

Sanjeevani Booti

V.IMP CASE
STUDIES FOR CA
FOUNDATION
Dec'23

**THE COMPANIES
ACT, 2013**


ABOUT NIRAJ AGARWAL

Niraj Agarwal is a Chartered Accountant, Company Secretary, Cost & Management Accountant. He is an All India Rank Holder in all the 3 courses. He has graduated from St. Xavier's College, Kolkata and holds a Master's degree in commerce too.

Prior to teaching, Niraj has worked with large corporates like Idea Cellular Ltd and Magma HDI. During his stint in corporate world he has recognised at different level for his dedication, diligence and commitment. Acknowledged with the "Start Performer Award" & "Aditya Birla Excellence Award" in Idea Cellular Limited. He has also served EIRC of ICAI as Hony Secretary of the Student's Association for a period of two Continuous years. He was awarded with best presenter during GMCS session of ICAI. He was also awarded with Letter of Appreciation from Vice Principal, St. Xavier's College for dynamic leadership skills, efficient communication skills, good academic record and active participation in College Activities.

Niraj possesses a vast experience of teaching to students. His unique lecture delivery and practical method of teaching help the student to easily grasp & remember the subject. His Corporate stint makes it possible for him to make students relate the concepts taught in classroom to the real transaction taking place outside the classroom.

He believes that learning is a continuous process and hence he is also a ICAI certified IFRS professional, a Licentiate from Insurance Institute of India and completed 6 papers of Actuarial Science. He is also a Faculty at ICAS, Kolkata.



COURSES OFFERED

-  CA FOUNDATION (All papers)
-  CA INTERMEDIATE (Accounting & Advance Accounting)
-  CMA FOUNDATION (All papers)
-  CMA INTERMEDIATE (Financial Accounting & Company Accounts)
-  CS EXECUTIVE (Corporate Accounting)

WHY JOIN US?



100% QUESTIONS IN EXAM FROM OUR MAT



100% COVERAGE



PERSONAL ATTENTION

REVISIONS 

UNLIMITED VIEWS 

HARD COPY OF MAT 



MULTIPLE MOCK TESTS



LAST MIN DOUBLE SUPPORT




100% VIDEO BACKUP

FACE TO FACE CLASSES 


ONLINE LIVE INTERACTIVE CLASSES 

D2H MODE (Pendrive/Googld Drive) CLASSES 


OUR PASSING % v/s NATIONAL PASSING %




NOV '18




MAY '19



NOV '19



NOV '20



JAN '21

NOV '18 RANKHOLDERS



**YATHARTH
CHOUHDURY**

AIR 28



**HIRSAT SINGH
SAJUJA**

AIR 38



**RAKESH KR.
SINGH**

AIR 48

NOV '19 RANKHOLDERS



SURAJ BAKLIWAL
AIR 26



AMAN CHOWDHARY
AIR 27



RAHUL AGARWAL
AIR 31

YASH DAMANI
AIR 34



DEVANSH DAMANI
AIR 44



CA FOUNDATION
NOV'20 & JAN'21
DISTINCTION HOLDERS



Oishika Ghosh Majumdar
329/400



Yash Sanghvi
299/400



Khushi Rathi
298/400



Anushka Prasad
296/400



Khushi Agarwal
295/400



Shubham Agarwal
294/400



Krish Kedia
286/400



Priyanka Goyal
286/400



Nitin Pasari
283/400



Shivam Choudhary
280/400




Yudhit More
278/400

STUDENT'S SPEAK

● Suraj Bakliwal | AIR 26

St. Xavier's College

Studying from niraj sir was an amazing experience. He is unlike all the teachers who have taught me. Sir is always ready for help no matter what the problem is, no matter what time it is. He has given me personal guidance throughout the course and the general teacher-student relation has become more like friendship. The study material given by sir is fully exhaustive and second to none. In addition to the classroom teaching, sir also motivated us a lot and didn't only show us the dream of getting a rank but also helped us in every way possible as if it were a dream of his own. I would like to thank sir for everything and suggest everyone to take his classes to experience the excellence!



● Aman Chowdhary | AIR 27

St. Xavier's College


I'm quite grateful to be a part of NAE family where I got to meet many new people and learn from extremely qualified teachers. Niraj sir helped me to shape my dream of becoming an AIR. Without his support it would have been very difficult. At each and every moment he supported me and encouraged me to improve myself. I'm really thankful to him.



● Yatharth Chowdhury | AIR 28

St. Xavier's College

Joining here was a very memorable experience for me. Niraj Sir was not only my teacher, but a mentor for life. He is more of a friend to me. The regular tests helped me to identify my weaknesses and work upon them. The conceptual clarity they provided, helped me to clear my CA foundation exam and secure an All India Rank.



● Rahul Agarwal | AIR 31

St. Xavier's College

Association with NAE was a great experience. Personal attention and doubt clearing (24x7) on any topic makes the faculty unique on its own. One feels good when you have a teacher as a friend. Focus on life examples supports in concept clarity and always motivating you to do more and better



STUDENT'S SPEAK

● Yash Damani | AIR 34

St. Xavier's College


"An opportunity which everyone should capitalize on", that's what learning things from Niraj sir is. From late night calls to endless doubts I always knew that sir was available to help me get things back on track. With the overwhelming love I have got for the entire 6 months of my preparation time, I really discovered a friend in him more than a teacher. Don't know about others, but I will miss your classes and will keep cherishing the memories I have made there. To end things, I would just want to say that I'm thankful to sir because whatever I've achieved today is all because of the motivation I've been receiving from him throughout this journey.



● Harsat Singh Saluja | AIR 38

St. Xavier's College


It's been all in all a great experience learning from sir. He has been a great guide and mentor throughout my journey towards excellence. I am obliged to sir for all the contribution he has made. I will always keep learning something from you sir.



● Devansh Damani | AIR 44

St. Xavier's College

Stepping into the line of a professional career was a very new and exciting experience. It seemed that the boards exams were just a trailer while the movie is about to come. He is a mentor not just for exams but for life who were instrumental in shaping my career. He kept me motivated throughout the 6 months of preparation. From books to revision papers to mock tests and obviously his vast knowledge, all together are more than sufficient for the preparation. The best thing in his teaching was the references to the practical world, which was a bonus for us. After all, their faith and dedication for us helped me achieve an AIR which was earlier only a dream. I greatly express my gratitude towards him.



● Rakesh Kr Singh | AIR 48

St. Xavier's College

It was my great opportunity and experience to study in this institute. He is very friendly with the students. He provides proper guidelines and notes for each and every chapter. As a result of his hard efforts while teaching and preparing me for CA Foundation exam, I got 48th All India Rank.




STUDENT'S SPEAK

● Mathuri Agarwal

St. Xavier's College


Apart from being a great teacher, Niraj sir is a very good mentor as well. Joining here, u receive not only conceptual clarity and full coverage of syllabus but also the right method to approach the course. I really enjoyed the classes here. This infact is the best among the rest. 😊



● Vidya B Singh

St. Xavier's College

For any student, guidance in right direction is more important than an intellectual mind and for me this academy became the catalyst. The personal guidance of sir really helped me in my studies but more importantly in taking the major decisions of my career. For a professional course like CA/CS/CMA initial guidance is a must for any aspirant.. I'll remain indebted to this institute



● Sailaja Dammani

Shri Shikshyatan College


One of the most dynamic teachers I have known. You have been more of a mentor than a teacher. You have an unbeatable formula for expediting learning and bringing success in the classroom. I have learnt a lot from you.



● Anisha Malawat

J D Birla Institute

Niraj sir makes us understand each and every topic with the slightest details possible. He is the best teacher I have met in my entire life . He puts in tremendous effort and hardwork to teach . Words would be less to describe him. Kudos to such an amazing mentor who has always been there with us .



● Ishika Agarwal

St. Xavier's College

A mentor for a lifetime ❤️

Classes with sir have been so worthwhile. A very patient teacher who has an amazing way of breaking complex things into simpler ones. I recommend him highly




STUDENT'S SPEAK

● Bhawna Chandak

Shri Shikshyatan College


If you are worried about maths then he is the ultimate solution for foundation. Believe me his guidance , concept building and test series has helped alot.



● Sankalp Sharma

The Bhawanipur Education Society College


I used to hear from people, the only way to understand a subject is to fall in love with the subject. Niraj bhaiya was the main reason because of whom I did fall in love with my studies. I have never seen such a passionate teacher in life.



● Anshu Jajodia

Shri Shikshyatan College

Sir, it's been an amazing experience being your student. You have always motivated me and encouraged me throughout. Couldn't thank you enough. All I can say, blessed to be your student.



● Shivam Choudhary

The Notes and booklets' compilations, Real-life illustrations, Calci weaponization, Eleventh-hour suggestions, Throughout-the-course motivations and Prior-to-exam Convictions topped by Your fulfilling and reassuring method of teaching is very much more than a Student can ask for.

My marks are dedicated to you. 😊



● Yudhit More

Thank you so much niraj sir !!

Sir apka har ek step pe guidance is the reason hamloag itna acha perform kiye. Sir ko ek student ka mindset se jaha mistakes hoga pehle hi bata dete and icai ka mindset se kya paper set hoga vo bhi bata dete 😊

2020 me pardhai karna was not easy but sir ka classes aisa hi laga jaise face to face ho

So again thank you sir !!



THE COMPANIES ACT, 2013

Case Study#1

Ravi Private Limited has borrowed ₹ 5 crores from Mudra Finance Ltd. This debt is ultra vires to the company. Examine, whether the company is liable to pay this debt? State the remedy if any available to Mudra Finance Ltd.?

Ans

As per the facts given, Ravi Private Limited borrowed ₹ 5 crore from Mudra Finance Ltd. This debt is ultra vires to the company, which signifies that Ravi Private Limited has borrowed the amount beyond the expressed limit prescribed in its memorandum. This act of the company can be said to be null and void.

In consequence, any act done or a contract made by the company which travels beyond the powers not only of the directors but also of the company is wholly void and inoperative in law and is therefore not binding on the company.

So is being the act void in nature, there being no existence of the contract between the Ravi Private Ltd. and Mudra Finance Ltd. Therefore, the company Ravi Private Ltd. is liable to pay this debt amount upto the limit prescribed in the memorandum.

Remedy available to the Mudra Finance Ltd.: The impact of the doctrine of ultra vires is that a company can neither be sued on an ultra vires transaction, nor can it sue on it. Since the memorandum is a “public document”, it is open to public inspection. Therefore, a company which deals with the other, is deemed to know about the powers of the company.

