

Carriers Act, 1865

Section 1 - SHORT TITLE This Act may be cited as The Carriers Act, 1865

CARRIERS ACT, 1865 CARRIERS ACT, 1865 3 of 1865 14th February, 1865 The defective State of the Law of India in respect of the liabilities of carriers, whether companies or individuals, has for some time past attracted the attention of the Governor General in Council, but it was thought desirable to postpone any enactment on the subject, until it should be seen whether the labours of Her Majesty's Commissioners for preparing a Body of Substantive Law would relieve the Indian Legislature from the necessity of special legislation. Meantime, however, the question has become pressing, from the increase in the numbers of carrying companies, from the transfer of part of the Government carrying business to one of them and from the prospect of Tramways being constructed under Act XXII of 1863 (to provide for taking land for works of public utility to be constructed by private persons or companies, and for regulating the construction and use of works on land so taken). The necessity for prompt legislation has further been urged on the Government in petitions, and by the Government of Madras in an official letter.. The Bill now published by the Viceroy's permission follows the principles, though not the form or language, of the English Statutes regulating the liability of carriers. The earlier sections extend to India the principle embodied in the English Statute 11 Geo. IV and I Will. IV. Chapter 68. They relieve carriers from the extraordinary liabilities which would be imposed on them by the delivery to them, without notice, of articles of peculiar value or perishableness. Any customers, delivering to the carrier any of the articles enumerated in the Schedule, must declare them, and then the carriers may charge at a higher rate for the additional risk, in conformity with a scale to be publicly exhibited in his place of business, under the ordinary law of contract, the carrier might relieve himself from the liability by such a notice but it would be necessary to bring the notice home to the customer by evidence. From the necessity of giving such evidence, the carrier will now be relieved by his enactment. By Section VI it is provided that the carrier shall not rid himself of his liability for articles, neither unusually valuable nor unusually perishable, by any public notice, but (unless he be the owner of a Tramway) he is permitted to modify his legal obligations by special contract. Section VII extends to Tramways constructed under Act XXII of 1863, the same rule which is applied to railways by Act XVIII of 1854. It seems highly expedient that the same law should, if possible, be made to govern both Railways and Tramways. The rule applicable to Indian Railway Companies is contained in Section XI of Act XVIII of 1854, and is as follows:- "The liability of such a Railway Company for loss or injury to any articles or goods to be carried by them other than those specially provided for by this Act, shall not be deemed or construed to be limited, or in anywise affected by any public notice given, or any private contract made, by them, but such a Railway Company shall be answerable for such loss or injury when it shall have been caused by gross negligence or misconduct on the part of their agents or servants. On this Section the Government of Madras observes: The first clause prohibiting any private contract in limitation of liability goes far beyond the Common Law of England and Statutes 17 and 18 Vic., Cap. 31, S. VII, which admits of such contracts if just and reasonable. It is difficult to see why a Railway company in India should be deprived of that power of protecting itself by special contract which a Railway Company in England possesses. If the latter clause of the section. which makes a company liable for gross negligence or misconduct of the agents, is meant to relieve them from liability in all other cases, it would be well to say so by distinct negative words. But it is very questionable whether so wide an exemption from responsibility is desirable or was intended. If, however, the word "only" be supplied after "answerable" in the last line but three of the extract from the Railways Act as printed above, the Section becomes intelligible. It limits the liability of Railways Companies to the consequences of gross negligence or misconduct on the part of their agents or servants but declares that from this liability so limited they shall not be allowed to relieve themselves by any kind of contract. There cannot indeed be much doubt that the intention of the Legislature was to place all Railway Companies in what was once supposed to be the exact position of a carrier who had contracted for himself as favourably as the law of England would permit. It was, in fact, long supposed in England that, while a carrier could by contract relieve himself from most of his

