

**MOCK TEST PAPER 1**  
**INTERMEDIATE (NEW): GROUP – I**  
**PAPER – 2: CORPORATE AND OTHER LAWS**  
**SUGGESTED ANSWERS/HINTS**

**MCQ'S**

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

**Descriptive Questions**

1. (a) The problem as asked in the question is governed by Section 58 of the Companies Act, 2013 dealing with the refusal to register transfer and appeal against refusal.

In the present case the company has committed the wrongful act of not sending the notice of refusal of registering the transfer of shares.

Under section 58 (4), if a public company without sufficient cause refuses to register the transfer of securities within a period of thirty days from the date on which the instrument of transfer is delivered to the company, the transferee may, within a period of sixty days of such refusal or where no intimation has been received from the company, within ninety days of the delivery of the instrument of transfer, appeal to the Tribunal.

Section 58 (5) further provides that the Tribunal, while dealing with an appeal made under sub-section (4), may, after hearing the parties, either dismiss the appeal, or by order—

- (a) direct that the transfer or transmission shall be registered by the company and the company shall comply with such order within a period of ten days of the receipt of the order; or

- (b) direct rectification of the register and also direct the company to pay damages, if any, sustained by any party aggrieved.

In the present case Ms. Receiver can make an appeal before the tribunal and claim damages..

- (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 her.

In the given situation, the company has failed to communicate to the shareholder Mrs. Sheetal about non-compliance of her direction regarding payment of dividend. Hence, the penal provisions under section 127 will be applicable.

- (ii) Section 127, inter-alia, provides that no offence shall be deemed to have been committed where the dividend could not be paid by reason of operation of law.

In the present circumstance, the dividend could not be paid because it was not allowed to be paid by the court until the matter was resolved about succession. Hence, there will not be any liability on the company and its Directors etc.

- (c) According to section 170 of the Indian Contract Act, 1872, where the bailee has, in accordance with the purpose of the bailment, rendered any service involving the exercise of labour or skill in respect of the goods bailed, he has, in the absence of a contract to the contrary, a right to retain such goods until he receives due remuneration for the services he has rendered in respect of them.

Thus, in accordance with the purpose of bailment if the bailee by his skill or labour improves the goods bailed, he is entitled for remuneration for such services. Towards such remuneration, the bailee can retain the goods bailed if the bailor refuses to pay the remuneration. Such a right to retain the goods bailed is the right of particular lien. He however does not have the right to sue.

Where the bailee delivers the goods without receiving his remuneration, he has a right to sue the bailor. In such a case the particular lien may be waived. The particular lien is also lost if the bailee does not complete the work within the time agreed.

Hence, in the given situation the jeweller is entitled to retain the stone till he is paid for the services he has rendered.

- (d) As per Section 44 of the Negotiable Instruments Act, 1881, when the consideration for which a person signed a promissory note, bill of exchange or cheque consisted of money, and was originally absent in part or has subsequently failed in part, the sum which a holder standing in immediate relation with such signer is entitled to receive from him is proportionally reduced.

**Explanation**—The drawer of a bill of exchange stands in immediate relation with the acceptor. The maker of a promissory note, bill of exchange or cheque stands in immediate relation with the payee, and the endorser with his endorsee. Other signers may by agreement stand in immediate relation with a holder.

On the basis of above provision, P would succeed to recover Rs. 7,000 only from Q and not the whole amount of the bill because it was accepted for value as to Rs. 7,000 only and an accommodation to P for Rs. 3,000.

- 2. (a) (i) The situation as stated in the question relates to the creation of a casual vacancy in the office of an auditor due to resignation of the auditor before the AGM in case of a company other government company. Under section 139 (8)(i) any casual vacancy in the office of an auditor arising as a result of his resignation, such vacancy can be filled by the Board of Directors within 30 days thereof and in addition the appointment of the new auditor shall also be approved by the company at a general meeting convened within 3 months of the recommendation of the Board and he shall hold the office till the conclusion of the next annual

general meeting.