So, Mudra Finance Ltd. can claim for the amount within the expressed limit prescribed in its memorandum.

Case Study#2

A company registered under section 8 of the Companies Act, 2013, earned huge profit during the financial year ended on 31st March, 2018 due to some favorable policies declared by the Government of India and implemented by the company. Considering the development, some members of the company wanted the company to distribute dividends to the members of the company. They approached you to advise them about the maximum amount of dividend that can be declared by the company as per the provisions of the Companies Act, 2013. Examine the relevant provisions of the Companies Act, 2013 and advise the members accordingly.

Ans

A company that is registered under section 8 of the Companies Act, 2013, is prohibited from the payment of any dividend to its members.

The company in question is a section 8 company and hence it cannot declare dividend. Thus, the contention of members is incorrect.

Case Study#3

Mr. X had purchased some goods from M/s ABC Limited on credit. A credit period of one month was allowed to Mr. X. Before the due date Mr. X went to the company and wanted to repay the amount due from him. He found only Mr. Z there, who was the factory supervisor of the company. Mr. Z told Mr. X that the accountant and the cashier were on leave, he is in-charge of receiving money and he may pay the amount to him. Mr. Z issued a money receipt under his signature. After two months M/s ABC Limited issued a notice to Mr. X for non-payment of the dues within the stipulated period. Mr. X informed the company that he had already cleared the dues and he is no more responsible for the same. He also contended that Mr. Z is an



employee of the company to whom he had made the payment and being an outsider, he trusted the words of Mr. Z as duty distribution is a job of the internal management of the company.

Analyse the situation and decide whether Mr. X is free from his liability.

Ans

Doctrine of Indoor Management: The Doctrine of Indoor Management is the exception to the doctrine of constructive notice. The doctrine of constructive notice does not mean that outsiders are deemed to have notice of the internal affairs of the company. For instance, if an act is authorised by the articles or memorandum, an outsider is entitled to assume that all the detailed formalities for doing that act have been observed.

The doctrine of Indoor Management is important to persons dealing with a company through its directors or other persons. They are entitled to assume that the acts of the directors or other officers of the company are validly performed, if they are within the scope of their apparent authority. So long as an act is valid under the articles, if done in a particular manner, an outsider dealing with the company is entitled to assume that it has been done in the manner required.

In the given question, Mr. X has made payment to Mr. Z and he (Mr. Z) gave to receipt of the same to Mr. X. Thus, it will be rightful on part of Mr. X to assume that Mr. Z was also authorised to receive money on behalf of the company. Hence, Mr. X will be free from liability for payment of goods purchased from M/s ABC Limited, as he has paid amount due to an employee of the company.

Case Study#4

Sound Syndicate Ltd., a public company, its articles of association empowers the managing agents to borrow both short and long term loans on behalf of the company, Mr. Liddle, the director of the company, approached Easy Finance Ltd., a non banking finance company for a loan of ` 25,00,000 in name of the company.

The Lender agreed and provided the above said loan. Later on, Sound Syndicate Ltd. refused to repay the money borrowed on the pretext that no resolution authorizing such loan have been actually passed by the company and the lender should have enquired about the same prior providing such loan hence company not liable to pay such loan.

Analyse the above situation in terms of the provisions of Doctrine of Indoor Management under the Companies Act, 2013 and examine whether the contention of Sound Syndicate Ltd. is correct or not?

Ans

Doctrine of Indoor Management

According to this doctrine, persons dealing with the company need not inquire whether internal proceedings relating to the contract are followed correctly, once they are satisfied that the transaction is in accordance with the memorandum and articles of association.

Stakeholders need not enquire whether the necessary meeting was convened and held properly or whether necessary resolution was passed properly. They are entitled to take it for granted that the company had gone through all these proceedings in a regular manner.

The doctrine helps protect external members from the company and states that the people are entitled to presume that internal proceedings are as per documents submitted with the Registrar of Companies.



- Thus, 1. What happens internal to a company is not a matter of public knowledge. An outsider can only presume the intentions of a company, but do not know the information he/she is not privy to.
- 2. If not for the doctrine, the company could escape creditors by denying the authority of officials to act on its behalf.

In the given question, Easy Finance Ltd. being external to the company, need not enquire whether the necessary resolution was passed properly. Even if the company claim that no resolution authorizing the loan was passed, the company is bound to pay the loan to Easy Finance Ltd.

Case Study#5

Popular Products Ltd. is company incorporated in India, having a total Share Capital of ₹ 20 Crores. The Share capital comprises of 12 Lakh equity shares of ₹ 100 each and 8 Lakhs Preference Shares of ₹ 100 each. Delight Products Ltd. and Happy Products Ltd. hold 2,50,000 and 3,50,000 shares respectively in Popular Products Ltd. Another company Cheerful Products Ltd. holds 2,50,000 shares in Popular Products Ltd. Jovial Ltd. is the holding company for all above three companies namely Delight Products Ltd; Happy Products Ltd.; Cheerful Products Ltd. Can Jovial Ltd. be termed as subsidiary company of Popular products. Ltd., if it. Controls composition of directors of Popular Products Ltd. State the related provision in the favour of your answer.

Ans

In the present case, the total share capital of Popular Products Ltd. is ₹ 20 crores comprised of 12 Lakh equity shares and 8 Lakhs preference shares.

Delight Products Ltd., Happy Products Ltd. and Cheerful Products Ltd together hold 8,50,000 shares (2,50,000+3,50,000+2,50,000) in Popular Products Ltd. Jovial Ltd. is the holding company of all above three companies. So, Jovial Ltd. along with its subsidiaries hold 8,50,000 shares in Popular Products Ltd. which amounts to less than one-half of its total share capital. Hence, Jovial Ltd. by virtue of share holding is not a holding company of Popular Products Ltd.

Secondly, it is given that Jovial Ltd. controls the composition of directors of Popular Products Ltd., hence, Jovial Ltd. is a holding company of Popular Products Ltd. and not a subsidiary company. [Section 2(87) of the Companies Act, 2013]

Case Study#6

Mr. Anil formed a One Person Company (OPC) on 16th April, 2018 for manufacturing electric cars. The turnover of the OPC for the financial year ended 31st March, 2019 was about ₹ 2.25 Crores. His friend Sunil wanted to invest in his OPC, so they decided to convert it voluntarily into a private limited company. Can Anil do so?

Ans

As per the provisions of Sub-Rule (7) of Rule 3 of the Companies (Incorporation) Rules, 2014, an OPC cannot convert voluntarily into any kind of company unless two years have expired from the date of its incorporation, except threshold limit (paid up share capital) is increased beyond fifty lakh rupees or its average annual turnover during the relevant period exceeds two crore rupees. In the instant case, Mr. Anil formed an OPC on 16th April, 2018 and its turnover for the financial year ended 31st March, 2019 was Rs. 2.25 Crores. Even though two years have not expired from the date of its incorporation, since its average annual turnover during the period starting from 16th April, 2018 to 31st March, 2019 has exceeded Rs. 2 Crores, Mr. Anil can convert the OPC into a private limited company along with Sunil.



Case Study#7

A, an assessee, had large income in the form of dividend and interest. In order to reduce his tax liability, he formed four private limited company and transferred his investments to them in exchange of their shares. The income earned by the companies was taken back by him as pretended loan. Can A be regarded as separate from the private limited company he formed?

Ans

The House of Lords in Salomon Vs Salomon & Co. Ltd. laid down that a company is a person distinct and separate from its members, and therefore, has an independent separate legal existence from its members who have constituted the company. But under certain circumstances the separate entity of the company may be ignored by the courts. When that happens, the courts ignore the corporate entity of the company and look behind the corporate façade and hold the persons in control of the management of its affairs liable for the acts of the company. Where a company is incorporated and formed by certain persons only for the purpose of evading taxes, the courts have discretion to disregard the corporate entity and tax the income in the hands of the appropriate assessee.

In Dinshaw Maneckjee Petit case it was held that the company was not a genuine company at all but merely the assessee himself disguised that the legal entity of a limited company. The assessee earned huge income by way of dividends and interest. So, he opened some companies and purchased their shares in exchange of his income by way of dividend and interest. This income was transferred back to assessee by way of loan. The court decided that the private companies were a sham and the corporate veil was lifted to decide the real owner of the income.

In the instant case, the four private limited companies were formed by A, the assessee, purely and simply as a means of avoiding tax and the companies were nothing more than the façade of the assessee himself. Therefore, the whole idea of Mr. A was simply to split his income into four parts with a view to evade tax. No other business was done by the company.

Hence, A cannot be regarded as separate from the private limited companies he formed.

Case Study#8

The Articles of Association of XYZ Ltd. provides that Board of Directors has authority to issue bonds provided such issue is authorized by the shareholders by a necessary resolution in the general meeting of the company. The company was in dire need of funds and therefore, it issued the bonds to Mr. X without passing any such resolution in general meeting. Can Mr. X recover the money from the company? Decide referring the relevant provisions of the Companies Act, 2013.

Ans

According to the Doctrine of Indoor Management, if an act is authorised by the articles or memorandum, an outsider is entitled to assume that all the detailed formalities for doing that act have been observed. As per the case of the Royal British Bank vs. Turquand [1856] 6E & B 327, the directors of R.B.B. Ltd. gave a bond to T. The articles empowered the directors to issue such bonds under the authority of a proper resolution. In fact, no such resolution was passed. Notwithstanding that, it was held that T could sue on the bonds on the ground that he was entitled to assume that the resolution had been duly passed. This is the doctrine of indoor management, popularly known as Turquand Rule.

Since, the given question is based on the above facts, accordingly here in this case Mr. X can recover the money from the company considering that all required formalities for the passing of the resolution have been duly complied.



Case Study#9

Flora Fauna Limited was registered as a public company. There are 230 members in the company as noted below:

(a) Directors and their relatives	190	
(b) Employees		15
(c) Ex-Employees (Shares were allotted when they were employees)	10	
(d) 5 couples holding shares jointly in the name of husband and wife (5*2)	10	
(e) Others		5

The Board of Directors of the company propose to convert it into a private company. Also advise whether reduction in the number of members is necessary.

Ans

According to section 2(68) of the Companies Act, 2013, "Private company" means a company having a minimum paid-up share capital as may be prescribed, and which by its articles, except in case of One Person Company, limits the number of its members to two hundred.

However, where two or more persons hold one or more shares in a company jointly, they shall, for the purposes of this clause, be treated as a single member.

