IJCRT.ORG ISSN : 2320-2882

INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF CREATIVE RESEARCH THOUGHTS (IJCRT)
An International Open Access, Peer-reviewed, Refereed Journal

Regulation Of Shell Companies Under The Companies Act, 2013 With Special Reference To Lifting Of Corporate Veil

Theresa Charles, Akanksha Srivastava Student, Assistant Professor
School of Law

Christ Deemed to be University, Pune Lavasa Campus

Abstract : This paper explores the regulation of shell companies in India, focusing mainly on its interaction with the doctrine of lifting the corporate veil. Shell companies are often used for legitimate purposes and are also at the same time widely misused for tax evasion, money laundering, and other fraudulent activities. The study delves into how the corporate veil that separates a company from its members can be lifted to expose actual beneficiaries and perpetrators of illicit acts.

The research analyses the legislative framework governing shell companies in India and evaluates judicial interpretations of the corporate veil doctrine in addressing misuse. By uncovering the role of lifting the corporate veil in promoting transparency and accountability, the following paper contributes to understanding and strengthening India's corporate regulatory landscape.

Keywords: Corporate, Company, Law, Shell, Corporate Veil

Introduction

Shell companies, which are often referred to as "mailbox companies", are entities that exist on paper but engage in little to no substantial operational activities in their registered jurisdictions. [1]OECD defines 'shell companies' as a firm formally registered, incorporated, or otherwise legally organised in an economy that does not conduct any operations in that economy other than in a pass-through capacity'. Shell companies are not inherently illegal. They can serve legitimate

[1] Economic Times, Government, regulators mull 'challenge-proof' definition for shell companies, TIMES OF INDIA (May 13, 2018, 08:58 PM), https://timesofindia.indiatimes.com/business/india-business/government-regulators-mull-challenge-proof-definition for-shell-companies/articleshow/64148494.cms.

purposes such as holding funds temporarily, protecting assets, facilitating access to foreign markets, or engaging in confidential business dealings. Their inherent lack of transparency makes them an attractive vehicle for misuse by many multinational corporations, high-net-worth individuals, and criminal enterprises to facilitate tax evasion, money laundering, and other illicit activities.

[2]The aspect of corporate personality came to light in *Salomon v. Salomon & Co. Ltd.*.In the case of *Salomon v. Salomon & Co. Ltd.*, the learned judge made a proposition that a company is a legal entity that is different from its members. This principle is fundamental in the Law of Incorporations as it provides a veil behind which certain persons in the company may hide separate legal entities different from their members. This principle is foundational to corporate law as it creates a "corporate veil" that can shield individuals behind the company from legal accountability. This veil is not absolute. It recognised that courts have the authority to examine where the corporate cloak is being worn for improper motives.

Since shell companies are often used in fraud, especially where the owners seek anonymity, it is imperative to have well-developed laws and energetic prosecution by the courts. The incorporation rule also means that the corporate veil can be lifted, a factor that remains instrumental when trying to pin responsibility on the real benefactors of such companies.

The purpose of this study is to map the current legislative regime that is touching shell companies in India, known as The Companies Act, 2013, and assess the judicial pronouncements in relation to the misuse of corporate vehicles. This paper helps to enhance the perception of the sophistication of shell companies' position and the measures required to curb their abuse.

Shell Companies and its relation with the Corporate veil

The principle of lifting the corporate veil plays an essential role in regulating shell companies, especially in addressing fraudulent practices and ensuring accountability. Although they are frequently established for lawful reasons like asset holding or transaction facilitation, shell corporations can also be used as a front for illicit activities, including fraud, money laundering, and tax evasion. A key component of corporate law is that the corporate veil shields companies'

[2] Salomon v. Salomon & Company Ltd (1895-96) All ER Rep 33 (HL)

legal identities from those of its members. But when this idea is applied improperly, the courts step in to see through the cover and find the people behind the wrongdoing committed in the business's name.

