



# The Companies Act, 2013










In *Salomon vs. Salomon & Co. Ltd.* the House of Lords laid down that a company is a person distinct and separate from its members. In this case one Salomon incorporated a company named –Salomon & Co. Ltd., with seven subscribers consisting of himself, his wife, four sons and one daughter. This company took over the personal business assets of Salomon for ₹38,782 and in turn, Salomon took 20,000 shares of ₹1 each, debentures worth





₹ 10,000 of the company with charge on the company's assets and the balance in cash. His wife, daughter and four sons took up one ₹1 share each. Subsequently, the company went into liquidation due to general trade depression. The unsecured creditors to the tune of ₹7,000 contended that Salomon could not be treated as a secured creditor of the company, in respect of the debentures held by him, as he was the managing director of one-man company, which was not different from Salomon and the cloak of the company was a mere sham and fraud.





**It was held by Lord Mac Naughten:**




*The Company is at law a different person altogether from the subscribers to the memorandum, and though it may be that after incorporation the business is precisely the same as it was before and the same persons are managers, and the same hands receive the profits, the company is not in law the agent of the subscribers or trustees for them. Nor are the subscribers, as members, liable, in any shape or form, except to the extent and in the manner provided by the Act.”*


























## SECTION 7 – INCORPORATION OF COMPANY



## **EFFECT OF REGISTRATION**

1. From date of incorporation, Company is separate from Subscriber to MoA ( Separate legal entity)
2. A company purchase 100 percent shares of other company but still they are different
3. Central Govt owns 100 percent shares of all the company but still it is not an agent of Govt
4. Any money payable by members to company will be considered as debt due to company

Where a company has been got incorporated by furnishing false or incorrect information or representation or by suppressing any material fact or information in any of the documents or declaration filed or made for incorporating such company or by any fraudulent action, the Tribunal may, on an application made to it, on being satisfied that the situation so warrants.

1. Pass such orders, as it may think fit, for regulation of the management of the company including changes, if any, in its memorandum and articles, in public interest or in the interest of the company and its members and creditors; or
2. direct that liability of the members shall be unlimited
3. Declaration that not convict/ not filed guilty for fraud
4. direct removal of the name of the company from the register of companies;
5. pass an order for the winding up of the company
6. pass such other orders as Tribunal may deem fit:

### **Before passing order, Tribunal**

1. Give the company shall be given a reasonable opportunity of being heard in the matter.
2. Shall take into consideration the transactions entered into by the company, including the obligations, if any, contracted or payment of any liability.

## **CONTENT OF MOA – COMPULSORY CLAUSES**

1. Name Clause – Name of the Company Private Co/. – Private Limited, Public Co. – Limited
2. Registered Office Clause – Only name of state in which registered office is situated
3. Object Clause – Main object and incidental objects thereto
4. Liability Clause – Limited by shares/guarantee/ unlimited Liability
5. Capital Clause – Only applicable for company limited by shares
6. Association Clause – Every subscriber must take atleast 1 share
7. Nominee clause (applicable to OPC) – In death of subscriber who will become member

## **MOA IS CHARTER OF THE COMPANY**

1. Contains the object of the Company
2. Identifies the possible scope of its operations

3. MoA is a public document
4. Deemed Assumption – Everyone dealing with Co. has knowledge about the content of MoA
5. Format of MoA is given for each type of company

FORMAT	Applicable for
Table A	Limited by shares
Table B	Limited by guarantee and not having share capital
Table C	Limited by guarantee and having a share capital
Table D	Unlimited Company
Table E	Unlimited Company having share capital

## CONTENT OF AOA



1. Contains Regulations: Contain the regulations for management of the Company.
2. Other Matters: Contains Matters as are prescribe under the Rules.
3. Contains provision for Entrenchment.
4. Manner of Inclusion of Entrenchment.
5. Notice to Registrar of the entrenchment Provision.
6. Forms of Articles: Table F, G, H, I & J in Schedule I.
7. A company may adopt all or any of the regulations contained in the model articles.
8. In case of any company, which is registered after the commencement of this Act, in so far as the registered articles of such company do not exclude or modify the regulations contained in the model articles applicable to such company, those regulations shall, so far as applicable, be the regulations of that company in the same manner and to the extent as if they were contained in the duly registered articles of the company.