It is further provided that -

- (A) persons who are in the employment of the company; and
- (B) persons who, having been formerly in the employment of the company, were members of the company while in that employment and have continued to be members after the employment ceased, shall not be included in the number of members.

In the instant case, Flora Fauna Limited may be converted into a private company only if the total members of the company are limited to 200.

Total Number of members

(i) Directors and their relatives	190
(ii) 5 Couples (5*1)	5
(iii) Others	5
Total	200

Therefore, there is no need for reduction in the number of members since existing number of members are 200 which does not exceed maximum limit of 200.

Case Study#10

F, an assessee, was a wealthy man earning huge income by way of dividend and interest. He formed three Private Companies and agreed with each to hold a bloc of investment as an agent for them. The dividend and interest income received by the companies was handed back to F as a pretended loan. This way, F divided his income into three parts in a bid to reduce his tax liability.

Decide, for what purpose the three companies were established? Whether the legal personality of all the three companies may be disregarded.

Ans

The House of Lords in Salomon Vs Salomon & Co. Ltd. laid down that a company is a person distinct and separate from its members, and therefore, has an independent separate legal existence from its members who have constituted the company. But under certain circumstances the separate entity of the company may be ignored by the courts. When that happens, the courts ignore the corporate entity of the company and look behind the corporate



façade and hold the persons in control of the management of its affairs liable for the acts of the company. Where a company is incorporated and formed by certain persons only for the purpose of evading taxes, the courts have discretion to disregard the corporate entity and tax the income in the hands of the appropriate assessee.

(1) The problem asked in the question is based upon the aforesaid facts. The three companies were formed by the assessee purely and simply as a means of avoiding tax and the companies were nothing more than the façade of the assessee himself. Therefore, the whole idea of Mr. F was simply to split his income into three parts with a view to evade tax. No other business was done by the company.

(2) The legal personality of the three private companies may be disregarded because the companies were formed only to avoid tax liability. It carried on no other business, but was created simply as a legal entity to ostensibly receive the dividend and interest and to hand them over to the assessee as pretended loans. The same was upheld in *Re Sir Dinshaw Maneckji Petit* AIR 1927 Bom.371 and *Juggilal vs. Commissioner of Income Tax* AIR (1969) SC (932).

Case Study#11

ABC Pvt. Ltd., is a Private Company having five members only. All the members of the company were going by car to Mumbai in relation to some business. An accident took place and all of them died. Answer with reasons, under the Companies Act, 2013 whether existence of the company has also come to the end?

Ans

Death of all members of a Private Limited Company, Under the Companies Act, 2013: The most distinguishing feature of a company is its being a separate entity from the shareholders and promoters who form it. This lends stability and perpetuity to the company form of business organization. In short, a company is brought into existence by a process of law and can be terminated or wound up or brought to an end only by a process of law. Its life is not impacted by the death, insolvency or retirement of any or all shareholder(s) or director(s).

The provision for transferability or transmission of the shares helps to preserve the perpetual existence of a company by allowing the constitution and identity of shareholders to change. In the present case, ABC Pvt. Ltd. does not cease to exist even by the death of all its shareholders. The legal process will be for the successors of the deceased shareholders to get the shares registered in their names by way of the process which is called “transmission of shares”. The company will cease to exist only when it is wound up by a due process of law.

Therefore, even with the death of all members (i.e. 5), ABC (Pvt.) Ltd. does not cease to exist.

Case Study#12

Some of the creditors of Pharmaceutical Appliances Ltd. have complained that the company was formed by the promoters only to defraud the creditors and circumvent the compliance of legal provisions of the Companies Act, 2013. In this context they seek your advice as to the meaning of corporate veil and when the promoters can be made personally liable for the debts of the company.

Ans

Corporate Veil: Corporate Veil refers to a legal concept whereby the company is identified separately from the members of the company.

The term Corporate Veil refers to the concept that members of a company are shielded from liability connected to the company’s actions. If the company incurs any debts or contravenes



any laws, the corporate veil concept implies that members should not be liable for those errors. In other words, they enjoy corporate insulation.

Thus, the shareholders are protected from the acts of the company.

However, under certain exceptional circumstances the courts lift or pierce the corporate veil by ignoring the separate entity of the company and the promoters and other persons who have managed and controlled the affairs of the company. Thus, when the corporate veil is lifted by the courts, the promoters and persons exercising control over the affairs of the company are held personally liable for the acts and debts of the company.

The following are the cases where company law disregards the principle of corporate personality or the principle that the company is a legal entity distinct and separate from its shareholders or members:

- (i) To determine the character of the company i.e. to find out whether co-enemy or friend
- (ii) To protect revenue/tax
- (iii) To avoid a legal obligation
- (iv) Formation of subsidiaries to act as agents
- (v) Company formed for fraud/improper conduct or to defeat law

Case Study#13

Naveen incorporated a "One Person Company" making his sister Navita as the nominee. Navita is leaving India permanently due to her marriage abroad. Due to this fact, she is withdrawing her consent of nomination in the said One Person Company. Taking into considerations the provisions of the Companies Act, 2013 answer the questions given below.

- (a) If Navita is leaving India permanently, is it mandatory for her to withdraw her nomination in the said One Person Company?
- (b) If Navita maintained the status of Resident of India after her marriage, then can she continue her nomination in the said One Person Company?

Ans

A) Yes, it is mandatory for Navita to withdraw her nomination in the said OPC as she is leaving India permanently as only a natural person who is an Indian citizen and resident in India shall be a nominee in OPC.

(B) Yes, Navita can continue her nomination in the said OPC, if she maintained the status of Resident of India after her marriage by staying in India for a period of not less than 182 days during the immediately preceding financial year.

Case Study#14

PQR Private Ltd. is a company registered under the Companies Act, 2013 with a Paid Up Share Capital of ` 40 lakh and turnover of ` 2.5 crores. Explain the meaning of the "Small Company" and examine whether the PQR Private Ltd. can avail the status of small company in accordance with the provisions of the Companies Act, 2013.

Ans

Small Company: According to Section 2(85) of the Companies Act, 2013, Small Company means a company, other than a public company,—

- (1) paid-up share capital of which does not exceed fifty lakh rupees or such higher amount as may be prescribed which shall not be more than ten crore rupees; and
- (2) turnover of which as per its last profit and loss account for the immediately preceding financial year does not exceed two crore rupees or such higher amount as may be prescribed which shall not be more than one hundred crore rupees.

Nothing in this clause shall apply to—

- (A) a holding company or a subsidiary company;



- (B) a company registered under section 8; or
- (C) a company or body corporate governed by any special Act.

In the present case, PQR Private Ltd., a company registered under the Companies Act, 2013 with a paid up share capital of ` 40 lakh and having turnover of ` 2.5 crore. Since only one criteria of share capital of ` 50 Lakhs is met, but the second criteria of turnover of ` 2 crores is not met and the provisions require both the criteria to be met in order to avail the status of a small company, PQR Ltd. cannot avail the status of small company.

Case Study#15

The Articles of Association of Sound Syndicate Ltd., a public company, empowers the managing agents to borrow both short and long term loans on behalf of the company. Mr. Liddle, the director of the company, approached Easy Finance Ltd., a non banking finance company for a loan of ` 25,00,000 in name of the company.

The Lender agreed and provided the above said loan. Later on, Sound Syndicate Ltd. refused to repay the money borrowed on the pretext that no resolution authorizing such loan have been actually passed by the company and the lender should have enquired about the same prior providing such loan hence company not liable to pay such loan. Analyse the above situation in terms of the provisions of Doctrine of Indoor Management under the Companies Act, 2013 and examine whether the contention of Sound Syndicate Ltd. is correct or not?

Ans

Doctrine of Indoor Management

According to this doctrine, persons dealing with the company need not inquire whether internal proceedings relating to the contract are followed correctly, once they are satisfied that the transaction is in accordance with the memorandum and articles of association.

Stakeholders need not enquire whether the necessary meeting was convened and held properly or whether necessary resolution was passed properly. They are entitled to take it for granted that the company had gone through all these proceedings in a regular manner.

The doctrine helps protect external members from the company and states that the people are entitled to presume that internal proceedings are as per documents submitted with the Registrar of Companies.

Thus,

(a) What happens internal to a company is not a matter of public knowledge. An outsider can only presume the intentions of a company, but do not know the information he/she is not privy to.

(b) If not for the doctrine, the company could escape creditors by denying the authority of officials to act on its behalf.

In the given question, Easy Finance Ltd. being external to the company, need not enquire whether the necessary resolution was passed properly. Even if the company claim that no resolution authorizing the loan was passed, the company is bound to pay the loan to Easy Finance Ltd.

Case Study#16

Alfa school started imparting education on 1st April, 2010, with the sole objective of providing education to children of weaker society either free of cost or at a very nominal fee depending upon the financial condition of their parents. However, on 30th March 2018, it came to the knowledge of the Central Government that the said school was operating by violating the objects clause due to which it was granted the status of a section 8 company under the



Companies Act, 2013. Describe what powers can be exercised by the Central Government against the Alfa School, in such a case?

Ans

Section 8 of the Companies Act, 2013 deals with the formation of companies which are formed to promote the charitable objects of commerce, art, science, education, sports etc. Such company intends to apply its profit in promoting its objects. Section 8 companies are registered by the Registrar only when a license is issued by the Central Government to them. Since, Alfa School was a Section 8 company and it had started violating the objects clause, hence in such a situation the following powers can be exercised by the Central Government:

(i) The Central Government may by order revoke the licence of the company where the company contravenes any of the requirements or the conditions of this sections subject to which a licence is issued or where the affairs of the company are conducted fraudulently, or violative of the objects of the company or prejudicial to public interest, and on revocation the Registrar shall put 'Limited' or 'Private Limited' against the company's name in the register. But before such revocation, the Central Government must give it a written notice of its intention to revoke the licence and opportunity to be heard in the matter.

(ii) Where a licence is revoked, the Central Government may, by order, if it is satisfied that it is essential in the public interest, direct that the company be wound up under this Act or amalgamated with another company registered under this section.

However, no such order shall be made unless the company is given a reasonable opportunity of being heard.

(iii) Where a licence is revoked and where the Central Government is satisfied that it is essential in the public interest that the company registered under this section should be amalgamated with another company registered under this section and having similar objects, then, notwithstanding anything to the contrary contained in this Act, the Central Government may, by order, provide for such amalgamation to form a single company with such constitution, properties, powers, rights, interest, authorities and privileges and with such liabilities, duties and obligations as may be specified in the order

Case Study#17

Examine with reasons whether the following statement is correct or incorrect: (i) A private limited company must have a minimum of two members, while a public limited company must have at least seven members.

