



SUGGESTED SOLUTION

CA INTERMEDIATE

Test Code - JKN_LAW_12

(Date :25/09/2020)

Head Office : Shraddha, 3rd Floor, Near Chinai College, Andheri (E), Mumbai – 69.

Tel : (022) 26836666

SECTION A

1. D
2. C
3. D
4. B
5. A
6. A
7. D
8. C
9. B
10. B
11. i
12. ii
13. ii
14. iii
15. iv
16. ii
17. B
18. C
19. C
20. D

SECTION B

ANSWER -1

ANSWER –A

- (i) According to section 2(42) of the Companies Act, 2013, “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 Rule 2(1)(c)(iv) of the Companies (Registration of Foreign Companies) Rules, 2014, “electronic mode” means carrying out electronically based, whether main server is installed in India or not, including, but not limited to online services such as telemarketing, telecommuting, telemedicine, education and information research.

Looking to the above description, it can be said that being involved in telemarketing in India having its main server for online business outside India, Herry Limited will be treated as foreign company.

(2 Marks)

- (ii) Where a company or body corporate, which is a holding company or a subsidiary or associate company of a company incorporated outside India and is required to follow a different financial year for consolidation of its accounts outside India, the Central Government may, on an application made by that company or body corporate in such form and manner as may be prescribed, allow any period as its financial year, whether

or not that period is a year.

Any application pending before the Tribunal as on the date of commencement of the Companies (Amendment) Act, 2019, shall be disposed of by the Tribunal in accordance with the provisions applicable to it before such commencement.

Also, a company or body corporate, existing on the commencement of this Act, shall, within a period of two years from such commencement, align its financial year as per the provisions of this clause.

SKP Limited is advised to follow the above procedure accordingly.

[Note: This answer is based on the assumption that Herry limited is a foreign Company registered outside India as inferred from part (i) of the question]

(2 Marks)

(iii) **As per** Rule 3 & 4 of the Companies (Incorporation) Rules, 2014 following the answers :

- (A) Yes, it is mandatory for Navita to withdraw her nomination in the said OPC as she is leaving India permanently as only a natural person who is an Indian citizen and resident in India shall be a nominee in OPC.
- (B) Yes, Navita can continue her nomination in the said OPC, if she maintained the status of Resident of India after her marriage by staying in India for a period of not less than 182 days during the immediately preceding financial year.

(2 Marks)

ANSWER –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 11th May, 2019, MNC Limited can still get the charge registered within a further period of sixty

days from 11th 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.

(3 Marks)

(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.

(3 Marks)

ANSWER –C

Agent's duty to disclose all material circumstances & his duty not to deal on his own account without principal's consent. The problem is based on Sections 215 & 216 of the Indian Contract Act, 1872. According to Section 215, if an agent deals on his own account in the business of the agency, without obtaining the consent of his principal and without acquainting him with all material circumstances, then the principal may repudiate the transaction. On the other hand, section 216 provides that, if an agent, without the knowledge of his principal, acts on his own account in the business of the agency, then the principal may claim any benefit which may have accrued to the agent from such a transaction. Hence in the first instance, though Pankaj had given his consent to Shruti permitting the latter to act on his own account in the business of agency, Pankaj may still repudiate the sale as the existence of the mine, a material circumstance, had not been disclosed to him.

(3 Marks)

In the second instance, Pankaj had knowledge that Shruti was acting on her own account and also that the mine was in existence; hence, Pankaj cannot repudiate the transaction under section 215. Also, under Section 216, Pankaj cannot claim any benefit from Shruti as he had knowledge that Shruti was acting on her own account in the business of the agency.

(1 Mark)

ANSWER –D

According to 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 indorser with his indorsee. Other signers may by agreement stand in immediate relation with a holder.

In the given question, Singh is a party in immediate relation with the drawer (Ram) of the cheque and so he is entitled to recover only the exact amount due from Ram and not the amount entered in the cheque. However, the right of Chandra, who is a holder for value, is not adversely affected and he can claim the full amount of the cheque from Singh.

