

MOCK TEST PAPER
INTERMEDIATE (NEW): GROUP – I
PAPER – 2: CORPORATE AND OTHER LAWS
ANSWERS

Time Allowed – 3 Hours

Maximum Marks – 100

Division A

1. (i) (b)
(ii) (c)
(iii) (d)
(iv) (c)
2. (i) (d)
(ii) (c)
(iii) (b)
3. (b)
4. (d)
5. (d)
6. (d)
7. (b)
8. (a)
9. (a)
10. (a)
11. (b)
12. (d)
13. (a)
14. (b)

Division B

1. (a) **Restrictions on purchase by company or giving of loans by it for purchase of its share:** As per section 67 (3) of the Companies Act, 2013 a company is allowed to give a loan to its employees subject to the following limitations:
 - (a) The employee must not be a director or Key Managerial Personnel;
 - (b) The amount of such loan shall not exceed an amount equal to six months' salary of the employee.
 - (c) The loan must be extended for subscribing fully paid-up shares.

In the given instance, Human Resource Manager Mr. Shyam Kumar is not a Key Managerial Personnel of the OEMR Limited. Further, he is drawing a salary of ₹ 40,000 per month and wants

to avail loan for purchasing 500 partly paid-up equity shares of ₹ 1000 each of OEMR Limited in which he is employed.

Keeping the above facts and legal provisions in view, the decision of OEMR Limited in granting a loan of ₹ 4,00,000 for purchase of its partly paid-up shares to Human Resource Manager is invalid due to the following reasons:

- i. The amount of loan is more than 6 months' salary of Mr. Shyam Kumar, the HR Manager. It should have been restricted to ₹ 2,40,000 only.
 - ii. The loan to be given by OEMR Limited to its HR Manager Mr. Shyam Kumar is meant for purchase of partly paid shares.
- (b) (i)** According to section 123 of the Companies Act, 2013 a company may, before the declaration of any dividend in any financial year, transfer such percentage of its profits for that financial year as it may consider appropriate to the reserves of the company. Such transfer is not mandatory and the percentage to be transferred to reserves is at the discretion of the company.

As per the given facts, Dev Pharma Limited has earned a profit of ₹ 910 crores for the financial year 2019-20. It has proposed a dividend @ 10%. However, it does not intend to transfer any amount to the reserves of the company out of the profits of current year.

As per the provisions stated above, the amount to be transferred to reserves out of profits for any financial year is at the discretion of the company acting through its Board of Directors. Therefore, at its discretion, if Dev Pharma Limited decides not to transfer any profit to reserves before the declaration of dividend at 10%, it is legally allowed to do so.

- (ii)** According to Section 8(1) of the Companies Act, 2013, the companies licenced under Section 8 of the Act (Formation of companies with Charitable Objects, etc.) are prohibited from paying any dividend to their members. Their profits are intended to be applied only in promoting the objects for which they are formed.

Hence, in the instant case, the proposed act of Alpha Herbals, a company licenced under Section 8 of the Companies Act, 2013, which is planning to declare dividend, is not according to the provisions of the Companies Act, 2013.

- (c)** The problem in this case, is based on the provisions of the Indian Contract Act, 1872 as contained in Section 215 read with Section 216. The two sections provide that where an agent without the knowledge of the principal, deals in the business of agency on his own account, the principal may:

- (1) repudiate the transaction, if the case shows, either that the agent has dishonestly concealed any material fact from him, or that the dealings of the agent have been disadvantageous to him.
- (2) claim from the agent any benefit, which may have resulted to him from the transaction.

Therefore, based on the above provisions, Mr. Arora is entitled to recover ₹ 6 lakhs from Mr. Saini being the amount of profit earned by Mr. Saini out of the transaction.

- (d)** As per Section 44 of the Negotiable Instruments Act, 1881, when the consideration for which a person signed a promissory note, bill of exchange or cheque consisted of money, and was originally absent in part or has subsequently failed in part, the sum which a holder standing in immediate relation with such signer is entitled to receive from him is proportionally reduced.

Explanation—The drawer of a bill of exchange stands in immediate relation with the acceptor. The maker of a promissory note, bill of exchange or cheque stands in immediate relation with the payee, and the endorser with his endorsee. Other signers may by agreement stand in immediate relation with a holder.

On the basis of above provision, P would succeed to recover ₹ 7,000 only from Q and not the whole amount of the bill because it was accepted for value as to ₹ 7,000 only and an accommodation to P for ₹ 3,000.

2. (a) (i) As per the section 2(45) of the Companies Act, 2013, the holding of 25% shares of AMC Ltd. by the Government of Rajasthan does not make it a government company. Hence, it will be treated as a non-government company.

