

**MODEL TEST PAPER 1**  
**FINAL (NEW) COURSE**  
**PAPER 4: CORPORATE AND ECONOMIC LAWS**  
**SUGGESTED ANSWER/HINTS**

**DIVISION A: MULTIPLE CHOICE QUESTIONS**

1. (b)
2. (b)
3. (c)
4. (c)
5. (c)
6. (c)
7. (d)
8. (d)
9. (a)
10. (c)
11. (c)
12. (c)
13. (a)
14. (d)
15. (c)
16. (a)
17. (a)
18. (c)
19. (b)

**Descriptive Questions**

1. (a) Section 152(6) of the Companies Act, 2013 specifies the legal provision as to the retirement of directors by rotation of public company. According to the said provision, out of retiring directors, 1/3<sup>rd</sup> of directors must retire every year. However, as per amendment to the Companies Act, 2013, by MCA vide Notification No. 463(E) on 13/6/17, the government companies are exempted from the applicability of Section 152(6) and 152 (7) of the Act. Accordingly, a Government company, which is not a listed company, in which not less than fifty-one per cent of paid up of share capital is held by the Central Government, or by any State Government or Governments or by the Central Government and one or more State Governments; and a subsidiary of a Government company, referred above, the provision as to retirement by rotation is not applicable.

Following are the answers in the light of the stated provisions:

- (i) Since Eternal Ltd. is a wholly owned Government Company (other than listed company), so section 152(6) in given circumstances is not applicable. None of the directors of Eternal Ltd. will be retired by rotation under section 152(6).

- (ii) Since Evergreen Ltd. is a subsidiary company of Eternal Ltd. so retirement by rotation is also not applicable here. None of the directors of Evergreen Ltd. will be retired by rotation under section 152(6).
  - (iii) In case Eternal Ltd. is a listed Government Company, then section 152(6) will be applicable presuming that a company has not committed a default in filing its financial statements under Section 137 or Annual Return under Section 92 with the Registrar. According to it, the Eternal Ltd will be treated as a public company, with 10 directors in its Board, 3 can be non-retiring and out of 7 retiring directors, 2 must retire every year.
- (b) (i) As per section 196(3) of the Companies Act, 2013, no company shall appoint or continue the employment of any person as managing director, whole-time director or manager who is below the age of twenty-one years or has attained the age of seventy years, unless that appointment of a person who has attained the age of seventy years may be made by passing a special resolution in which case the explanatory statement annexed to the notice for such motion shall indicate the justification for appointing such person.

Where no such special resolution is passed but votes cast in favour of the motion exceed the votes, if any, cast against the motion and the Central Government is satisfied, on an application made by the Board, that such appointment is most beneficial to the company, the appointment of the person who has attained the age of seventy years may be made.

Therefore, appointment of Mr. Chander in the shining Ltd. being of 75 years, is valid in compliance to above legal provisions.

- (ii) As per section II of Part II of Schedule V to the Companies Act 2013- "effective capital" means the aggregate of the paid-up share capital (excluding share application money or advances against shares); amount, if any, for the time being standing to the credit of share premium account; reserves and surplus (excluding revaluation reserve); long-term loans and deposits repayable after one year (excluding working capital loans, overdrafts, interest due on loans unless funded, bank guarantee, etc., and other short-term arrangements) as reduced by the aggregate of any investments (except in case of investment by an investment company whose principal business is acquisition of shares, stock, debentures or other securities), accumulated losses and preliminary expenses not written off.

According to the particulars given:

Particulars	Amounts (in Crores)
Paid up share capital (Excluding share application money) (215-15)	INRs 200
General Reserve (Excluding Revaluation Reserve) (170-20)	INRs 150
Long term loans	INRs 200
Less: Investments (40) and Accumulated losses (10)	(INRs 50)
Effective Capital	INRs 500

- (iii) As per Section II of Part II of Schedule V to the Companies Act 2013, in case of no or inadequate profits, if effective capital of company is INR 250 crore or more then, yearly remuneration per person payable shall not exceed by INR 120 lakh plus 0.01% of the effective capital in excess of INR 250 crore.

