



**J.K. SHAH**<sup>®</sup>  
**TEST SERIES**  
Evaluate Learn Succeed

**SUGGESTED SOLUTION**

**CA INTERMEDIATE**

**SUBJECT- LAW**

**Test Code – INP 2112**

**BRANCH - () (Date :)**

**Head Office : Shraddha, 3<sup>rd</sup> Floor, Near Chinai College, Andheri (E), Mumbai – 69.**

**Tel : (022) 26836666**

## DIVISION A

### MCQ ANSWER :

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

## DIVISION B

### ANSWER : 1(A)

As per section 3 of the Companies Act, 2013, the memorandum of One Person Company (OPC) shall indicate the name of the other person (nominee), who shall, in the event of the subscriber's death or his incapacity to contract, become the member of the company.

The other person (nominee) whose name is given in the memorandum shall give his prior written consent in prescribed form and the same shall be filed with Registrar of companies at the time of incorporation along with its Memorandum of Association and Articles of Association.

Such other person (nominee) may withdraw his consent in such manner as may be prescribed.

Therefore, in terms of the above law, Mr. King, the nominee, whose name was given in the memorandum, can withdraw his consent as a nominee of the OPC by giving a notice in writing to the sole member and to the One Person Company.

Following are the answers to the second part of the question as regards the eligibility for being nominated as nominee:

- (i) As per the Rule 3 of the Companies (Incorporation) Rules, 2014, no minor shall become member or nominee of the OPC. Therefore, Mr. Shyam, being a minor is not eligible for being nominated as Nominee of the OPC.
- (ii) As per the Rule 3 of the Companies (Incorporation) Rules, 2014, only a natural person who is an Indian citizen and resident in India, shall be a nominee or the sole member of a One Person Company. The term "Resident in India" means a person who has stayed in India for a period of not less than 182 days during the immediately preceding financial year. Here Ms. Devaki though an Indian Citizen but not resident in India as she stayed for a period of less than 182 days during the immediately preceding financial year in India. So, she is not eligible for being nominated as nominee of the OPC.

(iii) As per the Rule 3 of the Companies (Incorporation) Rules, 2014, a person shall not be a member of more than one OPC at any point of time and the said person shall not be a nominee of more than one OPC. Mr. Ashok, an Indian Citizen residing in India who is a member of an OPC (Not a nominee in any OPC), can be nominated as nominee.

**(6 MARKS)**

**ANSWER : 1(B)**

According to Section 63 of the Companies Act, 2013, a company may issue fully paid - up bonus shares to its members, in any manner whatsoever, out of -

- (i) its free reserves;
- (ii) the securities premium account; or
- (iii) the capital redemption reserve account.

Provided that no issue of bonus shares shall be made by capitalising reserves created by the revaluation of assets.

**Conditions for issue of Bonus Shares:** No company shall capitalise its profits or reserves for the purpose of issuing fully paid-up bonus shares, unless—

- (i) it is authorised by its Articles;
- (ii) it has, on the recommendation of the Board, been authorised in the general meeting of the company;
- (iii) it has not defaulted in payment of interest or principal in respect of fixed deposits or debt securities issued by it;
- (iv) it has not defaulted in respect of payment of statutory dues of the employees, such as, contribution to provident fund, gratuity and bonus;
- (v) the partly paid-up shares, if any, outstanding on the date of allotment, are made fully paid-up;
- (vi) it complies with such conditions as are prescribed by Rule 14 of the Companies (Share Capital and debentures) Rules, 2014 which states that the company which has once announced the decision of its Board recommending a bonus issue, shall not subsequently withdraw the same.

Further, the company has to ensure that the bonus shares shall not be issued in lieu of dividend.

For the issue of bonus shares Shiva Cement Limited will require reserves of Rs. 50,00,000 (i.e. half of Rs. 1,00,00,000 being the paid-up share capital), which is readily available with the company. Hence, after following the above conditions relating to the issue of bonus shares, the company may proceed for a bonus issue of 1 share for every 2 shares held by the existing shareholders.

**(5 MARKS)**

**ANSWER : 1(C)**

- (i) **Pledge by person in possession under voidable contract** [Section 178A of the Indian Contract Act, 1872]: When the pawnor has obtained possession of the goods pledged by him under a contract voidable under section 19 or section 19A, but the contract has not been rescinded at the time of the pledge, the pawnee acquires a good title to the goods, provided he acts in good faith and without notice of the pawnor's defect of title. Therefore, the pledge of diamond by Srushti with Mr. VK is valid.
- (ii) **Right of retainer** [Section 173 of the Indian Contract Act, 1872]: Yes, the pawnee may retain the goods pledged, not only for payment of the debt or the performance of the promise, but for the interest, of the debt, and all necessary expenses incurred by him in respect of the possession or for the preservation of the goods pledged.