## ENTRENCHMENT

Contain provisions for entrenchment: The articles may contain provisions for entrenchment (to protect something) to the effect that specified provisions of the articles may be altered only if conditions or procedures as that are more restrictive than those applicable in the case of a special resolution, are met or complied with.

Manner of inclusion of the entrenchment provision: The provisions for entrenchment shall only be made either on formation of a company, or by an amendment in the articles agreed to by all the members of the company in the case of a private company and by a special resolution in the case of a public company.

Notice to the registrar of the entrenchment provision: Where the articles contain provisions for entrenchment, whether made on formation or by amendment, the company shall give notice to the Registrar of such provisions in such form and manner as may be prescribed.





### FACTS of the Royal British Bank vs. Turquand

Mr. Turquand was the official manager (liquidator) of the insolvent Cameron's Coalbrook Steam, Coal and Swansea and Loughor Railway Company. It was incorporated under the Joint Stock Companies Act, 1844. The company had given a bond for £ 2,000 to the Royal British Bank, which secured the company's drawings on its current account. The bond was under the company's seal, signed by two directors and the secretary. When the company was sued, it alleged that under its registered deed of settlement (the articles of association), directors only had power to borrow up to an amount authorized by a company resolution. A resolution had been passed but not specifying how much the directors could borrow.

Held, it was decided that the bond was valid, so the Royal British Bank could enforce the terms. He said the bank was deemed to be aware that the directors could borrow only up to the amount resolutions allowed. Articles of association were registered with Companies House, so there was constructive notice. But the bank could not be deemed to know which ordinary resolutions passed, because these were not registrable. The bond was valid because there was no requirement to look into the company's internal workings. This is the indoor management rule, that the company's indoor affairs are the company's problem.

**PART-B**

**Q1.** What do you mean by the term *Capital*? Describe its classification in the domain of Company Law

*Sol.*

(a) **Meaning of capital:** The term *capital* has variety of meanings. But in relation to a company limited by shares, the term '*capital*' means '*share capital*'. Share capital means capital of the company expressed in terms of rupees divided into shares of fixed amount.

(b) **Classification of capital:** In the domain of Company Law, the term *capital* can be classified as follows:

(a) **Nominal or authorised or registered capital:**

This expression means such capital as is authorised by memorandum of a company to be the maximum amount of share capital of the company.

(b) **Issued capital:** It means such capital as the company issues from time to time for subscription.

(c) **Subscribed capital:** As such part of the capital which is for the time being subscribed by the members of a company.

(d) **Called up capital:** As such part of the capital which has been called for payment. It is the total amount called up on the shares issued.

(e) **Paid-up capital:** It is the total amount paid or credited as paid up on shares issued. It is equal to called up capital less calls in arrears.

**Q2.** 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 Rs. 30 Lakhs (3 Lakhs equity shares of Rs. 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?

*Sol.*

Provision

(a) 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.

**Analysis and conclusion**

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.

- (b) 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.

- Q3.** 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.

**Sol.**

**Provision**

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.

#### Analysis and conclusion

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.

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.

**Q4.** Explain Doctrine of 'Indoor Management' under the Companies Act, 2013. Also state the circumstances where the outsider cannot claim relief on the ground of 'Indoor Management'.

**Sol.** Doctrine of Indoor Management (The Companies Act, 2013): According to the "doctrine of indoor management" the outsiders, dealing with the company though are supposed to have satisfied themselves regarding the competence of the company to enter into the proposed contracts are also entitled to assume that as far as the internal compliance to procedures and regulations by the company is concerned, everything has been done properly.