The maximum remuneration that may be paid to each managerial person will be  $[120 \text{ lakh} + (0.01\% \times 250 \text{ cr})] = 122.5 \text{ lakh}$ .

Provided that the remuneration in excess of above limits may be paid if the resolution passed by the shareholders is a special resolution.

2. (a) (i) Section 244 of the Companies Act, 2013 provides the eligibility of members who hold the right to file the application under section 241 for oppression and mismanagement with the Tribunal. These qualification as provided in section 244 ensure that only the persons with sufficient interest in the affairs of the company can file the petition under section 241 of the Act. According to the section in the case of a company not having a share capital, not less than one-fifth of the total number of its members are eligible to make an application before the Tribunal. Where any members of a company are entitled to make an application under Section 244 (1), any one or more of them having obtained the consent in writing of the rest, may make the application on behalf and for the benefit of all of them.

In the given scenario, requirement of minimum numbers of members is fulfilled i.e. it is more than  $1/5^{\text{th}}$  of the total number of its members of the company ( $1/5 \times 100 = 20$ ). So the members of the company are eligible to file the petition to tribunal under section 241.

- (ii) According to section 221 of the Companies Act, 2013, if it appears to the Tribunal, on a complaint made by members as specified under section 244(1) that the removal, transfer or disposal of funds, assets, properties of the company is likely to take place in a manner that is prejudicial to the interests of its members, Tribunal may order that such transfer, removal or disposal shall not take place during such period not exceeding three years as may be specified in the order or may take place subject to such conditions and restrictions as the Tribunal may deem fit.

Here in the given case, management disposed of the certain assets within 1 year of such order of Tribunal. So accordingly, the company shall be punishable with fine which shall not be less than one lakh rupees but which may extend to twenty-five lakh rupees and every officer of the company who is in default shall be punishable with imprisonment for a term which may extend to three years or with fine which shall not be less than fifty thousand rupees but which may extend to five lakh rupees, or with both.

- (b) (i) Toy Ltd. being a Japanese company would be a person resident outside India. [Section 2(w)]. Section 2(u) defines 'person'. Under clause (vi) of section 2(u), thereof person would include any agency, office or branch owned or controlled by such 'person'. The term such 'person' appears to refer to a person who is included in clauses (i) to (v). Accordingly, robotic unit in Mumbai, being a branch of a company, would be a 'person'.

Section 2(v) defines 'person resident in India'. Under clause (iii) 'person resident in India' would include an office, branch or agency in India owned or controlled by a person resident outside India. Robotic unit in Mumbai is owned or controlled by a person 'resident outside India'. Hence, it would be 'person resident in India'.

However, robotic unit in Mumbai, though not 'owned' controls Singapore branch, which is a person resident in India. Hence *prima facie*, it may be possible to hold a view that the Singapore branch is 'person resident in India'.

- (ii) Apex Limited failed to repay the amount borrowed from the bankers, ACE Bank Limited, which is holding a charge on all the assets of the company. The bank took over management of the company in accordance with the provisions of the Securitisation and Reconstruction of Financial Assets and Enforcement of Security Interest Act, 2002 by appointing four persons as directors. The company is managed by a Managing Director, Mr. X.

Here, Apex Limited is a borrower and ACE Bank Limited is a secured creditor.

Compensation to Managing director (Mr. X) for loss of office: According to section 16 of the Securitisation and Reconstruction of Financial Assets and Enforcement of Security Interest Act, 2002, irrespective of anything contained in any contract or in any other law for the time being in force, no managing director or any other director or a manager or any person in charge of management of the business of the borrower shall be entitled to any compensation for the loss of office or for the premature termination under this Act. However any such

managing director or any other director or manager or any such person in charge of management has the right to recover from the business of the borrower, moneys recoverable otherwise than by way of such compensation.