(3 Marks)

ANSWER -2

ANSWER –A

According to first proviso to section 137(1) of the Companies Act, 2013, where the financial statements are not adopted at annual general meeting or adjourned annual general meeting, such unadopted financial statements along with the required documents shall be filed with the Registrar within thirty days of the date of annual general meeting and the Registrar shall take them in his records as provisional till the financial statements are filed with him after their adoption in the adjourned annual general meeting for that purpose.

According to second proviso to section 137(1) of the Companies Act, 2013, financial statements adopted in the adjourned AGM shall be filed with the Registrar within thirty days of the date of such adjourned AGM with such fees or such additional fees as may be prescribed.

(2 Marks)

In the instant case, the accounts of Sun Ltd. were adopted at the adjourned AGM held on 15th October, 2018 and filing of financial statements with Registrar was done on 12th November, 2018 i.e. within 30 days of the date of adjourned AGM.

Hence, Sun Ltd. has not complied with the statutory requirement regarding filing of unadopted accounts with the Registrar, but has certainly complied with the provisions by filing of adopted accounts within the due date with the Registrar.

(2 Marks)

ANSWER –B

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.

(6 Marks)

ANSWER –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 authorized 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 A 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. A did not deliver the complete possession of the good by keeping the keys with herself.

(4 Marks)

ANSWER –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.

(3 Marks)

ANSWER -3

ANSWER –A

According to section 62 of the Companies Act, 2013, where at any time, a company having a share capital proposes to increase its subscribed capital by the issue of further shares, such shares shall be offered—

- (a) to persons who, at the date of the offer, are holders of equity shares of the company in proportion, as nearly as circumstances admit, to the paid-up share capital on those shares by sending a letter of offer subject to the following conditions, namely:-
- (i) the offer shall be made by notice specifying the number of shares offered and limiting a time not being less than fifteen days and not exceeding thirty days from the date of the offer within which the offer, if not accepted, shall be deemed to have been declined;
 - (ii) unless the articles of the company otherwise provide, the offer aforesaid shall be deemed to include a right exercisable by the person concerned to renounce the shares offered to him or any of them in favour of any other person; and the notice referred to in clause (i) shall contain a statement of this right;
 - (iii) after the expiry of the time specified in the notice aforesaid, or on receipt of earlier intimation from the person to whom such notice is given that he declines to accept the shares offered, the Board of Directors may dispose of them in such manner which is not dis-advantageous to the shareholders and the company.

In the instant case, X Ltd. issued a notice on 1st Feb, 2018 to its existing shares holders offering to purchase one extra share for every five shares held by them. The last date to accept the offer was 15th Feb, 2018 only. Mr. Kavi has given an application to renounce the shares offered to him in favour of Mr. Ravi, who is not a shareholder of the company.

As nothing is specified related to the Articles of the company, it is assumed offer shall be deemed to include a right of renunciation. Hence, Mr. Kavi can renounce the shares offered to him in favour of Mr. Ravi, who is not a shareholder of the company.

In the second part of the question, even if Mr. Ravi is a shareholder of X Ltd. then also it does not affect the right of renunciation of shares of Mr. Kavi to Mr. Ravi.

(5 Marks)

ANSWER –B

Order of the Tribunal: According to section 7(7) of the Companies Act, 2013, where a company has been got incorporated by furnishing false or incorrect information or representation or by suppressing any material fact or information in any of the documents or declaration filed or made for incorporating such company or by any fraudulent action, the Tribunal may, on an application made to it, on being satisfied that the situation so warrants—

- (a) pass such orders, as it may think fit, for regulation of the management of the company including changes, if any, in its memorandum and articles, in public interest or in the interest of the company and its members and creditors; or
- (b) direct that liability of the members shall be unlimited; or
- (c) direct removal of the name of the company from the register of companies; or
- (d) pass an order for the winding up of the company; or
- (e) pass such other orders as it may deem fit.

