



drishti

Final Report on Penal Provisions of Company Act 2013

 drishtiias.com/printpdf/final-report-on-penal-provisions-of-company-act-2013

The Committee to review the existing framework dealing with offences under the Companies Act, 2013 and related matters has submitted its report.

- It was a 10 member committee headed by **Injeti Srinivas, Secretary, Ministry of Corporate Affairs.**
- The Committee broke down all penal provisions into **eight categories** based on the **nature of offences.**
- The Committee recommended that the existing law should **continue for serious offences, covering six categories**, whereas for lapses that are essentially **technical or procedural in nature**, mainly falling **under two categories** may be shifted to in-house adjudication process.
 - It observed that this would serve the **twin purposes** promoting of **ease of doing business** and **better corporate compliance.**
 - It would also **reduce the number of prosecutions filed** in the Special Courts, which would, in turn, facilitate **speedier disposal** of serious offences and bring serious offenders to book.

Major Recommendations

- Restructuring of Corporate Offences to **relieve Special Courts** from adjudicating routine offences.
 - **Compoundable offences**
 - Re-categorization of 16 out of the 81 compoundable offences by shifting them from the jurisdiction of special courts to an in-house E-adjudication framework.
 - The remaining 65 compoundable offences to continue under the jurisdiction of Special Courts due to their potential misuse.
 - **Non-compoundable offences**
 - Status quo recommended in respect of all serious corporate offences.
 - Instituting a transparent online platform for **E-adjudication and E-publication** of orders.
- **De-clogging the National Company Law Tribunal**
 - Enlarging the **jurisdiction of the Regional Director** with enhanced pecuniary limits.
 - Vesting in the **Central Government the power** to approve the **alteration in the financial year** of a company and also **conversion of public companies into private companies**.

National Company Law Tribunal

- The National Company Law Tribunal (NCLT) is a quasi-judicial body that adjudicates issues relating to Indian companies.
- The NCLT was established under the Companies Act 2013 and was constituted on 1 June 2016 by the Government of India and is based on the recommendation of the Justice Eradi committee on law relating to insolvency and winding up of companies.
- The NCLT has eleven benches, two at New Delhi (one being the principal bench) and one each at Ahmedabad, Allahabad, Bengaluru, Chandigarh, Chennai, Guwahati, Hyderabad, Kolkata and Mumbai.
- The NCLT has the power under the Companies Act to adjudicate proceedings:
 - Initiated before the Company Law Board under the previous act (the Companies Act 1956).
 - Pending before the Board for Industrial and Financial Reconstruction (BIFR), including those pending under the Sick Industrial Companies (Special Provisions) Act, 1985.
 - Pending before the Appellate Authority for Industrial and Financial Reconstruction.
 - Pertaining to claims of oppression and mismanagement of a company, winding up of companies and all other powers prescribed under the Companies Act.

Corporate compliance and corporate governance

- Re-introduction of **declaration of commencement of business** provision to better tackle the menace of shell companies.
- **Greater disclosures with respect to public deposits**, particularly in respect of transactions exempted from the definition of public deposits to prevent abuse and harming of public interest.
- Reduction in **time-limit for filing documents** related to creation, modification and satisfaction of charges.
- Stringent penal provisions for non-reporting.
- With respect to shares whose ownership remains undetermined, such shares should be transferred to the Investor Education and Protection Fund if rightful owner does not claim ownership within a year of such restrictions.
- **Non-maintenance** of registered office to trigger **de-registration process**.
- Holding of directorships beyond permissible limits to trigger disqualification of such directors.
- Imposition of a cap on independent director's remuneration in terms of percentage of income in order to prevent any material pecuniary relationship, which could impair his independence on the board of the company.

[Read more...](#)