(ii) Affixing of Common seal on company's documents is compulsory.

Ans

(i) Correct: Section 3 of the Companies Act, 2013 deals with the basic requirement with respect to the constitution of the company. In the case of a public company, any 7 or more persons can form a company for any lawful purpose by subscribing their names to memorandum and complying with the requirements of this Act in respect of registration. In exactly the same way, 2 or more persons can form a private company.

(ii) Incorrect: The common seal is a seal used by a corporation as the symbol of its incorporation. The Companies (Amendment) Act, 2015 has made the common seal optional by omitting the words "and a common seal" from Section 9 so as to provide an alternative mode of authorization for companies who opt not to have a common seal. This amendment provides that the documents which need to be authenticated by a common seal will be required to be so done, only if the company opts to have a common seal. In case a company does not have a common seal, the authorization shall be made by two directors or by a director and the Company Secretary, wherever the company has appointed a Company Secretary.



Case Study#18

ABC Limited has allotted equity shares with voting rights to XYZ Limited worth ₹ 15 Crores and issued Non-Convertible Debentures worth ₹ 40 Crores during the Financial Year 2019-20. After that total Paid-up Equity Share Capital of the company is ₹ 100 Crores and Non-Convertible Debentures stands at ₹ 120 Crores.

Define the Meaning of Associate Company and comment on whether ABC Limited and XYZ Limited would be called Associate Company as per the provisions of the Companies Act, 2013?

Ans

As per Section 2(6) of the Companies Act, 2013, an Associate Company in relation to another company, means a company in which that other company has a significant influence, but which is not a subsidiary company of the company having such influence and includes a joint venture company.

The term “significant influence” means control of at least 20% of total share capital, or control of business decisions under an agreement.

The term “Total Share Capital”, means the aggregate of the -

- (a) Paid-up equity share capital; and
- (b) Convertible preference share capital.

In the given case, as ABC Ltd. has allotted equity shares with voting rights to XYZ Limited of ₹ 15 cr, which is less than requisite control of 20% of total share capital (i.e 100 cr) to have a significant influence of XYZ Ltd. Since the said requirement is not complied, therefore ABC Ltd. and XYZ Ltd. are not associate companies as per the Companies Act, 2013. Holding/allotment of non-convertible debentures has no relevance for ascertaining significant influence.

Case Study#19

SK Infrastructure Limited has a paid up share capital divided into 6,00,000 equity shares of ₹ 100 each. 2,00,000 equity shares of the company are held by Central Government and 1,20,000 equity shares are held by Government of Maharashtra. Explain with reference to relevant provisions of the Companies Act, 2013, whether SK Infrastructure Limited can be treated as Government Company.

Ans

Government Company [Section 2(45) of the Companies Act, 2013]: Government Company means any company in which not less than 51% of the paid-up share capital is held by-

- (i) the Central Government, or
 - (ii) by any State Government or Governments, or
 - (iii) partly by the Central Government and partly by one or more State Governments,
- and the section includes a company which is a subsidiary company of such a Government company.

In the instant case, paid up share capital of SK Infrastructure Limited is 6,00,000 equity shares of ₹ 100 each. 200,000 equity shares are held by Central government and 1,20,000 equity shares are held by Government of Maharashtra. The holding of equity shares by both government is 3,20,000 which is more than 51% of total paid up equity shares.

Hence, SK Infrastructure Limited is a Government company.



Case Study#20

ABC Limited was registered as a public company. There were 245 members in the company. Their details are as follows:

Directors and their relatives		190
Employees		15
Ex-employees (shares were allotted when they were employees)	20	
Others		20

(Including 10 joint holders holding shares jointly in the name of father and son)
The Board of directors of the company propose to convert it into a private company. Advice whether reduction in the number of members is necessary for conversion.

Ans

In the given case, ABC Limited was having 245 members in the company. The Board of Directors of said company proposes to convert it into private company. In lines with Section 2 (68) of the Companies Act, 2013, a private company by its Articles, limits the number of its members to 200.

Provided that, where two or more persons hold one or more shares in a company jointly, they shall, for the purposes of this clause, be treated as a single member.

It is further provided that, following persons shall not be included in the number of members-

- (i) Persons who are in the employment of the company; and
- (ii) Persons, who, having been formerly in the employment of the company, were members of the company while in that employment and have continued to be members after the employment ceased.

As per the facts, ABC Limited has members constituting of Directors & their relatives, employees, Ex-employees and others including 10 joint holders. In line with the requirement for being a private company, following shall be restricted to be as members i.e., Directors & their relatives & joint holders holding shares jointly constituting 200 members (190+10).

Accordingly, ABC Limited when converted to private company shall not be required to reduce the number of members as the number of members as per requirement of a private company, is fulfilled that is of maximum 200 members.

Case Study#21

ABC Limited has allotted equity shares with voting rights to XYZ Limited worth ` 15 Crores and issued Non-Convertible Debentures worth ` 40 Crores during the Financial Year 2019-20. After that total Paid-up Equity Share Capital of the company is ` 100 Crores and Non-Convertible Debentures stands at ` 120 Crores.

Define the Meaning of Associate Company and comment on whether ABC Limited and XYZ Limited would be called Associate Company as per the provisions of the Companies Act, 2013?

Ans

As per Section 2(6) of the Companies Act, 2013, an Associate Company in relation to another company, means a company in which that other company has a significant influence, bpartmersut which is not a subsidiary company of the company having such influence and includes a joint venture company.

The term “significant influence” means control of at least 20% of total share capital, or control of business decisions under an agreement.



The term “Total Share Capital”, means the aggregate of the -

- (a) Paid-up equity share capital; and
- (b) Convertible preference share capital.

In the given case, as ABC Ltd. has allotted equity shares with voting rights to XYZ Limited of ₹ 15 crore, which is less than requisite control of 20% of total share capital (i.e. 100 crore) to have a significant influence of XYZ Ltd. Since the said requirement is not complied, therefore ABC Ltd. and XYZ Ltd. are not associate companies as per the Companies Act, 2013. Holding/allotment of non-convertible debentures has no relevance for ascertaining significant influence.

Case Study#22

The paid-up capital of Ram Private Limited is ₹ 10 Crores in the form of 7,00,000 Equity Shares of ₹ 100 each and 3,00,000 Preference Shares of ₹ 100 each. Lakhan Private Limited is holding 3,00,000 Equity Shares and 3,00,000 Preference Shares in Ram Private Limited. State with reason, Whether Ram Private Limited is subsidiary of Lakhan Private Limited?

Ans

According to Section 2(87) of Companies Act, 2013 “subsidiary company” in relation to any other company (that is to say the holding company), means a company in which the holding company—

- (i) controls the composition of the Board of Directors; or
- (ii) exercises or controls more than one-half of the total voting power either at its own or together with one or more of its subsidiary companies:

For the purposes of this section —

- (i) the composition of a company’s Board of Directors shall be deemed to be controlled by another company if that other company by exercise of some power exercisable by it at its discretion can appoint or remove all or a majority of the directors;
- (ii) the expression “company” includes anybody corporate;

It is to be noted that Preference share capital will also be considered if preference shareholders have same voting rights as equity shareholders.

In the instant case, Ram Private Limited is having paid-up capital of ₹ 10 Crores in the form of 7,00,000 Equity Shares of ₹ 100 each and 3,00,000 Preference Shares of ₹ 100 each. Lakhan Private Limited is holding 3,00,000 Equity Shares and 3,00,000 Preference Shares in Ram Private Limited.

As in the given problem it is not clear that whether Preference Shares are having voting rights or not, it can be taken that there is no voting right with these shares. On the basis of provisions of Section 2(87) and facts of the given problem, Lakhan Private Limited is holding 3,00,000 Equity Shares of total equity paid up share capital of Ram Private Limited. Therefore, as Lakhan Private Limited does not exercises or controls more than one-half of the total voting power in Ram Private Limited, Ram Private Limited is not subsidiary of Lakhan Private Limited.

Case Study#23

Five persons are the only members of a private company Flower Fans Limited. All of them go in a boat on a pleasure trip into an open sea. The boat capsizes and all the 5 die being drowned.

- (a) Is the private company Flower Fans Limited no longer in existence?
- (b) Further is it correct to say that a company being an artificial person cannot own property and cannot sue or be sued? Explain with reference to the provisions of Companies Act, 2013.



Ans

(a) Perpetual Succession – A company on incorporation becomes a separate legal entity. It is an artificial legal person and have perpetual succession which means even if all the members of a company die, the company still continues to exist. It has permanent existence.

In the instant case, five persons who were the only members of private company and they have died being drowned in the sea. The existence of a company is independent of the lives of its members. It has a perpetual succession. In this problem, the company will continue as a legal entity. The company's existence is in no way affected by the death of all its members.

(b) The statement given is incorrect. A company is an artificial person as it is created by a process other than natural birth. It is legal or judicial as it is created by law. It is a person since it is clothed with all the rights of an individual. Further, the company being a separate legal entity can own property, have banking account, raise loans, incur liabilities and enter into contracts. Even members can contract with company, acquire right against it or incur liability to it. It can sue and be sued in its own name. It can do everything which any natural person can do except be sent to jail, take an oath, marry or practice a learned profession. Hence, it is a legal person in its own sense.

Case Study#24

Jagannath Oils Limited is a public company and having 220 members of which 25 members were employee in the company during the period 1st April, 2006 to 28th June 2016. They were allotted shares in Jagannath Oils Limited first time on 1st July, 2007 which were sold by them 1st August, 2016. After some time, on 1st December, 2016, each of those 25 members acquired shares in Jagannath Oils Limited which they are holding till date. Now company wants to convert itself into a private company. State with reasons:

(I) Whether Jagannath Oils Limited is required to reduce the number of members.

(II) Would your answer be different if above 25 members were the employee in Jagannath Oils Limited for the period from 1st April, 2006 to 28th June, 2017?

Ans

According to Section 2(68) of Companies Act, 2013, "Private company" means a company having a minimum paid-up share capital as may be prescribed, and which by its articles,—

(i) restricts the right to transfer its shares;

(ii) except in case of One Person Company, limits the number of its members to two hundred: Provided that where two or more persons hold one or more shares in a company jointly, they shall, for the purposes of this clause, be treated as a single member:

Provided further that—

(A) persons who are in the employment of the company; and

(B) persons who, having been formerly in the employment of the company, were members of the company while in that employment and have continued to be members after the employment ceased,

shall not be included in the number of members; and

(iii) prohibits any invitation to the public to subscribe for any securities of the company.