3. (a) According to the Section 248(2) of the Companies Act, 2013, a company may, after extinguishing all its liabilities, by a special resolution, or consent of seventy-five per cent. members in terms of paid-up share capital, file an application in the prescribed manner to the Registrar for removing the name of the company from the register of companies on all or any of the grounds specified in section 248(1) and the Registrar shall, on receipt of such application, cause a public notice to be issued in the prescribed manner.

Further Section 249 provides restrictions on making application under section 248 .

An application under section 248 on behalf of a company shall not be made if, at any time in the previous three months, the company—

- (a) has changed its name or shifted its registered office from one State to another;
- (b) has made a disposal for value of property or rights held by it, immediately before cesser of trade or otherwise carrying on of business, for the purpose of disposal for gain in the normal course of trading or otherwise carrying on of business;
- (c) has engaged in any other activity except the one which is necessary or expedient for the purpose of making an application under that section, or deciding whether to do so or concluding the affairs of the company, or complying with any statutory requirement;
- (d) has made an application to the Tribunal for the sanctioning of a compromise or arrangement and the matter has not been finally concluded; or
- (e) is being wound up under Chapter XX of this Act or under the Insolvency and Bankruptcy Code, 2016.

**Violation of above conditions on filing of application:** If a company files an application in violation of restriction given above, it shall be punishable with fine which may extend to one lakh rupees.

**Rights of registrar on non-compliance of conditions by the company:** An application filed under above circumstances, shall be withdrawn by the company or rejected by the Registrar as soon as conditions are brought to his notice.

**Aggrieved person to file an appeal against the order of registrar:** As per section 252(1), any person aggrieved by an order of the Registrar, notifying a company as dissolved under section 248, may file an appeal to the Tribunal within a period of three years from the date of the order of the Registrar and if the Tribunal is of the opinion that the removal of the name of the company from the register of companies is not justified in view of the absence of any of the grounds on which the order was passed by the Registrar, it may order restoration of the name of the company in the register of companies. However a reasonable opportunity is given to the company and all the persons concerned.

According to the above provisions, following are the answers:

- (i) As per the restrictions marked in the Section 249(d) stating that an application under section 248 on behalf of a company shall not be made if, at any time in the previous three months, the company has made an application to the Tribunal for the sanctioning of a compromise or arrangement and the matter has not been finally concluded.

As per the facts application to the registrar for removal of the name of company from the register of companies, was filed by the Eminence Ltd. within three months to the filing of an

application to the Tribunal for approval of compromise or arrangement proposal. Therefore, filing of such an application by Eminence Ltd is not valid.

- (ii) If a company files an application in above situation, it shall be punishable with fine which may extend to one lakh rupees. An application so filed, shall be withdrawn by the company or rejected by the Registrar as soon as conditions are brought to his notice.
- (iii) According to the provision given in section 252(1), a person aggrieved by an order of the Registrar, notifying Eminence Ltd. as dissolved under section 248, may:
  - file an appeal to the Tribunal within a period of three years from the date of the order of the Registrar, and
  - if the Tribunal is of the opinion that the removal of the name of the company from the register of companies is not justified in view of the absence of any of the grounds on which the order was passed by the Registrar, it may order restoration of the name of the Eminence Ltd. in the register of companies.
  - A reasonable opportunity is given to the Eminence Ltd. and all the persons concerned.

- (b) (i) Section 25 of the Prevention of Money Laundering Act, 2002 empowers the Central Government to establish an Appellate Tribunal to hear appeal against order of the Adjudicating Authority and other authorities under the Act.

Section 26 deals with the right and time frame to make an appeal to the Appellate Tribunal. Any person aggrieved by an order made by the Adjudicating Authority may prefer an appeal to the Appellate Tribunal within a period of 45 days from the date on which a copy of the order is received by him. The appeal shall be in such form and be accompanied by such fee as may be prescribed. The Appellate Tribunal may extend the period if it is satisfied that there was sufficient cause for not filing it within the period of 45 days.

