

2. INDEMNITY AND GUARANTEE

QUESTION - WISE ANALYSIS OF PREVIOUS EXAMINATIONS

No.	M-09	N-09	M-10	N-10	M-11 TO N-13	M-14	N-14	M-15	N-15	M-16	N-16	M-17	N-17	M-18 (OLD)	M-18 (NEW)	N-18 (OLD)	N-18 (NEW)	M-19 (NEW)	M-19 (OLD)
THEORY QUESTIONS																			
T1	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
T14	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	4	-	-	-	-	-	-
PRACTICAL QUESTIONS FOR CLASS ROOM DISCUSSION																			
P5	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	5	-	-	-	-	5	-	-	-	-	-
P7	-	-	-	-	-	-	8	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
P10	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	4	-	-	-	-	-	-
P11	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	4	-	-	-
P15	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	4	-	-	-	-

Contract of Indemnity and Guarantee are the special types of contracts given under Sections 124 to 147 of the Indian Contract Act, 1872. Both the contracts are modes of compensation based on certain similar principles. However, both differ from each other on several issues.

CONTRACT OF INDEMNITY AND GUARANTEE (SEC 124 TO 147)

Q.No.1. Write about contract of Indemnity? What are the features of indemnity contracts? (B) (NEW SM, OLD SM, OLD PM, N98, M99, M01 - 5M, N08, N09 - 1M)

DEFINITION [SEC. 124]:

- A contract by which one party promises to save the other from loss caused to him
 - By the conduct of the promisor himself or
 - By the conduct of any other person
 Is called "Contract of Indemnity".
- Contract of Indemnity¹ is a form of contingent contract².

PARTIES:

- Indemnifier:** The party who promises to save the other party from loss is known as 'Indemnifier'.
- Indemnified:** The party who is promised to be saved against the loss is known as 'indemnified'.

FEATURES OF INDEMNITY CONTRACTS:

- Valid contract:** Just like any other contract, A contract of indemnity must satisfy all the essentials of a valid contract like Free consent, Competent parties, Lawful object, etc.

¹ The term *Indemnity* means to make good the loss or to compensate the party who has suffered some loss.

² A and B claim certain goods from a railway company as rival owners. A takes delivery of goods by agreeing to compensate the railway company against loss in case B turns out to be a true owner. There is a contract of Indemnity between A and the Railway company. In this case A is called Indemnifier and the Railway company is called Indemnified or Indemnity holder.

b) **Contingent contract:** The contract of indemnity assures to indemnify the loss. So, its performance is contingent upon incurring of such loss by the indemnity holder.

c) **Express or Implied:** A contract of indemnity may be expressed or implied³ from the circumstances of each case.

SIMILAR QUESTIONS:

1. Define contract of indemnity as per Indian contract Act, 1872. What are the parties to the contract of indemnity? Give an example to explain the contract of Indemnity. MTP-N18(N)
2. A entered into contract to indemnify B against the consequences of any proceedings which C may take against B in respect of a sum of Rs. 5,000/- advanced by C to B. In consequence, when B who is called upon to pay the sum of money to C fails to do so. Can C recover the amount from A?
 - A. Yes. C can recover amount from A.
 3. X, a shareholder of a company lost his share certificate. He applied for the duplicate. The company agreed to issue the same on the term that X will compensate the company against the loss where any holder produces the original certificate. Is there a contract of Indemnity.
 - A. Yes. The contract of indemnity is between X and the company.
 4. A asks B to beat C, promising to pay him against the consequences. B beats C and is fined with Rs. 1000. Can Promise of A be enforced? Will your answer be different in case A asks B to kill C?
 - A. No. Since the object of the agreement is illegal it can't be enforced. Just like any other contract, Contract of Indemnity shall also satisfy all the essential elements of a valid contract as stated in Section 10.

The answer remains same as killing a person is also an illegal activity.
5. The contract of Life insurance is not fully covered under the contract of indemnity. Comment. would your answer different in case of General Insurance?
 - A. Statement is correct. Contract of Indemnity includes loss occurred due to act of Promisor or some other person but it does not include loss occurred due to Promisee or act of god. Whereas contract of Life Insurance covers loss occurred due to act of god also. Contract of life insurance is a contract of Assurance.

In case of general insurance answer is different and it tantamount to contract of Indemnity.
6. Whether Contract of Indemnity covers the cases of Loss caused by the events or accidents which do not depend upon the conduct of the Promisor or any other person?
 - A. If the definition of the contract of Indemnity is strictly interpreted, it covers the cases where loss is caused by the conduct of the promisor himself or by the conduct of any other person.

Example: Mr. A and Mr. B are friends since childhood. Mr. A asked Mr. B to start a business. Out of fear of losses, Mr. B denied the offer of the Mr. A. Mr. A promised Mr. B that he will compensate Mr. B for any loss arising out of doing business. In the 1st year Mr. B did business and suffered 1,00,000 loss. Mr. A indemnified Mr. B for the suffered loss. In the 2nd year Mr. B did business and suffered Rs. 2,00,000 loss. Mr. A once again indemnified Mr. B. In the 3rd year, a fire accident happened in the business premises and Mr. B suffered a loss of Rs. 5,00,000. Now Mr. A is not responsible for the loss happened by way of fire accident which is not covered in terms of indemnity contract.

Q.No.2. What are the rights of indemnity-holder when sued against the indemnifier in the contract of indemnity? (B) (NEW SM - TYK, OLD SM)

First write what is Contract of Indemnity and who is Indemnity holder.

RIGHTS OF INDEMNITY HOLDER (Sec 125):

Indemnity holder is entitled to recover the following, from the Indemnifier (Promisor):

- a) **Damages in Suit:** All damages which he may be compelled to pay in any suit in respect of matter covered under the contract.
- b) **Cost of Suit:** All costs which he has paid in bringing or defending the suit provided that -
 - He acted under the authority of the Indemnifier
 - He did not contravene the orders of the indemnifier

³ X an auctioneer sold certain goods at the instructions of Y. Later on, it is discovered that the goods belonged to Z and not Y. Z recovered damages from X for selling his goods. Here, X is entitled to recover the compensation from Y because there was an implied contract to compensate the auctioneer.

- He acted in such a way as a prudent man would act in his own case

c) **Sum paid for compromising suit:** All sums which he has paid under the terms of any compromise of suit provided that -

- He acted under the authority of the Indemnifier.
- He did not contravene the orders of the Indemnifier.
- He acted in such a way as a prudent man would act in his own case.

d) **Sue for Specific performance:** If the indemnity holder had incurred an absolute liability, he becomes entitled to ask the indemnifier to indemnify him.

RIGHTS OF INDEMNIFIER: There is no provision in the Indian Contract Act about the Indemnifier's rights. However, the rights of the Indemnifier are same as the rights of a Surety.

SIMILAR QUESTIONS:

1. A may contract to indemnify B against the losses of business which B may start at the request of A. After completion of a year, B suffered huge losses in that business. B approached A for indemnity. A rejected the claim; subsequently B filed a suit on A for indemnification. In the process of bringing suit against A, B incurred expenses like lawyer fees, court fees. Is B entitled for costs that are incurred in filing suit?
- A. B can get reimbursement of losses from A provided he has done the business according to the directions of A. B can also get reimbursement of expenses which he incurred in bringing suit for recovery of compensation from A.
2. Hell Laptops limited (manufacturer) may contract to indemnify Hell Laptop authorized dealer (Delhi) against the damages in the goods sent to later for the purpose of sale. Hell Laptop authorized dealer (Delhi) sold a laptop to Mr. C (customer) which is a damage piece. Mr. C filed case on Hell Laptop authorized dealer (Delhi) in a consumer court for recovery of laptop price. Hell Laptop authorized dealer (Delhi) paid Rs. 50,000 to the customer in compromising the suit. Now discuss the rights of Hell Laptop authorized dealer (Delhi) in respect of amount paid to Mr. C as per Indian contract act, 1872.
- A. Hell Laptop authorized dealer (Delhi) can get indemnification from Hell Laptops Limited for the sum paid in compromising the suit.
3. Ram, an auctioneer, sold certain goods on the instructions of Raj. Later on, it is discovered that the goods are belonged to Rahim. Rahim recovered damages from Ram for selling his goods. Discuss the rights of Ram?
- A. There is an implied contract of Indemnity between Ram (Indemnified) and Raj (Indemnifier). Hence, Ram is entitled to following rights:

Now write the rights of Indemnified as stated above.

