

Test Series: May, 2020

**MOCK TEST PAPER – 1**  
**FINAL (NEW) COURSE: GROUP – I**  
**PAPER 4: CORPORATE AND ECONOMIC LAWS**  
**ANSWERS**

**DIVISION A: MULTIPLE CHOICE QUESTIONS (TOTAL OF 30 MARKS)**

**1. Integrated Case Scenario**

- (1) Option (b)
- (2) Option (c)
- (3) Option (d)
- (4) Option (c)

**2. Integrated Case Scenario**

- (1) Option (a)
- (2) Option (d)
- (3) Option (d)
- (4) Option (b)

**Multiple choice questions**

- 3. Option (d)
- 4. Option (c)
- 5. Option (a)
- 6. Option (d)
- 7. Option (d)
- 8. Option (d)
- 9. Option (d)
- 10. Option (d)
- 11. Option (d)
- 12. Option (b)

**DIVISION B: Descriptive questions (70 Marks)**

1. (a) Section 161(1) of the Companies Act, 2013 provides that the articles of association of a company may confer on its Board of Directors the power to appoint any person, other than a person who fails to get appointed as a director at the general meeting, as an additional director at any time and such director will hold office upto the date of the next annual general meeting or the last date on which such annual general meeting should have been held, whichever is earlier.

Accordingly, following are the answers-

- (i) Mr. Mantri cannot continue as director till the adjourned annual general meeting, since he can hold the office of directorship only up to the date of the next annual general meeting or the last date on which the annual general meeting should have been held, whichever is earlier. Such an additional director shall vacate his office latest on the date on which the

annual general meeting should have been held under Section 96 of the Companies Act, 2013. He cannot continue in the office on the ground that the meeting was not held or it could not be called within the time prescribed.

- (ii) The power to appoint additional directors vests with the Board of Directors and not with the members of the company. The only condition is that the Board must be conferred such power by the articles of the company.
- (iii) As a Company Secretary, I would put the following checks in place in respect of Mr. Mantri's appointment as an additional director:
  - (a) He must have got the Directors Identification Number (DIN).
  - (b) He must furnish the DIN and a declaration that he is not disqualified to become a director under the Companies Act, 2013.
  - (c) He must give his written consent in Form DIR-2 on or before his appointment as director and such consent stands filed with the Registrar within 30 days of his appointment.
  - (d) His appointment is made by the Board of Directors.
  - (e) His name is entered in the statutory records as required under the Companies Act, 2013.
- (b) According to Section 202 of the Companies Act, 2013, compensation can be paid only to a Managing Director, Whole-time Director or Manager. Amount of compensation cannot exceed the remuneration which he would have earned if he would have been in the office for the unexpired term of his office or for 3 years whichever is shorter. No compensation shall be paid, if the director has been found guilty of fraud or breach of trust or gross negligence in the conduct of the affairs of the company.

In light of the above provisions of law, following are the answers-

- (i) W.r.t. this part of the question, the company is not liable to pay any compensation to Mr. Silencer, if he has been found guilty of fraud or breach of trust or gross negligence in the conduct of affairs of the company. But, it is not proper on the part of the company to withhold the payment of compensation on the basis of mere allegations. The compensation payable by the company to Mr. Silencer would be Rs. 25 Lakh calculated at the rate of Rs.12 Lakh per annum for unexpired term of 25 months.
  - (ii) In respect to this part of the question, ad-hoc payment made of Rs.5 Lakh, will not be possible for the company to recover from Mr. Silencer in view of the decision in case of *Bell vs. Lever Bros. (1932) AC 161* where it was observed that a director was not legally bound to disclose any breach of his fiduciary obligations so as to give the company an opportunity to dismiss him. In that case, the Managing Director was initially removed by paying him compensation and later on it was discovered that he had been guilty of breaches of duty and corrupt practices and that he could have been removed without compensation.
2. (a) (i) The argument of the majority shareholders that the petition may be dismissed on the ground of non-maintability is not correct. The proceedings shall continue irrespective of withdrawal of consent by some petitioners. It has been held by the Supreme Court in *Rajmundhry Electric Corporation vs. V. NageswarRao, AIR (1956) SC 213* that if some of the consenting members have subsequent to the presentation of the petition withdraw their consent, it would not affect the right of the applicant to proceed with the petition. Thus, the validity of the petition must be judged on the facts as they were at the time of presentation. Neither the right of the applicants to proceed with the petition nor the jurisdiction of Tribunal to dispose it of on its merits can be affected by events happening subsequent to the presentation of the petition.