When businesses are being exploited as tools of dishonesty or unethical behaviour, courts have the authority to uncover the corporate veil. [3]For example, the corporate structure was used to get around contractual obligations in Gilford Motor Co. Ltd v. Horne, and the court determined that the corporation was nothing more than a sham. [4]In a similar manner, the court in Jones v. Lipman had to lift the veil and reveal the actual perpetrator after a corporation was established only to evade a specific performance requirement. To uphold justice and preserve public confidence, the judiciary must see past the façade of corporate identity. Business owners occasionally abuse the idea of removing the corporate veil to commit fraud for their own benefit while using the company's name. This is frequently observed in shell corporations when the goal is to restrict the company's liabilities while securing personal gains. To preserve the integrity of corporate law, courts have a critical role in dealing with and stopping such misbehaviour.

Shell companies often help individuals evade taxes further to circumvent legal responsibilities and avoid liabilities. [5]In the case of *Dinshaw Maneckjee Petit Re,* the court held that a company created purely for tax evasion was merely an alter ego of its owner and disregarded its corporate existence.

In certain instances, groups of companies are treated as a single economic entity, especially when their operations are deeply intertwined. [6]This approach is evident in *D.H.N. Food Products Ltd. v. Tower Hamlets;* herein, the court lifted the veil to view the group of companies as a unified entity for equitable treatment. [7]Similarly, Indian courts have adopted this reasoning, as seen in the *State of UP v. Renusagar Power Co.* case, to address scenarios where shell companies are part of a larger network designed to obscure actual ownership or control.

[3] Gilford Motor Co. Ltd v. Horne and Others [1933] Ch 935 (CA)
[4] Jones v. Lipman [1962] 1 WLR 832 (Ch)
[5] In Re: Dinshaw Maneckjee Petit Bart v. Unknown (1927) 29 BOMLR 447 (Bom HC)
[6] D.H.N. Food Products Ltd. v. Tower Hamlets, [1976] 1 W.L.R. 852, 856 (C.A.)
[7] State of U.P. v. Renusagar Power Co., AIR 1988 SC 1737, 1743

The lifting of the corporate veil is crucial for protecting the public interest and ensuring that corporate structures do not undermine the objectives of regulatory frameworks. [8]In *Daimler Co. Ltd v. Continental Tyre and Rubber Co. Ltd,* a company controlled by nationals of an alien state was deemed an alien company during wartime. This case highlights how courts use the principle to address broader concerns, including national security and public welfare, which are also significant in regulating shell companies.

The Companies Act 2013 specifies various situations where lifting the corporate veil is considered necessary to uncover and penalise the real offenders or beneficiaries hiding behind the company's identity. Additionally the Indian courts have established significant precedents that provide legal authority to apply this principle whenever Companies or Key mangerieral persons managing the Company are found taking unfair advantage. These measures ensure that corporate protection cannot be exploited to shield fraudulent actions.

The misuse of shell companies often relies on the principle of corporate personality to hide illicit activities. By lifting the veil, the regulators and courts can penetrate these facades. This ensures compliance with the law and safeguarding the interests of stakeholders and the public. This principle thus serves as a cornerstone in effectively regulating shell companies and ensuring that the benefits of corporate personality are not exploited to undermine the rule of law.

Corporate laws regulating Shell Companies with special reference to lifting the corporate veil in India.

1. Provisions under the Companies Act 2013 (Section 7 and Section 251)

The Companies Act of 2013 lays the foundation for regulating shell companies and provides precise circumstances under which the corporate veil can be lifted. [9]Section 7(7) of the Act empowers the authorities to hold individuals personally liable if the incorporation of a company is conducted with fraudulent or unlawful purposes. This provision ensures that shell companies formed to deceive creditors or evade legal obligations can be held accountable by piercing through their corporate structure.

[8] Daimler Co. Ltd. v. Continental Tyre and Rubber Co. Ltd, [1916] 2 A.C. 307, 311 (H.L. 1915)[9] Companies Act, 2013, §§ 7, 251.

Further, Section 251 addresses cases where companies apply for the removal of their names from the Registrar with fraudulent intent. If it is discovered that the application was made to defraud creditors or other stakeholders, the Act allows for prosecution, and the individuals behind the fraud are held personally responsible. This ensures that shell companies cannot misuse the strike-off process to escape liabilities.

2. Provisions for Fraud Prevention (Section 447)

[10]Section 447 of the Companies Act of 2013 deals with punishment for fraud. It provides a strong deterrent against fraudulent activities by shell companies and imposes severe penalties. This includes imprisonment and fines on those parties involved in such fraud. The section applies when lifting the corporate veil reveals some aspect of fraudulent conduct and this ensures that perpetrators are penalised

under the law. This safeguards against individuals hiding behind the corporate entity to carry out illegal activities.

