

PAPER – 2 : CORPORATE & OTHER LAW

Question No. 1 is compulsory.

Attempt any **four** questions from the remaining **five** questions.

Question 1

- (a) A Ltd. issued 1,00,000 equity shares of ₹ 100 each at par to the public by issuing a prospectus. The prospectus discloses the minimum subscription amount of ₹ 15,00,000 required to be received on application of shares and share application money shall be payable at ₹ 20 per share. The prospectus further reveals that A Ltd. has applied for listing of shares in 3 recognized stock exchanges of which 1 application has been rejected. The issue was fully subscribed and A Ltd. received an amount of ₹ 20,00,000 on share application. A Ltd., then proceeded for allotment of shares.

Examine the three disclosures in the above case study which are the deciding factors in an allotment of shares and the consequences for violation, if any under the provisions of the Companies Act, 2013. **(6 Marks)**

- (b) (i) Three chartered accountants, Mr. Robert, Mr. Ram and Mrs. Rohini, formed a Limited Liability Partnership under the Limited Liability Partnership Act, 2008 in the name of 'R & Associates LLP', practicing chartered accountants. SR Ltd. intends to appoint 'R & Associates LLP' as auditors of the company.

Examine the validity of the proposal of SR Ltd. to appoint 'R & Associates LLP', a body corporate, as an auditor of the company as per the provisions of the Companies Act, 2013. **(3 Marks)**

- (ii) A company received a proxy form 54 hours before the time fixed for the start of the meeting. The company refused to accept the proxy form on the ground that the Articles of the company provided that a proxy form must be filed 60 hours before the start of the meeting. Define proxy and decide under the provisions of the Companies Act, 2013, whether the proxy holder can compel the company to admit the proxy in this case? **(3 Marks)**

- (c) Radheshyam borrowed a sum of ₹ 50,000 from a Bank on the security of gold on 1.07.2019 under an agreement which contains a clause that the bank shall have a right of particular lien on the gold pledged with it. Radheshyam thereafter took an unsecured loan of ₹ 20,000 from the same bank on 1.08.2019 for three months. On 30.09.2019 he repaid entire secured loan of ₹ 50,000 and requested the bank to release the gold pledged with it. The Bank decided to continue the lien on the gold until the unsecured loan is fully repaid by Radheshyam. Decide whether the decision of the Bank is valid within the provisions of the Indian Contract Act, 1872 ? **(4 Marks)**

- (d) Referring to the provisions of the Negotiable Instruments Act, 1881, examine the validity of the following:

A Bill of Exchange originally drawn by R for a sum of ₹ 10,000 but accepted by S only for ₹ 7,000. **(3 Marks)**

Answer

- (a) As per the requirement of the question, disclosures which are the deciding factors in an allotment of shares are laid down in section 39 of the Companies Act, 2013.

According to Section 39(1), no allotment of any securities of a company offered to the public for subscription shall be made unless-

- the amount stated in the prospectus as the minimum amount has been subscribed, and
- the sums payable on application for the amount so stated have been paid to, and received by the company by cheque or other instrument.
- The amount payable on application on every security shall not be less than five per cent of the nominal amount of the security or such other percentage or amount, as may be specified by the Securities and Exchange Board by making regulations in this behalf.

In the question, A Ltd. issued shares to public by issuing of prospectus, disclosing minimum subscription, sum payable on application for the amount; and the amount received on share application is more than 5% of the nominal amount of the security.

Further, it revealed that A Ltd. has applied for listing of shares in 3 recognized stock exchanges of which one application was rejected.

In the given instance, there is compliance to section 23, as nothing is talked about matters required to be included in the prospectus under section 26 (1) and about filing with the registrar; assuming that the said requirements have been complied with, requirement of section 39 as regards obtaining of minimum subscription and the minimum amount receivable on application (not less than 5% of the nominal value of the securities offered) are fulfilled.

The provisions of section 40 of the Companies Act, 2013 states that every company making public offer shall, before making such offer, make an application to one or more recognized stock exchange or exchanges and obtain permission for the securities to be dealt with in such stock exchange or exchanges.

The above provision is very clear that not only the company has to apply for listing of the securities at a recognized stock exchange, but also obtain permission thereof from all the stock exchanges where it has applied, before making the public offer. Since one of the three recognized stock exchanges, where the company has applied for enlisting, has rejected the application and the company has proceeded with making the offer of shares, it has violated the provisions of section 40. Therefore, this shall be deemed to be irregular allotment of shares.

Consequently, A Ltd. shall be required to refund the application money to the applicants in the prescribed manner within the stipulated time frame.

- (b) (i) As per the provisions of Section 141 (3) of the Companies Act, 2013 read with Rule 10 of Companies (Audit and Auditors) Rule 2014, a body corporate other than a limited liability partnership registered under the Limited Liability Partnership Act, 2008 shall not be qualified for appointment as auditor of a company.

In the given case, proposal of SR Ltd. to appoint 'R & Associates LLP' as auditors of the company is valid as the restriction marked for appointment as auditor for a body corporate is not applicable to Limited Liability Partnership.

- (ii) Section 105 of the Companies Act, 2013 deals with the provisions of proxy for meetings.