(I) Following the provisions of Section 2(68), 25 members were employees of the company but not during present membership which was started from 1st December 2016 i.e. after the date on which these 25 members were ceased to the employee in Jagannath Oils Limited. Hence, they will be considered as members for the purpose of the limit of 200 members. The company is required to reduce the number of members before converting it into a private company.

(II) On the other hand, if those 25 members were ceased to be employee on 28th June 2017, they were employee at the time of getting present membership. Hence, they will not be counted as members for the purpose of the limit of 200 members and the total number of members for the purpose of this sub-section will be 195. Therefore, Jagannath Oils Limited is not required to reduce the number of members before converting it into a private company.



Case Study#25

Manicar Limited has allotted equity shares with voting rights to Nanicar Limited worth ₹ 10 Crores and issued Non-Convertible Debentures worth ₹ 30 Crores during the Financial Year 2017-18. After that total Paid-up Equity Share Capital of the company is ₹ 100 Crores and Non-Convertible Debentures stands at ₹ 150 Crores.

Define the Meaning of Associate Company and comment on whether Manicar Limited and Nanicar Limited would be called Associate Company as per the provisions of the Companies Act, 2013?

Ans

As per Section 2(6) of the Companies Act, 2013, an Associate Company in relation to another company, means a company in which that other company has a significant influence, but which is not a subsidiary company of the company having such influence and includes a joint venture company. The term “significant influence” means control of at least 20% of total share capital, or control of business decisions under an agreement.

The term “Total Share Capital”, means the aggregate of the -

- (a) Paid-up equity share capital; and
- (b) Convertible preference share capital.

In the given case, as Manicar Ltd. has allotted equity shares with voting rights to Nanicar Limited of Rs. 10 crores, which is less than requisite control of 20% of total share capital (i.e. 100 crore) to have a significant influence of Nanicar Ltd. Since the said requirement is not complied, therefore Manicar Ltd. and Nanicar Ltd. are not associate companies as per the Companies Act, 2013.

Further holding/allotment of non-convertible debentures has no relevance for ascertaining significant influence. Hence the issue of non-convertible debentures will not make both the companies Associate Company.

Case Study#26

Mr. Dhruv was appointed as an employee in Sunmoon Timber Private Limited on the condition that if he was to leave his employment, he will not solicit customers of the company. After some time, he was fired from company. He set up his own business under proprietorship and undercut Sunmoon Timber Private Limited's prices. On the legal advice from his legal consultant and to refrain from the provisions of breach of contract, he formed a new company under the name Seven Stars Timbers Private Limited. In this company, his wife and a friend of Mr. Dhruv were the sole shareholders and directors. They took over Dhruv's business and continued it. Sunmoon Timber Private Limited files a suit against Seven Stars Timbers Private Limited for violation of contract. Seven Stars Timbers Private Limited argued that the contract was entered between Mr. Dhruv and Sunmoon Timber Private Limited and as company has separate legal entity, Seven Stars Timbers Private Limited has not violated the terms of agreement. Explain with reasons, whether separate legal entity between Mr. Dhruv and Seven Stars Timbers Private Limited will be disregarded?

Ans

It was decided by the court in the case of Gilford Motor Co. Vs. Horne, that if the company is formed simply as a mere device to evade legal obligations, though this is only in limited and discrete circumstances, courts can pierce the corporate veil. In other words, if the company is mere sham or cloak, the separate legal entity can be disregarded.

On considering the decision taken in Gilford Motor Co. Vs. Horne and facts of the problem given, it is very much clear that Seven Stars Timbers Private Limited was formed just to evade legal obligations of the agreement between Mr. Dhruv and Sunmoon Timber Private Limited. Hence, Seven Stars Timbers Private Limited is just a sham or cloak and separate legal entity between Mr. Dhruv and Seven Stars Timbers Private Limited should be disregarded.



Case Study#27

Narendra Motors Limited is a government company. Shah Auto Private Limited is a private company having share capital of ten crores in the form of ten lacs shares of ₹ 100 each. Narendra Motors Limited is holding five lacs five thousand shares in Shah Auto Private Limited. Shah Auto Private Limited claimed the status of Government Company. Advise as legal advisor, whether Shah Auto Private Limited is government company under the provisions of Companies Act, 2013?

Ans

According to the provisions of Section 2(45) of Companies Act, 2013, Government Company means any company in which not less than 51% of the paid-up share capital is held by-

- (i) the Central Government, or
 - (ii) by any State Government or Governments, or
 - (iii) partly by the Central Government and partly by one or more State Governments, and the section includes a company which is a subsidiary company of such a Government company.
- According to Section 2(87), “subsidiary company” in relation to any other company (that is to say the holding company), means a company in which the holding exercises or controls more than one-half of the total voting power either at its own or together with one or more of its subsidiary companies.

By virtue of provisions of Section 2(87) of Companies Act, 2013, Shah Auto Private Limited is a subsidiary company of Narendra Motors Limited because Narendra Motors Limited is holding more than one-half of the total voting power in Shah Auto Private Limited. Further as per Section 2(45), a subsidiary company of Government Company is also termed as Government Company. Hence, Shah Auto Private Limited being subsidiary of Narendra Motors Limited will also be considered as Government Company.

Case Study#28

Mr. A is an Indian citizen and his stay in India during immediately preceding financial year is for 115 days. He appoints Mr. B as his nominee who is a foreign citizen but has stayed in India for 130 days during immediately preceding financial year.

- (i) Is Mr. A eligible to be incorporated as a One Person Company (OPC). If yes, can he give the name of Mr. B in the memorandum of Association as his nominee to become the member after Mr. A’s incapacity to become a member.
- (ii) If Mr. A has contravened any of the provisions of the Act, what are the consequences?

Ans

As per the provisions of the Companies Act, 2013, only a natural person who is an Indian citizen and resident in India (person who stayed in India for a period of not less than 120 days during immediately preceding financial year) –

- Shall be eligible to incorporate an OPC
- Shall be a nominee for the sole member.

(i) In the given case, though Mr. A is an Indian citizen, his stay in India during the immediately preceding previous year is only 115 days which is below the requirement of 120 days. Hence Mr. A is not eligible to incorporate an OPC.

Also, even though Mr. B’s name is mentioned in the memorandum of Association as nominee and his stay in India during the immediately preceding financial year is more than 120 days, he is a foreign citizen and not an Indian citizen. Hence B’s name cannot be given as nominee in the memorandum.

(ii) Since Mr. A is not eligible to incorporate a One Person Company (OPC), he will be contravening the provisions, if he incorporates one. He shall be punishable with fine which may extent to ten thousand rupees and with a further fine which may extent to One thousand



Case Study #29

AK Private Limited has borrowed ₹ 36 crores from BK Finance Limited. However, as per memorandum of AK Private Limited the maximum borrowing power of the company is ₹ 30 crores. Examine, whether AK Private Limited is liable to pay this debt? State the remedy, if any available to BK Finance Limited.

Ans

This case is governed by the ‘Doctrine of Ultra Vires’. According to this doctrine, any act done or a contract made by the company which travels beyond the powers of the company conferred upon it by its Memorandum of Association is wholly void and inoperative in law and is therefore not binding on the company. This is because, the Memorandum of Association of the company is, in fact, its charter; it defines its constitution and the scope of the powers of the company. Hence, a company cannot depart from the provisions contained in the memorandum however imperative may be the necessity for the departure. Hence, any agreement ultra vires the company shall be null and void.

(i) Whether AK Private Limited is liable to pay the debt?

As per the facts given, AK Private Limited borrowed ₹ 36 crores from BK Finance Limited which is beyond its borrowing power of ₹ 30 crores.

Hence, contract for borrowing of ₹ 36 crores, being ultra vires the memorandum of association and thereby ultra vires the company, is void. AK Private Limited is not, therefore, liable to pay the debt.

(ii) Remedy available to BK Finance Limited:

In light of the legal position explained above, BK Finance Limited cannot enforce the said transaction and thus has no remedy against the company for recovery of the money lent. BK Finance limited may take action against the directors of AK Private Limited as it is the personal liability of its directors to restore the borrowed funds. Besides, BK Finance Limited

Case Study #30

BC Private Limited and its subsidiary KL Private Limited are holding 90,000 and 70,000 shares respectively in PQ Private Limited. The paid-up share capital of PQ Private Limited is ₹ 30 Lakhs (3 Lakhs equity shares of ₹ 10 each fully paid). Analyse with reference to provisions of the Companies Act, 2013 whether PQ Private Limited is a subsidiary of BC Private Limited. What would be your answer if KL Private Limited is holding 1,60,000 shares in PQ Private Limited and no shares are held by BC Private Limited in PQ Private Limited?

Ans

Section 2(87) defines “subsidiary company” in relation to any other company (that is to say the holding company), means a company in which the holding company—

(i) controls the composition of the Board of Directors; or

(ii) exercises or controls more than one-half of the total voting power either at its own or together with one or more of its subsidiary companies:

For the purposes of this section —

(I) a company shall be deemed to be a subsidiary company of the holding company even if the control referred to in sub-clause (i) or sub-clause (ii) is of another subsidiary company of the holding company;

(II) “layer” in relation to a holding company means its subsidiary or subsidiaries.

In the instant case, BC Private Limited together with its subsidiary KL Private Limited is holding 1,60,000 shares (90,000+70,000 respectively) which is more than one half in nominal value of the Equity Share Capital of PQ Private Limited. Hence, PQ Private Limited is subsidiary of BC Private Limited.



(ii) In the second case, the answer will remain the same. KL Private Limited is a holding 1,60,000 shares i.e., more than one half in nominal value of the Equity Share Capital of PQ Private Limited (i.e., holding more than one half of voting power). Hence, KL Private Limited is holding company of PQ Private Company and BC Private Limited is a holding company of KL Private Limited.

Hence, by virtue of Chain relationship, BC Private Limited becomes the holding company of PQ Private Limited.

Case Study #31

Jagannath Oils Limited is a public company and having 220 members. Of which 25 members were employee in the company during the period 1st April 2006 to 28th June 2016. They were allotted shares in Jagannath Oils Limited first time on 1st July 2007 which were sold by them on 1st August 2016. After some time, on 1st December 2016, each of those 25 members acquired shares in Jagannath Oils Limited which they are holding till date. Now company wants to convert itself into a private company. State with reasons:

(a) Whether Jagannath Oils Limited is required to reduce the number of members.