- (ii) As per section 233 (1), notwithstanding the provisions of section 230 and section 232, a scheme of merger or amalgamation may be entered between,

2 or more small companies

a holding company and its wholly-owned subsidiary company. If 100% of its share capital is held by the holding company, except the shares held by the nominee or nominees to ensure that the number of members of subsidiary company is not reduced below the statutory limit as provided in section 187.

such other class or classes of companies as may be prescribed.

The provisions given for fast track merger in the section 233 are in the optional nature and not a compulsion to the company. If a company wants to make application for merger as per section 232, it can do so.

Hence, here the Company Secretary of the XYZ limited has erred in the law and his contention is not valid as per law. The company shall have an option to choose between normal process of merger and fast track merger.

- (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 (vii) 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 (vi). 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 banker, 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 was 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.

Therefore, Mr.X is not entitled for any compensation for loss of office in the given case.

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:

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 Pioneer 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 Pioneer Ltd. is not valid.

- (i) 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.
- (ii) According to the provision given in section 252(1), a person aggrieved by an order of the Registrar, notifying Pioneer 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 Pioneer Ltd. in the register of companies.
  - A reasonable opportunity is given to the Pioneer Ltd. and all the persons concerned.
- (b) Section 45 provides that the offences under the Act shall be cognizable and non-bailable. Notwithstanding anything contained in the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973, no person accused of an offence under this Act shall be released on bail or on his own bond unless-
- (i) The Public Prosecutor has been given an opportunity to oppose the application for such release and
  - (ii) Where the Public Prosecutor opposes the application, the court is satisfied that there are reasonable grounds for believing that he is not guilty of such offence and that he is not likely to commit any offence while on bail.

In case of any person who is under the age of 16 years or in case of a woman or in case of a sick or infirm person or is accused either on his own or along with other co-accused of money-laundering a sum of less than one crore rupees, may be released on bail, if the Special Court so directs.

As in the given case, Mr. Fraudulent, a 16 year old person was accused of money laundering a sum of 70 lakh, Accordingly, as per above provision, though he is not under 16 years but accused of money laundering of amount of Rs. 70 Lakh, so will be released on bail on the direction of special court.

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 of the Companies Act, 2013 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 High Court 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) As per section 389 of the Companies Act, 2013, no person shall issue, circulate or distribute in India any prospectus offering for subscription in securities of a company incorporated or to be incorporated outside India, whether the company has or has not established, or when formed will or will not establish, a place of business in India, unless before the issue, circulation or distribution of the prospectus in India, a copy thereof certified by the

chairperson of the company and two other directors of the company as having been approved by resolution of the managing body has been delivered for registration to the Registrar and the prospectus states on the face of it that a copy has been so delivered, and there is endorsed on or attached to the copy, any consent to the issue of the prospectus required by section 388 and such documents as may be prescribed under *Rule 11 of the Companies (Incorporated outside India) Rules, 2014*.

Accordingly in the given situation, issue of prospectus by the Abroad Ltd., a foreign company will be valid if done in compliance with the above stated section 379 of the Act.

- (b) As per Regulation 3 of the Insolvency and Bankruptcy Board of India (Insolvency Resolution Process for Corporate Persons) Regulations, 2016, an insolvency professional shall be eligible to be appointed as a resolution professional for a corporate insolvency resolution process of a corporate debtor if he, and all partners and directors of the insolvency professional entity of which he is a partner or director, are independent of the corporate debtor.

Explanation– A person shall be considered independent of the corporate debtor, if he:

- (a) is eligible to be appointed as an independent director on the board of the corporate debtor under section 149 of the Companies Act, 2013, where the corporate debtor is a company;
- (b) is not a related party of the corporate debtor; or
- (c) is not an employee or proprietor or a partner:
  - (i) of a firm of auditors or secretarial auditors in practice or cost auditors of the corporate debtor in the last three financial years.
  - (ii) of a legal or a consulting firm, that has or had any transaction with the corporate debtor amounting to five per cent or more of the gross turnover of such firm, in the last three financial years.

