

1888

BRASBA
RABIDAT
SINGH
v.
INDAR
KUNWAR.

The conduct of the senior widow is not altogether to be commended, but it would be extravagant to describe it as fraudulent, or to maintain that the adoption was made for a corrupt purpose, or for a purpose foreign to the real object for which the authority to adopt was conferred. It may be true, as suggested by Mr. Arathoon, that the child of Guman Singh was selected in preference to the child of the appellant because the senior widow had reason to believe that the selection would be less likely to lead to her position being challenged. But it is difficult to understand how a declaration by Guman Singh or an agreement by him, if it was an agreement, could prejudice or affect the rights of his son, which could only arise when his parental control and authority determined. The ceremonies of adoption are unimpeached. The deed of adoption is open to no objection. The second deed is admittedly inoperative. No conditions therefore were attached to the adoption. Had it been otherwise, the analogy, such as it is, presented by the doctrines of Courts of Equity in this country relating to the execution of powers of appointment to which Mr. Arathoon appealed would rather suggest that, even in that case, the adoption would have been valid and the condition void.

Their Lordships will therefore humbly advise Her Majesty that the appeal ought to be dismissed. The appellant will pay the costs of the appeal.

Appeal dismissed.

Solicitors for the appellant: Messrs. *Young, Jackson & Beard.*

Solicitors for the respondents: Messrs. *T. L. Wilson & Co.*

P. O. *
1888
November
7 & 9,
December 1.

BHUGWAN DAS (PLAINTIFF) v. THE NETHERLANDS INDIA SEA AND FIRE INSURANCE COMPANY OF BATAVIA (DEFENDANTS).*

[On appeal from the Court of the Additional Recorder of Rangoon.]

Insurance—Marine Insurance—Open cover.—Proposal to issue policy—Acceptance—Refusal to issue policy in terms of open cover.

An open cover to an amount stated for insurance on cargo to be shipped for a voyage in a ship (afterwards lost on that voyage) was given by the agent of the defendant company to the owner of the ship in order

* *Present: LORD FITZGERALD, LORD HOBHOUSE, LORD MACRAGHTEN and SIR R. COUCH.*

that he might give it to the charterer, and it was a proposal to insure. The owner transferred the open cover to the plaintiff, who, under charter with him, shipped rice and applied for policies to the amount stated in the open cover. The defendants' agent then refused to issue any policy on the rice so shipped.

Held, that the open cover, as given to the owner, constituted a subsisting proposal to insure, and as soon as application for the policy under it was made to the defendant's agent by the shipper, to whom the open cover had been transferred, there was a binding contract that a policy should be issued in its terms. That the shipper asked for two policies did not, under the circumstances, prevent there being an acceptance, there having been a refusal to issue any policy.

APPEAL from a decree (23rd July 1886) of the Additional Recorder of Rangoon.

The suit out of which this appeal arose was brought by the appellant for the specific performances of a contract alleged to have been made by the respondents, through their agents to issue to the plaintiff a policy of insurance on cargo shipped from Rangoon to Calcutta, there having been a refusal to issue the policy, and the ship having been lost on the voyage.

The plaint, filed 18th August 1885, alleged that on the preceding 8th March, the plaintiff agreed with Mr. James Macrory of Rangoon for a charter from the latter as owner of the ship *Copeland Isle* from Rangoon to Bombay, the latter undertaking to obtain insurance for such goods as the plaintiff should ship by her; that the plaintiff required Macrory to obtain insurance for Rs. 15,000 upon 1,000 bags of rice which he intended to ship, and disbursements on account of the vessel; and that Macrory applied to the agents of the defendant company at Rangoon to take an insurance risk to that extent, which the agents agreed to do, and in due course issued an open cover for the same. This open cover Macrory endorsed and made over to the plaintiff, in accordance with custom, and the plaintiff thereupon executed a charter-party. He afterwards shipped 1,000 bags of rice on the *Copeland Isle*, and disbursed on her Rs. 4,000, writing on 31st March 1885 to the agents requesting them to declare policies of insurance on 1,000 bags of rice, value Rs. 10,000; also on the disbursement of the vessel from Rangoon to Bombay, Rs. 5,000, and enclosed the premium. The

1888

BHUGWAN
DAS
v.
THE
NETHER-
LANDS INDIA
SEA AND FIRE
INSURANCE
COMPANY OF
BATAVIA.