(b) Would your answer be different if above 25 members were the employee in Jagannath Oils Limited for the period from 1st April 2006 to 28th June 2017?

Ans

According to Section 2(68) of Companies Act, 2013, "Private company" means a company having a minimum paid-up share capital as may be prescribed, and which by its articles,—

(i) restricts the right to transfer its shares;

(ii) except in case of One Person Company, limits the number of its members to two hundred: Provided that where two or more persons hold one or more shares in a company jointly, they shall, for the purposes of this clause, be treated as a single member:

Provided further that—

(A) persons who are in the employment of the company; and

(B) persons who, having been formerly in the employment of the company, were members of the company while in that employment and have continued to be members after the employment ceased,

shall not be included in the number of members; and

Provided that where two or more persons hold one or more shares in a company jointly, they shall, for the purposes of this clause, be treated as a single member:

Provided further that—

(A) persons who are in the employment of the company; and

(B) persons who, having been formerly in the employment of the company, were members of the company while in that employment and have continued to be members after the employment ceased,

shall not be included in the number of members; and

(iii) prohibits any invitation to the public to subscribe for any securities of the company;

(a) Following the provisions of Section 2(68), 25 members were employees of the company but not during present membership which was started from 1st December 2016 i.e. after the date on which these 25 members were ceased to the employee in Jagannath Oils Limited. Hence, they will be considered as members for the purpose of the limit of 200 members. The company is required to reduce the number of members before converting it into a private company.

(b) On the other hand, if those 25 members were ceased to be employee on 28th June 2017, they were employee at the time of getting present membership. Hence, they will not be counted as members for the purpose of the limit of 200 members and the total number of members for the purpose of this sub-section will be 195. Therefore, Jagannath Oils Limited is not required to reduce the number of members before converting it into a private company.



Case Study #32

A, B and C has decided to set up a new club with name of ABC club having objects to promote welfare of Christian society. They planned to do charitable work or social activity for promoting the art work of economically weaker section of Christian society. The company obtained the status of section 8 company and started operating from 1st April, 2017 onwards.

However, on 30th September 2019, it was observed that ABC club was violating the objects of its objective clause due to which it was granted the status of section 8 Company under the Companies Act 2013.

Discuss what powers can be exercised by the central government against ABC club, in such a case?

Ans

Section 8 of the Companies Act, 2013 deals with the formation of companies which are formed to promote the charitable objects of commerce, art, science, education, sports etc. Such company intends to apply its profit in promoting its objects. Section 8 companies are registered by the Registrar only when a license is issued by the Central Government to them.

Since ABC Club was a Section 8 company and it was observed on 30th September, 2019 that it had started violating the objects of its objective clause. Hence in such a situation the following powers can be exercised by the Central Government:

- (i) The Central Government may by order revoke the licence of the company where the company contravenes any of the requirements or the conditions of this sections subject to which a licence is issued or where the affairs of the company are conducted fraudulently, or violative of the objects of the company or prejudicial to public interest, and on revocation the Registrar shall put 'Limited' or 'Private Limited' against the company's name in the register. But before such revocation, the Central Government must give it a written notice of its intention to revoke the licence and opportunity to be heard in the matter.
- (ii) Where a licence is revoked, the Central Government may, by order, if it is satisfied that it is essential in the public interest, direct that the company be wound up under this Act or amalgamated with another company registered under this section. However, no such order shall be made unless the company is given a reasonable opportunity of being heard.
- (iii) Where a licence is revoked and where the Central Government is satisfied that it is essential in the public interest that the company registered under this section should be amalgamated with another company registered under this section and having similar objects, then, notwithstanding anything to the contrary contained in this Act, the Central Government may, by order, provide for such amalgamation to form a single company with such constitution, properties, powers, rights, interest, authorities and privileges and with such liabilities, duties and obligations as may be specified in the order.

Case Study #33

An employee Mr. Karan signed a contract with his employer company ABC Limited that he will not solicit the customers after leaving the employment from the company.

But after Mr. Karan left ABC Limited, he started up his own company PQR Limited and he started soliciting the customers of ABC Limited for his own business purposes. ABC Limited filed a case against Mr. Karan for breach of the employment contract and for soliciting their customers for own business. Mr. Karan contended that there is corporate veil between him, and his company and he should not be personally held liable for this.



In this context, the company ABC Limited seek your advice as to the meaning of corporate veil and when the veil can be lifted to make the owners liable for the acts done by a company?

Ans

Corporate Veil: Corporate Veil refers to a legal concept whereby the company is identified separately from the members of the company.

The term Corporate Veil refers to the concept that members of a company are shielded from liability connected to the company's actions. If the company incurs any debts or contravenes any laws, the corporate veil concept implies that members should not be liable for those errors. In other words, they enjoy corporate insulation.

Thus, the shareholders are protected from the acts of the company.

However, under certain exceptional circumstances the courts lift or pierce the corporate veil by ignoring the separate entity of the company and the promoters and other persons who have managed and controlled the affairs of the company. Thus, when the corporate veil is lifted by the courts, the promoters and persons exercising control over the affairs of the company are held personally liable for the acts and debts of the company.

The following are the cases where company law disregards the principle of corporate personality or the principle that the company is a legal entity distinct and separate from its shareholders or members:

- (i) To determine the character of the company i.e. to find out whether co-enemy or friend.
- (ii) To protect revenue/tax
- (iii) To avoid a legal obligation
- (iv) Formation of subsidiaries to act as agents
- (v) Company formed for fraud/improper conduct or to defeat law

Based on the above provisions and leading case law of Gilford Motor Co. Vs Horne, the company PQR Limited was created to avoid the legal obligation arising out of the contract, therefore that employee Mr. Karan and the company PQR Limited created by him should be treated as one and thus veil between the company and that person shall be lifted. Karan has formed the company for fraud/improper conduct or to defeat the law. Hence, he shall be personally held liable for the acts of the company.

Case Study #34

Rohan incorporated a "One Person Company". The memorandum of OPC indicates the name of his brother Vinod as the nominee of OPC. However, Vinod is starting his new business in abroad and needs to leave India permanently. Due to this fact, Vinod is withdrawing his consent of nomination in the said One Person Company. Taking into considerations the provisions of the Companies Act, 2013 answer the questions given below:-

- I. If it is mandatory for Vinod to withdraw his nomination in the said OPC
- II. Can Rohan make his 17 year old son as a nominee in such a case.

Ans

(A) Yes, it is mandatory for Vinod to withdraw his nomination in the said OPC as he is leaving India permanently as only a natural person who is an Indian citizen and resident in India or otherwise and has stayed in India for a period of not less than 120 days during the immediately preceding financial year shall be a nominee in OPC.

Since Vinod will not satisfy this condition, so he needs to withdraw his nomination.

(B) No, Rohan cannot make his 17 year old son as a nominee of his OPC as no minor shall become member or nominee of the OPC or can hold beneficial interest.



Case Study #35

ABC Limited was into sale and purchase of iron rods. This was the main object of the company mentioned in the Memorandum of Association. The company entered into a contract with Mr. John for some finance related work. Later on, the company repudiated the contract as being ultra vires.

With reference to the same, briefly explain the doctrine of “ultravires” under the Companies Act, 2013. What are the consequences of ultravires acts of the company?

Ans

Doctrine of ultra vires: The meaning of the term ultra vires is simply “beyond (their) powers”. The legal phrase “ultra vires” is applicable only to acts done in excess of the legal powers of the doers. This presupposes that the powers in their nature are limited. It is a fundamental rule of Company Law that the objects of a company as stated in its memorandum can be departed from only to the extent permitted by the Act, thus far and no further. In consequence, any act done or a contract made by the company which travels beyond the powers not only of the directors but also of the company is wholly void and inoperative in law and is therefore not binding on the company. On this account, a company can be restrained from employing its fund for purposes other than those sanctioned by the memorandum. Likewise, it can be restrained from carrying on a trade different from the one it is authorised to carry on.

The impact of the doctrine of ultra vires is that a company can neither be sued on an ultra vires transaction, nor can it sue on it. Since the memorandum is a “public document”, it is open to public inspection. Therefore, when one deals with a company one is deemed to know about the powers of the company. If in spite of this you enter into a transaction which is ultra vires the company, you cannot enforce it against the company.

An act which is ultra vires the company being void, cannot be ratified even by the unanimous consent of all the shareholders of the company.

Hence in the given case, ABC Limited cannot enter into a contract outside the purview of its object clause of memorandum of association as it becomes ultra vires and thus null and void.

Case Study #36

Mr. Raj formed a company with a capital of ₹ 50,000. He sold his business to another company for ₹ 40,000. For the payment of sale, he accepted shares worth ₹ 30,000 (3000 shares of ₹ 1 each). The balance 10,000 was considered as loan and Mr. Raj secured the amount by issue of debentures. His wife and three daughters took one share each. Owing to strike the company was wound up. The assets of the company were valued at ₹ 6000. The debts due to unsecured creditors were ₹ 8000.

Mr. Raj retained the entire sum of ₹ 6000 as part payment of loan. To this, the other creditors objected. Their contention was that a man could not own any money to himself, and the entire sum of ₹ 6000 should be paid to them.

Examine the rights of Mr. Raj and other creditors. Who will succeed?

Ans

Separate Legal Entity: Corporate Veil refers to a legal concept whereby the company is identified separately from the members of the company.

The term Corporate Veil refers to the concept that members of a company are shielded from liability connected to the company’s actions. If the company incurs any debts or contravenes any laws, the corporate veil concept implies that members should not be liable for those errors. In other words, they enjoy corporate insulation.

Thus, the shareholders are protected from the acts of the company. The leading case law of Saloman Vs Saloman and Company Limited, laid the foundation of concept of corporate veil or



independent corporate personality. A company is a person distinct and separate from its members.

Based on the above discussion and provisions, Mr. Raj was entitled to the assets of the company as he was a secured creditor of the company and the contention of the creditors that Mr. Raj and the company are one and same person is wrong.

Case Study #37

A transport company wanted to obtain licenses for its vehicles but could not obtain licenses if applied in its own name. It, therefore, formed a subsidiary company and the application for license was made in the name of the subsidiary company. The vehicles were to be transferred to the subsidiary company. Will the parent and the subsidiary company be treated as separate commercial units? Explain in the light of the provisions of the Companies Act, 2013.