- (ii) According to section 139(5) of the Companies Act, 2013, in the case of a Government company or any other company owned or controlled, directly or indirectly, by the Central Government, or by any State Government or Governments, or partly by the Central Government and partly by one or more State Governments, the Comptroller and Auditor-General of India shall, in respect of a financial year, appoint an auditor duly qualified to be appointed as an auditor of companies under this Act, within a period of one hundred and eighty days from the commencement of the financial year, who shall hold office till the conclusion of the annual general meeting.

In the given case as the total shareholding of the three institutions adds up to 30% of the subscribed capital of the company it is not a government company. Hence, the provisions applicable to non-government companies in relation to the appointment of auditors shall apply.

- (b) Under Section 114(2) of the Companies Act, 2013, for a valid special resolution to be passed at a meeting of members of a company, the following conditions need to be satisfied:

- (1) The intention to propose the resolution, as a special resolution must have been specified in the notice calling the general meeting or other intimation given to the members;
- (2) The notice required under the Companies Act must have been duly given of the general meeting;
- (3) The votes cast in favour of the resolution (whether by show of hands or electronically or on a poll, as the case may be) by members present in person or by proxy or by postal ballot are not less than 3 times the number of votes, if any, cast against the resolution by members so entitled and voting.

Thus, in terms of the requisite majority, votes cast in favour have to be compared with votes cast against the resolution. Abstentions or invalid votes, if any, are not to be taken into account.

Accordingly, in the given problem, the votes cast in favour (20) being more than 3 times of the votes cast against (5), and presuming other conditions of Section 114(2) are satisfied, the decision of the Chairman is in order.

- (c) Agent's authority in an emergency (Section 189 of the Indian Contract Act, 1872): An agent has authority, in an emergency, to do all such acts for the purpose of protecting his principal from loss as would be done by a person of ordinary prudence, in his own case, under similar circumstances.

In the instant case, Rahul, the agent, was handling perishable goods like 'tomatoes' and can decide the time, date and place of sale, not necessarily as per instructions of the Aswin, the principal, with the intention of protecting Aswin from losses.

Here, Rahul acts in an emergency as a man of ordinary prudence, so Aswin will not succeed against him for recovering the loss.

- (d) As per section 91 of the Negotiable Instruments Act, 1881, a bill may be dishonoured either by non-acceptance or by non-payment.

**Dishonour by non-acceptance may take place in any one of the following circumstances:**

- (i) When the drawee either does not accept the bill within forty-eight hours (exclusive of public holidays) of presentment or refuse to accept it;
- (ii) When one of several drawees, not being partners, makes default in acceptance;
- (iii) When the drawee makes a qualified acceptance;

- (iv) When presentment for acceptance is excused and the bill remains unaccepted; and
  - (v) When the drawee is incompetent to contract.
3. (a) The Companies Act, 2013 under section 13 provides for the process of altering the Memorandum of a company. Since the location or Registered Office clause in the Memorandum only names the state in which its registered office is situated, a change in address from Mumbai to Pune, does not result in the alteration of the Memorandum and hence the provisions of section 13 (and its sub sections) do not apply in this case.

However, under section 12 (5) of the Act which deals with the registered office of company, the change in registered office from one town or city to another in the same state, must be approved by a special resolution of the company. Further, presuming that the Registrar will remain the same for the whole state of Maharashtra, there will be no need for the company to seek the confirmation to such change from the Regional Director.

- (b) Section 127 of the Companies Act, 2013 lays down the penalty for non - payment of dividend within the prescribed time period. Under section 127 where a dividend has been declared by a company but has not been paid or the warrant in respect thereof has not been posted within 30 days from the date of declaration to any shareholder entitled to the payment of the dividend:
- (i) every director of the company shall, if he is knowingly a party to the default, be punishable with imprisonment which may extend to two years and with fine which shall not be less than one thousand rupees for every day during which such default continues; and
  - (ii) the company shall be liable to pay simple interest at the rate of eighteen per cent. per annum during the period for which such default continues.