They are bound to examine the registered documents of the company and ensure that the proposed dealing is not inconsistent therewith, but they are not bound to do more. They are fully entitled to presume regularity and compliance by the company with the internal procedures as required by the Memorandum and the Articles.

This doctrine is a limitation of the doctrine of "constructive notice" and popularly known as the rule laid down in the celebrated case of *Royal British Bank v. Turquand*. Thus, the doctrine of indoor management aims to protect outsiders against the company.

The above mentioned doctrine of Indoor Management or Turquand Rule has limitations of its own. That is to say, it is inapplicable to the following cases, namely:

- (a) **Actual or constructive knowledge of irregularity:** The rule does not protect any person when the person dealing with the company has notice, whether actual or constructive, of the irregularity.
- (b) **Suspicion of Irregularity:** The doctrine in no way, rewards those who behave negligently. Where the person dealing with the company is put upon an inquiry, for example, where the transaction is unusual or not in the ordinary course of business, it is the duty of the outsider to make the necessary enquiry.

(c) **Forgery:** The doctrine of indoor management applies only to irregularities which might otherwise affect a transaction but it cannot apply to forgery which must be regarded as nullity.

**Q5.** SK Infrastructure Limited has a paid-up share capital divided into 6,00,000 equity shares of INR 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.

**Sol.**

(a) Provision

**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.

Analysis and conclusion

In the instant case, paid up share capital of SK Infrastructure Limited is 6,00,000 equity shares of Rs. 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.

**Q6.** Ravi Private Limited has borrowed Rs. 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.?

**Sol.**

Provision

As per the facts given, Ravi Private Limited borrowed Rs. 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.

### Analysis and conclusion

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.

- Q7. 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 Rs. 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?

Sol.

### Provision

#### **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.

### Analysis and conclusion

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.

Q8. What do you mean by “Companies with charitable purpose” (section 8) under the Companies Act, 2013? Mention the conditions of the issue and revocation of the licence of such company by the government.

Sol. Formation of companies with charitable purpose etc. (Section 8 company):

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,
- sports,
- education,
- research,
- social welfare,
- religion,
- charity,
- protection of environment etc.

Such company intends to apply its profit in

- promoting its objects and
- prohibiting the payment of any dividend to its members.

Examples of section 8 companies are FICCI, ASSOCHAM, National Sports Club of India, CII etc.

Power of Central government to issue the license–

- (i) Section 8 allows the Central Government to register such person or association of persons as a company with limited liability without the addition of words ‘Limited’ or ‘Private limited’ to its name, by issuing licence on such conditions as it deems fit.

- (ii) The registrar shall on application register such person or association of persons as a company under this section.
- (iii) On registration the company shall enjoy same privileges and obligations as of a limited company.

**Revocation of license:** The Central Government may by order revoke the licence of the company where

- (a) the company contravenes any of the requirements or the conditions of this sections subject to which a licence is issued or
- (b) 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.

**Q9.** 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.

**Sol.** 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.

**Q10.** There are cases where company law disregards the principle of corporate personality or the principle that the company is a legal entity distinct from its shareholders or members. Elucidate

Or

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.

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

However, this veil can be lifted which means looking behind the company as a legal person, i.e., disregarding the corporate entity and paying regard, instead, to the realities behind the legal facade.

Where the Courts ignore the company, and concern themselves directly with the members or managers, the corporate veil may be said to have been lifted. Only in appropriate circumstances, the Courts are willing to lift the corporate veil and that too, when questions of control are involved rather than merely a question of ownership.

### **Lifting of Corporate Veil**

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:

- **Trading with enemy:** If the public interest is likely to be in jeopardy, the Court may be willing to crack the corporate shell
- Where corporate entity is used to evade or circumvent tax, the corporate veil may be lifted
- Where companies form other companies as their subsidiaries to act as their agent
- Company is formed to circumvent welfare of employees
- **Where the device of incorporation is adopted for some illegal or improper purpose:** Where the device of incorporation is adopted for some illegal or improper purpose, e.g., to defeat or circumvent law, to defraud creditors or to avoid legal obligations.

