MODULE 5 Partnership Law

Exam (Part B) Booklet: Introduction to Business Law (2105AFE) T1/2017

Contents

Template: Is there a Partnership?1
Template: Firm liable for partner's actions in CONTRACT3
Template: Firm liable for partner's actions in TORT5
Template: Firm liable for partner's misapplication of money/property 7
Template: Firm liable for partner's misapplication of money/property Cont
Template: Partner breached fiduciary duties
Duty of partners to render accounts9
Duty of partner not to compete with firm
Template: Dissolution of partnership11
Template: How is partnership property distributed on dissolution? 13
Cases – Week 11 17
Flowchart – Is there a partnership?21
Flowchart: Is the firm liable for the partners' actions?
Flowchart: Has a partner breached a fiduciary duty owed to the firm (i.e. the partners)?24
Flowchart: What are the potential remedies for breach of duty? 25
Flowchart: How is a partnership dissolved?
Flowchart: How is the partnership property distributed on dissolution? (section 47 PA)
Partnership Act 189128

Template: Is there a Partnership?
A partnership is the relation which subsists between persons carrying on a business in common with a view to profit (s 5(1) Partnership Act 1891 (Qld) ('PA')).
{Party A} and {Party B} were involved in {Describe type of business:} (Canny Gabriel).
An agency relationship existed between {Party A} and {Party B} which is apparent by {details of agency(authority to create legal relations on each others behalf} and sharing the rights and obligations by {details of shared rights and responsibilities eg business profits, responsibility of organising and paying contractors—to satisfy all parties must have these rights and responsibilities} (Khan v Miah)
{Party A} and {Party B} intended to make a profit when they formed the business/partnership.
The existence of the partnership can be further established by applying the rules under s6 PA as follows:
{Party A} and {Party B} held joint ownership of (details of assets – eg property; bank account) (s6(1)(a)PA).
{Party A} and {Party B} shared the gross returns from the (details of the venture) (s6(1)(b)PA).
$\{Party\ A___\}$ and $\{Party\ B___\}$ were in receipt of a share of the profits of the business $(s6(1)(c)PA)$.

Not a Partnership

If any of the above tests fail there is likely no partnership and may be a joint venture or other business transaction. Points to look for:

- Single transaction (eg land owner and builder building a set of units on a block of land to sell). Single transactions are usually joint ventures.
- Separate responsibilities (eg only one party is liable for responsibilities and obligations and only that party can be sued for failure to comply)
- Only one party receives profit

Although each rule does not in itself prove a partnership has been
established, by applying the rules under s6 PA together with the
definition provided in s5 PA, it can be established that a partnership
exists between {Party A} and {Party B}.

To	emplate: Firm liable for partner's actions in <u>CONTRACT</u>
	The written/oral agreement between {Partners' names}
Actual Authority	stated that {Partner name} was authorised to
	{details of contract entered into } on behalf the firm
Aut	(Freeman & Lockyer v Buckhurst) (s8(1 PA). As there
tual	was actual authority for {Partner name} to enter
Act	into the contract, the firm is liable to {detail liability }.
	{Name of firm/partnership} was in the business
	of {what did they do}. The {products/services
	purchased} are directly related the kind of business
	carried on by the partnership (<i>Polkinghorne v</i>
	Holland)(s8(1) PA). It was usual for {Name of
ity	firm/partnership} to purchase good/services from
Apparent Authority	{Name of creditor:} } and the way in which
t Au	{Partner name} entered into the contract with
aren	{Name of creditor:} was carried out in the usual way
App	(Goldberg v Jenkins) (s8(1) PA). As previous contracts
7	had been entered into in the same way {Name of creditor
	: } was not aware that {Partner
	name} did not have actual authority
	(Construction Engineering v Hexyl P/L) and (s8(1)(a) PA)
	<u>OR</u>

Template: Firm liable for partner's actions in CONTRACT CONT		
	As previous contracts had been entered into in the same	
rity	way with {Partner name}, {Name of creditor	
Apparent Authority	} believed/knew that {Partner name}	
ıt Au	was a partner of {Name of firm/partnership }	
arer	(s8(1)(b) Partnership Act 1891 (Qld) ('PA') and	
App	(Panorama Developments v Fidelis Furnishing	
7	Fabrics).	
	It was usual for {Name of firm/partnership} to purchase	
	good/services from {Name of creditor:}} and the way in	
	which {Partner name} entered into the	
	contract with {Name of creditor:} was carried out in the	
ority	usual way (Goldberg v Jenkins) (s8(1) PA) .	
Implied Authority	(CHOOSE ONE: As there is no written partnership	
ed A	agreement/As the written partnership agreement is silent	
nplie	on the authority of entering into such contracts), the fact	
<u>=</u>	that it is not out of the ordinary for the partners to enter	
	into such contracts, {Partner name} had	
	implied authority to enter into the contract with {Name of	
	creditor:} (Lavery v Nelson).	
As {Partner name} had actual/apparent/implied authority to enter into the contract with {Name of creditor:} the partnership is jointly liable for the debt owed to {Name of creditor:} (s 12(1) PA; Kendall v Hamilton)		

Template: Firm liable for partner's actions in <u>TORT</u>		
	The written/oral agreement between {Partners'	
ority	names:} stated that {Partner name:} was	
utho	authorised to {details of act/conduct/job} on behalf the	
al A	firm at the time that {details of complaint/wrongful act or	
Actual Authority	omission} occurred. (Freeman & Lockyer v	
7	Buckhurst) (s8(1 PA).	
	{Name of firm/partnership} was in the business of	
	{what did they do}. The {details of act/conduct of	
	partner are directly related the kind of business	
	carried on by the partnership (<i>Polkinghorne v</i>	
işi İ	Holland)(s8(1) PA). It was usual for {Partner name:}} to	
rtho	{details of act/conduct/job:} on behalf of the firm and	
Apparent Authority	the way in which {Partner name}} {details of	
arer	act/conduct/job} was carried out in the usual way	
App	(Goldberg v Jenkins) (s8(1) PA) and accordingly it was	
	not clear that {Partner name} did not have actual	
	authority at the time that {details of complaint/wrongful act	
	or omission} occurred (s 8(1) Partnership Act 1891	
	(Qld) ('PA')).	