However before making any order-

- (i) the company shall be given a reasonable opportunity of being heard in the matter; and
- (ii) the Tribunal shall take into consideration the transactions entered into by the company, including the obligations, if any, contracted or payment of any liability

(5 Marks)

ANSWER –C

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.

Dishonour of Cheque for insufficiency, etc. of funds in the account: As per section 138 of the Negotiable Instruments Act 1881, where any cheque drawn by a person on an account maintained by him with a banker for payment is dishonoured due to insufficiency of funds, he shall be punished with imprisonment for a term which may extend to two years or with fine which may extend to twice the amount of the cheque or with both.

(4 Marks)

ANSWER –D

Foreign decisions of countries following the same system of jurisprudence as ours and given on laws similar to ours can be legitimately used for construing our own Acts. However, prime importance is always to be given to the language of the Indian statute. Further, where guidance can be obtained from Indian decisions, reference to foreign decisions may become unnecessary.

(3 Marks)

ANSWER -4

ANSWER –A

Disqualification of auditor: According to section 141(3)(d)(i) of the Companies Act, 2013, a person who, or his relative or partner holds any security of the company or its subsidiary or of its holding or associate company or a subsidiary of such holding company, which carries voting rights, such person cannot be appointed as auditor of the company. Provided that the relative of

such person may hold security or interest in the company of face value not exceeding 1 lakh rupees as prescribed under the Companies (Audit and Auditors) Rules, 2014.

(2 Marks)

In the case Mr. Naresh, Chartered Accountants, did not hold any such security. But Mrs. Reena, his wife held equity shares of New Limited of face value Rs. 1 lakh, which is within the specified limit.

Further Section 141(4) provides that if an auditor becomes subject, after his appointment, to any of the disqualifications specified in sub-section 3 of section 141, he shall be deemed to have vacated his office of auditor. Hence, Naresh & Company can continue to function as auditors of the Company even after 15 October 2019 i.e. after the investment made by his wife in the equity shares of New Limited.

(2 Marks)

ANSWER –B

Deposit: According to section 2 (31) of the Companies Act, 2013, the term 'deposit' includes any receipt of money by way of deposit or loan or in any other form, by a company, but does not include such categories of amount as prescribed in the Rule 2(1)(c) of the Companies (Acceptance of deposit) Rules, 2014, in consultation with the Reserve bank of India.

Amounts received by the company will not be considered as deposit: In terms of Rule 2(1)(c) of the Companies (Acceptance of deposit) Rules, 2014, following shall be the answers-

- (i) In the first case, where Rs. 5,00,000 raised by the Rishi Ltd. through issue of non- convertible debenture not constituting a charge on the assets of the company and listed on recognised stock exchange as per the applicable regulations made by the SEBI, will not be considered as deposit in terms of sub-clause (ixa) of the said rule.
- (ii) In the second case, Rs. 2,00,000 was received from Mr. T, an employee of the company drawing annual salary of Rs. 1,50,000 under a contract of employment with the company in the nature of non-interest bearing security deposit. This amount received by company from employee, Mr. T will be considered as deposit in terms of sub-clause (x) of the said rule, as amount received is more than his annual salary under a contract of employment with the company in the nature of non-interest bearing security deposit.
- (iii) In the third case, amount of Rs. 3,00,000 received by a private company from a relative of a Director, declaring details of the amount so deposited as out of gift received from his mother. This amount received by the private company will not be considered as deposit in terms of sub-clause (viii) of the said rule. Here as per the requirement, the relative of the director of the private company, from whom money is received, furnished the declaration in writing to the effect that the amount is given out of gift received from his mother and not being given out of funds acquired by him by borrowing or accepting loans or deposits from others.

(6 Marks)

ANSWER –C

According to section 27 of the General Clauses Act, 1897, where any legislation or regulation requires any document to be served by post, then unless a different intention appears, the service shall be deemed to be effected by:

- (i) Properly addressing
- (ii) Pre-paying, and
- (iii) Posting by registered post.

A letter containing the document to have been effected at the time at which the letter would be delivered in the ordinary course of post.