1888
 BHUGWAN
 DAS
 v.
 THE
 NETHER-
 LANDS INDIA
 SEA AND
 FIRE
 INSURANCE
 COMPANY OF
 BATAVIA.

plaint further alleged that the defendants refused to issue the policy; and lastly, the total loss of the *Copeland Isle*, and claimed specific performance.

The defendants by their answer denied that the open cover was given to Macrory as such, but alleged that it was given in answer to his question whether the Company was prepared to insure rice by that ship, and in order to be shown to other insurance agents as indicating that they considered the ship a fair risk. The form was not signed by the agents, nor registered by them in the Company's books, as it would have been had it been issued as a preliminary to granting a policy. They further alleged that the plaintiff was informed of the facts before the sailing of the ship; and that the open cover made no mention of disbursements: also that the indorsement and transfer took place without their knowledge, or notice to them; and they denied the alleged custom as to transfer of open covers: stating that Macrory had no insurable interest in the rice shipped, and that the Company was not liable for the amounts claimed.

Issues were fixed raising the principal questions whether the open cover was a contract which the plaintiff could claim to have specially performed; under what circumstances it was granted to Macrory; and whether it was transferable or assignable by him.

The Additional Recorder found that what took place at the issue of the open cover was the following:—

“Macrory wanting to get a charter for his ship applied to the plaintiff who entered into negotiations with him and approved of the terms of the proposed charter-party: the plaintiff, however, made one essential stipulation, before concluding the charter-party; and that was that Macrory should produce to him something to show that insurance risks would be taken by the insurance companies on the cargo shipped by the vessel. In order to satisfy this stipulation Macrory went to various insurance offices starting with the agents of the defendant Company, and obtained the document sued upon, and four other open covers, which he endorsed over to the plaintiff, who then executed the charter-party. What happened seems to have been done in pursuance of a practice which has been followed by other local shipowners like Mr. Macrory, who, according to the evidence of

Mr. Borland, apply to insurance agents here for open covers in order to be able to show them to persons whom they may ask to charter their vessels as a guarantee that cargo shipped by them will be insured."

The facts attending the plaintiff's application to Messrs. Gladstone, Wyllie & Co., as the defendants' Agents, to declare policies of insurance on the rice, and on disbursement, and their refusal, with the material part of the correspondence thereupon,—are set forth in their Lordships' judgment.

The Additional Recorder was of opinion that the contract to issue a policy had never been enforceable, by reason of Mr. Macrory's not having had any insurable interest in the rice shipped in the *Copeland Isle*. He had no doubt that the giving of the open cover might initiate a contract for insurance. But of that contract one of the most essential principles was that the assured should have at the time of the making of the contract an insurable interest in the subject-matter insured, and no such interest existed at the time. He was also of opinion that no custom in variation of this general principle, admitting the transferee who ultimately might become the shipper, to stand in the place of a person receiving the open cover, had been proved to prevail in Rangoon. Nor in his opinion did the relation of agency between the plaintiff and Macrory exist, it being the fact that at the time when Macrory was effecting the arrangements which he made with the insurance agents, it was uncertain whether the plaintiff would ship any rice on board the vessel. For these reasons he dismissed the suit with costs.