Section 105(1) of the Act provides that any member of a company entitled to attend and vote at a meeting of the company shall be entitled to appoint another person as a proxy to attend and vote at the meeting on his behalf.

Further, Section 105(4) of the Act provides that a proxy received 48 hours before the meeting will be valid even if the articles provide for a longer period.

In the given case, the company received a proxy form 54 hours before the time fixed for start of the meeting. The Company refused to accept proxy on the ground that articles of the company provides filing of proxy before 60 hours of the meeting. In the said case, in line with requirement of the above stated legal provision, a proxy received 48 hours before the meeting will be valid even if the articles provide for a longer period. Accordingly, the proxy holder can compel the company to admit the proxy.

- (c) **General lien of bankers:** According to section 171 of the Indian Contract Act, 1872, bankers, factors, wharfingers, attorneys of a High Court and policy brokers may, in the absence of a contract to the contrary, retain, as a security for a general balance of account any goods bailed to them; but no other persons have a right to retain, as a security for such balance, goods bailed to them, unless there is an express contract to the effect.

Section 171 empowers the banker with general right of lien in absence of a contract whereby it is entitled to retain the goods belonging to another party, until all the dues are discharged. Here, in the first instance, the banker under an agreement has a right of particular lien on the gold pledged with it against the first secured loan of ₹ 50,000/-, which has already been fully repaid by Radheshyam. Accordingly, Bank's decision to continue the lien on the gold until the unsecured loan of ₹ 20,000/- (which is the second loan) is not valid.

- (d) As per the provisions of Section 86 of the Negotiable Instruments Act, 1881, if the holder of a bill of exchange acquiesces in a qualified acceptance, or one limited to part of the

sum mentioned in the bill, or which substitutes a different place or time for payment, or which, where the drawees are not partners, is not signed by all the drawees, all previous parties whose consent is not obtained to such acceptance are discharged as against the holder and those claiming under him, unless on notice given by the holder they assent to such acceptance.

Explanation to the above section states that an acceptance is qualified where it undertakes the payment of part only of the sum ordered to be paid.

In view of the above provisions, the bill, which has been drawn by R for ₹ 10,000/-, has been accepted by S only for ₹ 7,000/-. It is a clear case of qualified acceptance, which may either be rejected by R or he may give assent to the acceptance of ₹ 7,000/- only.

Question 2

- (a) *RS Ltd. received share application money of ₹ 50.00 Lakh on 01.06.2019 but failed to allot shares within the prescribed time limit.*

The share application money of ₹ 5.00 Lakh received from Mr. Khanna, a customer of the Company, was refunded by way of book adjustment towards the dues payable by him to the company on 30.07.2019. The Company Secretary of RS Ltd. reported to the Board that the entire amount of ₹ 50.00 Lakh shall be deemed to be 'Deposits' as on 31.07.2019 and the Company is required to comply with the provisions of the Companies Act, 2013 applicable to acceptance of deposits in relation to this amount.

You are required to examine the validity of the reporting of the Company Secretary in the light of the relevant provisions of the Companies Act, 2013. **(4 Marks)**

- (b) (i) *The Board of Directors of Dilip Telelinks Ltd. consists of Mr. Choksey, Mr. Patel (Directors) and Mr. Shukla (Managing Director). The company has also employed a full time Secretary. The Profit and Loss Account and Balance Sheet were signed by Mr. Choksey and Mr. Patel. Examine whether the authentication of financial statements of the company is in accordance with the provisions of the Companies Act, 2013 ?* **(3 Marks)**
- (ii) *X Ltd. is a listed company having a paid-up share capital of ₹ 25 crore as at 31st March, 2019 and turnover of ₹ 100 crore during the financial year 2018-19. The Company Secretary has advised the Board of Directors that X Ltd. is not required to appoint 'Internal Auditor' as the company's paid up share capital and turnover are less than the threshold limit prescribed under the Companies Act, 2013. Do you agree with the advice of the Company Secretary? Explain your view referring to the provisions of the Companies Act, 2013.* **(3 Marks)**
- (c) *Explain whether the agency shall be terminated in the following cases under the provisions of the Indian Contract Act, 1872:*
- (i) *A gives authority to B to sell A's land, and to pay himself, out of the proceeds, the debts due to him from A. Afterwards, A becomes insane.*

- (ii) *A appoints B as A's agent to sell A's land. B, under the authority of A, appoints C as agent of B. Afterwards, A revokes the authority of B but not of C. What is the status of agency of C ?* **(4 Marks)**
- (d) *A promissory note specifies that three months after, A will pay ₹ 10,000 to B or his order for value received. It is to be noted that no rate of interest has been stipulated in the promissory note. The promissory note falls due for payment on 01.09.2019 and paid on 31.10.2019 without any interest. Explaining the relevant provisions under the Negotiable Instruments Act, 1881, state whether B shall be entitled to claim interest on the overdue amount?* **(3 Marks)**

Answer

- (a) According to Rule 2(1)(c) of the Companies (Acceptance of Deposits) Rules, 2014, the following category of receipt is not considered as deposit:

Any amount received and held pursuant to an offer made in accordance with the provisions of the Companies Act, 2013 towards subscription to any securities, including share application money or advance towards allotment of securities, pending allotment, so long as such amount is appropriated only against the amount due on allotment of the securities applied for;

It is clarified by way of Explanation that if the securities for which application money or advance for such securities was received cannot be allotted within 60 days from the date of receipt of the application money or advance for such securities and such application money or advance is not refunded to the subscribers within 15 days from the date of completion of 60 days, such amount shall be treated as a deposit under these rules.