**Q11.** 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 Rs. 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?

**Sol.** 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 except section 8 company. Mr. Anil can convert the OPC into a private limited company along with Sunil.

**Q12.** “The Memorandum of Association is a charter of a company”. Discuss. Also explain in brief the contents of Memorandum of Association.

**Sol.** The Memorandum of Association of company is in fact its charter; it defines its constitution and the scope of the powers of the company with which it has been established under the Act. It is the very foundation on which the whole edifice of the company is built.

**Object of registering a memorandum of association:**

- It contains the object for which the company is formed and therefore identifies the possible scope of its operations beyond which its actions cannot go.
- It enables shareholders, creditors and all those who deal with company to know what its powers are and what activities it can engage in.
- A memorandum is a public document under Section 399 of the Companies Act, 2013. Consequently, every person entering into a contract with the company is presumed to have the knowledge of the conditions contained therein

The shareholders must know the purposes for which his money can be used by the company and what risks he is taking in making the investment.

A company cannot depart from the provisions contained in the memorandum however imperative may be the necessity for the departure. It cannot enter into a contract or engage in any trade or business, which is beyond the power conferred on it by the memorandum. If it does so, it would be ultra vires the company and void.

**Contents of the memorandum:** The memorandum of a company shall state—

- (a) the name of the company (Name Clause) with the last word “Limited” in the case of a public limited company, or the last words “Private Limited” in the case of a private limited company. This clause is not applicable on the companies formed under section 8 of the Act.
- (b) the State in which the registered office of the company (Registered Office clause) is to be situated;
- (c) the objects for which the company is proposed to be incorporated and any matter considered necessary in furtherance thereof (Object clause);
- (d) the liability of members of the company (Liability clause), whether limited or unlimited
- (e) the amount of authorized capital (Capital Clause) divided into share of fixed amounts and the number of shares with the subscribers to the memorandum have agreed to take, indicated opposite their names, which shall not be less than one share. A company not having share capital need not have this clause.
- (f) the desire of the subscribers to be formed into a company. The Memorandum shall conclude with the association clause. Every subscriber to the Memorandum shall take at least one share, and shall write against his name, the number of shares taken by him.

**Q13.** 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?

Sol.

### Provision

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.

### Analysis and conclusion

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.

Q14. What are the significant points of Section 8 Company which are not applicable for other companies? Briefly explain with reference to provisions of the Companies Act, 2013

Sol. Section 8 Company- Significant points

- Formed for the promotion of commerce, art, science, religion, charity, protection of the environment, sports, etc.
- Requirement of minimum share capital does not apply.
- Uses its profits for the promotion of the objective for which formed.
- Does not declare dividend to members.
- Operates under a special licence from the Central Government.
- Need not use the word Ltd./ Pvt. Ltd. in its name and adopt a more suitable name such as club, chambers of commerce etc.
- Licence revoked if conditions contravened.
- On revocation, the Central Government may direct it to



- Converts its status and change its name
- Wind-up
- Amalgamate with another company having similar object.
- Can call its general meeting by giving a clear 14 days notice instead of 21 days.
- Requirement of minimum number of directors, independent directors etc. does not apply.
- Need not constitute Nomination and Remuneration Committee and Shareholders Relationship Committee.
- A partnership firm can be a member of Section 8 company.

**Q15.** Mike Limited company incorporated in India having Liaison office at Singapore. Explain in detail meaning of Foreign Company and analysis., on whether Mike Limited would be called as Foreign Company as it established a Liaison office at Singapore as per the provisions of the Companies Act, 2013?