**ANSWER : 1(D)**

**Irregular allotment:** The Companies Act, 2013 does not specifically provide for the term “Irregular Allotment” of securities. Hence, we have to examine the requirements of a proper issue of securities and consider the consequences of non- fulfillment of those requirements.

In broad terms an allotment of shares is deemed to be irregular when it has been made by a company in violation of Sections 23, 26, 39 or 40. Irregular allotment therefore arises in the following instances:

1. Where a company does not issue a prospectus in a public issue as required by section 23; or
2. Where the prospectus issued by the company does not include any of the matters required to be included therein under section 26 (1), or the information given is misleading, faulty and incorrect; or
3. Where the prospectus has not been filed with the Registrar for registration under section 26 (4); or
4. The minimum subscription as specified in the prospectus has not been received in terms of section 39; or
5. The minimum amount receivable on application is less than 5% of the nominal value of the securities offered or lower than the amount prescribed by SEBI in this behalf; or
6. In case of a public issue, approval for listing has not been obtained from one or more of the recognized stock exchanges under section 40 of the Companies Act, 2013.

(4 MARKS)

**ANSWER : 2(A)**

- (i) As per section 141 (3)(d)(i) of the Companies Act, 2013, an auditor is disqualified to be appointed as an auditor if he, or his relative or partner holding any security of or interest in the company or its subsidiary, or of its holding or associate company or a subsidiary of such holding company.

Further as per proviso to this Section, the relative of the auditor may hold the securities or interest in the company of face value not exceeding of Rs.1,00,000.

In the present case, Mr. Aakash (relative of Mr. Prakash, an auditor), is having securities of ABC Ltd. having face value of Rs. 70,000 (market value Rs. 1,10,000), which is within the limit as per requirement of under the proviso to section 141 (3)(d)(i). Therefore, Mr. Prakash will not be disqualified to be appointed as an auditor of ABC Ltd.

- (ii) As per section 141(3)(d)(ii), an auditor is disqualified to be appointed as an auditor if he or his relative or partner is indebted to the company, or its subsidiary, or its holding or associate company or a subsidiary of such holding company, in excess of Rs. 5 Lacs.

In the instant case, Mr. Ramesh will be disqualified to be appointed as an auditor of MNP Ltd. as he indebted to MNP Ltd. for Rs.6 lacs.

- (iii) As per section 141(3)(f), an auditor is disqualified to be appointed as an auditor if a person whose relative is a director or is in the employment of the company as a director or a key managerial personnel.

In the instant case, since Mrs. KVJ Spouse of Mr. Kumar (Chartered Accountant) is the store keeper (not a director or KMP) of PRC Ltd., hence Mr. Kumar will not be disqualified to be appointed as an auditor in the said company.

**ANSWER : 2(B)**

According to section 103 of the Companies Act, 2013, unless the articles of the company provide for a larger number in case of a public company, five members personally present if the number of members as on the date of meeting is not more than one thousand, shall be the quorum.

In this case the quorum for holding a general meeting is 7 members to be personally present (higher of 5 or 7). For the purpose of quorum, only those members are counted who are entitled to vote on resolution proposed to be passed in the meeting.

Again, only members present in person and not by proxy are to be counted. Hence, proxies whether they are members or not will have to be excluded for the purposes of quorum.

If a company is a member of another company, it may authorize a person by resolution to act as its representative at a meeting of the latter company, then such a person shall be deemed to be a member present in person and counted for the purpose of quorum. Where two or more companies which are members of another company, appoint a single person as their representative then each such company will be counted as quorum at a meeting of the latter company.

Further the President of India or Governor of a State, if he is a member of a company, may appoint such a person as he thinks fit, to act as his representative at any meeting of the company. A person so appointed shall be deemed to be a member of such a company and thus considered as member personally present.

In view of the above there are only three members personally present.

'A' will be included for the purpose of quorum. B & C have to be excluded for the purpose of quorum because they represent the preference shares and since the agenda being the appointment of Managing Director, their rights cannot be said to be directly affected and therefore, they shall not have voting rights. D will have two votes for the purpose of quorum as he represents two companies 'Y Ltd.' and 'Z Ltd.' E, F, G and H are not to be included as they are not members but representing as proxies for the members.

