

MOCK TEST PAPER 1
INTERMEDIATE : GROUP – I
PAPER – 2: CORPORATE AND OTHER LAWS
ANSWERS

Division A

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

Division B

1. (a) According to section 42 of the Companies Act, 2013 any private or public company may make private placement through issue of a private placement offer letter.

However, the offer shall be made to the persons not exceeding fifty or such higher number as may be prescribed, in a financial year. For counting number of persons, Qualified Institutional Buyers (QIBs) and employees of the company being offered securities under a scheme of employees' stock option will not be considered.

Further, Rule 14 (2) of *the Companies (Prospectus and Allotment of Securities) Rules, 2014* prescribes maximum of 200 persons who can be offered securities under the private placement in a financial year, though this limit should be counted separately for each type of security.

It is to be noted that if a company makes an offer or invitation to more than the prescribed number of persons, it shall be deemed to be an offer to the public and accordingly, it shall be governed by the provisions relating to prospectus.

Also, a company is not permitted to make fresh offer under this section if the allotment with respect to any offer made earlier has not been completed or otherwise, that offer has been withdrawn or abandoned by the company. This provision is applicable even if the issue is of different kind of security.

Any offer or invitation not in compliance with the provisions of this section shall be treated as a public offer and all provisions will apply accordingly.

In the given case Prakash Limited, though a public company but the private placement provisions allow even a public company to raise funds through this route. The company has given offer to 55 persons out of which 4 are qualified institutional buyers and hence, the offer is given effectively to only 51 persons which is well within the limit of 200 persons. From this point of view, the company complies the private placement provisions.

However, as per the question, the company has given another private placement offer of debentures before completing the allotment in respect of first offer and therefore, the second offer does not comply with the provisions of section 42. Hence, the offers given by the company will be treated as public offer.

In case the company gives offer for debentures in the same financial year after allotment of equity shares is complete then both the offers can well be treated as private placement offers.

- (b) (i) Section 127 of the Companies Act, 2013 provides for punishment for failure to distribute dividend on time. One of such situations is where a shareholder has given directions to the company regarding the payment of the dividend and those directions cannot be complied with and the same has not been communicated to the shareholder.

In the instant case, Vishal Ltd. has failed to communicate to the shareholder Mr. Ricky about non-compliance of his direction regarding payment of dividend. Hence, the penal provisions under section 127 will be attracted.

- (ii) As per the proviso to section 127 of the Companies Act, 2013, no offence will be deemed to have been committed by a director for adjusting the calls in arrears remaining unpaid or any other sum due from a member against the dividend declared by the company.

Thus, as per the given facts, Vicky Limited can adjust the unpaid call money of Rs. 50,000 against the declared dividend of 10%, i.e. $5,00,000 \times 10/100 = 50,000$. Hence, call money of Rs. 50,000 not paid by Kumar can be adjusted fully from the entitled dividend amount of Rs. 50,000 payable to him.

- (c) According to section 65 of the Indian Contract Act, 1872, when an agreement is discovered to be void, or when a contract becomes void, any person who has received any advantage under such agreement or contract is bound to restore, it, or to make compensation for it, to the person from whom he received it.

In the given case, the contract for supply of machinery by Rajeev Ltd. to Mr. Gogia by 31st May, 2019 was frustrated due to the occurrence of an earthquake on 31st March, 2019 which has led to the break in the operations of Rajeev Ltd. for at least one year.

Since, Mr. Gogia obtains no benefit from the contract, and he has paid part of a sum before frustration, he can recover the money paid in advance because it can be said there has been total failure of consideration. Hence, Mr. Gogia can recover the amount of Rs. 2,00,000 from Rajeev Ltd.

- (d) According to Section 26 of the Negotiable Instruments Act, 1881, every person competent to contract (according to the law to which he is subject to) has capacity to bind himself and be bound

by making, drawing, accepting, endorsing delivering and negotiating an instrument. A party having such capacity may himself put his signature or authorize some other person to do so.

A minor may draw, endorse, deliver and negotiate an instrument so as to bind all the parties except himself. A minor may be a drawer where the instrument is drawn or endorsed by him. In that case he does not incur any liability himself although other parties to the instrument can be made liable and the holder can receive payment from any other party thereto.

Therefore, in the instant case, the promissory note is valid and it is binding on Mr. Manoj Malik but not on Preet, a minor.

2. (a) As per the provisions of Section 73 (2) of the Companies Act, 2013 read with Rule 3 (3) of the *Companies (Acceptance of Deposits) Rules, 2014*, as amended from time to time, a company shall accept any deposit from its members, together with the amount of other deposits outstanding as on the date of acceptance of such deposits not exceeding 35% of the aggregate of the paid-up share capital, free reserves and securities premium account of the company. It is provided that a private company may accept from its members monies not exceeding 100% of aggregate of the paid-up share capital, free reserves and securities premium account and such company shall file the details of monies so accepted to the Registrar in Form DPT-3.