Q.No.3. What is meant by Contract of Guarantee? State the Essentials features of contract of guarantee. (Sec 126) (B) (NEW SM, OLD SM)

MEANING: A contract of guarantee is a contract to perform the promise made or discharge the liability incurred by a third person in case of his default.

Ex: A, advances a loan of Rs. 5,000 to B and C promises to A that if B does not repay the loan, C will repay the same. This is a Contract of Guarantee.

PARTIES: In a contract of guarantee there will be 3 parties.

- a) **Surety:** The person who gives the guarantee (*In the above example, C*).
- b) **Principal Debtor:** The party in respect of whose default the guarantee is given. (*In the above example, B*).
- c) **Creditor:** The person to whom guarantee is given (*In the above example, A*).

ESSENTIALS / DISTINGUISHING FEATURES OF CONTRACT GUARANTEE:

1. **Tripartite Agreement:** A contract of guarantee is a tripartite agreement between the Principal Debtor, Creditor and Surety⁴.

⁴ From the above definition, it is clear that in a contract of guarantee, there are three contracts

i) A principal contract between the Principal Debtor and the creditor, creating the debt.

2. **Concurrence:** A contract of Guarantee requires the concurrence (consent) of all the 3 parties to it viz. Principal Debtor, Creditor and Surety.
3. **Essentials of a Valid Contract:** A contract of Guarantee must have all the essential elements of a valid contract. However, the following points should be noted:
 - a) The Principal Debtor need not be competent to contract. Even if Principal Debtor is incompetent to contract, the guarantee is valid. But, if surety is incompetent to contract, the guarantee is void.
 - b) No separate consideration is required for Surety. Anything done, or promise made for the benefit of the principal debtor is sufficient consideration to the surety for giving the guarantee⁵.
4. **Existence of a Liability:** There should be a liability, existing or future, enforceable at law⁶. Thus a guarantee given for a non-enforceable debt or obligation is not valid⁷
5. **Consideration:**
 - a) Consideration received by the Principal Debtor is sufficient for the Surety.
 - b) It is not required that it must necessarily result in some benefit to the Surety himself.
 - c) It is sufficient if something is done or some promise is made for the benefit of the Principal Debtor
 - d) Past consideration is not a valid consideration for Contract of Guarantee.
6. Contract of surety/Guarantee should not be obtained by misrepresentation or concealment of a material fact.
7. Contract of guarantee can be oral or written. It can be express or implied⁸.
8. **Joining of other co-sureties:** If a contract of guarantee provides that a creditor shall not act on it until another person has joined in it as co-surety then the contract of guarantee is not valid, if that other person does not join.

SIMILAR QUESTIONS:

1. A obtains housing loan from BIG Housing Ltd. B promises to pay BIG Housing Ltd in the event of A failing to repay. Is there a contract of guarantee? Will your answer be different in case the loan is taken from NATIONAL Bank.
 - A. Yes. Creditor can be any person including NATIONAL bank.
 2. X and Y go into a car showroom where X says to the dealer to supply latest model of BMW to Y. If Y fails to pay, X will pay for it. Is there a contract of guarantee?
 - A. Yes. Because X promises to discharge the liability of Y in case of his defaults
 3. B requests A to sell and deliver to him goods on credit. A agrees to do so, provided C will guarantee the payment of the price of the goods. C promises to guarantee the payment in consideration of A's promise to deliver the goods. C argued that since he has not received any consideration from B, there is no contract of guarantee. He further said that a contract without consideration is void ab initio. You are required to state the following. Is C correct in his approach?

Will your answer be different, in case B pays to C an amount of Rs. 500 for giving guarantee, before the execution of contract?

- ii) *A secondary contract between the creditor and the surety, creating a liability of surety in case of debtor's fault.*
- iii) *An implied indemnity contract between the surety and the Principal Debtor whereby Principal Debtor is under an obligation to indemnify the surety; if the surety is made to pay or perform.*

⁵ There are 3 contracts in contract of guarantee. Consideration is present in all contracts. Principal debtor is getting loan from Creditor and Surety is giving guarantee.

Contract 1 between Principal Debtor and Creditor: Principal Debtor is getting loan from creditor and creditor is getting loan and interest from Principal Debtor.

Contract 2 between Surety and Creditor: Anything which is done for the benefit of Principal debtor is consideration to surety and Creditor is getting additional security that in the event of breach of contract by Principal debtor, creditor can claim from surety.

Contract 3 between Surety and Principal Debtor: The promise of Principal Debtor to indemnify surety is consideration to Surety. Surety is undertaking to pay liability (which is detriment to surety) is consideration to Principal Debtor.

⁶ Though minor's debt is not enforceable by law, yet the guarantee given for minor's debt is valid.

⁷ Guarantee to the time barred debt is not valid.

⁸ A is the mutual friend of B and C. One day B came to A for the want of necessaries. A asked B to approach C for anything he desires. Meanwhile A told to C to arrange necessities for B. Here A did not have given any guarantee expressly. However there is responsibility on A to repay the loan in the event of B's failure to repay the money. There is implied contract of guarantee between A and C.

A. The argument of C is not correct. In case of contract of Guarantee, credit given by Creditor to Principal Debtor based on the guarantee given by Surety is enough consideration for Surety (Sec.127)
 There is no change in answer even if B pays Rs.500 to C (Of course it is also valid contract of guarantee)

4. A sell and delivers goods to B. C afterwards requests A to forbear to sue B for the debt for a year, and promises that if he does so, C will pay for them in default of payment by B. A agrees to forbear as requested. Is this a sufficient consideration for C's promise.

A. Yes, A agrees to forbear to sue B for a year on the request of C is a sufficient consideration.

5. B requests A to sell and deliver to him goods on credit. A agrees to do so, provided C will guarantee the payment of the price of the goods. C promises to guarantee the payment in consideration of A's promise to deliver the goods. Is this a sufficient consideration for C's promise

A. Yes. A's promise to deliver the goods to B on the guarantee of C is a valid consideration to C.

6. A gave a loan of Rs. 1,00,000 to B. C afterwards, without consideration, agrees to pay the loan in default of B. Is the agreement valid? Would your answer differ if at the time of C giving guarantee, A gave to B a new loan of Rs. 10,000 and C gave guarantee for the entire debt due by B to A.

A. No. The agreement is void since past consideration is not valid consideration in contract of guarantee.
 Yes. The contract is valid. There is some fresh consideration moving from the creditor at the time of guarantee. Guarantee for Rs. 1,10,000 (old debt & new debt) is valid since consideration need not be adequate.

7. A, Minor has borrowed a sum of Rs.10,000 from B. C has guaranteed B that in the event of failure of A, he will repay to B. You are required to state the following.

- Is there a valid contract of guarantee?
- Will your answer be different, in case A is not a minor and C is minor?
- Will your answer be different, in case A & C are not minors but B is a minor.

A. The Principal Debtor need not be competent to contract. Even if Principal Debtor is incompetent to contract, the guarantee is valid. But, if surety is incompetent to contract, the guarantee is void.

- Yes there is a contract of Guarantee and it is valid.
- There is no valid contract of Guarantee
- Yes there is a contract of Guarantee and it is valid since a minor can be beneficiary in a contract.

8. C sells and delivers goods to P. Is contract of guarantee valid in each of the following alternative cases?

Case (a): If S afterwards agrees to pay for the goods in default of P.

Case (b): If S afterwards requests C to allow a credit for a period of 1 year to P and promises that if C does so, he will pay for the goods if P defaults. C agrees to allow as requested

A. Decision and Reason:
 Case (a): The agreement of guarantee is void because such agreement was without any consideration.
 Case (b): The agreement of guarantee is valid because credit period allowed was a sufficient consideration for S's promise.