As per the given facts, Mr. Mediator was proposed to be appointed as a resolution professional for the insolvency resolution process initiated against BMR Ltd. Whereas, Mr. R, a relative of director of BMR Ltd. is a partner in the insolvency professional entity in which Mr. Mediator is partner.

Since, Mr. R is the partner in insolvency professional entity in which Mr. Mediator is a partner, so, Mr. Mediator is not eligible for appointment as Resolution Professional as he is not independent of the corporate debtor, being a relative of director of BMR Ltd. (Corporate debtor).

6. (a) Under section 179(3) of the Companies Act, 2013, the Board of Directors of a company shall exercise the following powers on behalf of the company by means of resolutions passed at meetings of the Board:
- (a) To make calls on shareholders in respect of money unpaid on their shares;
  - (b) To authorise buy-back of securities under section 68;
  - (c) To issue securities, including debentures, whether in or outside India;
  - (d) To borrow monies;
  - (e) To invest the funds of the company;
  - (f) To grant loans or give guarantee or provide security in respect of loans;
  - (g) To approve financial statement and the Board's report;
  - (h) To diversify the business of the company
  - (i) To approve amalgamation, merger or reconstruction;
  - (j) To take over a company or acquire a controlling or substantial stake in another company;
  - (k) Any other matter which may be prescribed.

Provided that the Board may, by a resolution passed at a meeting, delegate to any Committee of Directors, the Managing Director, the manager or any other principal officer of the company or in the case of a branch office of the company, the principal officer of the branch office, the powers specified in clauses (d) to (f) on such conditions as it may specify.

In respect of a company covered under Section 8 of the Companies Act, 2013, which has not committed a default in filing its financial statements under Section 137 or Annual Return under Section 92 with the Registrar, the matters referred to in clauses (d), (e), and (f) of Section 179 (3) may be decided by the Board by circulation instead of at a meeting. This modification is permitted by Notification No. GSR 466 (E), dated 5<sup>th</sup> June, 2015 as amended by Notification No. GSR 584 (E), dated 13<sup>th</sup> June, 2017.

From the foregoing provisions, it is clear that the Board of MN Limited shall be perfectly in order if it delegates the power to borrow monies under clause (d) of Section 173 (3) to the Managing Director or to the manager or any other principal officer.

- (b) (i) **Appointment of IRP:** As per Section 16 of the Code where the application for corporate insolvency resolution process is made by an operational creditor and no proposal for an interim resolution professional is made in the said application. The Adjudicating Authority shall make a reference to the Board for the recommendation of an insolvency professional who may act as an interim resolution professional.

The Board shall recommend the name of an insolvency professional to the Adjudicating Authority against whom no disciplinary proceedings are pending, within ten days of the receipt of a reference from the Adjudicating Authority.

**Period of appointment of IRP:** The term of the interim resolution professional shall continue from his appointment till the date of appointment of the resolution professional by CoC in first meeting of CoC under section 22 of the Insolvency & Bankruptcy Code.

- (ii) **Money Laundering:** Whosoever directly or indirectly attempts to indulge or knowingly assists or knowingly is a party or is actually involved in any process or activity connected with the proceeds of crime and projecting it as untainted property shall be guilty of offence of money laundering. [Section 3 of the Prevention of Money Laundering Act, 2002]

Paragraph 2 of Part A of the Schedule to the Prevention of Money Laundering Act, 2002, covers Offences under the Narcotic Drugs and Psychotropic Substances Act, 1985. Whereby, illegal import into India, export from India or transshipment of narcotic drugs and psychotropic substances (section 23) is covered under paragraph 2 of Part A.

**Punishment:** Section 4 of the said Act provides for the punishment for Money-Laundering. Whoever commits the offence of money-laundering shall be punishable with rigorous imprisonment for a term which shall not be less than 3 years but which may extend to 7 years and shall also be liable to fine. But where the proceeds of crime involved in money-laundering relate to any offence specified under paragraph 2 of Part A of the Schedule, the maximum punishment may extend to 10 years instead of 7 years.