In the given question, since NIM Private Limited is a private company hence it may accept monies to the extent of Rs. 35.00 lacs as deposits from its members.

- (b) (i) According to section 139(6) of the Companies Act, 2013, the first auditor of a company, other than a Government Company, shall be appointed by the Board of directors within 30 days of the date of registration of the company and the auditor so appointed shall hold office until the conclusion of the first AGM.

If the Board fails to exercise its powers i.e. appointment of first auditor, it shall inform the members of the company and the company may appoint the first auditor within 90 days at an extra ordinary general meeting (EGM) and such auditor shall hold office till the conclusion of the first AGM.

- (ii) **Persons responsible to maintain books:** As per Section 128 (6) of the Companies Act, 2013, the person responsible to take all reasonable steps to secure compliance by the company with the requirement of maintenance of books of account etc. shall be:

- (a) Managing Director,
- (b) Whole-Time Director, in charge of finance
- (c) Chief Financial Officer
- (d) Any other person of a company charged by the Board with duty of complying with provisions of section 128.

- (c) Section 148 of Indian Contract Act 1872 defines 'Bailment' as the delivery of goods by one person to another for some purpose, upon a contract that they shall, when the purpose is accomplished, be returned or otherwise disposed of according to the direction of the person delivering them.

According to Section 149 of the Indian Contract Act, 1872, the delivery to the bailee may be made by doing anything which has the effect of putting the goods in the possession of the intended bailee or of any person authorised to hold them on his behalf. Thus, delivery is necessary to constitute bailment.

Thus, the mere keeping of the box at Y's shop, when Mrs. Shivani herself took away the key cannot amount to delivery as per the meaning of delivery given in the provision in section 149. Therefore, in this case there is no contract of bailment as Mrs. Shivani did not deliver the complete possession of the good by keeping the keys with herself.

(d) Not negotiable Crossing

This requires writing of words “not negotiable” in addition to the two parallel lines. These words may be written inside or outside these lines. According to Section 130, a person taking a cheque crossed generally or specially, bearing in either case the word “not negotiable” shall not have, and shall not be capable of giving a better title to the cheque than that which the person from whom he took it. It is a statutory crossing. A cheque with such crossing is not negotiable, but continues to be transferable as before. Ordinarily, in a negotiable instrument, if the title of the transferor is defective, the transferee, if he is a Holder in Due Course, will have a good title. When the words “not negotiable” are written, even a Holder in Due Course will get the same title as that of transferor. Thus, if the title of the transferor is defective, the title of transferee will also be so.

Hence, the addition of the words not negotiable does not restrict the further transferability of the cheque, but it entirely takes away the main feature of negotiability, which is that a holder with a defective title can give a good title to the subsequent holder in due course.

3. (a) Under section 20 of the Companies Act, 2013 a document may be served on a company or an officer thereof by sending it to the company or the officer at the registered office of the company by registered post or by speed post or by courier service or by leaving it at its registered office or by means of such electronic or other mode as may be prescribed. However, in case where securities are held with a depository, the records of the beneficial ownership may be served by such depository on the company by means of electronic or other mode.

Under section 20 (2), save as provided in the Act or the rule thereunder for filing of documents with the registrar in electronic mode, a document may be served on Registrar or any member by sending it to him by post or by registered post or by speed post or by courier or by delivering at his office or address, or by such electronic or other mode as may be prescribed. However, a member may request for delivery of any document through a particular mode, for which he shall pay such fees as may be determined by the company in its annual general meeting.

- (b) A copy of every instrument evidencing any creation or modification of charge and required to be filed with the Registrar shall be verified as follows:
- (i) **in case property is situated outside India:** where the instrument or deed relates solely to the property situated outside India, the copy shall be verified by a certificate issued either under the seal, if any, of the company, or under the hand of any director or company secretary of the company or an authorised officer of the charge holder or under the hand of some person other than the company who is interested in the mortgage or charge;
 - (ii) **in case property is situated in India (whether wholly or partly):** where the instrument or deed relates to the property situated in India (whether wholly or partly), the copy shall be verified by a certificate issued under the hand of any director or company secretary of the company or an authorised officer of the charge holder.
- (c) According to Section 128(1) of the Companies Act, 2013, every company shall prepare “books of account” and other relevant books and papers and financial statement for every financial year. These books of account should give a true and fair view of the state of the affairs of the company, including that of its branch office(s). These books of account must be kept on accrual basis and according to the double entry system of accounting.

Hence, maintenance of books of account under Singly Entry System of Accounting by Green Limited is not permitted.