(IMMEDIATELY REFER PRACTICAL QUESTION: 1)

Q.No.4. Types of guarantee. (C)

(NEW SM, OLD SM)

Guarantee can be classified as under:

- Retrospective Guarantee:** A guarantee given for an existing debt or obligation is called 'retrospective guarantee'. Of course, guarantee given for past debt is invalid. However, the same would be valid if some fresh consideration is moving from the creditor to the debtor at the time of guarantee. (for example, further advance made by creditor to debtor)
- Prospective Guarantee:** A guarantee given for a future debt or obligation is called prospective guarantee.
- Specific Guarantee:** This guarantee is for a specific or single transaction. It ends when the debt is discharged or promise is performed.
- Continuing Guarantee:** This guarantee is for a series of transactions. Liability extends till the revocation of guarantee.

Q.No.5. Write about specific guarantee and Continuing Guarantee? (B)

(NEW SM)

SPECIFIC GUARANTEE:

1. A guarantee given to a single debt or specific transaction is called 'Specific' or 'Simple' guarantee or Ordinary guarantee⁹.
2. The specific guarantee comes to an end when -
 - a) The guaranteed debt is repaid or
 - b) The promise is duly performed.
3. Revocation is not possible

CONTINUING GUARANTEE [SEC.129]:

1. A guarantee which extends to a series of transactions¹⁰ is called a "continuing guarantee".
2. In the continuing guarantee, the liability of surety extends till the -
 - a) Performance or discharge of all the transactions entered into or
 - b) Revocation of guarantee.

(IMMEDIATELY REFER PRACTICAL QUESTION. 2, 3)

Q.No.6. When surety is discharged? (C)

(NEW SM, OLD SM)

A Surety is discharged from liability on a guarantee under the following circumstances:

- a) By revocation of the Contract of Guarantee
- b) By the conduct of the Creditor, or
- c) By invalidation of the Contract of Guarantee

Q.No.7. Point out the circumstances in which Surety is discharged from liability by revocation of continuous Guarantee? (A)

(NEW SM, OLD SM)

1. **Express Revocation (Sec 130):** The continuing guarantee may be revoked at any time by the Surety, as to future transactions by serving notice to the creditors.

Note: However, no revocation is possible,

- a) Where a continuing relationship is established or
- b) For the past transactions which have already taken place

2. **Death of Surety (Sec 131):** In the absence of any contract to the contrary, death of the surety operates as a revocation of continuing guarantee, as to the future transactions taking place after the death of surety.

Note: However, the surety's estate remains liable for the past transactions which have already taken place. Notice of death need not be served to the creditor.

3. A continuing guarantee may also be revoked under the following circumstances:

⁹ Unlike a continuing guarantee, a specific guarantee can't be revoked. It comes to an end when the guaranteed debt is duly discharged or the promise is duly performed.

¹⁰ A guarantees payment to B, a tea-dealer, to the amount of \$ 100, for any tea he may from time to time supply to C. B supplies C with tea to above the value of \$ 100, and C pays B for it. Afterwards B supplies C with tea to the value of \$ 200. C fails to pay. The guarantee given by A was a continuing guarantee, and he is accordingly liable to B to the extent of \$100.

A guarantees payment to B of the price of five sacks of flour to be delivered by B to C and to be paid for in a month. B delivers five sacks to C. C pays for them. Afterwards B delivers four sacks to C, which C does not pay for. The guarantee given by A was not a continuing guarantee, and accordingly he is not liable for the price of the four sacks.

- a) Variance in terms of contract
- b) Loss of Security
- c) Release or discharge of Principal Debtor
- d) Arrangement with Principal Debtor

SIMILAR QUESTIONS:

1. A, in consideration of B's discounting, at A's request, bills of exchange for C, guarantees to B, for twelve months, the due payment of all such bills to the extent of 50,000 rupees. B discounts bills for C to the extent of 20,000 rupees. Afterwards, at the end of three months, A revokes the guarantee. Is the revocation of guarantee valid? Is A discharged from liability of Principal Debtor?
- A. Generally revocation of guarantee is invalid. However, a continuing guarantee can be revoked at any time only after giving proper notice to Creditor. This revocation discharges A from all liability to B for any subsequent discount. Of course A is liable to B for the 20,000 rupees, on default of C.
2. A guarantees to B, to the extent of 100,000 rupees, that C shall pay all the bills that B shall draw upon him. B draws upon C. C accepts the bill. A gives notice of revocation. C dishonors the bill at maturity. Is A liable to B
- A. Revocation of specific guarantee is not allowed. Therefore A is liable upon his guarantee.

(IMMEDIATELY REFER PRACTICAL QUESTION: 5, 6)

Q.No.8. State circumstances/conditions in which contract of guarantee can be treated as invalid/void? (A) (NEW SM, OLD SM)

Following are the circumstances where a guarantee can be treated as invalid.

1. Guarantee obtained by Misrepresentation [Sec 142]:

Any guarantee obtained by misrepresentation made by a creditor, or with his knowledge and assent, relating to a material part of the transaction, is invalid.

2. Guarantee obtained by Concealment of facts [Sec 143]: Any guarantee obtained by a creditor by means of keeping silence as to material circumstances to contract is invalid.

3. Failure of co-surety to join a Surety contract [Sec 144]:

When a contract of guarantee provides that a creditor shall not act on it until another person has joined in it as co-surety, the guarantee is not valid if that person does not join.

4. Failure of Consideration: When there is no consideration between the Principal Debtor and Creditor, the Surety is discharged.

SIMILAR QUESTION:

1. A engages B as a clerk to collect money for him, B fails to account for some of his receipts, and A in consequence calls upon him to furnish security for his duly accounting. C gives his guarantee for B's duly accounting. A does not acquaint C with B's previous conduct. B afterwards makes default. Is this guarantee valid?
- A. Since A does not acquaint C with B's previous conduct, in the given case the guarantee was invalid.
2. A guarantees to C payment for iron to be supplied by him to B for the amount of 2,00,000 tons. B and C have privately agreed that B should pay five rupees per ton beyond the market price, such excess to be applied in liquidation of an old debt. This agreement is concealed from A. Is this guarantee valid?
- A. Since the earlier agreement is concealed from A, A is not liable as a surety.

(IMMEDIATELY REFER PRACTICAL QUESTION: 7)

Q.No.9. Point out the circumstances in which a surety is discharged from liability by the conduct of the creditor. (A) (NEW SM, OLD SM, OLD PM, CMA D10-4M, M02 - 10M, M09 - 1M)

1. Variance in terms of contract (Sec 133):

- a) Any variance made in the terms of contract between the Principal Debtor and the creditor, without surety's consent, discharges the surety as to transactions subsequent to the variance
- b) However, the surety is not discharged in the following cases:

- i) Variance is made with the consent of Surety.
- ii) Variation which is not substantial or material, or which is beneficial to the Surety¹¹.

2. **Release or discharge of Principal Debtor (Sec 134):** The surety is discharged by -

- a) Any contract between the creditor and the Principal Debtor, by which Principal Debtor is released, or
- b) Any act or omission of the creditor, the legal consequence of which is the discharge of the Principal Debtor¹².

There are certain exceptions to the above rule. These are given hereunder:

- ii) *A mere forbearance on the part of a creditor to sue the debtor or to enforce any other remedy would not discharge the surety in the absence of any specific provision¹³.*
- iii) *Even where the claim is barred by limitation, surety is still responsible¹⁴ (Refer Pg. No. 2.20)*

3. **Impairment of surety's remedy (Sec 139):** Surety is discharged,

- a) If the creditor does any act which is inconsistent with the rights of the surety, or omits to do any act¹⁵ which the duty to the surety requires him to do, and
- b) The eventual remedy of the surety against the Principal Debtor is thereby impaired

4. **Compounding with Principal Debtor [Sec 135]:**

Surety is discharged by any contract between creditor and Principal Debtor by way of which -

- Creditor makes a composition¹⁶ with Principal Debtor or
- Creditor agrees to give time to Principal Debtor or
- Creditor agrees not to sue the Principal Debtor

But where the surety assents to such contract, then he is not discharged

HOWEVER, THE SURETY IS NOT DISCHARGED IN THE FOLLOWING CIRCUMSTANCES -

- a) **Agreement made with third person to grant time to Principal Debtor [Sec 136]:** Where a contract to give time to the Principal Debtor is made by the creditor with a third person, and not with the Principal Debtor, the surety is not discharged.
- b) **Creditor's forbearance to sue [Sec 137]:** In the absence of any contract to the contrary, mere forbearance on the part of the creditor to sue the Principal Debtor or to enforce any other remedy against him, does not discharge the surety.