Further, it is clarified that any adjustment of the amount for any other purpose shall not be treated as refund.

In the given question, RS Limited has received ₹ 50 Lakhs as share application money on 01.06.2019. It failed to allot shares within the prescribed limit. Further, on 30.07.2019 the company adjusted the amount of ₹ 5 Lakhs received from Mr. Khanna (a customer of the company), by way of book adjustment towards the dues payable by him to the company.

In the light of the facts of the question and provisions of Law:

- (1) If such application money or advance is not refunded to the subscribers within 15 days from the date of completion of 60 days, such amount shall be treated as a deposit. In the question, the prescribed limit of 60 days will end on 31.07.2019 and the company has 15 more days to refund such application money to the subscribers. Otherwise, after lapse of such 15 days, the amount not so refunded will be treated as deposit. Hence, the Company Secretary of RS Limited is not correct in treating the entire amount of ₹ 50 Lac as 'Deposits' on 31.07.2019.

- (2) Any adjustment of the amount for any other purpose shall not be treated as refund. Thus, the amount of ₹ 5 Lakhs adjusted against payment due to be received from Mr. Khanna, cannot be treated as refund.
- (b) (i) According to Section 134(1) of the Companies Act, 2013, the financial statement, including consolidated financial statement, if any, shall be approved by the Board of Directors before they are signed on behalf of the Board by the chairperson of the company where he is authorised by the Board or by two directors out of which one shall be managing director, if any, and the Chief Executive Officer, the Chief Financial Officer and the company secretary of the company, wherever they are appointed, or in the case of One Person Company, only by one director, for submission to the auditor for his report thereon.

In the instant case, the Balance Sheet and Profit and Loss Account have been signed only by Mr. Choksey and Mr. Patel, the directors. In view of Section 134(1) of the Companies Act, 2013, Mr. Shukla, the Managing Director should have been one of the two signing directors.

Further, since the company has also employed a full-time Secretary, he should also sign the Balance Sheet and the Statement of Profit and Loss.

- (ii) According to the provisions of Section 138 of the Companies Act, 2013, read with Rule 13 of the Companies (Accounts) Rules, 2014, the following class of companies shall be required to appoint an internal auditor which may be either an individual or a partnership firm or a body corporate, namely:
- (1) every listed company;
 - (2) every unlisted public company having-
 - (A) paid up share capital of 50 crore rupees or more during the preceding financial year; or
 - (B) turnover of 200 crore rupees or more during the preceding financial year;
 - (C) outstanding loans or borrowings from banks or financial institutions exceeding one hundred crore rupees or more at any point of time during the preceding financial year; or
 - (D) outstanding deposits of twenty five crore rupees or more at any point of time during the preceding financial year.

Besides, some private companies are also required to appoint an internal auditor which may be either an individual or a partnership firm or a body corporate.

Thus, X limited (which is a listed company) is required to appoint an internal auditor, irrespective of its paid-up share capital or turnover (as the limit of paid-up share capital or turnover is applicable for unlisted public company).

Hence, the advice of the Company Secretary is not correct.

- (c) (i) According to section 202 of the Indian Contract Act, 1872, where the agent has himself an interest in the property which forms the subject matter of the agency, the agency cannot, in the absence of an express contract, be terminated to the prejudice of such interest.

In other words, when the agent is personally interested in the subject matter of agency, the agency becomes irrevocable.

In the given question, A gives authority to B to sell A's land, and to pay himself, out of the proceeds, the debts due to him from A.

As per the facts of the question and provision of law, A cannot revoke this authority, nor it can be terminated by his insanity.

- (ii) According to section 191 of the Indian Contract Act, 1872, a "Sub-agent" is a person employed by, and acting under the control of, the original agent in the business of the agency.

Section 210 provides that, the termination of the authority of an agent causes the termination (subject to the rules regarding the termination of an agent's authority) of the authority of all sub-agents appointed by him.

In the given question, B is the agent of A, and C is the agent of B. Hence, C becomes a sub-agent.

Thus, when A revokes the authority of B (agent), it results in termination of authority of sub-agent appointed by B i.e. C (sub-agent).

- (d) **When no rate of interest is specified in the instrument:** As per the provisions of Section 80 of the Negotiable Instruments Act, 1881, when no rate of interest is specified in the instrument, interest on the amount due thereon shall, notwithstanding any agreement relating to interest between any parties to the instrument, be calculated at the rate of eighteen per centum per annum, from the date at which the same ought to have been paid by the party charged, until tender or realization of the amount due thereon, or until such date after the institution of a suit to recover such amount as the Court directs.

In the given question, the promissory note falls due for payment on 1.9.2019 and was paid on 31.10.2019. The note does not mention any rate of interest, hence interest will be charged @ 18% p.a.

Thus, B shall be entitled to claim interest on the overdue amount for the period from 01.09.2019 to 31.10.2019, @ 18% p.a.