Under section 139 of the Companies Act, 2013, the appointment of an auditor by a company vests generally with the members of the company except in the case of the first auditors and in the filling up of the casual vacancy not caused by the resignation of the auditor, in which case, the power to appoint the auditor vests with the Board of Directors. The appointment by the members is by way of an ordinary resolution only and no exceptions have been made in the Act whereby a special resolution is required for the appointment of the auditors.

Therefore, the contention of Mr. Mukesh is not tenable. The appointment is valid under the Companies Act, 2013.

- (ii) A Company has the option of keeping its books of account or other relevant papers in electronic mode as per Rule 3 of the Companies (Accounts) Rules, 2014. According to such Rule,

- (a) such books of accounts or other relevant books or papers maintained in electronic mode shall remain accessible in India so as to be usable for subsequent reference.
- (b) There shall be a proper system for storage, retrieval, display or printout of the electronic records as the Audit Committee, if any, or the Board may deem appropriate and such records shall not be disposed of or rendered unusable, unless permitted by law.
- (c) The back-up of the books of account and other books and papers of the company maintained in electronic mode, including at a place outside India, if any, shall be kept in servers physically located in India on a periodic basis.

Hence, a company cannot keep books of Account in electronic mode accessible only outside India.

- (b) Section 83 of the Companies Act, 2013 empowers the Registrar to make entries with respect to the satisfaction and release of charges even if no intimation has been received by him from the company. Accordingly, with respect to any registered charge if an evidence is shown to the satisfaction of Registrar that the debt secured by charge has been paid or satisfied in whole or in part or that the part of the property or undertaking charged has been released from the charge or has ceased to form part of the company's property or undertaking, then he may enter in the register of charges a memorandum of satisfaction that:

- ◆ the debt has been satisfied in whole or in part; or
- ◆ the part of the property or undertaking has been released from the charge or has ceased to form part of the company's property or undertaking.

This power can be exercised by the Registrar despite the fact that no intimation has been received by him from the company.

Information to affected parties: The Registrar shall inform the affected parties within 30 days of making the entry in the register of charges.

Issue of Certificate: As per Rule 8 (2), in case the Registrar enters a memorandum of satisfaction of charge in full, he shall issue a certificate of registration of satisfaction of charge in Form No. CHG-5.

Therefore, Ranjit can approach the Registrar and show evidence to his satisfaction that the charge has been duly settled and satisfied and request the Registrar to enter a memorandum of satisfaction noting the release of charge.

- (c) According to Section 157 of the Indian Contract Act, 1872, if the bailee, without the consent of the bailor, mixes the goods of the bailor with his own goods, in such a manner that it is impossible to separate the goods bailed from the other goods and deliver them back, the bailor is entitled to be compensated by the bailee for the loss of the goods.

In the given question, Srijith's employee mixed high quality sugar bailed by Amar and then packaged it for sale. The sugar when mixed cannot be separated. As Srijith's employee has mixed the two kinds of sugar, he (Srijith) must compensate Amar for the loss of his sugar.

- (d) According to section 9 of the Negotiable Instruments Act, 1881 'holder in due course' means any person who for consideration becomes the possessor of a promissory note, bill of exchange or cheque if payable to bearer or the payee or endorsee thereof, if payable to order, before the amount in it became payable and without having sufficient cause to believe that any defect existed in the title of the person from whom he derived his title.

As 'A' in this case *prima facie* became a possessor of the bill for value and in good faith before the bill became payable, he can be considered as a holder in due course.

But where a signature on the negotiable instrument is forged, it becomes a nullity. The holder of a forged instrument cannot enforce payment thereon. In the event of the holder being able to obtain payment in spite of forgery, he cannot retain the money. The true owner may sue on tort the person who had received. This principle is universal in character, by reason where of even a holder in due course is not exempt from it. A holder in due course is protected when there is defect in the title. But he derives no title when there is entire absence of title as in the case of forgery. Hence 'A' cannot receive the amount on the bill.

3. (a) According to section 8(1) of the Companies Act, 2013, where it is proved to the satisfaction of the Central Government that a person or an association of persons proposed to be registered under this Act as a limited company—

- (a) has in its objects the promotion of commerce, art, science, sports, education, research, social welfare, religion, charity, protection of environment or any such other object;
- (b) intends to apply its profits, if any, or other income in promoting its objects; and
- (c) intends to prohibit the payment of any dividend to its members;

the Central Government may, by issue of licence, allow that person or association of persons to be registered as a limited liability company.