¹¹ *In M.S. Anirudhan v. Thomco's Bank, the surety guaranteed overdraft provided by the bank to the principal debtor only up to Rs. 25,000. Subsequently since the bank was willing to provide overdraft only up to Rs. 20,000, the principal debtor reduced the amount in the guarantee form to Rs. 20,000. On default by the principal debtor the court held the surety liable as the alteration was beneficial to him and it was not of a substantial nature.*

¹² *A contracts with B for a fixed price to build a house for B within a stipulated time, B supplying the necessary timber. C guarantees A's performance of the contract. B omits to supply the timber. C is discharged from his surety ship.*

¹³ *B owes to C a debt guaranteed by A. The debt becomes payable. C does not sue B for a year after the debt has become payable. A is not discharged from his surety ship.*

¹⁴ Case law: *In Krishto Kishore vs. Radha Romun,*

Facts of the case: The plaintiff sued the surety & legal representatives of the Principal Debtor after knowing the fact of the death of the Principal Debtor to avoid the debt being barred by limitation.

Decision: The surety is still liable. Where it was held that omission of the creditor to sue within the period of limitation does not discharge the surety.

¹⁵ *A puts M as apprentice to B, and gives a guarantee to B for M's fidelity. B promises on his part that he will, at least once a month, see that M make up the cash. B omits to see this done as promised, and M embezzles. A is not liable to B on his guarantee.*

¹⁶ *P purchased a Motor Bike from C under a hire-purchase agreement on guarantee of S for the due performance of the agreement. C for valuable consideration gives P further time for payment of one of the installments. Held, the giving of time to P discharged S from any further liability under the guarantee.*

c) **Release of one co-surety [Sec 138]:** When there are co-sureties, release of one of them by creditor does not discharge the others neither does it free the surety so released from his responsibilities to the other sureties

SIMILAR QUESTIONS:

1. P borrowed a sum of Rs. 50,000 from C for which S gave a guarantee to C. The contract was executed on a document. Later P changed his residential address. C modified the contract with respect to change of address of P without consent of S. Is S discharged from the contract of surety ship? Would your answer different if C also changed the interest rate from 8% to 10%?
A. Change of address of P in a contract without consent of surety is not substantial or material variation. Thus, surety Is not discharged from the contract of surety ship.
Yes there is change in answer in the Second case, as rate of interest is increased without consent of surety is material variation. Thus, S gets discharged.
2. C, the holder of an overdue bill of exchange drawn by A as surety for B, and accepted by B, contracts with X to give time to B. Is A discharged from his liability?
A. The contract to give time to the Principal Debtor is made by the creditor with X who is a third person. X is not the Principal Debtor. Hence A is not discharged.
3. A, contracts with B for a fixed price to build a house for B within a stipulated time, B would supply necessary material to be used in the construction. C guarantees A's performance of the contract. B does not supply the material as per the agreement. Is C is discharged from his liability
(NEW SM-TYK)
- A. The contract between A and B is Mutual and dependent. The surety is discharged by any contract between the creditor and the principal debtor, by which the principal debtor is released or by any act or omission for the creditor, the legal consequence of which is the discharge of the principal debtor. In the given case the B omits to supply the timber. Hence C is discharged from his liability.
4. A becomes surety to C for B's conduct as a manager in C's bank. Afterwards, B and C contract, without A' consent, that B's salary shall be raised, and that he shall become liable for one-fourth of the losses on overdrafts. B allows a customer to overdraft, and the bank losses a sum of money. Is A liable for the losses arises out of B's conduct?
A. No. Surety is not liable for the conduct of B. A is discharged from his surety ship by variance made without his consent, and is not liable to make good this loss.
5. S, Y and C guarantees payment to Z for the supplies of iron to G. G defaulted his payment to Z. Z releases Y to pay of his debt. Is Y released from his responsibilities to the other sureties?
A. No, because as per Sec-138 Release of one co-surety does not discharge others.—Where there are co-sureties, a release by the creditor of one of them does not discharge the others, neither does it free the surety so released from his responsibility to the other sureties.

(IMMEDIATELY REFER PRACTICAL QUESTION 8, 9, 10, 11, 12)

Q.No.10. State the rights of a Surety against the Principal Debtor, Creditor? (B)

(NEW SM, OLD SM, OLD PM, N 99 - 5M)

After the performing of the promise or discharging of the liability of the Principal Debtor, surety acquires various rights against the parties.

1. RIGHTS AGAINST THE PRINCIPAL DEBTOR:

a) Rights of subrogation [Sec 140]:

- i) On payment of the guaranteed debt or performance of the guaranteed duty, the surety acquires all the rights with which the creditor had against the Principal Debtor.
- ii) This right is known as right of subrogation¹⁷. The surety steps into the shoes of the creditor.

b) Right to be Indemnified [Sec 145]:

- i) In every contract of guarantee there is an implied promise by the Principal Debtor to indemnify the surety.
- ii) The surety is entitled to recover from the Principal Debtor whatever sum he has rightfully paid under the guarantee, but no sums which he has paid wrongfully.

¹⁷ On payment of guaranteed debt or performance of the guaranteed duty, the surety may therefore, claim the securities (if any) held by the creditor and sue the principal debtor, or may claim dividend in insolvency of the debtor.

2. RIGHT AGAINST THE CREDITOR:

a) Right to claim the creditor's securities [Sec 141]:

- i) A surety is entitled to the benefit of every security which the creditor has against the Principal Debtor, irrespective of whether the surety knows of the existence of such security or not;
- ii) If the creditor loses or parts with the security without the consent of the surety, the surety is discharged to the extent of the value of the security.

b) Right to claim Set off: The surety has the right to claim set off or counter claim, if any, which the Principal Debtor had against the creditors in case the creditors sue him for payment of liability of Principal Debtor.

SIMILAR QUESTION:

1. B is indebted to C, and A is surety for the debt. C demands payment from A, and on his refusal sues him for the amount. A defends the suit, having reasonable grounds for doing so, but is compelled to pay the amount of the debt with costs. Discuss the Rights of A against B?
- A. Refer Rights of Surety against Principal Debtor (He can recover from B the amount paid by him for costs, as well as the principal debt).
2. C advances to B, his tenant, 2,00,000 rupees on the guarantee of A. C has also a further security for the 2,00,000 rupees by a mortgage of B's furniture. C cancels the mortgage without consent of A. B becomes insolvent and C sues A on his guarantee. Comment?
- A. A is discharged from liability to the amount of the value of the furniture.
3. P took a loan of Rs. 50,000 from C. S gave a guarantee for the said loan amount. Also C is liable to S for Rs. 25,000 in a separate contract between C and S. On due date, P failed to repay the loan amount. C sued S for recovery of Rs. 50,000 but S paid only Rs. 25,000. Can S do so?
- A. S can set off Rs. 25,000 which is due to him from C. However, S can claim total Rs. 50,000 from P.
4. A guarantees to C, to the extent of 2,00,000 rupees, payment for rice to be supplied by C to B. C supplies to B, rice amount of Rs. 1,00,000 rupees, but obtains from A payment of the sum of 2,00,000 rupees in respect of the rice supplied. Can A recover Rs. 2,00,000 from B?
- A. A cannot recover from B more than the price of the rice actually supplied. However, A might recover from C the excess paid u/s 72 – "payment made under a mistake or coercion can be taken back."

Q.No.11. State the rights of a Surety against Co-sureties (B)

(New SM & OLD SM)

RIGHT OF CONTRIBUTION: When a debt is guaranteed by two or more sureties, they are called co-sureties. The co-sureties are liable to contribute, as agreed, towards the payment of the guaranteed debt. When one of the co-sureties makes payment to the creditor, he has a right to claim contribution from the other co-surety or co-sureties.

a) Co-sureties liable to contribute equally (Sec 146):

- In the absence of any contract to the contrary, the co-sureties are liable to contribute equally.
- The principle will apply even when the liability of co-sureties is joint or several, and whether under the same or different contracts and whether with or without the knowledge of each other.

b) Liability of co-sureties bound in different sums (Sec 147): Co-sureties bound in different sums, shall pay equally up to the limits of their respective obligations.

c) Release of a co-surety: Where there are co-sureties, release of one co-surety by the creditor does not discharge the others. Also the surety so released by the creditor is liable to other co-sureties.