Question 3

- (a) *State the reasons for the issue of shares at premium or discount. Also write in brief the purposes for which the securities premium account can be utilized?* **(5 Marks)**
- (b) *Mr. R, holder of 1000 equity shares of ₹ 10 each of AB Ltd. approached the Company in the last week of September, 2019 with a claim for the payment of dividend of ₹ 2000*

declared @ 20% by the Company at its Annual General Meeting held on 31.08.2011 with respect to the financial year 2010-11. The Company refused to accept the request of R and informed him that his shares on which dividend has not been claimed till date, have also been transferred to the Investor Education And Protection Fund.

Examine, in the light of the provisions of the Companies Act, 2013, the validity of the decision of the Company and suggest the remedy, if available, to him for obtaining the unclaimed amount of dividend and re-transfer of corresponding shares in his name.

(5 Marks)

- (c) *Gireesh, a legal successor of Ripun, the deceased person, signs a Bill of Exchange in his own name admitting a liability of ₹ 50,000 i.e. the extent to which he inherits the assets from the deceased payable to Mukund after 3 months from 1st January, 2019. On maturity, when Mukund presents the bill to Gireesh, he (Gireesh) refuses to pay for the bill on the ground that since the original liability was that of Ripun, the deceased, therefore, he is not liable to pay for the bill.*

Referring to the provisions of the Negotiable Instruments Act, 1881 decide whether Mukund can succeed in recovering ₹ 50,000 from Gireesh. Would your answer be still the same in case Gireesh specified the limit of his liability in the bill and the value of his inheritance is more than the liability ?

(4 Marks)

- (d) *Sohel, a director of a Company, not being personally concerned or interested, financially or otherwise, in a matter of a proposed motion placed before the Board Meeting, did not disclose his interest although he has knowledge that his sister is interested in that proposal. He restrains from making any disclosure of his interest on the presumption that he is not required by law to disclose any interest as he is not personally interested or concerned in the proposal. He made his presumption relying on the 'Rule of Literal Construction'. Explaining the scope of interpretation under this rule in the given situation, decide whether the decision of Soheli is correct?*

(3 Marks)

Answer

- (a) When a company issues shares at a price higher than their face value, the shares are said to be issued at premium and the differential amount is termed as premium. On the other hand, when a company issues shares at a price lower than their face value, the shares are said to be issued at discount and the differential amount is termed as discount. However, as per the provisions of section 53 of the Companies Act, 2013, a company is prohibited to issue shares at a discount except in the case of an issue of sweat equity shares given under section 54 of the Companies Act, 2013.

As per the provisions of sub-section (1) of section 52 of the Companies Act, 2013, where a company issues shares at a premium, whether for cash or otherwise, a sum equal to the aggregate amount of the premium received on those shares shall be transferred to a "securities premium account".

Application of Securities Premium Account: As per the provisions of sub-section (2) of section 52 of the Companies Act, 2013, the securities premium account may be applied by the company—

- (a) towards the issue of unissued shares of the company to the members of the company as fully paid bonus shares;
 - (b) in writing off the preliminary expenses of the company;
 - (c) in writing off the expenses of, or the commission paid or discount allowed on, any issue of shares or debentures of the company;
 - (d) in providing for the premium payable on the redemption of any redeemable preference shares or of any debentures of the company; or
 - (e) for the purchase of its own shares or other securities under section 68.
- (b) According to section 124 of the Companies Act, 2013:
- (1) **Unpaid or Unclaimed Dividend to be transferred to the Unpaid Dividend Account** - Where a dividend has been declared by a company but has not been paid or claimed within thirty (30) days from the date of declaration, the company shall, within seven (7) days from the expiry of the said period of 30 days, transfer the total amount of unpaid or unclaimed dividend to a special account called the Unpaid Dividend Account (UDA). The UDA shall be opened by the company in any scheduled bank.
 - (2) **Transfer of Unclaimed Amount to Investor Education and Protection Fund (IEPF)** - Any money transferred to the Unpaid Dividend Account which remains unpaid or unclaimed for a period of seven (7) years from the date of such transfer shall be transferred by the company along with interest accrued thereon to the Investor Education and Protection Fund.
 - (3) **Transfer of Shares to IEPF**- All shares in respect of which dividend has not been paid or claimed for 7 consecutive years or more shall be transferred by the company in the name of Investor Education and Protection Fund along with a statement containing the prescribed details.
 - (4) **Right of Owner of 'transferred shares' to Reclaim** - Any claimant of shares so transferred to IEPF shall be entitled to reclaim the 'transferred shares' from Investor Education and Protection Fund in accordance with the prescribed procedure and on submission of prescribed documents.

As per the provisions of sub-section (3) of section 125 of the Companies Act, 2013, read with rule 7 of Investor Education and Protection Fund Authority (Accounting, Audit, Transfer and Refund) Rules, 2016, any person, whose unclaimed dividends have been transferred to the Fund, may apply for refund, to the Authority, by submitting an online application.