In the instant case, the decision of the group of individuals to form a limited liability company for charitable purpose under section 8 for a period of ten years and thereafter to dissolve the club and to distribute the surplus of assets over the liabilities, if any, amongst the members will not hold good, since there is a restriction as pointed out in point (b) above regarding application of its profits or other income only in promoting its objects. Further, there is restriction in the application of the surplus assets of such a company in the event of winding up or dissolution of the company as provided in sub-section (9) of Section 8 of the Companies Act, 2013. Therefore, the proposal is not feasible.

- (b) As per section 130 of the Companies Act, 2013, a company shall not re-open its books of account and not recast its financial statements, unless an application in this regard is made by the Central Government, the Income-tax authorities, the Securities and Exchange Board, any other statutory body or authority or any person concerned and an order is made by a court of competent jurisdiction or the Tribunal to the effect that—

- (i) the relevant earlier accounts were prepared in a fraudulent manner; or
- (ii) the affairs of the company were mismanaged during the relevant period, casting a doubt on the reliability of financial statements.

However, no order shall be made in respect of re-opening of books of account relating to a period earlier than eight financial years immediately preceding the current financial year.

In the given instance, an application was filed for re-opening and re-casting of the financial statements of Chetan Ltd. for the financial year 2008-2009.

Though application filed by the Income Tax Authorities to NCLT is valid, its recommendation for reopening and recasting of financial statements for the period earlier than eight financial years immediately preceding the current financial year i.e. 2019-2020, is invalid.

- (c) **Bill drawn in fictitious name:** The problem is based on the provision of Section 42 of the Negotiable Instruments Act, 1881. In case a bill of exchange is drawn payable to the drawer's order in a fictitious name and is endorsed by the same hand as the drawer's signature, it is not permissible for the acceptor to allege as against the holder in due course that such name is fictitious. Accordingly, in the instant case, Y cannot avoid payment by raising the plea that the drawer (Z) is fictitious. The only condition is that the signature of Z as drawer and as endorser must be in the same handwriting.
- (d) **Effect of usage:** Usage or practice developed under the statute is indicative of the meaning recognized to its words by contemporary opinion. A uniform notorious practice continued under an old statute and inaction of the Legislature to amend the same are important factors to show that the practice so followed was based on correct understanding of the law. When the usage or practice receives judicial or legislative approval it gains additional weight.

In this connection, we have to bear in mind two Latin maxims:

- (i) '*Optima Legum interpret est consuetudo*' (the custom is the best interpreter of the law); and
- (ii) '*Contemporanea exposito est optima et fortissima in lege*' (the best way to interpret a document is to read it as it would have been read when made).

Therefore, the best interpretation/construction of a statute or any other document is that which has been made by the contemporary authority. Simply stated, old statutes and documents should be interpreted as they would have been at the time when they were enacted/written.

Contemporary official statements throwing light on the construction of a statute and statutory instruments made under it have been used as *contemporanea exposition* to interpret not only ancient but even recent statutes in India.

4. (a) **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.
- (i) In the present case, MNP Private Ltd., a company registered under the Companies Act, 2013 with a paid up share capital of ₹ 45 lakh and having turnover of ₹ 3 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, MNP Ltd. cannot avail the status of small company.
 - (ii) If the turnover of the company is ₹ 1.50 crore, then both the criteria will be fulfilled and MNP Ltd. can avail the status of small company.
- (b) According to section 92(4) of the Companies Act, 2013, every company shall file with the Registrar a copy of the annual return, within sixty days from the date on which the annual general meeting is held or where no annual general meeting is held in any year within sixty days from the date on which the annual general meeting should have been held together with the statement specifying the reasons for not holding the annual general meeting.

Sub-section (5) of Section 92 also states that if any company fails to file its annual return under sub-section (4), before the expiry of the period specified therein, such company and its every officer who is in default shall be liable to a penalty of fifty thousand rupees and in case of continuing failure, with further penalty of one hundred rupees for each day during which such failure continues, subject to a maximum of five lakh rupees.

In the instant case, the annual general meeting of Bazaar Limited should have been held within a period of six months, from the date of closing of the financial year but it did not take place. The idea of the directors that since the AGM was cancelled, the provisions requiring the company to file annual returns within 60 days from the date of AGM would not apply, is incorrect. Thus, the company has contravened the provisions of section 92 of the Companies Act, 2013 for not filing the annual returns and shall attract the penal provisions along with every officer of the company who is in default as specified in Section 92(5) of the Act.

- (c) Section 203(3) of the Companies Act, 2013 provides that whole time key managerial personnel shall not hold office in more than one company except in its subsidiary company at the same time. With respect to the issue that whether a whole time KMP of holding company be appointed in more than one subsidiary companies or can be appointed in only one subsidiary company.