**Sol.**

Provision

**Foreign Company [Section 2(42) of the Companies Act, 2013]:** It means any company or body corporate incorporated outside India which—

- (i) has a place of business in India whether by itself or through an agent, physically or through electronic mode; and
- (ii) conducts any business activity in India in any other manner.

Analysis and conclusion

Since Mike Limited is a company incorporated in India, hence, it cannot be called as a foreign company. Even though, Liaison was officially established at Singapore, it would not be called as a foreign company as per the provisions of the Companies Act, 2013.

**Q16.** Explain the concept of “Dormant Company” as envisaged in the Companies Act, 2013.

**Sol.**

**1. Dormant Company (Section 455 of the Companies Act, 2013)**

Where a company is formed and registered under this Act for a future project or to hold an asset or intellectual property and has no significant accounting transaction, such a company or an inactive company may make an application to the Registrar in such manner as may be prescribed for obtaining the status of dormant company.

“Inactive company” means a company which has not been carrying on any business or operation, or has not made any significant accounting transaction during the last two financial years, or has not filed financial statements and annual returns during the last two financial years.

“Significant accounting transaction” means any transaction other than –

- (a) payment of fees by a company to the Registrar;
- (b) payments made by it to fulfil the requirements of this Act or any other law;
- (c) allotment of shares to fulfil the requirements of this Act; and
- (d) payments for maintenance of its office and records.

**Q17.** 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.

**Sol.**

#### Provision

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.

#### Analysis and conclusion

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.

**Q18.** When a company is registered, it is clothed with a legal personality. Explain.

**Sol.** When a company is registered, it is clothed with a legal personality. It comes to have almost the same rights and powers as a human being. Its existence is distinct and separate from that of its members. A company can own property, have bank account, raise loans, incur liabilities and enter into contracts.

- (a) It is at law, a person different altogether from the subscribers to the memorandum of association. Its personality is distinct and separate from the personality of those who compose it.
- (b) Even members can contract with company, acquire right against it or incur liability to it. For the debts of the company, only its creditors can sue it and not its members.

A company is capable of owning, enjoying and disposing of property in its own name. Although the capital and assets are contributed by the shareholders, the company becomes the owner of its capital and assets. The shareholders are not the private or joint owners of the company's property.

Q19. Flora Fauna Limited was registered as a public company. There are 230 members in the company as noted below:

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

Sol.

#### Provision

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.

#### Analysis and conclusion

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

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

**Q20.** Can a non-profit organization be registered as a company under the Companies Act, 2013? If so, what procedure does it have to adopt?

**Sol.** Yes, a non-profit organization be registered as a company under the Companies Act, 2013 by following the provisions of section 8 of the Companies Act, 2013. 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, sports, education, research, social welfare, religion, charity, protection of environment etc.

Such company intends to apply its profit in

- promoting its objects and
- prohibiting the payment of any dividend to its members.

The Central Government has the power to issue license for registering a section 8 company.

- (i) Section 8 allows the Central Government to register such person or association of persons as a company with limited liability without the addition of words 'Limited' or 'Private limited' to its name, by issuing licence on such conditions as it deems fit.
- (ii) The registrar shall on application register such person or association of persons as a company under this section.
- (iii) On registration the company shall enjoy same privileges and obligations as of a limited company.

**Q21.** 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.

**Sol.**

- (a) **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.

(b) *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*

**Q22.** *Briefly explain the doctrine of “ultravires” under the Companies Act, 2013. What are the consequences of ultravires acts of the company?*

**Sol.** *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 by the shareholders of the company. Sometimes, act which is ultra vires can be regularised by ratifying it subsequently.*

**Q23.** *ABC Limited has allotted equity shares with voting rights to XYZ Limited worth Rs. 15 Crores and issued Non-Convertible Debentures worth Rs. 40 Crores during the Financial Year 2019-20. After that total Paid-up Equity Share Capital of the company is Rs. 100 Crores and Non-Convertible Debentures stands at Rs. 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?*

Sol.