3. Lifting the Corporate Veil to Prevent Misuse (Section 34 and Section 35)

[11]Sections 34 and 35 of the Companies Act of 2013 focus on misstatements in prospectuses. If false or misleading information is provided during the company's formation and used to defraud investors or stakeholders, these sections allow for piercing the corporate veil to identify and hold the offenders accountable. These provisions are particularly significant in cases involving shell companies that misrepresent facts to gain an unfair advantage.

4. Statutory Provisions Addressing Tax Evasion and Economic Offenses (Section 248)

[12]Section 248 of the Companies Act 2013 empowers the Registrar of Companies to remove the name of a company from the Register if it is found to be inactive or engaged in fraudulent practices. This provision is instrumental in identifying and eliminating shell companies solely for tax evasion or other economic offences. By lifting the corporate veil, the authorities can trace the individuals who use such companies to evade tax obligations.

[10] Companies Act, 2013, § 447.
[11] Companies Act, 2013, §§ 34-35.
[12] Companies Act, 2013, § 248.

5. Role of Judicial Precedents in Enforcing Lifting of the Veil

Apart from statutory provisions, judicial precedents have significantly contributed to shaping the regulation of shell companies. Courts have invoked the principle of lifting the corporate veil in landmark cases such as *Gilford Motor Co. Ltd. v. Horne* and *Jones v. Lipman*, where companies were used as tools to perpetrate fraud. These rulings establish that the court can disregard the company’s separate legal identity when the corporate structure is used to defeat public interest, commit fraud, or evade liabilities.

Statutory Acts complimenting Companies Act, 2013 in the regulation of shell companies with special reference to lifting of the corporate veil

1. Provisions under the Prevention of Money Laundering Act, 2002

[13]The Prevention of Money Laundering Act (PMLA) of 2002, complements the Companies Act. The Prevention of Money Laundering Act (PMLA) of 2002 addressed money laundering activities often associated with shell companies. By lifting the corporate veil, authorities can investigate the financial transactions of companies suspected of laundering money. The Act ensures that such activities are curbed and thus the individuals involved face legal consequences.

2. Income Tax Act, 1961

[14]The Income Tax Act 1961 also plays a vital role in regulating shell companies. Sections 68 and 69 allow tax authorities to investigate unexplained income or investments made through shell companies. By lifting the corporate veil, the actual beneficiaries of such unexplained funds can be identified and taxed accordingly. This prevents individuals from using shell companies to evade taxes or hide illicit income.

3. Enforcement under the Insolvency and Bankruptcy Code, 2016

[13] Prevention of Money Laundering Act, 2002, Pub. L. No. 15 of 2003, 46 Stat. 981.
[14] Income Tax Act, 1961, §§ 68-69.
[15]The Insolvency and Bankruptcy Code (IBC), 2016, enables lifting the corporate veil to identify fraudulent practices during insolvency proceedings. If a company is found to have indulged in fraudulent transactions or wrongful trading, the IBC empowers authorities to hold the individuals behind these actions personally liable, thereby ensuring transparency and accountability.

This robust framework of statutory provisions and judicial precedents ensures that the concept of lifting the corporate veil serves as a powerful tool to combat fraudulent practices associated with shell companies while safeguarding the interests of stakeholders and upholding the integrity of corporate law.

Judicial Approach to Shell Companies with special reference to Lifting of Corporate Veil

Singer India Ltd. v. Chander Mohan Chadha and Ors. (2004)

[16]In the case of *Singer India Ltd. v. Chander Mohan Chadha and Ors.* (2004), the court emphasised that the doctrine of a separate legal entity was established to promote trade and commerce and not to enable illegal or fraudulent activities aimed at deceiving creditors or other parties. Under such circumstances the court affirmed its authority to lift the corporate veil to deliver justice to the aggrieved parties.

The court observed that the primary objective of the doctrine of separate legal entities is to support business growth by allowing companies to operate independently, make decisions and assume risks without subjecting their owners to unlimited personal liability. However, this privilege must not be misused to engage in unlawful or unethical practices.

In this case the court found that the defendants named Chander Mohan Chadha and others had incorporated multiple companies with the intent to siphon off assets and defraud creditors. These companies were merely facades, used to conceal their wrongful actions and evade legal accountability.

