TIJER || ISSN 2349-9249 || © April 2023 Volume 10, Issue 4 || www.tijer.org

Sales Management in India

Author: Dr. Abhilasha Raj,

Assistant professor

Amity Law School Noida

Co-Author: Aaditya Berwal & Aditya Chhikara

Abstract

There are numerous laws, rules, and regulations that control the legal framework for sales management in India. The basic legislative basis for sales management in India is the Indian Contract Act, 1872. It controls how contracts are created and upheld, especially sales agreements. The Sale of Products Act of 1930, the Consumer Protection Act of 2019, and the Foreign Exchange Management Act are further pertinent laws and regulations (FEMA). Also, it is forbidden for companies to sign contracts that limit competition in the market, according to the Competition Commission of India's recommendations. Businesses must be aware of the legal requirements for sales management in India to comply and stay out of trouble. In this assignment there will be a in depth discussion on major topics related to the legal aspects of sales management in India.

Introduction:

Planning, organizing, directing, and controlling a company's sales efforts to meet its sales goals is referred to as sales management. An important statute governing Indian contract law and governing contracts in India is the Indian Contract Act, 1872. All Indian states, apart from Jammu & Kashmir, are covered by it. The Act establishes the conditions under which commitments made by contracting parties are enforceable. The Act is crucial to sales management because it establishes the legal ties between the parties to a sales transaction. The Act makes sure that the promises expressed in the contract by both parties are legally binding, and any breach of those agreements may result in legal repercussions. The fundamental components of a contract, such as consideration, performance, and breach of contract and its remedies, are covered in Chapter 1 of the Act. The Indian Contract Act, 1872 is crucial for sales managers to grasp since it makes sure that sales contracts are enforceable and legally binding.

The legal framework for sales management in India:

Businesses must abide by several laws, rules, and guidelines that make up India's legal framework for sales management.

The basic legislative basis for sales management in India is the Indian Contract Act, 1872. It controls how contracts are created and upheld, especially sales agreements. According to the Act, a contract is any arrangement between two or more parties that results in binding legal commitments. It also describes the fundamental components of a contract, including offer, acceptance, and consideration, as well as the possible remedies in the event of a breach of the agreement.[i] Another regulation that controls sales in India is the Sale of Products Act of 1930. The rights of buyers and sellers are described, as well as the terms and circumstances of sales. The Act covers several topics including the transfer of ownership, warranties, and conditions and is relevant to merchants and traders who sell goods. [ii] Businesses must consider the Consumer Protection Act, 2019[iii], in addition to the Sale of Products Act when handling sales in India. The Act defines consumer rights and controls how products and services are sold to customers. It outlines the rights of consumers, including the right to information, the right to be safeguarded against unfair business practices, and the right to seek redress in the event of a disagreement. Foreign entities conducting sales in India must follow the Foreign Exchange Management Act (FEMA)[iv]. The Act governs foreign investment in India as well as sales transactions between foreign entities and Indian firms. It establishes the rules and regulations for foreign investment, including the mode and manner of investment as well as fund repatriation. Apart from the laws and regulations, there are also guidelines that businesses must follow when managing sales in India. The Indian Competition Commission has issued guidelines on anti-competitive agreements, which prohibit businesses from entering into agreements that limit market competition. These guidelines are intended to promote fair competition and protect consumers' market interests. Ultimately, the legal framework for sales management in India includes several laws, regulations, and guidelines, including the Indian Contract Act, Sale of Goods Act, Consumer Protection Act, FEMA, and Competition Commission of India guidelines on anti-competitive agreements. To ensure compliance and avoid legal liabilities, businesses must have a thorough understanding of these laws and regulations.

The role of the Indian Contract Act, 1872, in sales management:

The court declares void any agreement that prevents two or more parties from engaging in a lawful trade or business profession. The court rules that prohibiting one or more people from conducting certain lawful business is unjust and violates a person's fundamental right and freedom to choose the type of profession in which he wishes to engage. It restricts one's interest in business, so the court ruled that the trade restraint agreement is unreasonable and void.