In the given question, Mr. R did not claim the payment of dividend on his shares for a period of more than 7 years (i.e. expiry of 30 days from 31.08.2011 to last week of September 2019). As a result, his unclaimed dividend (₹ 2,000) along with such shares (1,000 equity shares) must have been transferred to Investor Education and Protection Fund Account. Therefore, the company is justified in refusing to accept the request of Mr. R for the payment of dividend of ₹ 2,000 (declared in Annual General Meeting on 31.8.2011).

In terms of the above stated provisions, Mr. R should be advised as under:

- (i) If Mr. R wants to reclaim the transferred shares, he should apply to IEPF authorities along with the necessary documents in accordance with the prescribed procedure.
- (ii) He is also entitled to get refund of the dividend amount, which was transferred to the above fund; in accordance with the prescribed rules.

- (c) **Liability of a legal representative** (Section 29 of the Negotiable Instruments Act, 1881): A legal representative of a deceased person, who signs his name on a promissory note, bill of exchange or cheque is liable personally thereon unless he expressly limits his liability to the extent of the assets received by him.

Thus, in the absence of an express contract to the contrary, the liability of a legal representative is unlimited. However, a legal representative may, by an express agreement, limit his liability to the extent of the assets received by him.

In the light of the stated provision, Mukund can succeed in recovering ₹ 50,000 from Gireesh as he has admitted liability of ₹ 50,000 i.e. to the extent of the assets received by him from the Ripun, the deceased.

Yes, the limit of liability specified in the bill by Gireesh, will remain same even if value of his inheritance is more than the liability, in case he specified the liability by an express agreement.

- (d) **Rule of Literal Construction**

Normally, where the words of a statute are in themselves clear and unambiguous, then these words should be construed in their natural and ordinary sense and it is not open to the court to adopt any other hypothetical construction. This is called the rule of literal construction.

This principle is contained in the Latin maxim "*absoluta sententia expositore non indeget*" which literally means "an absolute sentence or preposition needs not an expositor". In other words, plain words require no explanation.

Sometimes, occasions may arise when a choice has to be made between two interpretations – one narrower and the other wider or bolder. In such a situation, if the narrower interpretation would fail to achieve the manifest purpose of the legislation, one should rather adopt the wider one.

When we talk of disclosure of 'the nature of concern or interest, financial or otherwise' of a director or the manager of a company in the subject-matter of a proposed motion (as referred to in section 102 of the Companies Act, 2013), we have to interpret in its broader sense of referring to any concern or interest containing any information and facts that may enable members to understand the meaning, scope and implications of the items of business and to take decisions thereon. What is required is a full and frank disclosure without reservation or suppression, as, for instance where a son or daughter or father or mother or brother or sister is concerned in any contract or matter, the shareholders ought fairly to be informed of it and the material facts disclosed to them. Here a restricted narrow interpretation would defeat the very purpose of the disclosure.

In the given question, Sohail (a director) did not disclose his interest in a matter placed before the Board Meeting (in which his sister has interest), as he is not personally interested or concerned in the proposal.

Here, he ought to have considered broader meaning of the provision of law; and therefore, even though he was personally not interested or concerned in the proposal, he should have disclosed the interest.

Question 4

- (a) *CDS Ltd. is planning to make a private placement of securities. The Managing Director arranged to obtain a brief note from some source explaining the salient features of the issue of private placement that the Board of Directors shall keep in mind while approving the proposal on this subject. The brief note includes, inter alia, the information / suggestions on the following points:*

- (i) *A private placement shall be made only to a select group of identified persons not exceeding 200 in a financial year.*

The aforesaid ceiling of identified persons shall not apply to the offer made to the qualified institutional buyers but is applicable to the employees of the Company who will be covered under the Company's Employees Stock Option Scheme.

- (ii) *The offer on private placement basis shall be made only once in a financial year for any number of identified persons not exceeding 200.*

The Company solicits your remarks on the points referred above as to whether they are valid or not? Reasoned remarks should be given in accordance with the provisions of the Companies Act, 2013. **(4 Marks)**

- (b) (i) *Referring to the provisions of the Companies Act, 2013, examine the validity of the following:*

Safar Limited having a net worth of ₹ 130 crore wants to accept deposits from its members. It has approached you to advise whether it falls within the category of an eligible company? What special care has to be taken while accepting such deposits from members? **(3 Marks)**

- (ii) *Moon Light Ltd. is having its establishment in USA. It obtained a loan there creating a charge on the assets of the foreign establishment. The Company received a notice from the Registrar of Companies for not filing the particulars of charge created by the Company on the property or assets situated outside India. The Company wants to defend the notice on the ground that it shall not be the duty of the company to register the particulars of the charge created on the assets not located in India. Do you agree with the stand taken by the Company? Give your answer with respect to the provisions of the Companies Act, 2013. (3 Marks)*
- (c) (i) *PK and VK had a long dispute regarding the ownership of a land for which a legal suit was pending in the court. The court fixed the date of hearing on 29.04.2018, which was announced to be a holiday subsequently by the Government. What will be the computation of time of the hearing in this case under the General Clauses Act, 1897? (2 Marks)*
- (ii) *Income Tax Act, 1961 provides that the gratuity paid by the government to its employees is fully exempt from tax. You are required to explain the scope of the term 'government' and clarify whether the exemption from gratuity income will be available to the State Government Employees? Give your answer in accordance with the provisions of the General Clauses Act, 1897. (2 Marks)*
- (d) *What is External Aid to interpretation? Explain how the Dictionary definitions are the External Aids to Interpretations? (3 Marks)*

Answer

- (a) As per the provisions of sub-section (2) of section 42 of the Companies Act, 2013, private placement shall be made only to a select group of persons who have been identified by the Board (herein referred to as "identified persons"), whose number shall not exceed 50 or such higher number as may be prescribed, in a financial year subject to such conditions as may be prescribed.