- (d) The question arising in this problem is whether the making of promissory note is complete when one half of the note was delivered to Nina. Under Section 46 of the Negotiable Instruments Act, 1881, the making of a promissory note is completed by delivery, actual or constructive. Delivery refers to the whole of the instrument and not merely a part of it. Delivery of half instrument cannot be treated as constructive delivery of the whole. So, the claim of Nina to have the other half of the

promissory note sent to her is not maintainable. Mina is justified in demanding the return of the first half sent by her. She can change her mind and refuse to send the other half of the promissory note.

- (e) **Principles of Grammatical Interpretation and Logical Interpretation:** In order to ascertain the meaning of any law/ statute the principles of Grammatical and Logical Interpretation is applied to conclude the real meaning of the law and the intention of the legislature behind enacting it.

Grammatical interpretation concerns itself exclusively with the verbal expression of law. It does not go beyond the letter of the law, whereas Logical interpretation on the other hand, seeks more satisfactory evidence of the true intention of the legislature.

4. (a) Yes, the Director shall be held liable for the false statements made in the prospectus under sections 34 and 35 of the Companies Act, 2013. Whereas section 34 imposes a criminal punishment on every person who authorises the issue of such prospectus, section 35 more particularly includes a director of the company in the imposition of liability for such mis-statements.

The only situations when a director will not incur any liability for mis-statements in a prospectus are as under:

- (1) No criminal liability under section 34 shall apply to a person if he proves that such statement or omission was immaterial or that he had reasonable grounds to believe, and did up to the time of issue of the prospectus believe, that the statement was true or the inclusion or omission was necessary.
- (2) No civil liability for any mis-statement under section 35 shall apply to a person if he proves that:
 - (i) having consented to become a director of the company, he withdrew his consent before the issue of the prospectus, and that it was issued without his authority or consent; or
 - (ii) the prospectus was issued without his knowledge or consent, and that on becoming aware of its issue, he forthwith gave a reasonable public notice that it was issued without his knowledge or consent.
 - (iii) that, as regards every misleading statement purported to be made by an expert or contained in what purports to be a copy of or an extract from a report or valuation of an expert, it was a correct and fair representation of the statement, or a correct copy of, or a correct and fair extract from, the report or valuation; and he had reasonable ground to believe and did up to the time of the issue of the prospectus believe, that the person making the statement was competent to make it and that the said person had given the consent required by sub-section (5) of section 26 to the issue of the prospectus and had not withdrawn that consent before filing of a copy of the prospectus with the Registrar or, to the defendant's knowledge, before allotment thereunder.

Therefore, in the present case the director cannot escape the liability by stating that he had relied on the promoters for making correct statements in the prospectus. He will be liable for mis-statements in the prospectus.

- (b) According to section 80 of the Companies Act, 2013, where any charge on any property or assets of a company or any of its undertakings is registered under section 77 of the Companies Act, 2013, any person acquiring such property, assets, undertakings or part thereof or any share or interest therein shall be deemed to have notice of the charge from the date of such registration.

Thus, Section 80 clarifies that if any person acquires a property, assets or undertaking in respect of which a charge is already registered, it would be deemed that he has complete knowledge of charge from the date of its registration. Mr. A, therefore, ought to have been careful while purchasing property and should have verified beforehand that Kesha Limited had already created a charge on the property.

In view of above, the contention of Kesha Limited is correct.

(c) **“Immovable Property” [Section 3(26) of the General Clauses Act, 1897]:** ‘Immovable Property’ shall include:

- (i) Land,
- (ii) Benefits to arise out of land, and
- (iii) Things attached to the earth, or
- (iv) Permanently fastened to anything attached to the earth.

It is an inclusive definition. It contains four elements: land, benefits to arise out of land, things attached to the earth and things permanently fastened to anything attached to the earth. Where, in any enactment, the definition of immovable property is in the negative and not exhaustive, the definition as given in the General Clauses Act will apply to the expression given in that enactment.

In the instant case, M sold Land along with timber (obtained after cutting trees) of fifty tamarind trees of his land. According to the above definition, Land is immovable property; however, timber cannot be immovable property since the same are not attached to the earth.

(d) Where the language used in a statute is capable of more than one interpretation, the most firmly established rule for construction is the principle laid down in the Heydon’s case. This rule enables, consideration of four matters in constituting an act:

- (1) what was the law before making of the Act,
- (2) what was the mischief or defect for which the law did not provide,
- (3) what is the remedy that the Act has provided, and
- (4) what is the reason for the remedy.

The rule then directs that the courts must adopt that construction which ‘shall suppress the mischief and advance the remedy’. Therefore, even in a case where the usual meaning of the language used falls short of the whole object of the legislature, a more extended meaning may be attributed to the words, provided they are fairly susceptible of it. If the object of any enactment is public safety, then its working must be interpreted widely to give effect to that object. Thus in the case of Workmen’s Compensation Act, 1923 the main object being provision of compensation to workmen, it was held that the Act ought to be so construed, as far as possible, so as to give effect to its primary provisions.