Provision

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.

Analysis and conclusion

In the given case, as ABC Ltd. has allotted equity shares with voting rights to XYZ Limited of Rs. 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.

- Q24. SK Infrastructure Limited has a paid up share capital divided into 6,00,000 equity shares of Rs. 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.

Sol.

Povision

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.

Analysis and conclusion

In the instant case, paid up share capital of SK Infrastructure Limited is 6,00,000 equity shares of Rs. 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.

- Q25. 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 1<sup>st</sup> April 2006 to 28<sup>th</sup> June 2017?

Sol.

### Provision

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;

### Analysis and conclusion

- (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 be 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 28<sup>th</sup> 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.

**Q26.** 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 1<sup>st</sup> 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?

**Sol.** 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 30<sup>th</sup> 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:

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.

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.

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.

**Q27.** 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?

**Sol.** *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

**Q28.** 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?

**Sol.**

Provision

*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.

#### Analysis and conclusion

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.

**Q29.** Explain clearly the doctrine of 'Indoor Management' as applicable in cases of companies registered under the Companies Act, 1956. Explain the circumstances in which an outsider dealing with the company cannot claim any relief on the ground of 'Indoor Management'.

Or

The persons (not being members) dealing with the company are always protected by the doctrine of indoor management. Explain. Also, explain when doctrine of Constructive Notice will apply.

**Sol.** **Doctrine of Indoor Management:** The Doctrine of Indoor Management is the exception to the doctrine of constructive notice. The aforesaid doctrine of constructive notice does in no sense 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. This can be explained with the help of a landmark case *The Royal British Bank vs. Turquand*. This is the doctrine of indoor management popularly known as *Turquand Rule*.

#### **FACTS of the Royal British Bank vs. Turquand**

Mr. Turquand was the official manager (liquidator) of the insolvent *Cameron's Coalbrook Steam, Coal and Swansea and Loughor Railway Company*. It was incorporated under the *Joint Stock Companies Act, 1844*. The company had given a bond for £ 2,000 to the *Royal British Bank*, which secured the company's drawings on its current account. The bond was under the company's seal, signed by two directors and the secretary.

When the company was sued, it alleged that under its registered deed of settlement (the articles of association), directors only had power to borrow up to an amount authorized by a company resolution. A resolution had been passed but not specifying how much the directors could borrow.

Held, it was decided that the bond was valid, so the Royal British Bank could enforce the terms. He said the bank was deemed to be aware that the directors could borrow only up to the amount resolutions allowed. Articles of association were registered with Companies House, so there was constructive notice.

But the bank could not be deemed to know which ordinary resolutions passed, because these were not registrable. The bond was valid because there was no requirement to look into the company's internal workings. This is the indoor management rule, that the company's indoor affairs are the company's problem.

You will notice that the aforementioned rule 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.

**Q30.** What are the exceptions to the Doctrine of Indoor Management?

**Sol.**

- (a) **Actual or constructive knowledge of irregularity:** The rule of Indoor management does not protect any person when the person dealing with the company has notice, whether actual or constructive, of the irregularity.

In *Howard vs. Patent Ivory Manufacturing Co.* where the directors could not defend the issue of debentures to themselves because they should have known that the extent to which they were lending money to the company required the assent of the general meeting which they had not obtained.

Likewise, in *Morris v Kansseen*, a director could not defend an allotment of shares to him as he participated in the meeting, which made the allotment. His appointment as a director also fell through because none of the directors appointed him was validly in office.

- (b) **Suspicion of Irregularity:** The doctrine in no way, rewards those who behave negligently. Where the person dealing with the company is put upon an inquiry, for example, where the transaction is unusual or not in the ordinary course of business, it is the duty of the outsider to make the necessary enquiry.

The protection of the "Turquand Rule" is also not available where the circumstances surrounding the contract are suspicious and therefore invite inquiry.