It can be noted that Section 13 of General Clauses Act, 1897 provides that the word 'singular' shall include the 'plural', unless there is anything repugnant to the subject or the context. Thus, a whole time key managerial personnel may hold office in more than one subsidiary company as per the present law.

- (d) **Mischieve Rule:** Where the language used in a statute is capable of more than one interpretation, principle laid down in the Heydon's case is followed. This is known as 'purposive construction' or 'mischieve rule'. The rule then directs that the courts must adopt that construction which 'shall suppress the mischief and advance the remedy'.

It has been emphasized by the Supreme Court that the rule in Heydon's case is applicable only when the words used are ambiguous and are reasonably capable of more than one meaning.

It enables consideration of four matters in construing an Act:

- (1) what was the law before the making of the Act;
- (2) what was the mischief or defect for which the law did not provide;

- (3) what is the remedy that the Act has provided; and
 - (4) what is the reason for the remedy.
5. (a) As per Rule 3 of *the Companies (Incorporation) Rules, 2014*, no One Person Company (OPC) can convert voluntarily into any kind of company unless two years have expired from the date of its incorporation, except where the paid up share capital is increased beyond fifty lakh rupees or its average annual turnover during the relevant period exceeds two crore rupees.

Besides, Section 18 of the Companies Act, 2013 provides that a company of any class registered under this Act may convert itself as a company of other class under this Act by alteration of memorandum and articles of the company in accordance with the provisions of Chapter II of the Act.

Based on the above provisions, our advice in the given circumstances will be as under:

- (i) The promoter increases the paid up capital of the company by ₹ 10.00 lakh during 2019-2020, i.e., to ₹ 55 lakhs (45+10= 55). In this situation, XYZ (OPC) can convert itself voluntarily into any other kind of company by alteration of memorandum and articles of the company in compliance with the Provisions of the Act.
 - (ii) Where the turnover of XYZ (OPC) during 2019-20 was ₹ 3.00 crore, there will be no change in the answer. In this situation also, XYZ (OPC) can convert itself voluntarily into any other kind of company by alteration of memorandum and articles of the company in compliance with the Provisions of the Act.
- (b) The company is advised to immediately file an application for rectification of the Register of Charges in Form No CHG- 8 to the Central Government under Section 87 of the Companies Act, 2013

Section 87 of the Act of 2013 and Rule 12 empowers the Central Government to order rectification of Register of Charges in the following cases of default:

- (i) when there was omission in giving intimation to the Registrar with respect to payment or satisfaction of charge within the specified time;
- (ii) when there was omission or mis-statement of any particulars in any filing previously made to the Registrar. Such filing may relate to any charge or any modification of charge or with respect to any memorandum of satisfaction or other entry made under Section 82 (*Company to report satisfaction of charge*) or Section 83 (*Power of Registrar to make entries of satisfaction and release*).

Before directing that the 'time for giving the intimation of payment or satisfaction shall be extended' or the 'omission or mis-statement shall be rectified', the Central Government needs to be satisfied that such default was accidental or due to inadvertence or because of some other sufficient cause or it did not prejudice the position of creditors or shareholders.

The application in Form CHG-8 shall be filed by the company or any interested person. Therefore Z Bank can also proceed under Section 87 as aforesaid.

The order of rectification shall be made by the Central Government on such terms and conditions as it deems just and expedient.

- (c) **Co-sureties liable to contribute equally** (Section 146 of the Indian Contract Act, 1872): Equality of burden is the basis of Co-suretyship. This is contained in section 146 which states that "when two or more persons are co-sureties for the same debt, or duty, either jointly, or severally and whether under the same or different contracts and whether with or without the knowledge of each other, the co-sureties in the absence of any contract to the contrary, are liable, as between

themselves, to pay each an equal share of the whole debt, or of that part of it which remains unpaid by the principal debtor”.

Accordingly, on the default of D in payment, B cannot escape from his liability. All the three sureties A, B and N are liable to pay equally, in absence of any contract between them.

- (d) In *Navrangpura Gam Dharmada Milkat Trust Vs. Rmtuji Ramaji*, AIR 1994 Guj 75 case, it was decided that ‘Repeal’ of provision is in distinction from ‘deletion’ of provision. ‘Repeal’ ordinarily brings about complete obliteration (abolition) of the provision as if it never existed, thereby affecting all incoherent rights and all causes of action related to the ‘repealed’ provision while ‘deletion’ ordinarily takes effect from the date of legislature affecting the said deletion, never to effect total effecting or wiping out of the provision as if it never existed.