It is also provided that any offer or invitation made to qualified institutional buyers, or to employees of the company under a scheme of employees' stock option as per provisions of section 62(1)(b) shall not be considered while calculating the limit of two hundred persons.

According to Rule 14 (2) of the Companies (Prospectus and Allotment of Securities) Rules, 2014, an offer or invitation to subscribe securities under private placement shall not be made to persons more than two hundred in the aggregate in a financial year.

As per Explanation given in this Rule, it is clarified that the restrictions aforesaid would be reckoned individually for each kind of security that is equity share, preference share or debenture.

Referring to the above mentioned provisions of sub-section (2) of section 42 of the Companies Act, 2013 and Rule 14 the Companies (Prospectus and Allotment of Securities) Rules, 2014, we can conclude as follows:

- (i) The company is correct in proposing that private placement shall be made only to a select group of identified persons not exceeding 200 in a financial year. This part of the proposal is correct.

The company is also correct in proposing that the aforesaid ceiling of identified persons shall not apply to offer made to the qualified institutional buyers, but the company is not correct in saying that the said ceiling is applicable to employees covered under the Company's Employee Stock Option Scheme. Hence, the second part of the proposal is only partially correct.

- (ii) The Companies (Prospectus and Allotment of Securities) Rules, 2014 provides that an offer or invitation to subscribe securities under private placement shall not be made to persons more than 200 in aggregate in a financial year.

Keeping the ceiling of 200 persons in aggregate during a financial year, offer of private placement can be made more than once in a financial year. Therefore, the second statement is not fully correct.

- (b) (i) According to Rule 2(1)(e) of the Companies (Acceptance of Deposits) Rules, 2014, an "eligible company" as referred to in section 76(1) of the Companies Act, 2013 means a public company, having a net worth of not less than one hundred crore rupees or a turnover of not less than five hundred crore rupees and which has obtained the prior consent of the company in general meeting by means of a special resolution and also filed the said resolution with the Registrar of Companies before making any invitation to the public for acceptance of deposits.

However, an 'eligible company', which is accepting deposits within the limits specified under section 180 (1) (c), may accept deposits by means of an ordinary resolution.

According to Rule 4 (a) of the Companies (Acceptance of Deposits) Rules, 2014, an 'eligible company' shall accept or renew any deposit from its members, if the amount of such deposit together with the amount of deposits outstanding as on the date of acceptance or renewal of such deposits from members does not exceed ten per cent. of the aggregate of the paid-up share capital, free reserves and securities premium account of the company.

Safar Limited is having a net worth of ₹ 130 crores. Hence, it falls in the category of 'eligible company'.

The fact that turnover has not been stated in the question will not affect this answer, since fulfilling any one criteria will be sufficient.

Thus, Safar Limited has to ensure that acceptance of deposits from its members together with the amount of deposits outstanding as on the date of acceptance or renewal of such deposits from the members, in no case, exceeds 10% of the aggregate of the paid-up share capital, free reserves and securities premium account of the company.

- (ii) According to section 77 of the Companies Act, 2013, it shall be duty of the company creating a charge within or outside India, on its property or assets or any of its undertakings, whether tangible or otherwise and situated in or outside India, to register the particulars of the charge.

Thus, charge may be created within India or outside India. Also the subject-matter of the charge i.e. the property or assets or any of the company's undertakings, may be situated within India or outside India.

In the given question, the company has obtained a loan by creating a charge on the assets of the foreign establishment.

As per the above provisions, it is the duty of the company creating a charge within or outside India, on its property or assets or any of its undertakings, whether tangible or otherwise and whether situated in or outside India, to register the particulars of the charge.

Hence, the stand taken by Moon Light Ltd. not to register the particulars of charge created on the assets located outside India is not correct.

- (c) (i) According to Section 10 of the General Clauses Act, 1897, where by any legislation or regulation, any act or proceeding is directed or allowed to be done or taken in any court or office on a certain day or within a prescribed period then, if the Court or office is closed on that day or last day of the prescribed period, the act or proceeding shall be considered as done or taken in due time if it is done or taken on the next day afterwards on which the Court or office is open.

In the given question, the court fixed the date of hearing of dispute between PK and VK, on 29.04.2018, which was subsequently announced to be a holiday.

Applying the above provisions we can conclude that the hearing date of 29.04.2018, shall be extended to the next working day.

- (ii) According to section 3(23) of the General Clauses Act, 1897, 'Government' or 'the Government' shall include both the Central Government and State Government.

Hence, wherever, the word 'Government' is used, it will include Central Government and State Government both.

Thus, when the Income Tax Act, 1961, provides that gratuity paid by the government to its employees is fully exempt from tax, the exemption from gratuity income will be available to the State Government employees also.