SIMILAR QUESTIONS:

1. Explaining the provisions of the Indian Contract Act, 1872, answer the following.

Mr. D was in urgent need of money amounting to Rs. 5,00,000. He asked Mr. K for money. Mr. K lent the amount on the sureties of A, B and N without any contract between them in the case of default in the repayment of money by D to K. D makes default in payment. B refused to contribute, examine whether B can escape liability? MTP-M19(N)

- A. Co-sureties liable to contribute equally (Section 146 of the Indian Contract act, 1872): Equality of burden is the basis of Co-suretyship. This is contained in section 146 which states that "when two or more persons are co-sureties for the same debt, or duty, either jointly, or severally and whether under the same or different contracts and whether with or without the knowledge of each other, the co-sureties in the absence of any contract to the contrary, are liable, as between themselves, to pay each an equal share of the whole debt, or of that part of it which remains unpaid by the principal debtor".

Accordingly, on the default of D in payment, B cannot escape from his liability. All the three sureties A, B and N are liable to pay equally, in absence of any contract between them.

(IMMEDIATELY REFER PRACTICAL QUESTION: 13, 14)

Q.No.12. Is liability of two sureties affected by mutual arrangements? (C) (NEW SM, OLD SM)

Liability of two sureties is not affected by mutual arrangements [Sec 132]:

1. Where two persons contract with a third person to undertake a certain liability and
2. Such two persons also contract with each other that one of them shall be liable only on the default of the other, third person not being a party to such contract,
3. The liability of each of such two persons to the third person under the first contract is not affected by the existence of the second contract between those two persons, even though such third person may have been aware of its existence.

SIMILAR QUESTION:

1. Mr. D was in urgent need of money amounting to Rs. 5,00,000. He asked Mr. K for money. Mr. K lent the amount on the sureties of A, B and N. Later A, B and N entered into an agreement stating that, Mr A would be liable if Mr D defaults in repayment of loan to Mr. K. Does this agreement discharge B and N from their guarantee?
- A. Refer above Provision, B and N are not discharged as the contract among A, B and N does not affect the main guarantee contract.
2. A and B make a joint and several promissory note to C. A makes it, in fact, as surety for B, and C knows this at the time, when the note is made. The fact that A, to the knowledge of C, made the note as surety for B is not an answer to a suit by C against A upon the note.

Q.No.13. Explain the nature and extent of Surety's liability. (B)

(NEW SM, OLD SM, M 98, N 00, N 01 - 5M, M08 - 1M)

1. **Liability of Surety:** In the absence of contract to the contrary, the liability of the surety is co-extensive with that of the Principal Debtor. (Refer Note)
2. **Secondary Liability:** The liability of a surety arises only on default by the Principal Debtor.
3. Where a debtor cannot be held liable on account of any defect in the document, the liability of the surety also comes to an end.
4. Surety's liability continues even if the Principal Debtor has not been sued or is omitted from being sued because the liability of surety is separate in the contract of guarantee.
5. If the principal debt is illegal or unenforceable, the Principal Debtor as well as surety shall not be liable.
6. If the Principal Debtor is discharged by creditor's breach, the Surety shall also be discharged¹⁸.

Note: The term "co-extensive with that of Principal Debtor" means that the surety is liable for what the Principal Debtor is liable.

SIMILAR QUESTIONS:

1. A has discounted a bill for Rs. 50,000 at DIGITAL BANK given by B. C has guaranteed the payment for A to DIGITAL BANK. The bill is dishonoured by B on the due date. DIGITAL BANK charged an amount of Rs. 5,000 towards interest. On due date, A failed to pay the amount to DIGITAL BANK. C claimed that he is liable only for amount received by A. You are required to
 - a) State whether C's contention is correct?
 - b) To what extent C is held liable?
- A. No. C is liable not only for the amount of the bill but also for any interest and charges which may have become due on it.

Total Liability of C (surety) is Rs. 55,000/- (Rs. 50,000 + Rs. 5,000).

¹⁸ A contracts with B for a fixed price to build a house for B within a stipulated time on a condition that B will supply the necessary timber. C guarantees A's performance of the contract. This is a mutual and dependent contract between A and B. B omits to supply the timber. A gets discharged on B's breach of duty in supplying the timber. As a result C is also discharged from his surety ship.

Q.No.14. Contract of Indemnity Vs. Contract of Guarantee (A) (NEW SM -TYK, OLD SM, N17 - 4M)
(FOR STUDENT'S SELF STUDY)

DIFFERENCES	CONTRACT OF INDEMNITY	CONTRACT OF GUARANTEE
Meaning	It is a contract by which one party promises to save the other from loss caused to him	It is a contract to perform the promise or discharge the liability of third party in case of his default.
Parties	Indemnifier & indemnity holder.	Creditor, Principal Debtor & Surety.
Nature of liability	The liability of indemnifier is primary and independent.	The liability of a Surety is secondary and conditional.
Purpose	To reimburse the loss.	To provide security of a debt or performance of the promisor.
Time of Liability	Liability of the indemnifier arises only on the happening of a contingency.	Liability of Surety is secondary i.e., It arises only on default of Principal Debtor.
Right to sue the third party	Indemnifier cannot sue a third party for loss in his own name as there is no privity of contract. Such a right would arise only if there is an assignment in his favour.	A Surety can proceed against Principal Debtor in his own right because he gets all the rights of a creditor after discharging the debts.
Competency to contract	All parties must be competent to contract.	The contract is valid even if a minor is Principal Debtor.
Number of Contracts	Only one (original and independent) contract between Indemnifier and Indemnified.	There are 3 contracts, between- <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Creditor and Principal Debtor • Creditor and Surety • Surety and Principal Debtor
Time to Act	It is not necessary for the Indemnifier to act at the request of the Indemnified	It is necessary that the Surety should give the guarantee at the request of the Principal Debtor

PRACTICAL QUESTIONS FOR CLASSROOM DISCUSSION

Q.No.1. X took a loan of Rs.10,000 from Y on 1st Jan 2013 and paid nothing on account of interest and principal. On 2nd Jan 2016, Z gave the guarantee to Y for the payment of Rs.10,000 due from X. Is this a valid guarantee? Would your answer be different if loan was taken on 02nd Jan 2016?

MTP - M19(N)&N18(N)

Provision: As per Section 126 of the Indian Contract act, 1872, a contract of Guarantee is valid if there is an existing liability and such liability or promise must be enforceable by law.

Analysis: In the present case, Z gave the guarantee to Y for the payment of Rs.10,000 due from X. Since the debt becomes a time barred debt, it is not enforceable by law.

Conclusion: This is not a Valid Contract of Guarantee because the primary liability between X and Y is a time barred debt which is not enforceable by law.

In the second case the contract of guarantee is valid as debt between principal debtor and creditor is enforceable.

Q.No.2. A guarantees payment to a grocer to the amount of Rs. 2,000 for any grocery that is being purchased from time to time by his wife. Grocer supplies more than the value of Rs. 2000 which is paid by the A. Afterwards grocer again supplies the grocery to the value of Rs. 8,000. State the liability of A.
 RTP N18 (O)

Provision: As per Sec. 126 of the Indian contract Act, 1872, "Contract of Guarantee is a contract to perform the promise or discharge the liability of a third party in case of his default. Sec 129 of the Indian Contract Act, 1872, defines continuing guarantee as, "a guarantee which extends to a series of transactions". The liability of the surety in such a guarantee continues until the performance or discharge of all the transactions entered into or the guaranteee is withdrawn.

Analysis and Conclusion: In the present case, guarantee given by A was a continuing guarantee and thus he is accordingly liable to grocer to the extent of Rs.2,000.

Q.No.3. S guarantees payment to C for the price of four laptop sets to be sold by C to P and to be paid for in a month. C delivers the sets to P. P pays for them. Later on, C delivers three more sets to P. State the liability of S.