Mr. *J. Gorell Barnes, Q.C.*, and Mr. *A. Agabeg*, for the appellant, argued that the judgment was incorrect in holding that the case turned on the absence of an insurable interest in Macrory at the time when he received the open cover. It had been settled for a century past that it was sufficient for the party assured to have an interest at the date of the contract. This the plaintiff had when he accepted the offer of insurance previously made in the open cover. The contention on his behalf was that he accepted the terms offered to any shipper who should ship under charter with Macrory, which terms, in effect, were those of the open cover. It was further contended for the appellant that

1888

BHUGWAN
DAS
v.
THE
NETHER-
LANDS INDIA
SEA AND
FIRE
INSURANCE
COMPANY OF
BATAVIA.

1888
 BHUGWAN
 DAS
 v.
 THE
 NETHER-
 LANDS INDIA
 SEA AND
 FIRE
 INSURANCE
 COMPANY OF
 BATAVIA.

when he signed the charter-party, which he did upon the faith that he could have the policy referred to in the open cover, there was an adoption by the appellant of the terms, and thereupon a completed contract between him and the respondents who had offered those terms. The Court below had erred in holding that the evidence as to the mercantile usage regarding the issue of open covers was insufficient and in not holding that the plaintiff as principal was entitled to enforce the contract on which he sued.

They referred to Arnould on Insurance, 6th Edition, Part 10, Chapter III; *Sutherland v. Pratt* (1); *Irving v. Richardson* (2); *Routh v. Thompson* (3); *Fisher v. The Liverpool Maritime Insurance Company* (4); The Specific Relief Act, I of 1877, s 22; Fry on Specific Performance.

Mr. A. Cohen, Q.C., and Mr. R. G. Arbuthnot, for the respondent Company, argued that the suit had been rightly dismissed. Macrory could not, by assigning the so-called open cover, confer greater rights on another than he had in himself; nor had the supposed custom, to issue open covers by the insurance agents to serve as an offer to any shipper subsequently coming forward to accept them, been proved to prevail in Rangoon. There were doubts how far such a custom would be enforceable. Again, it was argued that there was ground for the finding that there had been no relation of principal and agent between the appellant and Mr. Macrory in the obtaining the open cover; as to which it was open to doubt whether the document had been given as an open cover at all. Its effect might be considered to have been only that the Company regarded the shipment as a fair risk. Lastly, as to the acceptance, without which the case for the appellant must fail, to whom could it be said to have been addressed; and when was it complete. In regard to these points, the evidence did not enable the plaintiff to recover. They cited *Dickenson v. Dodds* (5), *Maclensie v. Coulson* (6).

(1) 11 M. & W., 296.

(2) 1 Mood. and Rob., 153; 2 B. and Ad., 193.

(3) 11 East, 433; 13 East, 279.

(4) L. R., 8 Q. B., 469; L. R., 9 Q. B., 425.

(5) L. R., 2 Ch. D., 463.

(6) L. R., 8 Exch., 368.

Mr. *J. Gorell Barnes, Q.C.*, replied, arguing that there had been a complete acceptance by the plaintiff of a previous offer, made through and by means of the open cover, in which there was no necessity for persons to be named. He cited *Weidner v. Hoggett* (1), *Ionides v. Pacific Insurance Company* (2), *Great Northern Railway Company v. Witham* (3), *Morrison v. Universal Marine Insurance Company* (4), *Lishman v. Northern Maritime Insurance Company* (5).

Their Lordships' judgment was afterwards (1st December) delivered by

SIR R. COUCH—The appellant in this case brought a suit against the respondents, for specific performance of a contract of insurance. The Recorder of Rangoon, in whose Court it was brought, dismissed the suit with costs, and this appeal is from that judgment.