The facts of the question are similar to a decided case law, wherein it was held that where a notice is sent to the landlord by registered post and the same is returned by the tenant with an endorsement of refusal, it will be presumed that the notice has been served. Thus, in the given question it can be deemed that the notice was rightfully served on Mr. Vyas.

(4 Marks)

ANSWER –D

Effect of usage: Usage or practice developed under the statute is indicative of the meaning recognized to its words by contemporary opinion. A uniform notorious practice continued under an old statute and inaction of the Legislature to amend the same are important factors to show that the practice so followed was based on correct understanding of the law. When the usage or practice receives judicial or legislative approval it gains additional weight.

In this connection, we have to bear in mind two Latin maxims:

- (i) 'Optima Legum interpret est consuetude' (the custom is the best interpreter of the law); and
- (ii) 'Contemporanea exposito est optima et fortissinia in lege' (the best way to interpret a document is to read it as it would have been read when made).

Therefore, the best interpretation/construction of a statute or any other document is that which has been made by the contemporary authority. Simply stated, old statutes and documents should be interpreted as they would have been at the time when they were enacted/written.

Contemporary official statements throwing light on the construction of a statute and statutory instruments made under it have been used as contemporanea exposition to interpret not only ancient but even recent statutes in India.

(3 Marks)

ANSWER -5**ANSWER –A**

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.

(5 Marks)

ANSWER –B

(i) Section 123(6) of the Companies Act, 2013, specifically provides that a company which fails to comply with the provisions of section 73 (Prohibition of acceptance of deposits from public) and section 74 (Repayment of deposits, etc., accepted before the commencement of this Act) shall not, so long as such failure continues, declare any dividend on its equity shares.

In the given instance, the Board of Directors of Anand Limited proposes to declare dividend at the rate of 20% to the equity shareholders, in spite of the fact that the company has defaulted in repayment of public deposits accepted before the commencement of the Companies Act, 2013. Hence, according to the above provision, declaration of dividend by the Anand Limited is not valid.

(ii) As per Second Proviso to Section 123 (1) of the Companies Act, 2013, in the event of inadequacy or absence of profits in any financial year, a company may declare dividend out of the accumulated profits of previous years which have been transferred to the free reserves. However, such declaration of dividend shall be subject to the conditions as prescribed under Rule 3 of the Companies (Declaration and Payment of Dividend) Rules, 2014.

(5 Marks)

ANSWER –C

The situation asked in the question is based on the provisions related with the modes of creation of agency relationship under the Indian Contract Act, 1872. Agency may be created by a legal presumption; in a case of cohabitation by a married woman (i.e. wife is considered as an implied agent of her husband). If wife lives with her husband, there is a legal presumption that a wife has authority to pledge her husband's credit for necessaries. But the legal presumption can be rebutted in the following cases:

- (i) Where the goods purchased on credit are not necessities.
- (ii) Where the wife is given sufficient money for purchasing necessities.
- (iii) Where the wife is forbidden from purchasing anything on credit or contracting debts.
- (iv) Where the trader has been expressly warned not to give credit to his wife.

If the wife lives apart for no fault on her part, wife has authority to pledge her husband's credit for necessities. This legal presumption can be rebutted only in cases (iii) and (iv) above.

Applying the above conditions in the given case M/s Rainbow Silks will succeed. It can recover the said amount from Naresh if sarees purchased by Aarthi are necessities for her.

(4 Marks)

ANSWER –D

Section 203(3) of the Companies Act, 2013 provides that whole time key managerial personnel shall not hold office in more than one company except in its subsidiary company at the same time. With respect to the issue that whether a whole time KMP of holding company be appointed in more than one subsidiary companies or can be appointed in only one subsidiary company.

It can be noted that Section 13 of General Clauses Act, 1897 provides that the word 'singular' shall include the 'plural' unless there is anything repugnant to the subject or the context. Thus, a whole time key managerial personnel may hold office in more than one subsidiary company as per the present law.

(3 Marks)