The History of Section 27 of the Indian Contract Act of 1872

The section on trade restraint was adapted from David D. Field's Draft Code for New York, which was based on the ancient English concept of trade restraint. While interpreting Section 27, the Indian High Courts decided that the "reasonable" and "principle of restraint" criteria were irrelevant to the cases covered by this Section, unless they fall under specific exceptions. The first draught of legislation proposed by the law commission did not include any trade restrictions. However, only Section 27 of the Indian Contract Act of 1872 was introduced during the enactments. This Section's primary goal is to protect Indian trade. Even though the Law Commission's original draught ignored the subject of trade restraint, it has incorporated it into the Indian Contract Act via Section 27 after considering the complexities of market freedom and contract freedom.

The goal of legally destroying these trade restraint agreements is to improve market competition because the dominance of contract freedom contributes to discouraging competitive agreements that restrict competition from using unique deals within the contract limitations. The law commission proposed in its thirteenth report that the statute be amended to allow limits and thus all contracts in restraint of trade, whether general or partial, that were appropriate in the interests of the parties and the public. However, no action was taken in response to the suggestions made above.

What does Section 27 of the Indian Contract Act of 1872 serve?

Section 27 of the Indian Contract Act of 1872 declares that any agreement that restricts commerce or business is illegal. According to the clause, any agreement that prohibits or restricts one person from engaging in any trade, business, or lawful profession is void. As a result, a void agreement is one in which a person agrees not to engage in a business that is unfavorable to the other parties. Every law must be structured in accordance with the Indian Constitution's dependence, and trade restraint is also permitted under Part XIII of the Indian Constitution. Articles 301 to 307 of the Constitution recognize the freedom of trade, business, and exchange. It ensures that every Indian citizen can pursue any legal profession, business, or trade.

There are exceptions that are considered valid contracts under Section 27 of the Indian Contract Act of 1872. However, Act 9 of 1932 repeals exceptions 2 and 3, but exception 1 is still considered a valid contract, as follows:

Exception 1: Agreement not to carry on the business whose goodwill is sold is saved.

When one party (seller) sells a business's goodwill to another party (buyer), the buyer agrees not to carry on the same business within specified local limits if the buyer purchases the title of goodwill from the seller, who is making an offer not to carry on a similar business within specified limits. Because of the nature of the company, this criterion makes the court appear reasonable. Section 27 of the Indian Contract Act of 1872 is based on public policy.

According to public policy, every person should be free to engage in his or her profession, i.e., occupation, and to conduct his or her business (i.e., buying and selling products and services) and trade in any specified area of activity. This liberty is critical for the economic development of society. It promotes both competition and business. Agreements that limit this liberty violate public policy and are thus void. In this case, there is also an exception to the rule. If 'A' sells his business to 'B,' 'B' may tell 'A' that he would not do the same thing in the same town as 'B.' A contract like this limits his business independence, which is fair. Section 27 enacts public policy and gives effect to the exception.

Exceptions 2 and 3 were repealed, but Sections 11(2) and 55 of the Partnership Act of 1932 were added to their place. Article 19 (1) of the Indian Constitution guarantees freedom of trade, profession, and business (g). An agreement dealing with trade freedom is deemed illegal because it is a trade restriction agreement that is also contrary to public policy. Reasonable restrictions on freedom of trade are enforced under Article 19 (6) of the Indian Constitution. Public policy's goal is to promote trade while avoiding monopolies.

Case laws with respect to Section 27 of the Indian Contract Act, 1872

1. Superintendence Company of India Private Limited v. Krishan Murgai (1979)

Facts of the case:
This article examines a trade restraint case study. A contract of employment stated that the employee would not work for any of his employer's competitors in Delhi or start a nearly equivalent business in Delhi for two years after his employment with the respondent ended. The respondent worked for the appellant's firm as the branch manager of the New Delhi office under the terms of the contract. The respondent's employment ended after seven years. In Delhi, the respondent established his own business, which is identical to that of the former appellant. The appellant has now filed a lawsuit in this matter, seeking Rs. 55,000 in damages for breach of the employment contract.