However, it has been emphasized by the Supreme Court that the rule in Heydon’s case is applicable only when the words used are ambiguous and are reasonably capable of more than one meaning [*CIT v. Sodra Devi (1957) 32 ITR 615 (SC)*].

5. (a) In terms of section 2 (87) of the Companies Act 2013 "subsidiary company" or "subsidiary", 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:

Provided that such class or classes of holding companies as may be prescribed shall not have layers of subsidiaries beyond such numbers as may be prescribed.

Since, Kavya Ltd. is holding more than one half (50 crores out of 80 crores) of the total share capital of Kavya Ltd., it (Amjali Ltd.) is holding of Kavya Ltd.

Further, as per the provisions of section 19 of the Companies Act, 2013, no company shall, either by itself or through its nominees, hold any shares in its holding company and no holding company

shall allot or transfer its shares to any of its subsidiary companies and any such allotment or transfer of shares of a company to its subsidiary company shall be void:

Provided that nothing in this sub-section shall apply to a case—

- (a) where the subsidiary company holds such shares as the legal representative of a deceased member of the holding company; or
- (b) where the subsidiary company holds such shares as a trustee; or
- (c) where the subsidiary company is a shareholder even before it became a subsidiary company of the holding company

In the given question, Kavya Ltd. cannot acquire the shares of Amjali Ltd. as the acquisition of shares does not fall within the ambit of any of the exceptions provided in section 19.

- (b) According to Section 96 of the Companies Act, 2013, every company shall be required to hold its first annual general meeting within a period of 9 months from the date of closing of its first financial year.

The first financial year of Shambhu Ltd is for the period 1st April 2018 to 31st March 2019, the first annual general meeting (AGM) of the company should be held on or before 31st December, 2019.

The section further provides that the Registrar may, for any special reason, extend the time within which any annual general meeting, other than the first annual general meeting, shall be held, by a period not exceeding three months.

Thus, the first AGM of Infotech should have been held on or before 31st December, 2019. Further, the Registrar does not have the power to grant extension to time limit for the first AGM of the company.

- (c) An agency by estoppel is based on the principle of estoppel. The principle of estoppel lays down that “when one person by declaration (representation), act or omission has intentionally caused or permitted another person to believe a thing to be true and to act upon such belief, he shall not be allowed to deny his previous statement or he shall be stopped to deny his previous statement or conduct”.

The agency by Estoppel is provided under section 237 of the Indian Contract Act. Section 237 states: “When an agent has without authority done acts or incurred obligations to third persons on behalf of his principal the principal is bound by such acts or obligations if he has by his words or conduct induced such third persons to believe that such acts and obligations were within the scope of the agent's authority”.

According to section 237 of the Contract Act, an agency by estoppel may be created when following essentials are fulfilled:

1. the principal must have made a representation;
2. the representation may be express or implied;
3. The representation must state that the agent has an authority to do certain act although really he has no authority;
4. The principal must have induced the third person by such representation; and
5. The third person must have believed the representation and made the contract on the belief of such representation.

- (d) ‘**Construction**’ as applied to a written statute or document means to determine from its known elements its true meaning or the intention of its framers. Construction involves drawing conclusions beyond the actual expressions used in the text. This is done by referring to other parts of the enactment and the context in which the law was made. Thus, when you construe a statute you are attempting to ascertain the intention of the legislature.

Difference between Interpretation and Construction:

It would also be worthwhile to note, at this stage itself, the difference between the terms '**Interpretation**' and '**Construction**'. While more often the two terms are used interchangeably to denote a process adopted by the courts to ascertain the meaning of the legislature from the words with which it is expressed, these two terms have different connotations.

Interpretation is the art of ascertaining the meaning of words and the true sense in which the author intended that they should be understood.

It is the drawing of conclusions from a statute that lie beyond the direct expression of the words used therein. [*Bhagwati Prasad Kedia v. C.I.T., (2001)*]

It is the duty of the courts to give effect to the meaning of an Act when the meaning can be equitably gathered from the words used. Words of legal import occurring in a statute which have acquired a definite and precise sense, must be understood in that sense. (*State of Madras v. Gannon Dunkerly Co. AIR 1958*)

Thus, where the Court adheres to the plain meaning of the language used by the legislature, it would be 'interpretation' of the words, but where the meaning is not plain, the court has to decide whether the wording was meant to cover the situation before the court. Here, the court would be resorting to 'construction'. Conclusions drawn by means of construction are within the spirit though not necessarily within the letter of the law.

In practice construction includes interpretation and the terms are frequently used synonymously.