Suspicion should arise, for example, from the fact that an officer is purporting to act in matter, which is apparently outside the scope of his authority. Where, for example, as in the case of *Anand Bihari Lal vs. Dinshaw & Co.* the plaintiff accepted a transfer of a company's property from its accountant, the transfer was held void. The plaintiff could not have supposed, in absence of a power of attorney that the accountant had authority to effect transfer of the company's property.

Similarly, in the case of *Haughton & Co. v. Nothard, Lowe & Wills Ltd.* where a person holding directorship in two companies agreed to apply the money of one company in payment of the debt to other, the court said that it was something so unusual "that the plaintiff were put upon inquiry to ascertain whether the persons making the contract had any authority in fact to make it."

Any other rule would "place limited companies without any sufficient reasons for so doing, at the mercy of any servant or agent who should purport to contract on their behalf."

(c) **Forgery:** The doctrine of indoor management applies only to irregularities which might otherwise affect a transaction but it cannot apply to forgery which must be regarded as nullity. Forgery may in circumstances exclude the 'Turquand Rule'

The only clear illustration is found in the *Ruben v Great Fingall Consolidated*. In this case the plaintiff was the transferee of a share certificate issued under the seal of the defendant's company.

The company's secretary, who had affixed the seal of the company and forged the signature of the two directors, issued the certificate.

The plaintiff contended that whether the signature were genuine or forged was apart of the internal management, and therefore, the company should be estopped from denying genuineness of the document. But it was held, that the rule has never been extended to cover such a complete forgery.

**Q31.** *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 Rs. 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?

Sol.

#### Provision

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.

### Analysis and conclusion

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.

**Q32.** What is meant by a Guarantee Company? State the similarities and dissimilarities between a Guarantee Company and a Company having Share Capital.

Or

**Explain** the meaning of Guarantee Company? State the similarities and dissimilarities between a ‘Guarantee Company’ and ‘Company Limited by Shares’

**Sol.** Meaning of Guarantee Company: Section 2(21) of the Companies Act, 2013 defines a Company Limited by Guarantee as a company having the liability of its members limited by the memorandum to such amount as the members may respectively undertake to contribute to the assets of the company in the event of its being wound up.

Thus, the liability of the members of a guarantee company is limited to a stipulated amount in terms of individual guarantees given by members and mentioned in the memorandum. The members cannot be called upon to contribute more than such stipulated amount for which each member has given a guarantee in the memorandum of association.

**Similarities and dis-similarities between the Guarantee Company and the Company limited by shares:** The common features between a “guarantee company” and the “company limited share” are legal entity and limited liability.

In case of a company limited by shares, the liability of its members is limited to the amount remaining unpaid on the shares held by them. Both these type of companies have to state this fact in their memorandum that the members’ liability is limited.

However, the dissimilarities between a ‘guarantee company’ and ‘company limited by shares’ is that in the former case the members will be called upon to discharge their liability only after commencement of the winding up of the company and only to the

extent of amounts guaranteed by them respectively; whereas in the case of a company limited by shares, the members may be called upon to discharge their liability at any time, either during the life of the company or during the course of its winding up.

**Q33.** Examine with reasons whether the following statement is correct or incorrect:

**Sol.** Affixing of Common seal on company's documents is compulsory.

*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.

**Q34.** 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 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.

**Sol.**

#### Provision

**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.

#### Analysis and conclusion

In the given question, Mr. X has made payment to Mr. Z and he (Mr. Z) gave a 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.

**Q35.** Alfa school started imparting education on 1.4.2010, 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 of its objective 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?

**Sol.** 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 of its objective clause, hence in such a situation the following powers can be exercised by the Central Government:

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 section 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.

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.

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.

**Q36.** 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?

**Sol.**

#### Provision

**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.

#### Analysis and conclusion

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

**Q37.** The paid-up capital of Ram Private Limited is Rs. 10 Crores in the form of 7,00,000 Equity Shares of Rs. 100 each and 3,00,000 Preference Shares of Rs. 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?