Issues involved in the case:
How valid and enforceable was the agreement against the respondent?

Decision of the Court
Restriction on trade after the termination of an employment contract was found to be void and unenforceable in this case. The agreement was declared null and void against the respondent.

2. Madhub Chunder Poramanik v. Rajcoomar Doss and Others (1874)

Facts of the case:

In this case, the plaintiff and defendant were both running the same business in Calucatta. Because the defendant had suffered a loss, he suggested that the plaintiff close his business in exchange for a certain sum of money. After the defendant failed to pay the agreed-upon sum, the plaintiff filed a lawsuit against him.

Issues involved in the case:

Is the agreement in this case one of trade restraint?

Decision of the Court:

The High Court of Calcutta dismissed the plaintiff's claim because the agreement was in the form of a trade restraint. This lawsuit marks a watershed moment in the history of fair competition protection. As a result of this decision, the concept of trade restraint was established in India. It dispelled all doubts and ambiguity surrounding this concept.

Legal Challenges faced by the Sales managers in India:

Sales managers in India face a number of legal challenges related to consumer protection, anti-trust, and competition laws. Consumer protection laws seek to prevent businesses from engaging in deceptive or unfair business practices that harm consumers. The Consumer Protection Act makes endorsers liable for false and misleading advertisements and allows for penalties. However, in the Indian market, consumer sovereignty is regarded as a myth, with no power, privilege, or rights. The consumer's sovereignty in the Indian market is considered a myth due to a variety of factors, including widespread illiteracy, poverty, a lack of knowledge of consumer rights, a lack of sufficient information about products and services, a sluggish consumer attitude, and a lack of power, privilege, or rights. These factors contribute to a situation in which consumers are unable to make informed decisions and are frequently victims of unfair business practices. According to an exploratory study on the myth of consumer sovereignty, the belief that consumers have complete market control is unrealistic and misleading. As a result, while the concept of consumer sovereignty is prevalent in capitalist economies, it does not apply in the Indian market due to a variety of socioeconomic factors. These factors lead to a situation where consumers are not able to make informed decisions, and they often fall prey to unfair trade practices by businesses. An exploratory study on the myth of consumer sovereignty states that the belief that consumers have complete control over the market is unrealistic and misleading. Therefore, even though the concept of consumer sovereignty is prevalent in capitalist economies, it does not hold true in the Indian market due to various socio-economic factors.

Competition laws, on the other hand, seek to promote fair competition and protect the interests of consumers. The Interplay of Consumer Protection and Competition Law in India emphasizes the importance of consumer protection in all modern competition laws, which is a direct goal of Indian consumer protection laws. Meanwhile, anti-trust laws prohibit anti-competitive behavior and promote competition in the market. AZB & Partners is one of the notable legal firms in India with experience in competition law, including advising clients on gaining clearance for mergers.

Case studies of legal disputes related to sales management in India:

1. Cyrus Investments Pvt. Ltd. & Anr. v. Tata Sons Ltd.& Ors [3]

Facts of the Case:
The National Company Law Tribunal, Mumbai Bench ("NCLT") issued a significant ruling on oppression and mismanagement under the company law regime in the case of Cyrus Investments Private Limited & Others ("Petitioners") v. Tata Sons Limited & Others1 ("Respondents"). The decision was delivered by Hon'ble Mr. B.S.V. Prakash Kumar, Member (Judicial), and Hon'ble Mr. V. Nallasenapathy, Member (Judicial) (Technical).

In this case, Cyril Mistry joined the board of the Shapoorji Pallonji group in 1991, becoming the largest stakeholder in TATA and Sons. He was appointed to the company's board of directors in 1994. His company owns approximately 80% of the shares in TATA Sons. Following his father's retirement from the TATA Group in November 2011, Cyrus Mistry joined the Tata Sons Board of Directors in September 2006.Cyrus Mistry was named Deputy Chairman following Ratan Tata's retirement, and then Chairman of Tata Sons in December 2012.

