

SALE OF GOODS ACT

QUESTION- ANSWERS

1. M/s Woodworth & Associates, a firm dealing with the wholesale and retail buying and selling of various kinds of wooden logs, customized as per the requirement of the customers. They dealt with Rose wood, Mango wood, Teak wood, Burma wood etc.

Mr. Das, a customer came to the shop and asked for wooden logs measuring 4 inches broad and 8 feet long as required by the carpenter. Mr. Das specifically mentioned that he required the wood which would be best suited for the purpose of making wooden doors and window frames. The Shop owner agreed and arranged the wooden pieces cut into as per the buyers requirements.

The carpenter visited Mr. Das's house next day, and he found that the seller has supplied Mango Tree wood which would most unsuitable for the purpose. The carpenter asked Mr. Das to return the wooden logs as it would not meet his requirements.

The Shop owner refused to accept return of the wooden logs on the plea that logs were cut to specific requirements of Mr. Das and hence could not be resold.

i. Explain the duty of the buyer as well as the seller according to the doctrine of "Caveat Emptor".

ii. Whether Mr. Das would be able to get the money back or the right kind of wood as required serving his purpose?

Answer- i- Caveat Emptor

ii. As Mr. Das has specifically mentioned that he required the wood which would be best suited for the purpose of making wooden doors and window frames but the seller supplied Mango tree wood which is most unsuitable for the purpose. Mr. Das is entitled to get the money back or the right kind of wood as required serving his purpose. It is the duty of the seller to supply such goods as are reasonably fit for the purpose mentioned by buyer. [Section 16(1) of the Sale of Goods Act, 1930]

2. X consults Y, a motor-car dealer for a car suitable for touring purposes to promote the sale of his product. Y suggests 'Santro' and X accordingly buys it from Y. The car turns out to be unfit for touring purposes. What remedy X is having now under the Sale of Goods Act, 1930?

Answer- "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". [section 12]

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 X purchases the car.

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

3. Certain goods were sold by sample by A to B, who in turn sold the same goods by sample to C and C by sample sold the goods to D. The goods were not according to the sample. Therefore, D who found the deviation of the goods from the sample rejected the goods and gave a notice to C. C sued B and B sued A. Advise B and C under the Sale of Goods Act, 1930.

Answer- In the instant case, D who noticed the deviation of goods from the sample can reject the goods and treat it as a breach of implied condition as to sample which provides that when the goods are sold by sample the goods must correspond to the sample in quality and the buyer should be given reasonable time and opportunity of comparing the bulk with the sample. Whereas C can recover only damages from B and B can recover damages from A. For C and B, 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).

4. Mrs. Neeta went to the local rice and wheat wholesale shop and asked for 100 kgs of Basmati rice. The Shopkeeper quoted the price of the same as Rs. 125 per kg to which she agreed. Mrs. Neeta insisted that she would like to see the sample of what will be provided to her by the shopkeeper before she agreed upon such purchase. The shopkeeper showed her a bowl of rice as sample. The sample exactly corresponded to the entire lot.

The buyer examined the sample casually without noticing the fact that even though the sample was that of Basmati Rice but it contained a mix of long and short grains. The cook on opening the bags complained that the dish if prepared with the rice would not taste the same as the quality of rice was not as per requirement of the dish. Now Mrs. Neeta wants to file a suit of fraud against the seller alleging him of selling mix of good and cheap quality rice. Will she be successful?

Decide the fate of the case and options open to the buyer for grievance redressal as per the provisions of Sale of Goods Act, 1930?

What would be your answer in case Mrs. Neeta specified her exact requirement as to length of rice?

Answer- As per the provisions of Section 17 of the Sale of Goods Act, 1930, in a contract of sale by sample, there is an implied condition that the bulk shall correspond with the sample in quality.

(i) In the instant case, Mrs. Neeta will not be successful as she casually examined the sample of rice (which exactly corresponded to the entire lot) without noticing the fact that even though the sample was that of Basmati Rice but it contained a mix of long and short grains.