Sol.

Provision

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;

Analysis and conclusion

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

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.

**Q38.** The Object Clause of Memorandum of Association of ABC Pvt. Ltd. authorised the company to carry on the business of trading in Fruits and Vegetables. The Directors of the company in recently concluded Board Meeting decided and accordingly, the company ordered for fish for the purpose of trading. FSH Limited supplied fish to ABC Pvt. Ltd. worth Rs. 36 Lakhs. The members of the company convened an extraordinary general meeting and negated the proposal of the Board of Directors on the ground of ultra vires acts. FSH Limited being aggrieved of the said decision of ABC Pvt Ltd. seeks your advice. Advice them.

Sol.

Provision

**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 authorized 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.

#### Analysis and conclusion

Therefore, the resolution passed by the Board of Director ABC Pvt. Limited for an ultra vires transaction is invalid. As a result of this, the transaction entered into the supply of fish with FSH Limited is not legal and is void.

**Q39.** What is the meaning of "Certificate of Incorporation" under the provisions of the Companies Act, 2013? What are the effects of registration of a company?

**Sol.** Under section 7(2) the Registrar shall on the basis of documents and information filed for the formation of a company, shall register all the documents and information and issue a certificate that the company is incorporated in the prescribed form to the effect that the proposed company is incorporated under this Act.

The company becomes a legal entity from the date mentioned in the certificate of incorporation and continues to be so till it is wound up.

#### Effects of registration of a company

Section 9 of the Companies Act, 2013 provides that, from the date of incorporation mentioned in the certificate of incorporation, such of the subscribers to the Memorandum and all other persons, as may from time to time become members of the company, shall be a body corporate by the name contained in the memorandum, capable forthwith of exercising all the functions of an incorporated company under this Act and having perpetual succession with power to acquire, hold and dispose of property, both movable and immovable, tangible and intangible, to contract and to sue and be sued by the said name. Accordingly, when a company is registered and a certificate of incorporation is issued by the Registrar, three important consequences follow:

(a) **the company becomes a distinct legal entity.** Its life commences from the date mentioned in the certificate of incorporation capable of entering into contracts in its own name, acquiring, holding and disposing of property of any nature whatsoever and capable of suing and being sued in its own name.

(b) it acquires a life of perpetual existence by the doctrine of succession. The members may come and go, but it goes on forever, unless it is wound up.

Its property is not the property of the shareholders. The shareholders have a right to share in the profits of the company as and when declared either as dividend or as bonus shares. Likewise any liability of the company is not the liability of the individual shareholders

**Q40.** FAREB Limited was incorporated by acquisition of FAREB & Co., a partnership firm, which was earlier involved in many illegal activities. The promoters furnished some false information and also suppressed some material facts at the time of incorporation of the company. Some members of the public (not being directors or promoters of the company) approached the National Company Law Tribunal (NCLT) against the incorporation status of FAREB Limited. NCLT is about to pass the order by directing that the liability of the members of the company shall be unlimited.

Given the above, advice on whether the above order will be legal and mention the precaution to be taken by NCLT before passing order in respect of the above as per the provisions of the Companies Act, 2013.

**Sol.**

(i) As per section 7(7) of the Companies Act, 2013, where a company has been got incorporated by furnishing false or incorrect information or representation or by suppressing any material fact or information in any of the documents or declaration filed or made for incorporating such company or by any fraudulent action, the Tribunal may, on an application made to it, on being satisfied that the situation so warrants, direct that liability of the members shall be unlimited.

Hence, the order of NCLT will be legal.

Precautions: Before making any order,—

- (a) the company shall be given a reasonable opportunity of being heard in the matter; and
- (b) the Tribunal shall take into consideration the transactions entered into by the company, including the obligations, if any, contracted or payment of any liability.

□□□