The Appellate Tribunal may after giving the parties to the appeal an opportunity of being heard, pass such order as it thinks fit, confirming, modifying or setting aside the order appealed against.

The Act also provides further appeal. According to Section 42 any person aggrieved by any decision or order of the Appellate Tribunal may file an appeal to the High Court within 60 days from the date of communication of the order of the Appellate Tribunal.

In the light of the provisions of the Act explained above the company is advised to prefer an appeal to Appellate Tribunal in the first instance.

- (ii) In the present case, Sohan Lal, a farmer, who was involved in embezzlement of opium cultivated by him shall be said to have committed a scheduled offence under the Paragraph 2 of Part A of Schedule to the Prevention of Money Laundering Act, 2002. It covers offences under the Narcotic Drugs and Psychotropic Substances Act, 1985 whereby, embezzlement of opium by cultivator (section 19) is an offence which is illegal by law and hence the person involved in the proceeds of crimes arising out of the commission of scheduled offences shall be liable for commission of trial under PMLA.

Accordingly, as per section 4 of the PMLA, 2002, Sohan Lal shall be liable for the rigorous imprisonment for a term which may extend to 10 years and shall also be liable to fine.

4. (a) (i) Regulation 24: Corporate Governance Requirements with respect to Subsidiary of Listed Entity.

**The Board:** At least one Independent Director on Board shall be a Director on Board of Unlisted Material Subsidiary. The management of the unlisted subsidiary shall periodically bring to the notice of the board of directors of the listed entity, a statement of all significant transactions and arrangements entered into by the unlisted subsidiary.

**A listed entity shall not dispose of shares in its material subsidiary** resulting in reduction of its shareholding (either on its own or together with other subsidiaries) to less than **50 %** or cease the exercise of control over the subsidiary without passing a special resolution in its General Meeting except in cases where such divestment is made under a scheme of arrangement duly approved by a Court/Tribunal or under a resolution plan duly approved under section 31 of the IBC and such an event is disclosed to the recognised stock exchange within one day of the resolution plan being approved.

Selling, disposing and leasing of assets amounting to more than 20% of the assets of the material subsidiary on an aggregate basis during a financial year shall require prior approval of shareholders by way of special resolution, unless the sale/disposal/lease is made under a scheme of arrangement duly approved by a Court/Tribunal/ duly approved resolution plan.

- (ii) In this case, Mr. Vijay may opt for 'Option' derivative contract, which is an agreement to buy or sell a set of assets at a specified time in the future for a specified amount. However, it is not obligatory for him to hold the terms of the agreement, since he has an 'option' to exercise the contract. For example, if the current market price of the share is Rs. 100 and he buy an option to sell the shares to Mr. X at Rs. 200 after three-month, so Vijay bought a put option.

Now, if after three months, the current price of the shares is Rs. 210, Mr. Vijay may opt not to sell the shares to Mr. X and instead sell them in the market, thus making a profit of Rs. 110. Had the market price of the shares after three months would have been Rs. 90, Mr. Vijay would have obliged the option contract and sold those shares to Mr. X, thus making a profit, even though the current market price was below the contracted price. Thus, here, the shares of Travel Everywhere Limited is the underlying asset and the option contract is a form of derivative.

- (b) (i) No. As per Section 4(e) of FCRA, 2010 read with Rule 6 of FCRR, 2011, even the persons prohibited under section 3, i.e., persons not permitted to accept foreign contribution, are allowed to accept foreign contribution from their relatives. However, in terms of Rule 6 of FCRR, 2011, any person receiving foreign contribution in excess of one lakh rupees or equivalent thereto in a financial year from any of his relatives shall inform the Central Government in prescribed Form within thirty days from the date of receipt of such contribution.

So Mr. Indian shall inform the Central Government of his receiving of the foreign contribution of 1.10 lakh from his relative due to receiving of foreign contribution in excess of 1 lakh rupees.