In January 2017, N. Chandrasekhar, CEO of Tata Consultancy Services Limited, was appointed Chairman of Tata and Sons. On February 6, 2017, the Board of Directors removed Cyrus Pallonji Mistry as a director.

This resulted in a dispute between Cyrus Mistry and TATA, which was broadcast around the world, and everyone learned of Cyrus Mistry's dismissal.

This decision was not made on the spur of the moment, but rather after careful consideration. Ratan Tata then wrote a letter to the Prime Minister in which he mentioned the dismissal of the group's chairman. Cyrus Mistry was fired because he did not carry out his responsibilities properly. Cyrus Mistry filed a petition with the National Company Law Tribunal, but it was dismissed because there was no such mismanagement at the TATA Group company.

Judgement

The National Company Law Tribunal reinstated Cyrus Mistry as chairman of TATA Sons on December 18, 2019, and gave TATA four weeks to file an appeal against the NCLAT decision. The Supreme Court then issued an injunction against the NCLAT's order, citing gaps and flaws. The Supreme Court ordered a thorough investigation into the matter. Cyrus Mistry won the case by proving that he had done nothing wrong and that his dismissal was unconstitutional. The Shapoorji Pallonji Group has stated that they are not facing any difficulties and will not pursue legal action against TATA Sons. Despite TATA's filing of a caveat in all courts, Cyrus Mistry stated that he would not take legal action against the corporation but would consult with a law firm about possible steps ahead of his dismissal. The corporate sector was stunned by Cyrus Mistry's dismissal, and the company's stock dropped 3.16 percent in the stock market.

The chairman can only be removed by the board members if he is found to have committed any fraud, been involved in any kind of internal mismanagement, or been found disloyal to the company, according to the company's Articles of Association; however, Cyrus Mistry has not met any of the above conditions.

Finally, Cyrus Mistry's removal is ruled unconstitutional by the National Company Law Appellate Tribunal (NCLAT). The NCLAT also halted TATA Sons' transition from a public to a private corporation. The return of mystery to the TATA Sons is also announced. The Supreme Court has delayed the NCLAT's order because it contains "fundamental errors." According to the Court, the Tribunal granted a prayer that had not been requested.

2. The Maggi ban in India:

Facts of the case:

On August 13, 2015, the Bombay High Court overturned FSSAI's nationwide ban on Nestlé Maggi instant noodles. The Court ordered Nestlé to conduct new safety tests on the product before reintroducing it to the market. Nestlé was asked to send samples of each variant of Maggi instant noodles to three labs in Punjab, Hyderabad, and Jaipur for fresh testing. The High Court ruled that if the lead content was found to be above the permissible limit even after the new tests, Nestlé would be barred from manufacturing and selling Maggi noodles in India. The results of the new tests performed at the three labs favored Nestlé. As a result, Nestlé India resumed operations. As a result, Nestlé India resumed selling Maggi noodles in November 2015.

In the Supreme Court of India, the FSSAI challenged the lifting of the ban on noodles. The Bombay High Court erred by allowing Nestlé to choose the Maggi samples for the new tests rather than appointing a neutral authority to do so. The FSSAI believed that the Maggi ban should be maintained until a neutral agency selected samples and retested the products.

Issues involved in the case:

The issues in this case concern food safety and consumer protection. Due to concerns about the presence of lead and MSG (monosodium glutamate) in the product, the Food Safety and Standards Authority of India (FSSAI) banned the sale and production of Maggi noodles in India. Nestlé, the maker of Maggi noodles, challenged the ban in the Bombay High Court, which upheld the ban but ordered Nestlé to conduct new safety tests on the product before reintroducing it to the market. The FSSAI appealed the decision to the Supreme Court of India, claiming that the Bombay High Court erred in allowing Nestlé to select the samples for the new tests rather than appointing a neutral authority to do so.