Ans

If the subsidiary is formed to act as agent of the Principal Company, it may be deemed to have lost its individuality in favour of its principal. The veil of Corporate Personality is lifted and the principal will be held liable for the acts of subsidiary company.

The facts of the case are similar to the case of Merchandise Transport Limited vs. British Transport Commission (1982), wherein a transport company wanted to obtain licences for its vehicles but could not do so, if applied in its own name. It, therefore, formed a subsidiary company, and the application for the licence was made in the name of the subsidiary. The vehicles were to be transferred to the subsidiary company. Held, the parent and the subsidiary were held to be one commercial unit and the application for licences was rejected.

Hence, in this case the parent and the subsidiary company shall not be treated as separate commercial units.

Case Study #38

ABC Pvt Ltd, has been overstating expenditures in their Profit & Loss account for the past few years. On Inquiry, it was found that the mere purpose was to avoid tax. However, there was no fraudulent intentions. Should the corporate veil of the company be lifted? Kindly justify.

Ans

Corporate veil refers to the concept that members of a company are shielded from liability connected to the company's action. It is the legal concept whereby the company is identified separately from the members of the company. However, under the below circumstances, the company law disregards the principle of corporate personality.

- To determine the character of the company
- To protect revenue/tax
- To avoid a legal obligation
- Formation of subsidiaries to act as agents
- Company formed for fraud/improper conduct.

In the given scenario, though the intention of the company was not fraudulent to defeat law, it had the intention of avoiding taxes and protecting revenue.

Hence, corporate veil should be lifted and the principles of corporate personality will be disregarded.

Case Study #39

A Company registered under Section 8 of the Companies Act, 2013, has been consistently making profits for the past 5 years after a major change in the management structure. Few members contented that they are entitled to receive dividends. Can the company distribute dividend? If yes, what is the maximum percentage of dividend that can be distributed as per



provisions of the Companies Act, 2013? Also, to discuss this along with other regular matters, the company kept a general meeting by giving only 14 days' notice. Is this valid?

Ans

A company registered under Section 8 of the Companies Act, 2013 is prohibited from the payment of any dividends to its members.

Hence in the given case, the contention of the members to distribute dividend from the profits earned is wrong.

Also, Section 8 company is allowed to call a general meeting by giving 14 days instead of 21 days.

Case Study #40

Nolimit Private Company is incorporated as unlimited company having share capital of ₹ 10,00,000. One of its creditors, Mr. Samuel filed a suit against a shareholder Mr. Innocent for recovery of his debt against Nolimit Private Company. Mr. Innocent has given his plea in the court that he is not liable as he is just a shareholder. Explain, whether Mr. Samuel will be successful in recovering his dues from Mr. Innocent?

Ans

Section 2(92) of Companies Act, 2013, provides that an unlimited company means a company not having any limit on the liability of its members. The liability of each member extends to the whole amount of the company's debts and liabilities, but he will be entitled to claim contribution from other members. In case the company has share capital, the Articles of Association must state the amount of share capital and the amount of each share. So long as the company is a going concern the liability on the shares is the only liability which can be enforced by the company. The creditors can institute proceedings for winding up of the company for their claims. The official liquidator may call the members for their contribution towards the liabilities and debts of the company, which can be unlimited.

On the basis of above, it can be said that Mr. Samuel cannot directly claim his dues against the company from Mr. Innocent, the shareholder of the company even the company is an unlimited company. Mr. Innocent is liable upto his share capital. His unlimited liability will arise when official liquidator calls the members for their contribution towards the liabilities and debts of the company at the time of winding up of company.

Case Study #41

Articles of Association of XYZ Private Limited provides that Board of Directors can take the loan upto ₹ 50,00,000 for company by passing the Board Resolution. In the case where the loan amount is in excess of the said limit, Special Resolution is required to be passed in general meeting. Due to urgent need of funds, Board of Directors applied for loan in a reputed bank for ₹ 60,00,000 without passing the Special Resolution in the general meeting. Board of Directors gave an undertaking to bank that Special Resolution has been passed for such loan. The bank on believing on such undertaking lend the money. On demanding the repayment of loan, company denied the payment as the act was ultra vires to company. Advise.

Ans

According to doctrine of Indoor Management, persons dealing with the Company are presumed to have read the registered documents and to see that the proposed dealing is not inconsistent therewith, but they are not bound to do more; they need not enquire into the regularity of internal proceedings as required by M & A. This was also decided in case of Royal British Bank Vs. Turquand.



In the instant case, Articles of Association of XYZ Private Limited have taken loan from reputed bank for ₹ 60,00,000 by passing Board Resolution while Special Resolution was necessary for such amount. Board of Directors gave an undertaking to bank that Special Resolution has been passed for such loan. The bank on believing on such undertaking lends the money.

On the basis of provisions of doctrine of Indoor Management, the bank can claim the amount of his loan from the company. The bank can believe on the undertaking given by board and no need to enquire further.

Case Study #42

Mr. R is an Indian citizen, and his stay in India during the immediately preceding financial year is for 130 days. He appoints Mr. S, a foreign citizen, as his nominee, who has stayed in India for 125 days during the immediately preceding financial year. Is Mr. R eligible to be incorporated as a One - Person Company (OPC)? If yes, can he give the name of Mr. S in the Memorandum of Association as his nominee? Justify your answers with relevant provisions of the Companies Act, 2013.

Ans

As per the provisions of the Companies Act, 2013, only a natural person who is an Indian citizen and resident in India (person who stayed in India for a period of not less than 120 days during immediately preceding financial year) –

- Shall be eligible to incorporate an OPC
- Shall be a nominee for the sole member.

In the given case, Mr. R is an Indian citizen and his stay in India during the immediately preceding financial year is 130 days which is above the requirement of 120 days. Hence, Mr. R is eligible to incorporate an OPC.

Also, even though Mr. S's name is mentioned in the Memorandum of Association as nominee and his stay in India during the immediately preceding financial year is more than 120 days, he is a foreign citizen and not an Indian citizen. Hence, S's name cannot be given as nominee in the memorandum.

Case Study #43

The Articles of Association of Aarna Limited empowers its managing agents to borrow loans on behalf of the company. Ms. Anika, the director of the company, borrowed ₹ 18 Lakhs in name of the company from Quick Finance Limited, a non-banking finance company. Later on, Aarna Limited refused to repay the money borrowed on the pretext that no resolution authorizing such loan have been actually passed by the company and therefore the company is not liable to pay such loan.

Decide whether the contention of Aarna Limited is correct in accordance with the provisions of the Companies Act, 2013?

Ans

Doctrine of Indoor Management

According to this doctrine, persons dealing with the company need not inquire whether internal proceedings relating to the contract are followed correctly, once they are satisfied that the transaction is in accordance with the memorandum and articles of association. Stakeholders need not enquire whether the necessary meeting was convened and held properly or whether necessary resolution was passed properly. They are entitled to take it for granted that the company had gone through all these proceedings in a regular manner.



The doctrine helps to protect the external members from the company and states that the people are entitled to presume that internal proceedings are as per documents submitted with the Registrar of Companies.

Thus,

1. What happens internal to a company is not a matter of public knowledge. An outsider can only presume the intentions of a company, but do not know the information he/she is not privy to.
2. If not for the doctrine, the company could escape creditors by denying the authority of officials to act on its behalf.

In the given question, Quick Finance Limited being external to the company, need not enquire whether the necessary resolution was passed properly. Even if Aarna Limited claims that no resolution authorizing the loan was passed, Aarna Limited is bound to repay the loan to Quick Finance Limited.

Case Study #44

Mr. R is an Indian citizen, and his stay in India during the immediately preceding financial year is for 130 days. He appoints Mr. S, a foreign citizen, as his nominee, who has stayed in India for 125 days during the immediately preceding financial year. Is Mr. R eligible to be incorporated as a One-Person Company (OPC)? If yes, can he give the name of Mr. S in the Memorandum of Association as his nominee? Justify your answers with relevant provisions of the Companies Act, 2013.

Ans

As per the provisions of the Companies Act, 2013, only a natural person who is an Indian citizen and resident in India (person who stayed in India for a period of not less than 120 days during immediately preceding financial year) –

- Shall be eligible to incorporate an OPC
- Shall be a nominee for the sole member.

In the given case, Mr. R is an Indian citizen and his stay in India during the immediately preceding financial year is 130 days which is above the requirement of 120 days. Hence, Mr. R is eligible to incorporate an OPC.

Also, even though Mr. S's name is mentioned in the Memorandum of Association as nominee and his stay in India during the immediately preceding financial year is more than 120 days, he is a foreign citizen and not an Indian citizen. Hence, S's name cannot be given as nominee in the memorandum.

Case study #45

Sound Syndicate Ltd., a public company, its articles of association empowers the managing agents to borrow both short and long term loans on behalf of the company, Mr. Liddle, the director of the company, approached Easy Finance Ltd., a non banking finance company for a loan of ₹ 25,00,000 in name of the company.

The Lender agreed and provided the above said loan. Later on, Sound Syndicate Ltd. refused to repay the money borrowed on the pretext that no resolution authorizing such loan have been actually passed

by the company and the lender should have enquired about the same prior providing such loan hence company not liable to pay such loan.

Analyse the above situation in terms of the provisions of Doctrine of Indoor Management under the Companies Act, 2013 and examine whether the contention of Sound Syndicate Ltd. is correct or not?



Ans

Doctrine of Indoor Management

According to this doctrine, persons dealing with the company need not inquire whether internal proceedings relating to the contract are followed correctly, once they are satisfied that the transaction is in accordance with the memorandum and articles of association. Stakeholders need not enquire whether the necessary meeting was convened and held properly or whether necessary resolution was passed properly. They are entitled to take it for granted that the company had gone through all these proceedings in a regular manner.

The doctrine helps protect external members from the company and states that the people are entitled to presume that internal proceedings are as per documents submitted with the Registrar of Companies.

Thus,

1. What happens internal to a company is not a matter of public knowledge. An outsider can only presume the intentions of a company, but do not know the information he/she is not privy to.
2. If not for the doctrine, the company could escape creditors by denying the authority of officials to act on its behalf.

Case study #46

Examine the following whether they are correct or incorrect along with reasons:

- (a) A company being an artificial person cannot own property and cannot sue or be sued.
- (b) A private limited company must have a minimum of two members, while a public limited company must have at least seven members.

Ans

(a) A company being an artificial person cannot own property and cannot sue or be sued
Incorrect: A company is an artificial person as it is created by a process other than natural birth. It is legal or judicial as it is created by law. It is a person since it is clothed with all the rights of an individual.