Therefore, in the given case Mr Rajan will not succeed in his claim for 20% interest as the limit under section 127 is 18% per annum.

- (c) Cheque payable to order [Section 85 of the Negotiable Instruments Act, 1881]
- (1) Where a cheque payable to order purports to be indorsed by or on behalf of the payee, the drawee is discharged by payment in due course.
  - (2) Where a cheque is originally expressed to be payable to bearer, the drawee is discharged by payment in due course to the bearer thereof, notwithstanding any indorsement whether in full or in blank appearing thereon, and notwithstanding that any such indorsement purports to restrict or exclude further negotiation.

As per the given facts, cheque is drawn payable to "Mr. Vyas or order". It was lost and Mr. Vyas was not aware of the same. The person found the cheque and forged and endorsed it to Mr. Parshwanath, who encashed the cheque from the drawee bank. After few days, Mr. Vyas intimated about the theft of the cheque, to the drawee bank, by which time, the drawee bank had already made the payment.

According to above stated section 85, the drawee banker is discharged when it has made a payment against the cheque payable to order when it is purported to be endorsed by or on behalf of the payee. Even though the signature of Mr. Vyas is forged, the banker is protected and is discharged. The true owner, Mr. Vyas, cannot recover the money from the drawee bank in this situation.

- (d) Dictionary Definitions: First we refer the Act in question to find out if any particular word or expression is defined in it. Where we find that a word is not defined in the Act itself, we may refer to dictionaries to find out the general sense in which that word is commonly understood. However, in selecting one out of the several meanings of a word, we must always take into consideration the context in which it is used in the Act. It is the fundamental rule that the meanings of words and expressions used in an Act must take their colour from the context in which they appear. Further, judicial decisions laying down the meaning of words in construing statutes in 'pari materia' will have

greater weight than the meaning furnished by dictionaries. However, for technical terms, reference may be made to technical dictionaries.

4. (a) **Alteration of Capital:** Under section 61(1) of the Companies Act, 2013, a limited company having a share capital may, if authorized by its Articles, alter its Memorandum in its general meeting to:

- (i) increase its authorized share capital by such amount as it thinks expedient;
- (ii) consolidate and divide all or any of its share capital into shares of a larger amount than its existing shares

However, no consolidation and division which results in changes in the voting percentage of shareholders shall take effect unless it is approved by the Tribunal on an application made in the prescribed manner.

- (iii) convert all or any of its paid-up shares into stock and reconvert that stock into fully paid shares of any denomination
- (iv) sub-divide the whole or any part of its shares into shares of smaller amount than is fixed by the Memorandum
- (v) cancel shares which, at the date of the passing of the resolution in that behalf, have not been taken or agreed to be taken by any person, and diminish the amount of its share capital by the amount of the shares so cancelled.

Further, under section 64, where a company alters its share capital in any of the above mentioned ways, the company shall file a notice in the prescribed form with the Registrar within a period of thirty days of such alteration or increase or redemption, as the case may be, along with an altered memorandum. The memorandum shall be altered by a special resolution and in compliance with other relevant provisions of section 13 of the Companies Act, 2013.

- (b) (i) The charge in the present case was created after 02-11-2018 (*i.e.* the date of commencement of the Companies (Amendment) Second Ordinance, 2019) to which another set of provisions is applicable. These provisions are different from a case where the charge was created before 02-11-2018.

Initially, the prescribed particulars of the charge together with the instrument, if any, by which the charge is created or evidenced, or a copy thereof, duly verified by a certificate, are to be filed with the Registrar within 30 days of its creation. [Section 77 (1)]. In this case particulars of charge were not filed within the prescribed period of 30 days.

However, the Registrar is empowered under clause (b) of first proviso to section 77 (1) to extend the period of 30 days by another 30 days (*i.e.* sixty days from the date of creation) on payment of prescribed additional fee. Taking advantage of this provision MNC Limited should immediately file the particulars of charge with the Registrar after satisfying him through making an application that it had sufficient cause for not filing the particulars of charge within 30 days of its creation.