In March 1885, one John Macrory, a ship builder and owner of a vessel called the *Copeland Isle* then lying in Rangoon river, applied to the plaintiff, a merchant carrying on business at Rangoon, and also at Calcutta and Bombay, to charter that vessel. The evidence of the plaintiff, who was examined as a witness, was as follows:—

"I said to Macrory that if an open cover were given to me free of particular average, I would charter the vessel. When the charter-party was drawn and brought to me by Macrory and Sutherland (one of the brokers who arranged the charter) I said: 'Where is the open cover?' Then Mr. Macrory gave me this open cover, with these five others. When I got these the charter-party was signed by me. I shipped goods on the *Copeland Isle*. I shipped my own goods, 6,220 bags of rice. This is a copy of the charter-party. Subsequently I went to Messrs. Finlay Fleming, Messrs. Strang Steel, and Messrs. Gladstone Wyllie's, for policies on the covers. I got policies from all, except from Messrs. Gladstone Wyllie. I went to Gladstone Wyllie's

(1) L. R., 1 C. P. D., 533.

(2) L. R., 6 Q. B., 674.

(3) L. R., 9 C. P. D., 16.

(4) L. R., 8 Exch., 40.

(5) L. R., 8 C. P., 216; L. R., 10 C. P., 179.

1888
 BHUGWAN
 DAS
 v.
 THE
 NETHER-
 LANDS INDIA
 SEA AND
 FIRE
 INSURANCE
 COMPANY OF
 BATAVIA.

1888
 BHUGWAN
 DAS
 v.
 THE
 NETHER-
 LANDS INDIA
 SEA AND
 FIRE
 INSURANCE
 COMPANY OF
 BATAVIA.

and saw Mr. Bertram. I went three times to them before I wrote to them. Once I saw Mr. Bertram, and twice Mr. Gordon. I showed Bertram the open cover, and asked him for policies for Rs. 10,000 for 1,000 bags of rice, and Rs. 5,000 for disbursements. Mr. Bertram said: 'We have given a policy to a chetty.' That was, I believe, for Rs 17,500. I said: 'I have no concern with the chetty's policy. I want the policy for my goods.' Bertram said he would not give one. I then went to Gordon, who was the then Manager of Gladstone Wyllie's. Gordon said: 'I cannot give a policy, go to Mr. Macrory.' I went that day or the next day with Macrory to Gordon. Macrory asked Gordon to give the policy, as the ship was to be cleared. He spoke for a long time, and so did I. We both pressed Gordon to give one, but he said he would not. Then I said: 'If you do not give one I will send the customary notice.' Afterwards I addressed a letter to Gladstone Wyllie as the agents of the defendants' company."

The open cover was in these terms:—

"Rangoon, 9th March 1885.

"NETHERLANDS INDIA SEA AND FIRE INSURANCE COMPANY
 OF BATAVIA.

"Dear Sir,

"We hereby consider you insured under an open cover to the extent of rupees fifteen thousand only, on rice per *Copeland Isle*, Captain———, Rangoon to Bombay.

"Premium, 2 per cent.

"Free of war risks.

"Average f. p. a.

"Policy to be applied for before the ship sails, and vessel to be towed by steamer to sea.

"Yours faithfully,

"GLADSTONE WYLLIE & Co.:

"J. R. BERTRAM,

Agents in Rangoon.

"To R. MACRORY, Esq."

(On the back:) "J. MACRORY."

The letter to Gladstone Wyllie as the defendants' agents above-mentioned was dated the 31st March 1885, and requested them,

to declare policies of insurance on 1,000 bags of rice, value Rs. 10,000, and on disbursements of the vessel from Rangoon to Bombay Rs. 5,000, and it enclosed Government promissory notes for Rs. 300 for the premium. Gladstone Wyllie & Co. replied by letter, dated the 1st April 1885, saying: "As we did not grant you an open cover by the *Copeland Isle*, we regret we cannot issue a policy, and we return Rs. 300 in Government currency notes which you sent us." On the 1st April the plaintiff again wrote, stating that Macrory had transferred the open cover to him, and enclosing it with the Government notes, to which Gladstone Wyllie & Co. replied on the 2nd April that they could not recognize the transfer by Macrory of the open cover, and that they never entered into any engagement to grant the plaintiff a policy for Rs. 15,000.