- (d) External aids are the factors that help in interpreting/construing an Act and have been given the convenient nomenclature of 'External Aids to Interpretation'. Apart from the statute itself there are many matters which may be taken into account when the statute is ambiguous. These matters are called external aids.

Dictionary Definitions: Dictionary Definitions is one of the External Aids to interpretation. First we have to refer to the Act in question to find out if any particular word or expression is defined in it. Where we find that a word is not defined in the Act itself, we may refer to dictionaries to find out the general sense in which that word is commonly understood. However, in selecting one out of the several meanings of a word, we must always take into consideration the context in which it is used in the Act. It is the fundamental rule that the meanings of words and expressions used in an Act must take their colour from the context in which they appear. Further, judicial decisions laying down the meaning of words in construing statutes in '*pari materia*' will have greater weight than the meaning furnished by dictionaries. However, for technical terms reference may be made to technical dictionaries.

Question 5

- (a) (i) *London Limited, at a general meeting of members of the company, passed an ordinary resolution to buy-back 30 percent of its equity share capital. The articles of the company empower the company for buy-back of shares. Explaining the provisions of the Companies Act, 2013, examine:*

(A) *Whether company's proposal is in order?*

(B) *Would your answer be still the same in case the company instead of 30 percent, decides to buy-back only 20 per cent of its equity share capital?*

(3 Marks)

- (ii) *The Board of Directors of Rajesh Exports Ltd., a subsidiary of Manish Ltd., decides to grant a loan of ₹ 3 lakh to Bhaskar, the finance manager of Manish Ltd., getting salary of ₹ 40,000 per month, to buy 500 partly paid-Up equity shares of ₹ 1,000 each of Rajesh Exports Ltd. Examine the validity of Board's decision with reference to the provisions of the Companies Act, 2013.*

(2 Marks)

OR

- (a) *The role of doctrine of 'Indoor management' is opposed to that of the role of 'Constructive notice'. Comment on this statement with reference to the Companies Act, 2013.*

(5 Marks)

- (b) *Veena Ltd. held its Annual General Meeting on September 15, 2018. The meeting was presided over by Mr. Mohan Rao, the Chairman of the Company's Board of Directors. On September 17, 2018, Mr. Mohan Rao, the Chairman, without signing the minutes of the meeting, left India to look after his father who fell sick in London. Referring to the*

provisions of the Companies Act, 2013, state the manner in which the minutes of the above meeting are to be signed in the absence of Mr. Mohan Rao and by whom?

(5 Marks)

(c) *Satya has given his residential property on rent amounting to ₹ 25,000 per month to Tushar. Amit became the surety for payment of rent by Tushar. Subsequently, without Amit's consent, Tushar agreed to pay higher rent to Satya. After a few months of this, Tushar defaulted in paying the rent.*

(i) *Explain the meaning of contract of guarantee according to the provisions of the Indian Contract Act, 1872.*

(ii) *State the position of Amit in this regard.* **(4 Marks)**

(d) *"The act done negligently shall be deemed to be done in good faith."*

Comment with the help of the provisions of the General Clauses Act, 1897. **(3 Marks)**

Answer

(a) (i) According to the provisions of section 68 (2) of the Companies Act, 2013, no company shall purchase its own shares or other specified securities under sub-section (1), unless—

(a) the buy-back is authorised by its articles;

(b) a special resolution has been passed at a general meeting of the company authorising the buy-back:

Provided that nothing contained in this clause shall apply to a case where—

(i) the buy-back is, ten per cent or less of the total paid-up equity capital and free reserves of the company; and

(ii) such buy-back has been authorised by the Board by means of a resolution passed at its meeting;

(c) the buy-back is twenty-five per cent or less of the aggregate of paid-up capital and free reserves of the company:

Provided that in respect of the buy-back of equity shares in any financial year, the reference to twenty-five per cent in this clause shall be construed with respect to its total paid-up equity capital in that financial year.

In the instant case, London Limited, at a general meeting of members of the company, passed an ordinary resolution to buy back 30% of its equity share capital. The articles of the company empower the company for buy back of shares.

(A) the Company's proposal is not in order, since a special resolution as required by the above provision has not been passed, rather an ordinary resolution has only been passed.

- (B) if the company instead of 30%, decides to buy back only 20% (even if it is within the specified limit of 25%) of its equity share capital, then also special resolution is required. Hence, our answer will not change. This proposal of the company will also be not in order.
- (ii) As per section 67(2) of the Companies Act, 2013, no public company shall give, whether directly or indirectly and whether by means of a loan, guarantee, the provision of security or otherwise, any financial assistance for the purpose of, or in connection with, a purchase or subscription made or to be made, by any person of or for any shares in the company or in its holding company.

As per the provisions of section 67(3)(c) of the Companies Act, 2013, nothing stated above, shall apply to the giving of loans by a company to persons in the employment of the company other than its directors or key managerial personnel, for an amount not exceeding their salary or wages for a period of six months with a view to enabling them to purchase or subscribe for fully paid-up shares in the company or its holding company to be held by them by way of beneficial ownership.