Provision: As per Sec. 126 of the Indian contract Act, 1872, "Contract of Guarantee is a contract to perform the promise or discharge the liability of a third party in case of his default. Sec 129 of the Indian Contract Act, 1872, defines specific guarantee as, A guarantee given to a single debt or specific transaction is called Specific contract or Simple contract

Analysis and Conclusion: In the present case, The Guarantee given by S is not a continuing guarantee but it is a specific guarantee. Therefore, S is not liable for the price of the three sets which are supplied later to P.

Q.No.4. S gives guarantee for the loans given by C to P. P owes Rs. 1,00,000 to C. P becomes insolvent and a dividend of 20 paise in a rupee is declared. Discuss the rights of C and S if
 a) S gives the guarantee for the payment of the loan of Rs. 60,000
 b) S gives the guarantee for the payment of the loan subject to a limit of Rs. 60,000.

Provisions: According to Sec 128 of the Indian Contract Act, 1872, in the absence of contract to the contrary, the liability of the surety is co-extensive with that of the Principal Debtor. The Guarantee may be given for a part of the entire debt or for the entire debt subject to a limit.

Analysis and Conclusion:

a. **If the Guarantee is only for a part of the entire debt:**

C will recover Rs.60,000 from S (i.e., the full guaranteed amount) and Rs.8,000 (20% of the balance of Rs.40,000) from P's estate. S after making payment to C, will step into C's shoes and recover Rs12,000 (20% of Rs.60,000) from P's estate¹⁹.

b. **If the guarantee is for the entire debt subject to a limit:**

C will recover Rs.60,000 from S (i.e., up to the guaranteed limit) and Rs.20,000 (20% of the entire debt 1,00,000) from P's estate. He will, therefore, get Rs.80,000 in all. S will not get any dividend from P's estate till the full amount of Rs.1,00,000 is paid to C²⁰.

Q.No.5. Ravi becomes guarantor for Ashok for the amount which may be given to him by Nalin within six months. The maximum limit of the said amount is Rs 1 lakh. After two months Ravi withdraws his guarantee. Up to the time of revocation of guarantee, Nalin had given to Ashok Rs 20,000.

a) Whether Ravi is discharged from his liabilities to Nalin for any subsequent loan.
 b) Whether Ravi is liable if Ashok fails to pay the amount of Rs 20,000 to Nalin?

(OLD PM, M06 - 5M, Similar: N15 - 5M, N17 - 5M; RTP M18(O))

¹⁹ In the given debt Rs. 1,00,000, Rs. 60,000 is the guaranteed debt and Rs. 40,000 is unguaranteed debt. Surety is responsible for entire guaranteed debt. On payment of Rs. 60,000 by S, S becomes creditor for the amount paid i.e. Right of subrogation. So S is entitled to claim dividend on Rs. 60,000 from the assets of P

²⁰ In the given debt Rs. 1,00,000, Rs. 1,00,000 is guaranteed debt but surety restricted his liability to the extent of Rs. 60,000. Surety gets right of subrogation only when the guaranteed debt is cleared. But in the present case the creditor C has recovered Rs. 20,000 from the estate of P and Rs. 60,000 from S which amounts to Rs. 80,000. The total debt was not cleared so, surety is not entitled for right of subrogation.

Provisions: As per Sec 130 of the India Contract Act, 1872 a specific guarantee cannot be revoked by the surety if the liability has already occurred. A continuing guarantee may, at any time, be revoked by the surety, as to future transactions, by notice to the creditor, but the surety remains liable for transactions already entered into.

Analysis and Conclusion: In the present case, Ravi is discharged from all the subsequent loans because it's a case of continuing guarantee.

Whereas in second case, Ravi is liable for payment of Rs.20,000 to Nalin because the transaction has already completed.

Q.No.6. 'A' stands surety for 'B' for any amount which 'C' may lend to B from time to time during the next three months subject to a maximum of Rs. 50,000. One month later, A revokes the guarantee, when C had lent to B Rs. 5,000. Referring to the provisions of the Indian Contract Act, 1872 decide whether 'A' is discharged from all the liabilities to 'C' for any subsequent loan. What would be your answer in case 'B' makes a default in paying back to 'C' the money already borrowed i.e. Rs. 5,000?

Provisions: The problem asked in the question is based on the provisions of the Indian Contract Act 1872, as contained in Sec 130 relating to the revocation of a continuing guarantee as to future transactions which can be done mainly in the following two ways:

- 1. By Notice:** A continuing guarantee may at any time be revoked by the surety as to future transactions, by notice to the creditor.
- 2. By death of surety:** The death of the surety operates, in the absence of any contract to the contrary, as a revocation of a continuing guarantee, so far as regards future transactions. (Sec 131). The liability of the surety for previous transactions however remains.

Conclusion: Thus, applying the above provisions in the given case, A is discharged from all the liabilities to C for any subsequent loan.

In the second case the answer would change i.e. A is liable to C for Rs. 5,000 on default of B since the loan was taken before the notice of revocation was given to C.

Q.No.7. Mayank engages Babloo as a clerk to collect money for him. But Babloo fails to account for some of his receipts, and Mayank in consequence calls upon him to furnish security for his duly accounting. Amrit gives his guarantee for Babloo's duly accounting. Mayank does not acquaint Amrit with Babloo's previous conduct. Babloo afterwards makes default. Decide in the light of the provisions of the Contract Act, 1872, whether the guarantee is valid. (MTP-M18)(N)

Provisions: According to Sec 143 of the Indian Contract Act, 1872, any guarantee which the creditor has obtained by means of keeping silence as to material circumstances is invalid.

Analysis and Conclusion: In the present case, Mayank does not intimate Amrit about Babloo's previous conduct. Since guarantee is obtained by concealment of the material facts, the guarantee is invalid.

Q.No.8. A gives to C a continuing guarantee to the extent of Rs.5,000 for the vegetables to be supplied by C to B from time to time on credit. Afterwards, B became embarrassed, and without the knowledge of A, B and C contract that C shall continue to supply B with vegetables for ready money, and that the payments shall be applied to the then existing debts between B and C. Examining the provision of the Indian Contract Act, 1872, decide whether A is liable on his guarantee given to C.

(OLD PM, N08 - 5M, N17 - 4M, RTP-M19(N)&M18(O))

Provisions and Analysis: Discharge of surety by variance in the terms of the contract. As per Sec.133 of the Indian Contract Act, 1872 any variance made without the surety's consent in the terms of the contract between the Principal Debtor and the creditor, discharges the surety with respect to the transactions subsequent to the variance.

The reason for such a discharge in the given case is that the surety agreed to be liable for a contract which is no more in existence and he is not liable on the altered contract because it is different from the contract made by him.

Conclusion:

1. In the given situation, A is discharged from all the subsequent arrangements because it's a case of continuing guarantee.
2. Further A is liable for payment of Rs. 5,000/- to C because the transaction has already completed.

Q.No.9. Mr. X, is employed as a cashier on a monthly salary of Rs 2,000 by ABC bank for a period of three years. Y gave surety for X's good conduct. After nine months, the financial position of the bank deteriorates. Then X agrees to accept a lower salary of Rs 1,500/- per month from Bank. Two months later, it was found that X has misappropriated cash since the time of his appointment. What is the liability of Y?

(NEW SM-TYK, OLD PM, RTP N14, N18(N) - 4M)

Provisions: Sec 133 of the Indian Contract Act, 1872

If the creditor makes any variance (i.e. change in terms) without the consent of Surety, then the surety is discharged as to the transactions subsequent to the change.

Analysis: In the instant case Y is liable as a surety for the loss suffered by the bank due to misappropriation of cash by X during the first nine months but not for misappropriations committed after the reduction in salary.

Conclusion: Hence, Mr. Y will be liable as a surety for the act of X before the change in the terms of contract i.e. during the first nine months. Variation in the terms of the contract (as to the reduction of salary) without consent of Mr. Y will discharge Mr. Y from all the liabilities towards the act of the Mr. X after such variation.

Q.No.10. S guaranteed overdraft provided by the bank to the P only up to Rs.25,000. Subsequently, since the bank was willing to provide overdraft only up to Rs.20,000, P reduced the overdraft amount (amount in the Guarantee) from Rs.25,000 to Rs.20,000. P defaulted in repayment of loan. The Bank sues S for the recovery of Guarantee amount. S refuses to pay the loan. Discuss the liability of S?