Judgement of the Court:

The Supreme Court of India stated in its decision that the Bombay High Court's decision to overturn the ban was correct, but that allowing Nestlé to conduct its own tests was incorrect. The Supreme Court ordered that the FSSAI appoint an independent laboratory to conduct new product tests. The Court also stated that the FSSAI acted responsibly in imposing the ban on Maggi noodles and taking measures to protect consumers' health and safety. The Court also stated that the FSSAI had the authority to ban any food product found to be unsafe for consumption. As a result, the Supreme Court upheld the Bombay High Court's decision to lift the ban on Maggi noodles on the condition that they pass FSSAI-accredited safety tests.

Conclusion:

In India, sales management is a critical component of business operations. It is critical for a law student to understand the legal framework that governs sales management in India. Various laws, regulations, and guidelines comprise the legal framework, with the goal of protecting consumers, ensuring fair competition, and preventing fraudulent activities. The Indian Contract Act of 1872 is a significant piece of legislation that affects sales management in India by defining the rules for contract formation and enforcement. In India, sales managers face a variety of legal challenges, including consumer protection, anti-trust laws, and competition laws. Consumer protection laws in India aim to protect consumers' interests by requiring businesses to provide safe and high-quality goods and services. Antitrust and competition laws seek to prevent monopolistic practices and promote market fairness. To ensure that their business operations comply with the relevant laws and regulations, sales managers must effectively navigate these legal challenges. There have been several legal disputes involving sales management. These disputes have highlighted the importance of sales managers understanding the legal framework and adhering to the relevant laws and regulations. Other than the above-mentioned cases, more noteworthy cases include the Amway India Enterprises Pvt. Ltd. case, which addressed the legality of direct selling in India, and the PepsiCo India Holdings Pvt. Ltd. case, which addressed intellectual property rights protection in the context of advertising.

In conclusion, sales management in India is governed by a complex legal framework comprised of numerous laws, regulations, and guidelines. To ensure compliance with applicable laws and regulations, sales managers must effectively navigate this legal framework. It is critical for a law student to understand the legal aspects of sales management in India in order to effectively advise businesses on legal compliance and risk management.

Bibliography:

1.Shriney Micheal (2022). Section 27 of Indian Contract Act, 1872. Sathyabama Institute of Science and Technology.

https://blog.ipleaders.in/section-27-of-indian-contract-act-1872/

2.Dasaraju Himachalam (2021). The myth of consumer sovereignty in India. Hans News Service.

https://www.thehansindia.com/hans/opinion/news-analysis/the-myth-of-consumer-sovereignty-in-india-676822

3.Nathani, S and Akman, P (2017). The interplay between consumer protection and competition law in India. Journal of Antitrust Enforcement, 5 (2). pp. 197-215. ISSN 2050-0688

https://eprints.whiterose.ac.uk/121795/1/JAE%20article%20-%20Akman%20Nathani%20Nov%2016%20Final%20Pre-print.pdf

4. Mohanty Aaryan. Famous Cases under Company Law. Legal Services India E-Journal.

https://www.legalserviceindia.com/legal/article-8705-famous-cases-under-company-law.html

5.ICMR. IBS center for management research.

https://www.icmrindia.org/casestudies/catalogue/Law/LAW010.htm

Endnotes

[i] The Indian Contract Act of 1872 defines "Contract" as "An agreement enforceable by law" in section 2 (h). In other words, a contract is anything that is an agreement and is enforceable under the law of the land.

[ii] The Sale of Goods Act governs any contract in which one party sells goods to another.

[iii] An Act to provide for the protection of consumers' interests and, for that purpose, to establish authorities for the timely and effective administration and resolution of consumer disputes, as well as for matters connected with or incidental thereto.

[iv] The Foreign Exchange Management Act, 1999 (FEMA) is an Act of the Indian Parliament that seeks to "consolidate and amend the law relating to foreign exchange with the goal of facilitating external trade and payments and promoting the orderly development and maintenance of the foreign exchange market in India."