If we analyse the provisions of section 67(3)(c) of the Companies Act, 2013, we can come to know that the relaxation given here can be availed only when all the following three conditions are fulfilled:

1. The loan has been given to the employees of the company other than its directors or key managerial personnel (not the employee of its holding company). - Therefore this condition has not been fulfilled;
2. The amount does not exceed their salary or wages for a period of six months.- This condition has not been fulfilled.
3. The amount should be utilized by the employee for purchase of fully shares or subscribe for fully paid-up shares in the company or its holding company to be held by them by way of beneficial ownership. - Here Mr. Bhaskar is going to purchase the shares in Rajesh Exports Ltd., which is neither his employer company, nor holding company of his employer company and the shares are not fully paid-up. Therefore, this condition has also not been fulfilled.

Even in case Mr. Bhaskar would not have fulfilled any one of the above conditions, the decision of the Board of Directors of Rajesh Exports Ltd. would not have been valid. Therefore we can conclude that the decision of the Board of Directors of Rajesh Exports Ltd. is not valid.

OR

(a) Doctrine of Indoor Management

According to this doctrine, persons dealing with the company cannot be assumed to have knowledge of internal problems of the company. They can simply assume that all the required things were done properly in the company.

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.

The doctrine of indoor management was evolved around 150 years ago in the context of the doctrine of constructive notice. The role of doctrine of indoor management is opposed to of the role of doctrine of constructive notice. Whereas the doctrine of constructive notice protects a company against outsiders, the doctrine of indoor management protects outsiders against the actions of a company. This doctrine also is a possible safeguard against the possibility of abusing the doctrine of constructive notice.

Basis for Doctrine of Indoor Management

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 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.

Exceptions to Doctrine of Indoor Management (Applicability of doctrine of constructive notice)

Knowledge of irregularity: In case this 'outsider' has actual knowledge of irregularity within the company, the benefit under the rule of indoor management would no longer be available. In fact, he/she may well be considered part of the irregularity.

Negligence: If, with a minimum of effort, the irregularities within a company could be discovered, the benefit of the rule of indoor management would not apply. The protection of the rule is also not available in the circumstances where company does not make proper inquiry.

Forgery: The rule does not apply where a person relies upon a document that turns out to be forged since nothing can validate forgery. A company can never be held bound for forgeries committed by its officers.

The above doctrines have been well considered while framing the provisions of various Acts pertaining to the companies worldwide. The Companies Act, 2013 and the earlier Acts relevant for the Companies in India are no exception to the same.

- (b) Section 118 of the Companies Act, 2013 provides that every company shall prepare, sign and keep minutes of proceedings of every general meeting, including the meeting called by the requisitionists and all proceedings of meeting of any class of shareholders or

creditors or Board of Directors or committee of the Board and also resolution passed by postal ballot within thirty days of the conclusion of every such meeting concerned. Minutes kept shall be evidence of the proceedings recorded in a meeting.

By virtue of Rule 25 of the Companies (Management and Administration) Rules, 2014 read with section 118 of the Companies Act, 2013, each page of every such book shall be initialled or signed and the last page of the record of proceedings of each meeting or each report in such books shall be dated and signed by, in the case of minutes of proceedings of a general meeting, by the chairman of the same meeting within the aforesaid period of thirty days or in the event of the death or inability of that chairman within that period, by a director duly authorized by the Board for the purpose.

Therefore, the minutes of the meeting referred to in the case of Veena Ltd. can be signed in the absence of Mr. Mohan Rao, by any director, authorized by the Board in this respect.

- (c) (i) **Contract of guarantee:** As per the provisions of section 126 of the Indian Contract Act, 1872, a contract of guarantee is a contract to perform the promise made or discharge the liability, of a third person in case of his default.

Three parties are involved in a contract of guarantee:

Surety- person who gives the guarantee,

Principal debtor- person in respect of whose default the guarantee is given,

Creditor- person to whom the guarantee is given

- (ii) According to the provisions of section 133 of the Indian Contract Act, 1872, where there is any variance in the terms of contract between the principal debtor and creditor without surety's consent, it would discharge the surety in respect of all transactions taking place subsequent to such variance.

In the instant case, Satya (Creditor) cannot sue Amit (Surety), because Amit is discharged from liability when, without his consent, Tushar (Principal debtor) has changed the terms of his contract with Satya (creditor). It is immaterial whether the variation is beneficial to the surety or does not materially affect the position of the surety.

- (d) **Good Faith**

In general, anything done with due care and attention, which is not malafide is presumed to have been done in good faith.

But, according to section 3(22) of the General Clauses Act, 1897, a thing shall be deemed to be done in "good faith" where it is in fact done honestly, whether it is done negligently or not.

The question of good faith under the General Clauses Act is one of fact. It is to determine with reference to the circumstances of each case.

It is therefore understood that the General Clauses Act, 1897 considers the honesty in doing the Act as a primary test to constitute the thing done in good faith and therefore the act done honestly but with negligence may also be termed as done in good faith as per the General Clauses Act, 1897.

The term "Good faith" has been defined differently in different enactments. This definition of the good faith does not apply to that enactment which contains a special definition of the term "good faith" and there the definition given in that particular enactment has to be followed. This definition may be applied only if there is nothing repugnant in subject or context, and if that is so, the definition is not applicable.