Provisions: Sec 133 of the Indian Contract Act, 1872 where there is any variance in the terms of contract between the Principal Debtor and creditor without surety's consent it would discharge the surety in respect of all transactions taking place subsequent to such variance. However, the surety is not discharged if variation in the contract is not substantial or material.

Analysis and Conclusion: In the Present case, the variation made between P and bank was beneficial to the S. Thus, S is held liable on default by P

Q.No.11. Mr. Ray made a contract with Mr. Basu to grow vegetables on Mr. Ray's land and to deliver to Mr. Basu at a fixed rate. Mr. Karmakar guarantees Mr. Ray's performance of this contract. Mr. Basu diverts stream of water, which is necessary for production thereby prevented Mr. Ray to grow vegetables. Mr. Ray fails to supply as per contract. Hence, Mr. Basu sues Mr. Karmakar (Guarantor), for non-performance. Advice.

Provision: Sec. 139 of the contract Act. - Surety is discharged. If the creditor does any act which is inconsistent with the rights of the surety, or omits to do any act which the duty to the surety requires him to do, and the eventual remedy of the surety against the Principal Debtor is thereby impaired

Analysis and Conclusion: In the present case, it is the duty of Mr. Basu to supply water which is necessary for producing vegetables. Since Mr. Basu diverts steam of water, and thereby prevents Mr. Ray from growing the vegetables. Mr. Karmakar is no longer liable for his guarantee. Mr. Basu can not enforce this Surety contract.

Q.No.12. B owes C a debt guaranteed by A. C does not sue B for a year after the debt has become payable. In the meantime, B becomes insolvent. Is A discharged? Decide with reference to the provisions of the Indian Contract Act, 1872. (Old PM, CMA D08 - 2M, RTP - N 14)

Provisions: According to sec 137 of the Indian Contract Act, 1872 relating to discharge of surety. In the absence of any contract to the contrary, mere forbearance on the part of the creditor to sue the Principal Debtor or to enforce any other remedy against him, does not discharge the surety.

Analysis and Conclusion: In view of these provisions, A is not discharged from his liability as a surety.

Q.No.13. Mr. D was in urgent need of money amounting Rs 5,00,000. He asked Mr. K for the money. Mr. K lent the money on the sureties of A, B and N without any contract between them in case of default in repayment of money by D to K. D makes default in payment. B refused contribute. Examine whether B can escape liability? (M18(N) - 4M)

Provisions and Analysis: As per section 146 of the Indian contract act, 1872, "when two or more persons are co-sureties for the same debt, or duty, either jointly, or severally and whether under the same or different contracts and whether with or without the knowledge of each other, the co-sureties in the absence of any contract to the contrary, are liable, as between themselves, to pay each an equal share of the whole debt, or of that part of it which remains unpaid by the Principal Debtor".

Conclusion: On the default of D in the payment, B cannot escape from his liability. All the three sureties A, B, and N are liable to pay equally, in the absence of any contract between them.

Q.No.14. A, B and C as sureties for D, enter into 3 separate bonds of different amounts- A for Rs.10,000, B for Rs.20,000 and C for Rs.40,000. If D makes default to the extent of (a) Rs.30,000 (b) Rs.40,000 (c) Rs.70,000. Discuss the liability of A, B, C?

Provisions: As per Section 147 of the Indian contract act, 1872, where the co-sureties have agreed to guarantee to different sums, the co-sureties are liable to contribute equally subject to the maximum amount guaranteed by each one. They are not liable in proportion to the amount guaranteed by them.

Analysis and Conclusion:

Case (a):

	A's Liability	B's Liability	C's Liability
i. Equal share in default (Rs 30,000 / 3)	10,000	10,000	10,000
ii. Maximum amount Guaranteed	10,000	20,000	40,000
iii. Actual Liability (Least of (i) & (ii))	10,000	10,000	10,000

Case (b):

	A's Liability	B's Liability	C's Liability
i. Equal share in default(Rs40,000/3)	13,333	13,333	13,334
ii. Maximum amount guaranteed	10,000	20,000	30,000
iii. Actual Liability of A (Least of (i) & (ii))	10,000	-	-
iv. Equal share in remaining default to be shared by remaining co-sureties (Rs. 40,000 - Rs 10,000/2)	-	15,000	15,000
v. Actual Liability of B & C (Least of (ii) & (iv))	-	15,000	15,000

Case (c):

	A's Liability	B's Liability	C's Liability
i. Equal share in default (Rs70,000/3)	26,666	26,667	26,667

ii. Maximum amount guaranteed	10,000	20,000	30,000
iii. Actual Liability of A & B (least of (i) & (ii))	10,000	20,000	-
iv. Remaining default to be shared by remaining Co-surety (Rs. 70,000 - Rs 10,000 - Rs. 20,000)	-	-	40,000
v. Actual liability of C (Least of (ii) & (iv))	-	-	30,000

PRACTICAL QUESTIONS FOR STUDENT'S SELF PRACTICE

Q.No.1. M advances to N Rs 5,000 on the guarantee of P. The loan carries interest at 10% per annum. Subsequently, N becomes financially embarrassed. On N's request, M reduces the interest to 6% per annum and does not sue N for one year after the loan becomes due. N becomes insolvent. Can M sue P? (NEW SM – TYK, OLD PM, N18(O) - 4M)

Applicable Section 133 of the Indian Contract Act, 1872

Hint: M cannot sue P

Reason: If the creditor makes any change in the terms of his contract with the Principal Debtor without surety's consent then surety is discharged from his liability, no matter whether the variation is beneficial to the surety or does not materially affect the position of the surety.

Q.No.2. A stands as a Surety for the good conduct of B who is employed in a bank. B misappropriates some moneys but the bank excuses him without informing A of B's misconduct. B again misappropriates. Is A liable to the bank?

Applicable Sec. 139 of the contract Act.

Hint: Surety is discharged from his liability.

Reason: It is the duty of the creditor not to do anything inconsistent with the rights of the surety. If the creditors act or omission deprives the surety of benefit of his remedy, the surety is discharged.

Q.No.3. C, the holder of an overdue bill of exchange drawn by A as surety for B, and accepted by B, contracts with X to give time to B. Is A discharged from his liability? (OLD PM)

Applicable Sec.136 of the Indian Contract Act, 1872

Hint: A is not discharged

Reason: In the given question the contract to give time to the Principal Debtor is made by the creditor with X who is a third person. X is not the Principal Debtor.

Q.No.4. S₁, S₂ and S₃ are sureties to C for a sum of Rs.4,000 lent to P. P makes a default to the extent of Rs.3,000. Discuss the liability of sureties in each of the following alternative cases:

Case (a): If there is no contract between sureties.

Case (b): If there is a contract between sureties that S₁ is responsible to the extent of one-quarter, S₂ to be responsible to the extent of one quarter and S₃ to be responsible to the extent of two quarters.

Case (c): If sureties enter into three separate security bonds of different amounts. S₁- Rs.700, S₂-Rs.1,100, and S₃-Rs.1,200. (CMA D12 - 2M)

Sec. to which the given problem relates: Sec. 146 and 147.

Hint:

Case (a): S_1 , S_2 and S_3 are liable to pay Rs 1000 each because in the absence of any contract to the contrary, sureties are liable to contribute equally to the extent of default.

Case (b): S_1 , S_2 and S_3 are liable to pay Rs.750, Rs.750 and Rs.1500, respectively, because co-sureties are liable to contribute according to the terms of contract.

Case (c): S_1 is liable to pay Rs.700 (being least of one third of Rs.3,000 and Rs.700), S_2 is liable to pay Rs.1,100 (being least of one half of Rs.2,300 and Rs.1,100) and S_3 is liable to pay Rs.1,200 (being least of Rs.1,200 and Rs.1,200).

Reason: Co-sureties are liable to pay equally subject to the maximum amount guaranteed by each one.

Q.No.5. A has approached BANK OF ORISSA and requested for a loan of Rs. 1 crore towards working capital and an amount of Rs. 75 Lakhs towards Term Loan. After due examination, the BANK OF ORISSA has asked for guarantee to both the loans. A has approached B to give a guarantee for repayment of working capital loan and C to give a guarantee for repayment of term loan. B's agreement is not said to C and C's agreement is not said to B. A defaulted the repayment of both loans. The concerned bank has demanded an amount of Rs. 1.75 crore from B and C and held them jointly responsible. Were the banker correct in his approach. You are also required to state the liability of B, C in the given case.