Further, the company being a separate legal entity can own property, have banking account, raise loans, incur liabilities and enter into contracts. Even members can contract with company, acquire right against it or incur liability to it. It can sue and be sued in its own name. It can do everything which any natural person can do except be sent to jail, take an oath, marry or practice a learned profession. Hence, it is a legal person in its own sense.

- (c) A private limited company must have a minimum of two members, while a public limited company must have at least seven members.

Correct: Section 3 of the Companies Act, 2013 deals with the basic requirement with respect to the constitution of the company. In the case of a public company, any 7 or more persons can form a company for any lawful purpose by subscribing their names to memorandum and complying with the requirements of this Act in respect of registration. In exactly the same way, 2 or more persons can form a private company.



Case study #47

Articles of Association of XYZ Private Limited provides that Board of Directors (BOD) can take the loan upto ₹ 5,00,000 for Company by passing the board resolution. In that case, the loan amount is in excess of the limit, special resolution is required to be passed in general meeting. Due to urgent needs of funds, BOD applied for loan in a reputed bank for ₹ 10,00,000 without passing the resolution in the general meeting. BOD gave an undertaking to bank that Special Resolution has been passed for such loan. The bank on believing on such undertaking lend the money. On demanding the repayment of loan, company denied the payment as act was ultra vires to company. Kindly, advise.

Ans

According to doctrine of Indoor Management, persons dealing with the Company are presumed to have read the registered documents and to see that the proposed dealing is not inconsistent therewith, but they are not bound to do more; they need not enquire into the regularity of internal proceedings as required by Memorandum and Articles. This was also decided in case of Royal British Bank Vs. Turquand.

In the instant case, XYZ Private Limited have taken loan from reputed bank for ₹ 10,00,000 by passing Board Resolution while Special Resolution was necessary for such amount. BOD gave an undertaking to bank that Special Resolution has been passed for such loan. The bank on believing on such undertaking lends the money. On demanding the repayment of loan, company denied the payment as act was ultra vires to company.

On the basis of provisions of doctrine of indoor management, the bank can claim the amount of his loan from the company. The bank can believe on the undertaking given by board and no need to enquire further.

Case study #48

Mr. R, a manufacturer of toys approached MNO Private Limited for supply of raw material worth ₹ 1,50,000/-. Mr. R was offered a credit period of one month. Mr. R went to the company prior to the due date and met Mr. C, an employee at the billing counter, who convinced the former that the payment can be made to him as the billing-cashier is on leave.

Mr. R paid the money and was issued a signed and sealed receipt by Mr. C. After the lapse of due date, Mr. R received a recovery notice from the company for the payment of ₹ 1,50,000/-. Mr. R informed the company that he has already paid the above amount and being an outsider had genuine reasons to trust Mr. C who claimed to be an employee and had issued him a receipt.

The Company filed a suit against Mr. R for non-payment of dues. Discuss the fate of the suit and the liability of Mr. R towards company as on current date in consonance with the provision of the Companies Act 2013? Would your answer be different if a receipt under the company seal was not issued by Mr. C after receiving payment?

Ans

(i) Fate of the suit and the liability of Mr. R towards the company:

Doctrine of the Indoor Management

According to the Doctrine of the Indoor Management, the outsiders are not deemed to have notice of the internal affairs of the company. They are entitled to assume that the acts of the directors or other officers of the company are validly performed, if they are within the scope of their apparent authority. So long as an act is valid under the articles, if done in a particular manner, an outsider dealing with the company is entitled to assume that it has been done in the manner required. This is the indoor management rule, that the company's indoor affairs are the company's problem. This rule has been laid down in the landmark case-the Royal British Bank vs. Turquand. (Known as "Turquand Rule")



In the instant case, Mr. R is not liable to pay the amount of ₹ 1,50,000 to MNO Private Limited as he had genuine reasons to trust Mr. C, an employee of the company who had issued him a signed and sealed receipt.

(ii) Liability of Mr. R in case no receipt is issued by Mr. C:

Exceptions to doctrine of indoor management: Suspicion of irregularity is an exception to the doctrine of indoor management. The doctrine of indoor management, in no way, rewards those who behave negligently. It is the duty of the outsider to make necessary enquiry, if the transaction is not in the ordinary course of business.

If a receipt under the company seal was not issued by Mr. C after receiving payment, Mr. R is liable to pay the said amount as this will be deemed to be a negligence on the part of Mr. R and it is his duty to make the necessary enquiry to check that whether Mr. C is eligible to take the payment or not.

Case study #49

Mr. Mohan had purchased some goods from Sunflower Limited on credit. A credit period of one month was allowed to Mr. Mohan. Before the due date, Mr. Mohan went to the company and wanted to repay the amount due from him. He found only Mr. Ramesh there, who was the factory supervisor of the company. Mr. Ramesh told Mr. Mohan that the Accountant and the cashier are on leave, he is in-charge of receiving money and he may pay the amount to him. Mr. Ramesh issued a money receipt under his signature. After two months, Sunflower limited issued a notice to Mr. Mohan for non-payment of the dues within the stipulated period. Mr. Mohan informed the company that he had already cleared the dues and he is no more responsible for the same. He also contended that Mr. Ramesh is an employee of the company whom he had made the payment and being an outsider, he trusted the words of Mr. Ramesh as duty distribution is a job of the internal management of the company. Analyse the situation and decide whether Mr. Mohan is free from his liability.

Ans

Doctrine of Indoor Management: The Doctrine of Indoor Management is the exception to the Doctrine of Constructive Notice. The Doctrine of Constructive Notice does not mean that outsiders are deemed to have notice of the internal affairs of the company. For instance, if an act is authorised by the Articles or Memorandum, an outsider is entitled to assume that all the detailed formalities for doing that act have been observed.

The doctrine of Indoor Management is important to persons dealing with a company through its directors or other persons. They are entitled to assume that the acts of the directors or other officers of the company are validly performed, if they are within the scope of their apparent authority. So long as an act is valid under the articles, if done in a particular manner, an outsider dealing with the company is entitled to assume that it has been done in the manner required.

In the given question, Mr. Mohan has made payment to Mr. Ramesh and he (Mr. Ramesh) gave to receipt of the same to Mr. Mohan. Thus, it will be rightful on part of Mr. Mohan to assume that Mr. Ramesh was also authorised to receive money on behalf of the company. Hence, Mr. Mohan will be free from liability for payment of goods purchased from Sunflower Limited, as he has paid amount due to an employee of the company.

Case study #50

Mr. Rajeev, an assessee, was a wealthy man earning huge income by way of dividend and interest. He formed three Private Companies and agreed with each to hold a bloc of investment as an agent for them. The dividend and interest income received by the companies was handed back to Mr. Rajeev as a pretended loan. This way, Mr. Rajeev divided his income into three parts in a bid to reduce his tax liability.

Decide, for what purpose the three companies were established? Whether the legal personality of all the three companies may be disregarded.



Ans

The House of Lords in Salomon Vs. Salomon & Co. Ltd. laid down that a company is a person distinct and separate from its members, and therefore, has an independent separate legal existence from its members who have constituted the company. But under certain circumstances the separate entity of the company may be ignored by the courts. When that happens, the courts ignore the corporate entity of the company and look behind the corporate facade and hold the persons in control of the management of its affairs liable for the acts of the company. Where a company is incorporated and formed by certain persons only for the purpose of evading taxes, the courts have discretion to disregard the corporate entity and tax the income in the hands of the appropriate assessee.

1. The problem asked in the question is based upon the aforesaid facts. The three companies were formed by the assessee purely and simply as a means of avoiding tax and the companies were nothing more than the facade of the assessee himself. Therefore, the whole idea of Mr. Rajeev was simply to split his income into three parts with a view to evade tax. No other business was done by the company.

2. The legal personality of the three private companies may be disregarded because the companies were formed only to avoid tax liability. It carried on no other business, but was created simply as a legal entity to ostensibly receive the dividend and interest and to hand them over to the assessee as pretended loans. The same was upheld in Re Sir Dinshaw Maneckjee Petit and Juggilal vs. Commissioner of Income Tax.

Case study #51

Aqua Limited was registered as a public company. There are 230 members in the company as noted below:

- (a) Directors and their relatives 190
- (b) Employees 15
- (c) Ex-Employees (Shares were allotted when they were employees 10
- (d) 5 couples holding shares jointly in the name of husband and wife (5*2) 10
- (e) Others 5

The Board of Directors of the company proposes to convert it into a private company. Also advise whether reduction in the number of members is necessary.

Ans

According to section 2(68) of the Companies Act, 2013, "Private company" means a company having a minimum paid-up share capital as may be prescribed, and which by its articles, except in case of One Person Company, limits the number of its members to two hundred.

However, where two or more persons hold one or more shares in a company jointly, they shall, for the purposes of this clause, be treated as a single member.

It is further provided that -

(A) persons who are in the employment of the company; and

(B) persons who, having been formerly in the employment of the company, were members of the company while in that employment and have continued to be members after the employment ceased,

shall not be included in the number of members.

In the instant case, Aqua Limited may be converted into a private company only if the total members of the company are limited to 200.

Total Number of members:

Directors and their relatives	190
5 Couples (5*1)	5
Others	5
Total	200

Therefore, there is no need for reduction in the number of members since existing number of members are 200 which does not exceed maximum limit of 200.



Case study #51

ABC Private Limited is a registered company under the Companies Act, 2013 with paid up capital of ₹ 35 lakhs and turnover of ₹ 2.5 crores. Whether the ABC Private Limited can avail the status of a Small Company in accordance with the provisions of the Companies Act, 2013? Also discuss the meaning of a Small Company.

Ans

Small Company: Small Company as defined under Section 2(85) of the Companies Act, 2013 means a company, other than a public company—

- (i) paid-up share capital of which does not exceed ₹ 4 crore or such higher amount as may be prescribed which shall not be more than ₹ 10 crore; and
- (ii) turnover of which as per profit and loss account for the immediately preceding financial year does not exceed ₹ 40 Crore or such higher amount as may be prescribed which shall not be more than ₹ 100 crore:

Exceptions: This clause shall not apply to:

- (A) a holding company or a subsidiary company;
- (B) a company registered under section 8; or
- (C) a company or body corporate governed by any special Act.

In the instant case, since the paid-up capital of ABC Private Limited is ₹ 35 Lakhs and turnover is ₹ 2.5 crore, it can avail the status of a small company as both the requirements with regard to paid-up share capital as well as turnover are fulfilled by the Company.