1888
 BHUGWAN
 DAS
 v.
 THE
 NETHER-
 LANDS INDIA
 SEA AND
 FIRE
 INSURANCE
 COMPANY OF
 BATAVIA.

Although the plaintiff at the interviews with Bertram and Gordon, and in his letter of the 31st March, asked for two policies, he appears not to have insisted upon having the insurance in that way, and the defendants' agents did not take the ground that the open cover did not bind them to give a separate policy for disbursements, but absolutely refused to issue any policy. Their Lordships think the defendants cannot say that the plaintiff was not willing to take a policy on rice for Rs. 15,000. Whether upon such a policy he could recover the disbursements or the Rs. 4,000 advanced on account of freight it is not now necessary to determine. In his plaint he has simply asked for a policy of insurance in terms of the open cover.

When the defendants' agents refused to issue a policy to the plaintiff, he endeavoured to obtain an insurance on the cargo uninsured from other offices in Rangoon and Bombay, but did not succeed. The *Copeland Isle* proceeded on her voyage to Bombay on or about the 1st April 1885, and was totally lost in a cyclone on the following 10th of June.

To return to the evidence. About the open cover, Macrory said (omitting passages which it is not necessary to read):—

"I remember this open cover. I got it for the charterer, Bhugwandas. I was to see if an insurance could be effected on the cargo before he would sign the charter-party. I made it over to Bhugwandas, and endorsed it. . . . I made all the

1888
 BHUGWAN
 DAS
 v.
 THE
 NETHER-
 LANDS INDIA
 SEA AND
 FIRE
 INSURANCE
 COMPANY OF
 BATAVIA.

covers over to him on his signing the charter-party. . . . I saw Mr. Gordon when I first got this open cover. . . . I asked Mr. Gordon if he would take a risk, as I could get a charter if he would take a risk. I did not say that I only wanted it to show to other Companies, and not as an undertaking to issue a policy. . . . Mr. Bertram was present in Gordon's room when I had the conversation with Mr. Gordon, and immediately after I got the open cover . . . I went out of Gordon's room with Bertram. I got the open cover from Bertram in his room. I talked to Bertram there about the ship and the money I had expended on her, and the condition she was in. I said that if I could get an insurance I could effect a charter. I mentioned Bhugwandas as the charterer. . . . I asked Gordon whether he would insure a part of the cargo, or as much as he could take. When he said he could take up to Rs. 15,000, I asked for an open cover to that effect. I think the open cover was taken out of a book. I do not remember who put the stamp on."

Mr. Gordon was not examined as a witness, and there was a satisfactory explanation of this omission. Mr. Bortram was examined and said :—

"I am an assistant in the firm of Messrs. Gladstone Wyllie & Co., in Rangoon. The firm are the agents of the defendants' Company in Rangoon. I saw Macrory on the 9th March 1885 with reference to the vessel the *Copeland Isle*. He came to me personally at half-past two. . . . He asked me for a chit to show the other insurance offices that we were prepared to take insurance on the *Copeland Isle*; of course that had reference to what had previously taken place when the matter was arranged by Mr. Gordon. . . . I heard Gordon tell Macrory that he would be willing to take a risk up to Rs. 15,000 on the vessel for the defendant Company. . . . At this second interview Macrory asked if we would give him a letter to show to Steells and to Finlay's so that they could see that we were willing to take insurance on the vessel. I gave him a paper. This (the open cover) is the paper I gave. I used this form because he wanted something definite to show to people, mere word of mouth not being sufficient. I chose an open cover form because it was the most convenient thing we had, and it was much easier for me

to fill up this form than to write an open letter. . . . We said that we were prepared to accept a risk on the *Copeland Isle* to the extent of Rs. 15,000. Nothing was said about giving an open cover or a policy. Gordon said this. . . . We knew at the time Macrory had no rice to ship."