Sec. to which the given problem relates: Sec. 132

Hint: liability of two persons, primarily liable, not affected by arrangement between them that one shall be surety on other's default.

Reason: No, the bank is not correct in this approach, because both parties B and C are jointly and severally liable.

In this case B and C liable only for the contract they entered.

Q.No.6. Shambhu becomes guarantor for Aman for the amount which may be given to him by Naveen within six months. The maximum limit of the said amount is rupees one lakh. After two months, shambhu withdraws his guarantee. Up to the time of revocation of guarantee, Naveen had given to Aman twenty thousand rupees.

- Whether shambhu is discharged from his liabilities to Naveen for any subsequent loan?
- Whether shambhu is liable if Aman fails to pay the amount of twenty thousand rupees to Naveen?

Sec. to which the given problem relates: Sec. 130

Hint: The continuing guarantee may at any time be revoked by the surety as to future transactions by notice to the creditors.

Reason: In this case

- yes, shambhu is discharged from his liabilities to Naveen for any subsequent loan
- yes, shambhu is liable if Aman fails to pay the amount of twenty thousand rupees to Naveen.

Q.No.7. Star gives to Sun a continuing guarantee to the extent of Rs. 15,000 for the groceries to be supplied by Sun to Moon from time to time on credit. Later, Moon became embarrassed, and without knowledge of Star, Moon and Sun contract that Sun shall continue to supply him with groceries for ready money, and that the payment shall be applied to the then existing debts between Moon and Sun.

Examine the provision of the Indian Contract Act, 1872, decide whether Star is liable on his guarantee given to Sun?

Sec. to which the given problem relates: Sec. 133

Hint: Where there is any variance in the terms of contract between the principal debtor and creditor without surety's consent, it would discharge the surety in respect of all transactions taking place subsequent to such variance.

Reason: In this case star is not liable on his guarantee for any goods supplied after this new arrangement.

Q.No.8. Shambhu becomes guarantor for Aman for the amount which may be given to him by Naveen within six months. The maximum limit of the said amount is rupees one lakh. After two months, shambhu withdraws his guarantee. Up to the time of revocation of guarantee, Naveen had given to Aman twenty thousand rupees.

- Whether shambhu is discharged from his liabilities to Naveen for any subsequent loan?
- Whether shambhu is liable if Aman fails to pay the amount of twenty thousand rupees to Naveen?.

Sec. to which the given problem relates: Sec. 130

Hint: The continuing guarantee may at any time be revoked by the surety as to future transactions by notice to the creditors.

Reason: In this case

- yes, shambhu is discharged from his liabilities to naveen for any subsequent loan
- yes, shambhu is liable if Aman fails to pay the amount of twenty thousand rupees to naveen.

Q.No.9. A gives to M a continuing guarantee to the extent of Rs. 8,000 for the fruits to be supplied by M to S from time to time on credit. Later, S became embarrassed, and without knowledge of A, M and S contract that M shall continue to supply S with fruits for ready money, and that the payment shall be applied to the then existing debts between S and M.

Examine the provision of the Indian Contract Act, 1872, decide whether A is liable on his guarantee given to M?.

Sec. to which the given problem relates: Sec. 133

Hint: Where there is any variance in the terms of contract between the principal debtor and creditor without surety's consent, it would discharge the surety in respect of all transactions taking place subsequent to such variance.

Reason: In this case A is not liable on his guarantee for any goods supplied after this new arrangement.

Q.No.10. C agreed to sell a color TV set to P under a hire purchase agreement on guarantee of S and a pledge of P's furniture. The terms were:

Hire purchase price: 24000, Payable in 12 monthly installments, ownership to be transferred on the payment of last installment.

State whether S is discharged in each of the alternative cases.

- If after 7 months, P stopped paying the installments. C sued P for the payment of arrears and P then gave a notice revoking his guarantee for the remaining ones.
- If after 7 months, S died
- If C, without the knowledge of S agreed to increase the number of installments from 12 to 24 of Rs. 1,000 each
- If C terminated this agreement and entered into fresh contract with P taking a security bond from Z
- If C without the knowledge of S allowed P further time for payment of one of the installments.
- If C did not sue for a year after the debt has become payable
- If C without the knowledge of S transferred the ownership before the payment of last installment.
- If, on the installments being in arrears for 3 months, C terminated the contract and seized the

goods.

i) If C without the knowledge of S, canceled the pledge. P became insolvent and C sued S for his guarantee.

Solution:

Case	Decision	Reason
a.	S is not discharged from his liability	S could not revoke his guarantee for the remaining months because the hire-purchase agreement was an entire indivisible transaction and could not be classified as a series of transaction. In other words, this contract was a contract of specific guarantee and not of continuing guarantee (Section 130)
b.	S's estate is liable	Death operates as a revocation liable of the continuing guarantee and not of a specific guarantee (Section 131)
c.	S is discharged from his liability	The terms of the contract have been varied without the surety's consent (Section 133)
d.	S is discharged from his liability	The original agreement has been terminated by C (Section 134)
e.	S is discharged from his liability	The creditor has given further time to the principal debtor without the surety's consent (Section 135)
f.	S is not discharged from his liability	Mere forbearance on the part of the creditor to sue the principal debtor does not discharge the surety (Section 137)
g.	S is discharged from his liability	The creditor has transferred the ownership before the payment of the last installments (Section 139)
h.	S is discharged from his liability	The creditor has terminated the agreement and seized the goods (Section 139)
i.	S is discharged from liability to the extent of the value of furniture	The creditor has cancelled the pledge (Section 141)

Q.No.11. A becomes surety to C for B's Conduct as manager in C's Bank. Afterwards, B and C contract, without A's Consent, that B's Salary shall be raised, and that he shall become liable for one fourth of the losses and overdrafts. B allows a customer to overdraw, and the bank loses a sum of money. Is A liable for this?

Sec. to which the given problem relates: Sec. 133

Hint: Where there is any variance in the terms of contract between the principal debtor and creditor without surety's consent, it would discharge the surety in respect of all transactions taking place subsequent to such variance.

Reason: In this case A is discharged from his suretyship by the variance made without his consent, and is not liable to make good this loss.

Q.No.12. B is indebted to C, and A is surety for the debt. C demands payment from A, and on his refusal sues him for the amount. A defends the suit, having reasonable grounds for doing so, but he is compelled to pay the amount of debt with cost. Advice A.

Sec. to which the given problem relates: Sec. 145

Hint: In every contract of guarantee there is an implied promise by the principal debtor to indemnify the surety.

Reason: In this case A can recover from B the amount paid by him for costs, as well as the principal debt.

IMPORTANT SECTION NUMBERS

CONCEPT	SEC NO.
"Contract of indemnity" defined	124
Rights of indemnity-holder when sued	125
"Contract of guarantee", "surety", "Principal Debtor" and "creditor"	126
Consideration for guarantee	127
Surety's liability	128
"Continuing guarantee"	129
Revocation of continuing guarantee	130
Revocation of continuing guarantee by surety's death	131
Liability of two persons, primarily liable, not affected by arrangement between them that one shall be surety on other's default	132
Discharge of surety by variance in terms of contract	133
Discharge of surety by release or discharge of Principal Debtor	134
Discharge of surety when creditor compounds with, gives time to, or agrees not to sue, Principal Debtor	135
Surety not discharged when agreement made with third person to give time to Principal Debtor	136
Creditor's forbearance to sue does not discharge surety	137
Release of one co-surety does not discharge others	138
Discharge of surety of creditor's act or omission impairing surety's eventual remedy	139
Rights of surety on payment or performance	140
Surety's right to benefit of creditor's securities	141
Guarantee obtained by misrepresentation invalid	142
Guarantee obtained by concealment invalid	143
Guarantee on contract that creditor shall not act on it until co-surety joins	144
Implied promise to indemnify surety	145
Co-sureties liable to contribute equally	146
Liability of co-sureties bound in different sums	147

Copyrights Reserved
To **MASTER MINDS**, Guntur

THE END