(ii) In the instant case, the buyer does not have any option available to her for grievance redressal.

(iii) In case Mrs. Neeta specified her exact requirement as to length of rice, then there is an implied condition that the goods shall correspond with the description. If it is not so, the seller will be held liable.

5. Ms. Preeti owned a motor car which she handed over to Mr. Joshi on sale or return basis. After a week, Mr. Joshi pledged the motor car to

Mr. Ganesh. Ms. Preeti now claims back the motor car from Mr. Ganesh. Will she succeed? Referring to the provisions of the Sale of Goods Act, 1930, decide and examine what recourse is available to Ms. Preeti.

Answer- The term 'sale on approval' may be defined as the sale in which the buyer may return the goods within a reasonable time, if the goods do not serve his purpose. This is also known as 'sale on return' basis. In case of sale on approval, the ownership is transferred to the buyer in any of the following three ways:

1. When the buyer accepts the goods
2. When the buyer adopts the transaction: The buyer may adopt the goods by doing some act which shows that he has accepted the goods
3. Where the buyer fails to return the goods within fixed or reasonable time.

Since, Mr. Joshi, who had taken delivery of the Motor car on Sale or Return basis and pledged the motor car to Mr. Ganesh which is equivalent to accepting the goods. Therefore, the property therein (Motor car) passes to Mr. Joshi. Now in this situation, Ms. Preeti cannot claim back her Motor Car from Mr. Ganesh, but she can claim the price of the motor car from Mr. Joshi only.

6. J the owner of a car wants to sell his car. For this purpose, he hands 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 giving reasons whether J would succeed.

Answer- As per proviso of section 27, 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:

- (1) The agent should be in possession of the goods with the consent of the owner.
- (2) The agent should sell the goods while acting in the ordinary course of business.
- (3) The buyer should act in good faith.
- (4) The buyer should not have at the time of the contract of sale notice that the agent has no authority to sell.

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.

7. Mr. S agreed to purchase 100 bales of cotton from V, 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- According to Section 21 of the Sales of Goods Act, 1930, if the goods are not in a deliverable state and the contract is for the sale of specific goods, the property does not pass to the buyer unless: -

(i) The seller has done his act of putting the goods in a deliverable state and

(ii) The buyer has knowledge of it.

Sometimes the seller is required to do certain acts so as to put the goods in deliverable state like packing, filling in containers etc. No property in goods passes unless such act is done and buyer knows about it.

In this case, according to the provisions of law, 60 bales already packed. So, buyer S will be responsible to bear the loss. The loss of rest of the bales will be that of the seller V.

8. A, B and C were joint owner of a truck and the possession of the said truck was with B. X purchased the truck from B without knowing that A and C were also owners of the truck. Decide in the light of provisions of Sales of Goods Act 1930, whether the sale between B and X is valid or not?

Answer- According to Section 28 of the Sales of Goods Act, sale by one of the several joint owners is valid if the following conditions are satisfied: -

(i) One of the several joint owners has the sole possession of them.

(ii) Possession of the goods is by the permission of the co-owners.

(iii) The buyer buys them in good faith and has not at the time of contract of sale knowledge that the seller has no authority to sell.

In the above case, A, B and C were the joint owners of the truck and the possession of the truck was with B. Now B sold the said truck to X. X without knowing this fact purchased the truck from B. The sale between B and X is perfectly valid.

9. The buyer took delivery of 20 tables from the seller on sale or return basis without examining them. Subsequently, he sold 5 tables to his customers. The customer lodged a complaint of some defect in the tables. The buyer sought to return tables to the seller. Was the buyer entitled to return the tables to the seller under the provisions of the Sale of Goods Act, 1930?

Hint- In the given case, seller has delivered 20 tables to the buyer on sale or return basis. Buyer received the tables without examining them. Out of these 20 tables, he sold 5 tables to his customer. It implies that he has accepted 5 tables out of 20.

