. The accounts of the firm were settled and the amount due to the legal heirs of Mr. C was also determined on 10th October, 2018. But the same was not paid to the legal heirs of Mr. C. On 16th October, 2018, Mr. X, a supplier supplied furniture worth ₹ 20,00,000 to M/s ABC & Co. M/s ABC & Co. could not repay the amount due to heavy losses. Mr. X wants to recover the amount not only from M/s ABC & Co., but also from the legal heirs of Mr. C. Analyses the above situation in terms of the provisions of the Indian Partnership Act, 1932 and decide whether the legal heirs of Mr. C can also be held liable for the dues towards Mr. X.* **(3 Marks) (Nov. 2018)**

Answer:

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

CA Anand Kaku
F.C.A, DISA (ICAI), B.C.A

CA Anand Kaku's



TAARANK ACADEMY
Shine Like a Star

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

Case Study 3. *Mr. M, Mr. N and Mr. P were partners in a firm, which was dealing in refrigerators. On 1st October, 2018, Mr. P retired from partnership, but failed to give public notice of his retirement. After his retirement, Mr. M, Mr. N and Mr. P visited a trade fair and enquired about some refrigerators with latest techniques. Mr. X, who was exhibiting his refrigerators with the new techniques was impressed with the interactions of Mr. P and requested for the visiting card of the firm. The visiting card also included the name of Mr. P as a partner even though he had already retired. Mr. X supplied some refrigerators to the firm and could not recover his dues from the firm. Now, Mr. X wants to recover the dues not only from the firm, but also from Mr. P. Analyse the above case in terms of the provisions of the Indian Partnership Act, 1932 and decide whether Mr. P is liable in this situation.* **(3 Marks) (Nov. 2018)**

Answer:

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

Also, if the partnership is at will, the partner by giving notice in writing to all the other partners of his intention to retire will be deemed to be relieved as a partner without giving a public notice to this effect. Also, as per section 28 of the Indian Partnership Act, 1932, where a man holds himself out as a partner, or allows others to do it, he is then stopped from denying the character he has assumed and upon the faith of which creditors may be presumed to have acted.

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

Case Study 4. *M/s XYZ & Associates, a partnership firm with X, Y, Z as senior partners were engaged in the business of carpet manufacturing and exporting to foreign countries. On 25th August, 2016, they inducted Mr. G, an expert in the field of carpet manufacturing as their partner. On 10th January 2018, Mr. G was blamed for unauthorized activities and thus expelled from the partnership by united approval of rest of the partners.*

(i) *Examine whether action by the partners was justified or not?*

(ii) *What should have the factors to be kept in mind prior expelling a partner from the firm by other partners according to the provisions of the Indian Partnership Act, 1932?* **(6 Marks) (May 2019)**

Answer:

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

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

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

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

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



(i) Action by the partners of M/s XYZ & Associates, a partnership firm to expel Mr. G from the partnership was justified as he was expelled by united approval of the partners exercised in good faith to protect the interest of the partnership against the unauthorized activities charged against Mr. G. A proper notice and opportunity of being heard has to be given to Mr. G.

(ii) The following are the factors to be kept in mind prior expelling a partner from the firm by other partners:

- (a) the power of expulsion must have existed in a contract between the partners;
- (b) the power has been exercised by a majority of the partners; and
- (c) it has been exercised in good faith.

Case Study 5. 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?

(6 Marks) (Nov. 2019, RTP Nov. 2020)

Answer:

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.

Case Study 6. P, Q, R and S are the partners in M/S PQRS & Co., a partnership firm which deals in trading of Washing Machines of various brands. Due to the conflict of views between partners, P & Q decided to leave the partnership firm and started competitive business on 31st July, 2019, in the name of M/S PQ & Co. Meanwhile, R & S have continued using the property in the name of M/S PQRS & Co. in which P & Q also has a share.

Based on the above facts, explain in detail the rights of outgoing partners as per the Indian Partnership Act, 1932 and comment on the following:

(i) Rights of P & Q to start a competitive business.

CA Anand Kaku's

CA Anand Kaku
F.C.A, DISA (ICAI), B.C.A



(ii) Rights of P & Q regarding their share in property of M/S PQRS & Co.