Thus, it can be said that the requirements of quorum has not been met and it shall not constitute a valid quorum for the meeting.

(5 MARKS)

**ANSWER : 2(C)**

Restrictive and extensive definitions: The definition of a word or expression in the definition section may either be restricting of its ordinary meaning or may be extensive of the same.

When a word is defined to 'mean' such and such, the definition is 'prima facie' restrictive and exhaustive, we must restrict the meaning of the word to that given in the definition section.

But where the word is defined to 'include' such and such, the definition is 'prima facie' extensive: here the word defined is not restricted to the meaning assigned to it but has extensive meaning which also includes the meaning assigned to it in the definition section.

Thus,

- (i) The definition is restrictive and exhaustive to the effect that only an entity incorporated under the Companies Act, 2013 or under any previous Companies Act, shall deemed to be company.
- (ii) The definition is inclusive in nature, thereby the meaning assigned to the respective word (here 'person') is extensive. It has a wider scope to include other terms into the ambit of the definition having regard to the object of the definition.

(3 MARKS)

**ANSWER : 2(D)**

**Bill drawn in fictitious name:** The problem is based on the provision of Section 42 of the Negotiable Instruments Act, 1881. In case a bill of exchange is drawn payable to the drawer's order in a fictitious name and is endorsed by the same hand as the drawer's signature, it is not permissible for the acceptor to allege as against the holder in due course that such name is fictitious.

Accordingly, in the instant case, B cannot avoid payment by raising the plea that the drawer, C is fictitious. The only condition is that the signature of C as drawer and as endorser must be in the same handwriting.

Therefore, in the given case, B is bound to make the payment of the bill to D.

**(3 MARKS)**

**ANSWER : 3(A)**

- (i) As per Section 123(3) of the Companies Act, 2013, the Board of Directors of a company may declare interim dividend during any financial year out of the surplus in the profit and loss account and out of profits of the financial year in which such interim dividend is sought to be declared:

Provided that in case the company has incurred loss during the current financial year up to the end of the quarter immediately preceding the date of declaration of interim dividend, such interim dividend shall not be declared at a rate higher than the average dividends declared by the company during the immediately preceding three financial years.

According to the given facts, Alex Ltd. is facing loss in business during the financial year 2018-2019. In the immediate preceding three financial years, the company declared dividend at the rate of 7%, 11% and 12% respectively. Accordingly, the rate of dividend declared shall not exceed 10%, the average of the rates  $(7+11+12=30/3)$  at which dividend was declared by it during the immediately preceding three financial years.

Therefore the act of the Board of Directors as to declaration of interim dividend at the rate of 12% during the F.Y 2018-2019 is not valid.

**(2 MARKS)**

- (ii) Payment of dividend: According to section 123(5) of the Companies Act, 2013, dividend shall be payable only to the registered shareholder of the share or to his order or to his banker. As said in the question, East West Limited proposed dividend for Financial Year 2017- 2018. Mr. Binoy was the holder of 2000 equity shares on 31st March, 2018. He transferred the shares to Mr. Mohan, whose name was registered on 18th June 2018 in the register of members.

**(2 MARKS)**

**ANSWER : 3(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 amounts 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 : 3(C)**

<b>Point of distinction</b>	<b>Contract of Indemnity</b>	<b>Contract of Guarantee</b>
<b>Number of party/ Parties to the contract</b>	there are only two parties namely the indemnifier [promisor] and the indemnified [promisee]	there are three parties creditor, principal debtor and surety.
<b>Nature of liability</b>	The liability of the indemnifier is primary and unconditional.	The liability of the surety is secondary and conditional as the primary liability is that of the principal debtor.
<b>Time of liability</b>	The liability of the indemnifier arises only on the happening of a contingency.	The liability arises only on the non performance of an existing promise or non- payment of an existing debt.
<b>Time to act</b>	The indemnifier need not act at the request of indemnity holder	The surety acts at the request of principal debtor.
<b>Right to sue third party</b>	indemnifier cannot sue a third party for loss in his own name as there is no privity of contract. Such a right would arise only if there is an assignment in his favour.	surety can proceed against principal debtor in his own right because he gets all the right of a creditor after discharging the debts.
<b>Purpose</b>	Reimbursement of loss	For the security of the creditor
<b>Competency to contract</b>	All parties must be competent to contract	In the case of a contract of guarantee, where a minor is a principal debtor, the contract is still valid.