- (ii) As per the Arbitration and Conciliation Act, 1996 an agreement must be in writing There is however no requirement for the same to be in writing in one document. There is also no particular form or template for an arbitration agreement. The communication over email of the term of services is proper valid agreement and the same have been stood affirmed by reason of their conduct. This would be an arbitration agreement in writing contained in correspondence between the parties.

5. (a) (i) All offences which are punishable in this Act with imprisonment of 2 years or more, shall be triable only by the special court established for the area in which the registered office of the company in relation to which the offence is committed. According to section 436 where there are more special courts than one for such area, by such one of them as may be specified in this behalf by the high court concerned.

Accordingly, in the given case, there are more than one special court in Bundi district where registered office of Excel Ltd. is situated. The jurisdiction for trial in special court will be specified by H.C of the State (i.e. Rajasthan).

- (ii) In terms of the definition of a foreign company under section 2 (42) of the Companies Act, 2013 a "foreign company" means any company or body corporate incorporated outside India which:

- (a) Has a place of business in India whether by itself or through an agent, physically or through electronic mode; and
- (b) Conducts any business activity in India in any other manner

According to section 386 of the Companies Act, 2013, for the purposes of Chapter XXII of the Companies Act, 2013 (Companies incorporated outside India), "Place of business" includes a share transfer or registration office.

From the above definition, the status of XYZ Ltd. will be that of a foreign company as it is incorporated outside India, has a place of business in India and it may be presumed that it carries on a business activity in India.

- (iii) The Companies Act, 2013 vide section 380 provides that every foreign company is required to deliver to the Registrar for registration, within 30 days of the establishment of office in India, documents which have been specified therein. According to *the Companies (Registration of Foreign Companies) Rules, 2014*, any document which any foreign company is required to deliver to the Registrar shall be delivered to the Registrar having jurisdiction over New Delhi.
- (b) Section 59 of the Insolvency & Bankruptcy Code, 2016 empowers a corporate person intending to liquidate itself voluntarily if it has not committed any default, to initiate voluntary liquidation proceedings under the provisions of this Code.

Any corporate person registered as a company shall meet the following conditions to initiate a voluntary liquidation process:-

- (a) A declaration from majority of the directors of the company verified by an affidavit stating
  - i. That they have made a full inquiry into the affairs of the company and have formed an opinion that either the company has no debts or that it will be able to pay its debts in full from the proceeds of assets to be sold in the voluntary liquidation; and
  - ii. That the company is not being liquidated to defraud any person.
- (b) The declaration shall be accompanied with the following documents, namely:
  - i. Audited financial statements and a record of business operations of the company for the previous two years or for the period since its incorporation, whichever is later;
  - ii. A report of the valuation of the assets of the company, if any, prepared by a registered valuer.
- (c) After making the declaration the corporate debtor shall within four weeks -
  - i. Pass a special resolution at a general meeting stating that the company should be liquidated voluntarily and insolvency professional to act as the liquidator may be appointed.
  - ii. Pass a resolution at a general meeting stating that the company be liquidated voluntarily as a result of expiry of the period of its duration (fixed by its articles or on the occurrence of any event in respect of which the articles provide that the company shall be dissolved, if any) and appointing an insolvency professional to act as the liquidator.

Here, in the given situations, according to the above provisions, a declaration made with an affidavit of the some of the directors of the X Ltd. verifying that company have made full inquiry of the affairs of the company, is not in compliance, as the majority was the requirement for initiation of the voluntary liquidation proceedings. And the further declaration that the company is not being liquidated to defraud any person is not given in the affidavit. The documents to be accompanied with declaration shall be as per the point (b) given above in the stated provision.

Where if the articles fixed the period of duration of continuation of the Company and that period expires, X Ltd. after making declaration, shall within 4 weeks pass a resolution at a general meeting stating that the company be liquidated voluntarily as a result of expiry of the period of its duration as fixed by its articles and appointing an insolvency professional to act as the liquidator.