Mr. John Anderson, a witness for the plaintiff, whose firm are agents for several Marine Insurance Companies in Rangoon, said :—

"An open cover is issued generally before the shipment of the goods to be insured. After the goods are shipped the party producing the open cover gets a policy on payment of the premium. I do not know if we ever had a case of the kind, but our firm would issue a policy to the person producing the open cover to us, notwithstanding the open cover had been issued in another person's name." On cross-examination he spoke to the same effect.

Mr. John Borland, another witness for the plaintiff, whose firm at Rangoon also are agents for several Marine Insurance Companies, said : "If we issued an open cover to *A*, and afterwards *B* shipped the cargo, we should have no objection to issuing the policy to *B*." And on cross-examination : "I have many times issued an open cover to a man who has not an insurable interest. If Macrory came to us and told us he could not get a charter unless he got open covers on the cargo to be shipped, we would issue open covers to him, and look to him for the premium until we had intimation that the cargo had been shipped by some one else, and that the open cover was held by the shipper."

Upon the evidence in the suit their Lordships have come to the conclusion that the open cover was given to Macrory in order that he might give it to the charterer of the vessel, and that it was a proposal to insure. Although addressed to Macrory, it could not have been intended for his acceptance, as it was known that he was not going to ship the rice. When he handed it to Bhugwandas it was a subsisting proposal capable of being accepted by him, and when Bhugwandas went to Gladstone Wyllie's and showed Bertram the open cover, and asked him for policies, there was an acceptance of the proposal so as to make a binding contract with Bhugwandas to insure and issue a policy in terms

1888

BHUGWAN
DAS
v.
THE
NETHER-
LANDS INDIA
SEA AND
FIRE
INSURANCE
COMPANY OF
BATAVIA.

1888
 BHUGWAN
 DAS
 v
 THE
 NETHER-
 LANDS INDIA
 SEA AND
 FIRE
 INSURANCE
 COMPANY OF
 BATAVIA.

of the open cover. The asking for two policies did not prevent the acceptance being sufficient, as Bertram absolutely refused to give any policy.

The letter of the 1st April 1885, refusing to issue a policy, and of the 2nd April, refusing to recognize the transfer to Bhugwandas of the open cover, have been noticed. It is to be observed that neither in the interviews with Bhugwandas, nor in the letters, was it said that the paper given to Macrory was not intended to be an open cover. Indeed, in the letter of 2nd April it is so called. It was argued by the learned Counsel for the appellant that the contract became complete when the charter-party was signed, and the proposal to insure was acted upon. It is not necessary for their Lordships to give any opinion upon this contention, as they hold that the acceptance by Bhugwandas was made whilst the offer to insure was subsisting, and was sufficient to complete the contract. The plaintiff is entitled to specific performance, and their Lordships will humbly advise Her Majesty to reverse the decree of the Recorder's Court, and to make a decree that the defendants or their agents do make and issue a policy of insurance in terms of the open cover, and for the amount therein mentioned, and do pay the costs of the suit. The respondents will pay the costs of the appeal.

Appeal allowed.

Solicitors for the appellant : Messrs. *Bramall & White.*

Solicitors for the respondents : Messrs. *Freshfield & Williams.*

ORIGINAL CIVIL.

Before Sir W. Comer Petheram, Knight, Chief Justice, and Mr. Justice Wilcott,
 SOWDAMINI DASSI (PLAINTIFF) v. BROUGHTON AND OTHERS
 (DEFENDANTS).*

Hindu Law—Widow—Accumulations—Period up to which accumulations may be dealt with—Intention to accumulate.

Under the will of *N. C. M.* the testator left his estate to his brother provided that, within a term of eight years, no son should be born to such brother, capable of being adopted as a son of the testator, in accordance

* Appeal No. 1 of 1889, from the decision of Mr. Justice Trevelyan, dated 12th August 1887, in suits numbered 53, 64 and 141 of 1887.

1889
 March 18.