liabilities, his power of doing so slopped short of liability for negligence or misconduct. Such is the view of the law taken by Mr. Justice Storey in his "Commentaries on the Law of Bailnients" section 549. and such is under stood to be still the law in America. But a series of decisions in the English Courts overturned the older doctrine, and it was settled that a carrier could, by a properly framed contract, deliver himself from liability even for misconduct or negligence. The liberty thus conceded was. however, found to be a practical evil and the English Legislature intervened by 17 and 18 Vic.. Cap 31. The nearly contemporaneous enactment of the Indian Legislature, embodied in Sec. XI of Act XVIII of 1854. is obviously aimed at the same object. It seems very undesirable to adopt the rule contained in section VII of 17 and 18 Vic. Cap. 31. which permits companies to contract themselves, on certain conditions, out of their liability for negligence. The section in question has been severally condemned by the present Lord Chancellor of England on the ground both of obscurity of expression and of difficulty of application. On the other hand. the rule of the Indian Legislature is comparatively simple, it would probably be sustained by the general sense of the mercantile community and it is especially applicable to a country in which there exists considerable difference of opinion as to the general liabilities of carriers." - Gazette of India, 1-8-1864, Extra p. 2. An Act relating to the rights and liabilities of Common Carriers. Preamble.- WHEREAS It is expedient not only to enable common carriers to limit their liability for loss of or damage to property delivered to them to be carried but also to declare their liability for loss of. or damage to. such property occasioned by the negligence or criminal acts of themselves, their servants or agents. It is enacted as follows :- The Act has been declared to be in force in the whole of India, except the Scheduled Disiricts. by the Laws Local Extent Act. 1874 (15 of 1874), S. 3. It has been extended to Berar by the Berar Laws Act. 1941(4 of 1941) and has been applied to the Santhal Parganas. by the Santhal Parganas Settlement Regulation. 1872(3 of 1872). S. 31. Berar now form- pan of the State of Maharashtra and Santhal Parganas are in the Slate of Bihar. It has been declared by notification under S. 3(a) ofthe Scheduled Districts Act. 1874(15 of 1874). to be in force in the following Scheduled Districts, namely:- West Jalpaiguri, the Western Hills of Darjiling. Darjiling Tarai and the Damson Sub-Dn. of the Dariiling District. see Gaz. of Ind.. 1881.Pt. I, p. 74(now in the State of WestBengal):The Disiricisol Hazaribagh Lohardaga (now the Ranchi District). see Cal. Gaz.. 1899, Pt. 1. p. 44 (now in the State of Bihar) and Manbhum and Pargana Dhalbhum and the Kolhan in the District of Singhum, see gaz. of Ind.. 1881. Pt. 1. p. 504 (now in the State of Bihar).The Porahat Estate in the District of Singbhum, see 1897. Pt. I. p. 1059 (now in the State of Bihar); Kumaon and Garhwal. see 1876, Pt. I, p. 605: The schedule portion of the Mizapur District see 1878. Pt. I,p.383: Jaunsar.Bawar. see 1878. Pt. I. p. 382 (now in the State of U.P.): The Scheduled Districts of the C.P.. see 1879, Pt. I, p. 771; The Scheduled Districts in Ganjam (now in the State of Orissa) and Vizagapatam (now in the State of Andhra Pradesh). see 1898. Pt. I. p. 870: Assam (except theNorth Lushai Hills (now known as U.T.of Mizoram,see Act 81 of 1971. S. 5)) see Act 18 of 1954. S. 2. see Gaz. of Ind.. 1897. Pt. 1. p. 299. It has been declared, by notification under S. 3(b) of the last-mentioned Act. Not to be in force in the Scheduled District of Lahaul. This district along with Spiti District has now been transferred to the Union Terriory (Now State) of Himachal Pradesh-See Gaz.of Ind., 1886.Pt. 1.p.301 :The Punjab Reorganisation Act. 1966(31 of 1966). S. 5 (1-11-1966) and the State of Himachal Pradesh Act. 1970 (53 of 1970). It has been extended by notification under S. 5 of the same Act to the following Scheduled Districts, namely, the Tarai of the Province of Agra - See Gazette of India. 1876. Pt. I, p. 505: now in the State of Uttar Pradesh: Ajmer and Merwara-See 1877, Pt. 1. p. 605. Ajmer forms part of Rajasthan now-See Act 37 of 1956. S. 10. It has been extended to the new Provinces and Merged Slates bythe Merged States (Laws) Act. 1949(59 of 1949). S. 3 [1-1-1950] and tothe Union Territories of Manipur and Tripura by the Union Territories (Laws) Act. 1950(30 of 1950). S. 3 (16-4-1950). Panipur and Tripura are States now-See Act 81 of 1971: but Vindhya Pradesh now forms part of the State of Madhya Pradesh-See Act 37 of 1956. section 9(1)(e). The Act has been extended to lhe Union Territories of Pondicherry and Dadra and Nagar Haveli by Act 26 of 1968. S. 3(1) and Schedule (1-8-1968) and Regn. 6 of 1963 (with effect from 1-7-1965). respectively. It has been extended to the Slates merged in the State of Bombay-See Bom. Act 4 of 1950,. Bombay has been divided into the Slates of Maharashtra and Gujarat. by the Bombay Reorganisation Act. [1961 (XI of 1961). Extended to Sikkim w.e.f. 22-7-1983 - See Gaz. of India. 29 -7-1983 Pt. II-3 (ii). Ext., p. 4 (No. 329). It has been repealed as to carriers by rail bythe Indian Railways Act. 1879(4 of 1879). For the Railways Act now in force, seethe Indian Railways Act. 1890(9 of 1890). SECTION 01: SHORT TITLE This Act may be cited as The Carriers Act, 1865.