**(4 MARKS)**

**ANSWER : 3(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.

**ANSWER : 4(A)**

(i) In the instant case, the purchase of diamond ornaments by Mrs. K from a Jewellery Shop, the owners of which are notorious and indulged in smuggling activities, made in good faith, will not convey good title.

As per section 3 (22) of the General Clauses Act, 1897, a thing shall be deemed to be done in “good faith” where it is in fact done honestly, whether it is done negligently or not.

The definition of good faith as is generally understood in the civil law and which may be taken as a practical guide in understanding the expression in the Indian Contract Act, 1872 is that nothing is said to be done in good faith which is done without due care and attention as is expected with a man of ordinary prudence. An honest purchase made carelessly without making proper enquiries cannot be said to have been made in good faith so as to convey good title.

(ii) “Measurement of Distances” [Section 11 of the General Clauses Act, 1897]: In the measurement of any distance, for the purposes of any Central Act or Regulation made after the commencement of this Act, that distance shall, unless a different intention appears, be measured in a straight line on a horizontal plane.

**(4 MARKS)**

**ANSWER : 4(B)**

As per section 5 of the Companies Act, 2013 the article may contain provisions for entrenchment to the effect that specified provisions of the articles may be altered only if more restrictive conditions than a special resolution, are met.

The provisions for entrenchment shall only be made either on formation of a company, or by an amendment in the articles agreed to by all the members of the company in the case of a private company and by a special resolution in the case of a public company.

Where the articles contain provisions for entrenchment, whether made on formation or by amendment, the company shall give notice to the Registrar of such provisions in prescribed manner.

In the present case, Yadav Dairy Products Private Limited is a private company and wants to protect provisions of articles regarding forfeiture of shares. It means it wants to make entrenchment of articles, which is allowed. But the company will have to pass a resolution taking



permission of all the members and it should also give notice to Register of Companies regarding entrenchment of articles.

**ANSWER : 4(C)**

According to section 8(1) of the Companies Act, 2013, where it is proved to the satisfaction of the Central Government that a person or an association of persons proposed to be registered under this Act as a limited company—

- (a) has in its objects the promotion of commerce, art, science, sports, education, research, social welfare, religion, charity, protection of environment or any such other object;
- (b) intends to apply its profits, if any, or other income in promoting its objects; and
- (c) intends to prohibit the payment of any dividend to its members;

the Central Government may, by issue of licence, allow that person or association of persons to be registered as a limited liability company.

In the instant case, the decision of the group of individuals to form a limited liability company for charitable purpose under section 8 for a period of ten years and thereafter to dissolve the club and to distribute the surplus of assets over the liabilities, if any, amongst the members will not hold good, since there is a restriction as pointed out in point (b) above regarding application of its profits or other income only in promoting its objects. Further, there is restriction in the application of the surplus assets of such a company in the event of winding up or dissolution of the company as provided in sub- section (9) of Section 8 of the Companies Act, 2013. Therefore, the proposal is not feasible.

**(5 MARKS)**

**ANSWER : 4(D)**

**Intimation regarding Satisfaction of Charge**

Section 82 of the Companies Act, 2013, requires a company to give intimation of payment or satisfaction in full of any charge earlier registered, to the Registrar in the prescribed form. The intimation needs to be given within a period of 30 days from the date of such payment or satisfaction.

Extended period of intimation: Proviso to Section 82 (1) extends the period of intimation from thirty days to three hundred days. Accordingly, it is provided that the Registrar may, on an application by the company or the charge holder, allow such intimation of payment or satisfaction to be made within a period of 300 days of such payment or satisfaction on payment of prescribed additional fees.

**ANSWER : 5(A)**

An agent does all acts on behalf of the principal but incurs no personal liability. The liability remains that of the principal unless there is a contract to the contrary. An agent also cannot personally enforce contracts entered into by him on behalf of the principal. In the light of section 226 of the Indian Contract Act, 1872, Principal is considered to be liable for the acts of agents which are within the scope of his authority. Further section 228 of the Indian Contract Act, 1872 states that where an agent does more than he is authorised to do, and what he does beyond the scope of his authority cannot be separated from what is within it, the principal is not bound to recognise the transaction.