(6 Marks) (Nov. 2020)

Answer:

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

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

(a) use the firm name,

(b) represent himself as carrying on the business of the firm or

(c) solicit the custom of persons who were dealing with the firm before he ceased to be a partner.

(2) Although this provision has imposed some restrictions on an outgoing partner, it effectively permits him to carry on a business competing with that of the firm.

However, the partner may agree with his partners that on his ceasing to be so, he will not carry on a business similar to that of the firm within a specified period or within specified local limits. Such an agreement will not be in restraint of trade if the restraint is reasonable [Section 36 (2)]

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

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

According to Section 37, where any member of a firm has died or otherwise ceased to be partner, and the surviving or continuing partners carry on the business of the firm with the property of the firm without any final settlement of accounts as between them and the outgoing partner or his estate, then, in the absence of a contract to the contrary, the outgoing partner or his estate is entitled at the option of himself or his representatives to such share of the profits made since he ceased to be a partner as may be attributable to the use of his share of the property of the firm or to interest at the rate of six per cent per annum on the amount of his share in the property of the firm.

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

Case Study 7. M, N and P were partners in a firm. The firm ordered JR Limited to supply the furniture. P dies, and M and N continues the business in the firm's name. The firm did not give any notice about P's death to the public or the persons dealing with the firm. The furniture was delivered to the firm after P's death, fact about his death was known to them at the time of delivery. Afterwards the firm became insolvent and failed to pay the price of furniture to JR Limited.

Explain with reasons:

(i) Whether P's private estate is liable for the price of furniture purchased by the firm?

(ii) Whether does it make any difference if JR Limited supplied the furniture to the firm believing that all the three partners are alive?

(6 Marks) (Jan. 2021, RTP May 2021)

Answer:

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



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

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

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

(i) Since the delivery of furniture was made after P's death, his estate would not be liable for the debt of the firm. A suit for goods sold and delivered would not lie against the representatives of the deceased partner. This is because there was no debt due in respect of the goods in P's lifetime.

(ii) It will not make any difference even if JR Limited supplied furniture to the firm believing that all the three partners are alive, as it is not necessary to give any notice either to the public or the persons having dealings with the firm, so the estate of the deceased partner may be absolved from liability for the future obligations of the firm.

Case Study 8. *A, B, and C are partners of a partnership firm ABC & Co. The firm is a dealer in office furniture. A was in charge of purchase and sale, B was in charge of maintenance of accounts of the firm and C was in charge of handling all legal matters. Recently through an agreement among them, it was decided that A will be in charge of maintenance of accounts and B will be in charge of purchase and sale. Being ignorant about such agreement, M, a supplier supplied some furniture to A, who ultimately sold them to a third party. Referring to the provisions of the Partnership Act, 1932, advise whether M can recover money from the firm.*

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

(MTP May 2019, MTP May 2020, MTP May 2021)

Answer:

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

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

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

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

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

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



Case Study 9. A, B and C are partners in a firm called ABC Firm. A, with the intention of deceiving D, a supplier of office stationery, buys certain stationery on behalf of the ABC Firm. The stationery is of use in the ordinary course of the firm's business. A does not give the stationery to the firm, instead brings it to his own use. The supplier D, who is unaware of the private use of stationery by A, claims the price from the firm. The firm refuses to pay for the price, on the ground that the stationery was never received by it (firm). Referring to the provisions of the Indian Partnership Act, 1932 decide:

i. Whether the Firm's contention shall be tenable?

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

Answer:

The problem in the question is based on the 'Implied Authority' of a partner provided in Section 19 of the Indian Partnership Act, 1932. The section provides that subject to the provisions of Section 22 of the Act, the act of a partner, which is done to carry on, in the usual way, business of the kind carried on by the firm, binds the firm. The authority of a partner to bind the firm conferred by this section is called his 'Implied Authority' [Sub- Section (1) of section 19]. Furthermore, every partner is in contemplation of law the general and accredited agent of the partnership and may consequently bind all the other partners by his acts in all matters which are within the scope and object of the partnership. Hence, if the partnership is of a general commercial nature, he may buy goods on account of the partnership.