[15] Insolvency and Bankruptcy Code, 2016, Pub. L. No. 31 of 2016, 59 Stat. 915.

[16] Singer India Ltd. v. Chander Mohan Chadha and Ors., (2004) 7 SCC 1, 6

Acknowledging the need to curb such misuse of corporate structures, the court lifted the corporate veil and held the defendants personally liable for the company's debts and liabilities. The court concluded that allowing the defendants to shield themselves behind the corporate veil would undermine the principles of justice and equity and thus grant them an unjust advantage over their creditors.

The decision in *Singer India Ltd.* underscores that the doctrine of a separate legal entity is not absolute. Courts retain the authority to pierce the corporate veil and impose personal liability on individuals who misuse this doctrine to carry out illegal or fraudulent activities. This principle prevents individuals from exploiting corporate structures to evade legal responsibilities and harm innocent parties.

Richter Holding Ltd. v. The Assistant Director of Income Tax (2011)

[17]In the case of *Richter Holding Ltd. v. The Assistant Director of Income Tax* (2011), the Karnataka High Court addressed the scope of the income tax department's authority to lift the corporate veil. The court held that income tax authorities are fact-finding bodies; thus, the department is empowered to pierce the veil to uncover the true nature of a transaction. The case centred on the interpretation of

Section 2(22)(e) of the Income Tax Act, which allows the income tax department to disregard a company's separate legal entity if it is determined that the company was formed or is being utilised to avoid or reduce tax liabilities.

The department asserted that this provision granted it the authority to lift the corporate veil and examine the substance of the transactions under scrutiny. In response, the assessee, Richter Holding Ltd., argued that the separate legal identity of a company could not be disregarded unless the department could demonstrate that the company was a sham or a mere facade. The assessee relied on the principle of corporate personality, which recognises a company as a separate legal entity from its shareholders.

[17] Richter Holding Ltd. v. Assistant Director of Income Tax, (2011) 9 SCC 453, 460

State of Rajasthan and Ors. v. Gotan Lime Stone Khanji Udyog Pvt. Ltd. and Ors. (2016)

[18]In *State of Rajasthan and Ors. v. Gotan Lime Stone Khanji Udyog Pvt. Ltd. and Ors.* (2016) the Supreme Court held that the corporate veil could be lifted when a company acts against public interest. This landmark decision reinforces that companies cannot misuse the corporate veil to shield themselves from liability for wrongdoing and provides regulators with a robust tool to address illegal or unethical conduct.

Increased accountability for directors and shareholders, who may now be held personally accountable if a corporation is exploited fraudulently or to avoid legal duties, is one of the judgment's main ramifications. This decision also means that authorities will be paying more attention to how businesses behave, which will force businesses to make sure that laws and regulations are strictly followed. Furthermore, when directors and shareholders attempt to shield themselves from personal culpability by addressing unethical practices within their organisations, the ruling can result in additional lawsuits.

Conclusion

The regulation of shell companies in India, which, when viewed through the doctrine of lifting the corporate veil, reflects the judiciary's and legislature's commitment to curbing corporate misuse. The opacity often facilitates tax evasion, money laundering, and fraud. The principle of corporate personality is not absolute and is disregarded when the corporate veil conceals wrongdoing. Landmark cases like *Singer India Ltd.*, *Richter Holding Ltd.*, and *Gotan Lime Stone* illustrate the judiciary's proactive role in ensuring accountability.

Despite robust frameworks like the Companies Act of of 2013, the Prevention of Money Laundering Act, and the Income Tax Act, enforcement challenges remain. These include identifying actual beneficiaries, managing cross-border complexities, and improving coordination among regulatory bodies. Strengthening the lifting of the corporate veil doctrine is essential for promoting transparency and accountability.

Judicial training can ensure consistent application of the corporate veil doctrine, while international collaboration is necessary to address global networks of illicit shell companies.

[18] State of Rajasthan and Ors. v. Gotan Lime Stone Khanji Udyog Pvt. Ltd. and Ors., (2016) 4 SCC 469, 475

Increasing public awareness about the risks and consequences of corporate misuse will further promote compliance and ethical practices.These combined efforts can address the misuse of shell companies and uphold the integrity of India's corporate regulatory system.