In the given case, the agency agreement was signed between X and Y, authorizing Y to purchase goods maximum upto the value of Rs. 10 lakh. But Y purchased a single item of Rs. 12 lakh from Z as an agent of X at a discounted rate to financially benefit to X. On demand of payment by Z, X denied saying that Y has exceeded his authority therefore he is not liable for such purchase. Z filed a suit against X for payment.

As said above, liability remains that of the principal unless there is a contract to the contrary. The agency agreement clearly specifies the scope of authority of Y for the purchase of goods, however he exceeded his authority as an agent. Therefore, in the light of section 228 as stated above, since the transaction is not separable, X is not bound to recognize the transaction entered between Z and Y, and therefore may repudiate the whole transaction. Hence, Z will not succeed in his suit against X for recovery of payment.

**(4 MARKS)**

**ANSWER : 5(B)**

Under section 102(2)(b) of the Companies Act, 2013, in the case of any meeting other than an Annual General Meeting, all business transacted thereat shall be deemed to be special business.

Further, under section 102(1), an explanatory a statement setting out the following material facts concerning each item of special business to be transacted at a general meeting, shall be annexed to the notice calling such meeting., namely:-

- (a) the nature of concern or interest, financial or otherwise, if any, in respect of each items, of:
  - (i) every director and the manager, if any;
  - (ii) every other key managerial personnel; and
  - (iii) relatives of the persons mentioned in sub-clauses (i) and (ii);
- (b) any other information and facts that may enable members to understand the meaning, scope and implications of the items of business and to take decision thereon.

The information about the amount is also a material fact that may enable members to understand the meaning and implication of items of business to be transacted and to take decision thereon.

Section 102 also prescribes ordinary businesses for which explanatory statement is not required.

Part (i) of the question relating to increase in the Authorized Capital falls under special business and hence in the absence of amount of proposed increase of share capital, the notice will be treated as invalid.

Part(ii) is an ordinary business and hence explanatory statement is not required. However, considering the two resolutions mentioned in the question are to be passed in the same meeting, notice of the meeting is invalid.

Thus, the objection of the shareholder is valid since the details on the item to be considered are lacking.

The information about the amount is a material fact with reference to the proposed increase of authorized share capital and remuneration of Mr. Prateek as the auditor.

The notice is, therefore, not a valid notice under Section 102 of the Companies Act, 2013.

**(4 MARKS)**

**ANSWER : 5(C)**

- (i) 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 accounts 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 accounts 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 Ravi Limited is not permitted.

(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 accounts 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.

(iii) A Company have has the option of keeping such books of account or other relevant papers in electronic mode as per *Rule 3 of the Companies (Accounts) Rules, 2014*. According to such Rule,

- (a) such books of accounts or other relevant books or papers maintained in electronic mode shall remain accessible in India so as to be usable for subsequent reference.
- (b) There shall be a proper system for storage, retrieval, display or printout of the electronic records as the Audit Committee, if any, or the Board may deem appropriate and such records shall not be disposed of or rendered unusable, unless permitted by law.
- (c) The back-up of the books of account and other books and papers of the company maintained in electronic mode, including at a place outside India, if any, shall be kept in servers physically located in India on a periodic basis.

Hence, a company cannot keep books of Account in electronic mode accessible only outside India.

**(6 MARKS)**

**ANSWER : 5(D)**

**Preamble:** The Preamble expresses the scope, object and purpose of the Act more comprehensively. The Preamble of a Statute is a part of the enactment and can legitimately be used as an internal aid for construing it. However, the Preamble does not over-ride the plain provision of the Act. But if the wording of the statute gives rise to doubts as to its proper construction, for example, where the words or phrase has more than one meaning and a doubt arises as to which of the two meanings is intended in the Act, the Preamble can and ought to be referred to in order to arrive at the proper construction.

In short, the Preamble to an Act discloses the primary intention of the legislature but can only be brought in as an aid to construction if the language of the statute is not clear. However, it cannot override the provisions of the enactment.

**Example:** Use of the word 'may' in section 5 of the Hindu Marriage Act, 1955 provides that "a marriage may be solemnized between two Hindus" has been construed to be mandatory in the sense that both parties to the marriage must be Hindus as defined in section 2 of the Act. It was held that a marriage between a Christian male and a Hindu female solemnized under the Hindu Marriage Act was void. This result was reached also having regard to the preamble of the Act which reads: 'An Act to amend and codify the law relating to marriage among Hindus' [Gullipoli Sowria Raj V. Bandaru Pavani, (2009) 1 SCC 714].

**(3 MARKS)**