When the buyer received the complaint of some defect in the tables, he wanted to return all the tables to the seller. According to the provisions of law he is entitled to return only 15 tables to the seller and not those 5 tables which he has already sold to his customer. These tables are already accepted by him so the buyer becomes liable. (Section 24)

10. Ram sells 200 bales of cloth to Shyam and sends 100 bales by lorry and 100 bales by Railway. Shyam receives delivery of 100 bales sent by lorry, but before he receives the delivery of the bales sent by railway, he

becomes bankrupt. Can Ram exercise right of stopping the goods in transit?

Hint- The problem is based on Section 50 dealing with the right of stoppage of the goods in transit available to an unpaid seller. Applying the provisions to the given case, Ram being still unpaid, can stop the 100 bales of cloth sent by railway as these goods are still in transit.

- 11.** Suraj sold his car to Sohan for Rs.75,000. After inspection and satisfaction, Sohan paid Rs. 25,000 and took possession of the car and promised to pay the remaining amount within a month. Later on, Sohan refuses to give the remaining amount on the ground that the car was not in a good condition. Advise Suraj as to what remedy is available to him against Sohan.

Hint- According section 55 where the buyer wrongfully neglects or refuses to pay for the goods, the seller may sue him for the price of the goods. In a suit for recovery of price, the seller may also claim the interest on the amount of price payable by the buyer. (Section 61)

- 12.** J sold a machine to K. K gave a cheque for the payment. The cheque was dishonoured. But J handed over a delivery order to K. K sold the goods to R on the basis of the delivery order. J wanted to exercise his right of lien on the goods. Can he do so under the provisions of the Sale of Goods Act, 1930?

Hint- In the given case, J has sold the machine to K and K gave a cheque for the payment. But the cheque was dishonoured that means J, the seller is an unpaid seller. So, he is entitled to exercise the right of lien, but according to section 53(1) his right of lien is defeated because he has given the document of title to the buyer and the buyer has made a transaction of sale on the basis of this document. So, R who has purchased the machine from K can demand the delivery of the machine.

- 13.** A, who is an agent of a buyer, had obtained the goods from the Railway Authorities and loaded the goods on his truck. In the meantime, the Railway Authorities received a notice from B, the seller for stopping the goods in transit as the buyer has become insolvent. Referring to the provisions of Sale of Goods Act, 1930, decide whether the Railway Authorities can stop the goods in transit as instructed by the seller?

Hint- The right of stoppage of goods in transit means the right of stopping the goods after the seller has parted with the goods. Thereafter the seller regains the possession of the goods. This right is available to the unpaid seller only when the buyer has become insolvent. According section 51, the railway authorities cannot stop the goods because the goods are not in transit. A who has loaded the goods on his truck is the agent of the buyer. That means railway authorities have given the possession of the goods to the buyer. The transit comes to an end when the buyer or his agent takes the possession of the goods.

- 14.** Archika went to a jewellery shop and asked the shopkeeper to show the gold bangles with white polish. The shopkeeper informed that he has gold bangles with lots of designs but not in white polish rather if Archika

select gold bangles in his shop, he will arrange white polish on those gold bangles without any extra cost. Archika select a set of designer bangles and pay for that. The shopkeeper requested Archika to come after two days for delivery of those bangles so that white polish can be done on those bangles. When Archika comes after two days to take delivery of bangles, she noticed that due to white polishing, the design of bangles has been disturbed. Now, she wants to avoid the contract and asked the shopkeeper to give her money back but shopkeeper has denied for the same.

(a) State with reasons whether Archika can recover the amount under the Sale of Goods Act, 1930.

(b) What would be your answer if shopkeeper says that he can repair those bangles but he will charge extra cost for 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.

(a) On the basis of above provisions and facts given in the question, it can be said that there is an agreement to sell between Archika and shopkeeper and not a sale. Even the payment was made by Archika, the property in goods can be transferred only after the fulfilment of conditions fixed between buyer and seller. As the white polish was done but original design is disturbed due to polishing, bangles are not in original position. Hence, Archika has right to avoid the agreement to sell and can recover the price paid.