Considering the above provisions and explanation, the questions as asked in the problem may be answered as under:

i. The firm's contention is not tenable, for the reason that the partner, in the usual course of the business on behalf of the firm has an implied authority to bind the firm. The firm is, therefore, liable for the price of the goods.

ii. In the second case also, the answer would be the same as above, i.e. the implied authority of the partner binds the firm.

In both the cases, however, the firm ABC can take action against A, the partner but it has to pay the price of stationery to the supplier D.

Case Study 10. Mahesh, Suresh and Dinesh are partners in a trading firm. Mahesh, without the knowledge or consent of Suresh and Dinesh borrows himself Rs. 50,000 from Ramesh, a customer of the firm, in the name of the firm. Mahesh, then buys some goods for his personal use with that borrowed money. Can Mr. Ramesh hold Mr. Suresh & Mr. Dinesh liable for the loan? Explain the relevant provisions of the Indian Partnership Act, 1932. **(MTP Nov. 2019)**

Answer:

Implied authority of a partner

Yes, as per sections 19 and 22 of the Indian Partnership Act, 1932 unless otherwise provided in the partnership deed, every partner has an implied authority to bind every other partner for acts done in the name of the firm, provided the same falls within the ordinary course of business and is done in a usual manner. Mahesh has a right to borrow the money of ₹ 50,000/- from Ramesh on behalf of his firm in the usual manner. Since, Ramesh has no knowledge that the amount was borrowed by Mahesh without the consent of the other two partners, Mr. Suresh and Mr. Dinesh, he can hold both of them (Suresh and Dinesh) liable for the re-payment of the loan.

CA Anand Kaku
F.C.A, DISA (ICAI), B.C.A

CA Anand Kaku's



TAARANK ACADEMY
Shine Like a Star

<https://taarankacademy.business.site/>

Case Study 11. *M/s XYZ & Associates, a partnership firm with X, Y and Z as senior partners were engaged in the business of carpet manufacturing and exporting to foreign countries. On 25th August, 2018, they inducted Mr. G, an expert in the field of carpet manufacturing as their partner. On 10th January 2020, Mr. G was blamed for unauthorized activities and thus expelled from the partnership by approval of all of the other partners.*

(i) Examine whether action by the partners was justified or not?

(ii) What should have the factors to be kept in mind prior expelling a partner from the firm by other partners according to the provisions of the Indian Partnership Act, 1932? **(MTP Nov.2020)**

Answer:

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

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

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

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

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

(i) Action by the partners of M/s XYZ & Associates, a partnership firm to expel Mr. G from the partnership was justified as he was expelled by approval of the other partners exercised in good faith to protect the interest of the partnership against the unauthorized activities charged against Mr. G. A proper notice and opportunity of being heard has to be given to Mr. G.

(ii) The following are the factors to be kept in mind prior expelling a partner from the firm by other partners:

- (a) the power of expulsion must have existed in a contract between the partners;
- (b) the power has been exercised by a majority of the partners; and
- (c) it has been exercised in good faith.

Case Study 12. *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.* **(RTP Nov. 2018)**

Answer:

It is not possible for the majority of partners to expel a partner from the firm without satisfying the conditions as laid down in Section 33 of the Indian Partnership Act, 1932.

The essential conditions before expulsion can be done are:

- (i) the power of expulsion must have existed in a contract between the partners;
- (ii) the power has been exercised by a majority of the partners; and
- (iii) It has been exercised in good faith.

The test of good faith includes:

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

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.

CA Anand Kaku
F.C.A, DISA (ICAI), B.C.A

CA Anand Kaku's



TAARANK ACADEMY
Shine Like a Star

<https://taarankacademy.business.site/>

Case Study 13. *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.*

(RTP Nov. 2019)

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.

Case Study 14. *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?*

(RTP May 2020)

Answer:

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.

"Dreams and Dedications are a powerful combination."

CA Anand Kaku
F.C.A, DISA (ICAI), B.C.A

CA Anand Kaku's



TAARANK ACADEMY
Shine Like a Star

<https://taarankacademy.business.site/>