If the company realises its mistake of not registering the charge on 7th June, 2019 instead of 2nd May, 2019, it shall be noted that a period of sixty days has already expired from the date of creation of charge. However, Clause (b) of Second Proviso to Section 77 (1) provides another opportunity for registration of charge by granting a further period of sixty days but the company is required to pay *advalorem* fees. Since first sixty days from creation of charge were expired on 11<sup>th</sup> May, 2019, MNC Limited can still get the charge registered within a further period of sixty days from 11<sup>th</sup> May, 2019 after paying the prescribed *advalorem* fees. The company is required to make an application to the Registrar in this respect giving sufficient cause for non-registration of charge.

- (ii) Notice of Charge : 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, the section clarifies that if any person acquires a property, assets or undertaking for which a charge is already registered, it would be deemed that he has complete knowledge of charge from the date the charge is registered.

Thus, the contention of NRT Ltd. 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, X 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) **Mischieve Rule:** Where the language used in a statute is capable of more than one interpretation, principle laid down in the Heydon’s case is followed. This is known as ‘purposive construction’ or ‘mischieve rule’. The rule then directs that the courts must adopt that construction which ‘shall suppress the mischief and advance the remedy’.

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.

It enables consideration of four matters in construing an Act:

- (1) what was the law before the 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.

- 5. (a) Yes, the Director shall be held liable for the false statements 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 misstatements.

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

- (i) 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.

- (ii) No civil liability for any misstatement under section 35 shall apply to a person if he proves that:
  - (1) 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
  - (2) 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.

Therefore, in the present case the director cannot hide behind the excuse that he had relied on the promoters for making correct statements in the prospectus. He will be liable for misstatements in the prospectus.

- (b) Under Section 118 (5) of the Companies Act, 2013, there shall not be included in the Minutes of a meeting, any matter which, in the opinion of the Chairman of the meeting:
  - (i) is or could reasonably be regarded as defamatory of any person;
  - (ii) is irrelevant or immaterial to the proceeding; or
  - (iii) is detrimental to the interests of the company;

Further, under section 118(6) the chairman shall exercise absolute discretion in regard to the inclusion or non-inclusion of any matter in the Minutes on the grounds specified in sub-section (5) above.

Hence, in view of the above, the contention of Mukesh, a shareholder of Alpha Limited is not valid because the Chairman has absolute discretion on the inclusion or exclusion of any matter in the minutes for aforesaid reasons.

- (c) Section 124 of the Indian Contract Act, 1872 says that “A contract by which one party promises to save the other from loss caused to him by the conduct of the promisor himself, or the conduct of any person”, is called a “contract of indemnity”.

Section 126 of the Indian Contract Act says that “A contract to perform the promise made or discharge liability incurred by a third person in case of his default.” is called as “contract of guarantee”.

The conditions under which the guarantee is invalid or void are stated in section 142, 143 and 144 of the Indian Contract Act are :

- (i) Guarantee obtained by means of misrepresentation.
  - (ii) creditor obtained any guarantee by means of keeping silence as to material circumstances.
  - (iii) When contract of guarantee is entered into on the condition that the creditor shall not act upon it until another person has joined in it as co-surety and that other party fails to join as such.
- (d) In *Navrangpura Gam Dharmada Milkat Trust Vs. Rmtuji Ramaji*, AIR 1994 Guj 75 case, it was decided that ‘Repeal’ of provision is in distinction from ‘deletion’ of provision. ‘Repeal’ ordinarily brings about complete obliteration (abolition) of the provision as if it never existed, thereby affecting all incoherent rights and all causes of action related to the ‘repealed’ provision while ‘deletion’ ordinarily takes effect from the date of legislature affecting the said deletion, never to effect total effecting or wiping out of the provision as if it never existed.