(b) On the other hand, if shopkeeper offers to bring the bangles in original position by repairing, he cannot charge extra cost from Archika. Even he has to bear some expenses for repair; he cannot charge it from Archika.

15. Prashant reaches a sweet shop and ask for 1 Kg of 'Burfi' if the sweets are fresh. Seller replies 'Sir, my all sweets are fresh and of good quality.' Prashant agrees to buy on the condition that first he tastes one piece of 'Burfi' to check the quality. Seller gives him one piece to taste. Prashant, on finding the quality is good, ask the seller to pack. On reaching the house, Prashant finds that 'Burfi' is stale not fresh while the piece tasted was fresh. Now, Prashant wants to avoid the contract and return the 'Burfi' to seller.

(a) State with reason whether Prashant can avoid the contract under the Sale of Goods Act, 1930?

(b) Will your answer be different if Prashant does not taste the sweet?

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, Prashant can return the sweet 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. Prashant can return the sweet and avoid the contract.

- 16.** Akansh purchased a Television set from Jethalal, the owner of Gada Electronics on the condition that first three days he will 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. Jethalal demands the price of Television set from Akansh. Whether Akansh is liable to pay the price under the Sale of Goods Act, 1930? If not, 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:

- (i) when he signifies his approval or acceptance to the seller,
- (ii) when he does any other act adopting the transaction, and
- (iii) 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 above provisions and fact, the property is not passes 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. Jethalal.

- 17.** Rachit arranges an auction to sale an antic wall clock. Megha, being one of the bidders, gives highest bid. For announcing the completion of sale, the auctioneer fall the hammer on table but suddenly hammer brakes and damages the watch. Megha 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, Megha gives the highest bid in the auction for the sale of 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 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. Megha will not be liable for loss and can avoid the contract.

- 18.** X contracted to sell his car to Y. They did not discuss the price of the car at all. X later refused to sell his car to Y on the ground that the agreement was void being uncertain about price. Can Y demand the car under the Sale of Goods Act, 1930?

Answer- Payment of the price by the buyer is an important ingredient of a contract of sale. If the parties totally ignore the question of price while making the contract, it would not become an uncertain and invalid agreement. It will rather be a valid contract and the buyer shall pay a reasonable price. (Section 9 of the Sale of Goods Act, 1930)

In the give case, X and Y have entered into a contract for sale of car but they did not fix the price of the car. X refused to sell the car to Y on this ground. Y can legally demand the car from X and X can recover a reasonable price of the car from Y.

- 19.**“Nemo Dat Quod Non Habet” – “None can give or transfer goods what he does not himself own.” Explain the rule and state the cases in which the rule does not apply under the provisions of the Sale of Goods Act, 1930.

Answer- Exceptions to the Rule Nemo dat Quod Non Habet: The term means, “none can give or transfer goods what he does not himself own”. Exceptions to the rule and the cases in which the Rule does not apply under the provisions of the Sale of Goods Act, 1930 are enumerated below:

(i) Sale by a Mercantile Agent: A sale made by a mercantile agent of the goods or 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
- (c) 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).

Mercantile agent means an agent having in the customary course of business as such agent’s authority either to sell goods, or to consign goods for the purposes of sale, or to buy goods, or to raise money on the security of goods. [section 2(9)]

(ii) Sale by one of the joint owners: If one of the several joint owners of goods has the sole possession of them with the permission of the others, the property in the goods may be transferred to any person who

buys them from such a joint owner in good faith and does not at the time of the contract of sale have notice that the seller has no authority to sell. (Section 28)

(iii) Sale by a person in possession under voidable contract: A buyer would acquire a good title to the goods sold to him by 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).

(iv) 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 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. A pledge or other deposition of the goods or documents of title by the seller in possession are equally valid. [Section 30(1)]

(v) Sale by buyer obtaining possession before the property in the goods has vested in him: Where a buyer with the consent of 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 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)].

(vi) 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(3)].

(vii) 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.

(c) Sale by a pawnee under default of pawnor will give valid title to the purchaser.