6. (a) **Powers of Board:** In accordance with the provisions of the Companies Act, 2013, as contained under Section 179(1), the Board of Directors of a company shall be entitled to exercise all such powers and to do all such acts and things, as the company is authorized to exercise and do:

Provided that in exercising such power or doing such act or thing, the Board shall be subject to the provisions contained in that behalf in this Act, or in the memorandum or articles, or in any regulations not inconsistent therewith and duly made there under including regulations made by the company in general meeting.

Provided further that the Board shall not exercise any power or do any act or thing which is directed or required, whether under this Act or by the members or articles of the company or otherwise to be exercised or done by the company in general meeting.

Section 180(1) of the Companies Act, 2013, provides that the powers of the Board of Directors of a company which can be exercised only with the consent of the company by passing of a special resolution. Clause (a) of Section 180(1) defines one such power as the power to sell, lease or otherwise dispose of the whole or substantially the whole of the undertaking of the company or where the company owns more than one undertaking of the whole or substantially the whole or any of such undertakings.

Therefore, the sale of the undertaking of a company can be made by the Board of Directors only with the consent of members of the company accorded vide a special resolution.

Even if the power is given to the Board by the memorandum and articles of the company, the sale of the undertaking must be approved by the shareholders in general meeting by passing a special resolution.

Therefore, the correct procedure to be followed is for the Board to approve the sale of the undertaking clearly specifying the terms of such sale and then convene a general meeting of members to have the proposal approved by a special resolution.

In the given case, the procedure followed is completely incorrect and violative of the provisions of the Act. The shareholders cannot on their own make out a proposal of sale and pass an ordinary resolution to implement it through the directors.

The contention of the shareholders is incorrect in the first place as it is not within their authority to approve a proposal independently of the Board of Directors. It is for the Board to approve a proposal of sale of the undertaking and then get the members to approve it by a special resolution. Accordingly the contention of the members that they were the principals and directors being their agents were bound to give effect to the decisions of the members, is not correct.

Further, in exercising their powers the directors do not act as agent for the majority of members or even all the members. The members therefore, cannot by resolution passed by a majority or even unanimously supersede the powers of directors or instruct them how they shall exercise their powers. The shareholders have, however, the power to alter the Articles of Association of the company in the manner they like subject to the provisions of the Companies Act, 2013.



- (b) (i) In the given problem, on commission of default by the Wisdom Ltd. against Mr. F, entitled him to file an application for initiating corporate insolvency resolution process before adjudicating authority. Further, Mr. X another financial creditor also moved an application for initiation of insolvency resolution process against the Wisdom Ltd.

According to the section 6 of the Code, where any corporate debtor commits a default, a financial creditor, Operational creditor or the Corporate debtor itself may initiate insolvency resolution process against such corporate debtor.

As per the facts given in the question default has been committed only against Mr. F and not against Mr. X. So Mr. F is prima facie entitled to file an application for initiation of the CIRP.

Further, section 7 of the Code specifies financial creditor either by itself jointly with other financial creditor may file an application only when default has occurred. Since in the given case, default has occurred only against Mr. F and so further no application for initiation of CIRP can be initiated by Mr. X, however he being a creditor, is entitled under the Code to raise his claim in this case against the Wisdom Ltd. in compliance with the Insolvency and Bankruptcy Code, 2016.

- (ii) Following actions can be taken against the persons involved in Money Laundering:-
- (a) Attachment of property under Section 5, seizure/ freezing of property and records under Section 17 or Section 18. Property also includes property of any kind used in the commission of an offence under PMLA, 2002 or any of the scheduled offences.
  - (b) Persons found guilty of an offence of Money Laundering are punishable with imprisonment for a term which shall not be less than three years but may extend up to seven years and shall also be liable to fine [Section 4].
  - (c) When the scheduled offence committed is under the Narcotics and Psychotropic substances Act, 1985 the punishment shall be imprisonment for a term which shall not be less than three years but which may extend up to ten years and shall also be liable to fine.
  - (d) The prosecution or conviction of any legal juridical person is not contingent on the prosecution or conviction of any individual.