IJCRT.ORG ISSN : 2320-2882

INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF CREATIVE RESEARCH THOUGHTS (IJCRT)

An International Open Access, Peer-reviewed, Refereed Journal

Protection Of Rights Of Minority Shareholders

Critical Analysis

[1]Amar Ramchandra Rite, [2]Anu Solanki

[1]LLM, Ajeenkya D. Y. Patil University School Of Law, [2] Prof. Ajeenkya D. Y. Patil University, School Of Law
[1]Law Department,
[1]Ajeenkya D.Y. Patil University, School Of Law, Pune, India

Abstract: It is explicit to discover the appropriate response of the inquiry, in what conditions and upon what grounds is the desire of most investors vitiated? Along these lines, I have attempted to show what are subsidiary activities and the major complaints of subordinate activities. In explicit, when minority investors can apply to the on the ground of baseless bias cure and how far it has been polished in our country. At the same time, I have attempted to discover the components of uncalled-for bias and use of out-of-line bias tests lastly finished up with few ideas. At the point when an investor can carry an activity to control any proposed break of the organization's reminder or articles of affiliation or to pronounce any activity invalid dependent on such a penetration. I have likewise added the obligations owed to investors by and by. I have attempted to show that rights pronounced concerning the adjustment of Update or Articles of Relationship of the Organization, class rights, monetary help for and the buyers of an organization's offers, and division of exchange examination. I have attempted to, how far The Indian law varies from the Bangladesh, English, and Australian law (section 260 of the Australian Enterprises and protections enactment).

Technical terms: Company, Share, Shareholder, etc.

I Introduction

The privileges of minority shareholders are obtained from a few distinct spaces of company law and subsequently, law messages have a general arrangement with such rights inside explicit classes.

Section 397 of the Indian Companies Act 1956 observes the English law and give that any individuals from the company who grumble that the undertakings of the company are being led in a biased way to the public interest or in a way severe to any part or individuals including any at least one of themselves may apply to the organization law board gave such individuals comprised one-10th of the quantity of the gave share capital of the company and if the board thinks, that the claim is valid and that to end up the company would ridiculously bias such part or individuals, yet that something else, the realities would legitimize the creation of an ending up of request on the ground that it is simply and impartial of that the company ought to be ended up then the Board may, planning to finish the issue griped of, make such request as it might suspect fit. The beginning of this section 210 of the English Companies Act, 1948, gave an elective solution for ending up in instances of mistreatment. This arrangement gave quite a few the companies the option to request of the Court that the issues of the company were being run in a way severe to some piece of the individuals including himself and the Court on the off chance that it tracked down that the charge was genuine however that to end up the company would ridiculously bias those individuals yet something else, the realities would legitimize the making up of wrapping up request on the ground that it would be simply and impartial that it ought to be twisted up and afterward the Court may, proposing to finish the issue griped of, make such request as it might suspect fit, regardless of whether for managing the lead of the Company's issues in future or for the portion of the company by different individuals from the company as well as the actual company. The Court could likewise make a modification or augmentations to the organization's update or articles of affiliations and these progressions couldn't be adjusted by the company without the leave of the Court.

The Indian, English, and Australian law (section 260 of the Australian Enterprises and protections Act) are comparative and in that those laws necessitate that candidates to show that the undertakings of the company or the demonstration whined of are probably going to make 'ridiculous bias' the applicants. This, in principle, implies that Indian law doesn't make reference to anything about separation nor does the English Law yet obviously assuming segregation is demonstrated, that would be commensurate with mistreatment of individuals. The Australian law makes reference to that a demonstration or goal of the company if is 'unreasonably' biased, may make the Court meddle.

1.2 Scope

The liberation of minority investors is a new occasion. The privileges of minority investors are a significant and quickly creating part of the law. Albeit the beginning part of law delivers immense extension to examine, because of impediments, this paper endeavors to zero in just on those issues which are firmly associated with the standards of security of minority investors' privileges. To be exact, the paper attempts to discover answers to the previously mentioned questions. The sole reason, notwithstanding, of this paper, is to show how the privileges of minority investors of an organization can be secured really in our country. At the same time, it additionally attempts to make reference to and share the encounters of certain nations concerning the assurance of minority investors. At long last, it proposes some more routes as well as existing standards to ensure the privileges of minority investors in the light of the experience of other customary law nations.

1.3 Limitations Of The Research

The fundamental limit of this paper is its broad reliance on unfamiliar case laws and unfamiliar reference books. Further, the inaccessibility of information concerning milestone cases concerning the research issue may likewise be named as another restriction.

1.4 Historical Background

The Company Legislation in India has been obtained from Organization Enactment in Britain for eg. in light of the English Companies Act, 1844, the primary authoritative establishment for enrollment of Business entities was passed in the year 1850 and it likewise perceived organizations as particular legitimate elements. The Organizations Act, 1857 intently following the English Organizations Act, 1856 presented the idea of restricted obligation however there was a limitless risk of the individuals from the financial organizations, and the idea of restricted responsibility was reached out to banking organizations, not until 1858.

From there on the Companies Act, 1866 was passed, in light of the English Companies Act, 1862, for uniting and revising the law identifying with fuse, guideline, and ending up of exchanging organizations and different affiliations. In 1882 the Indian Company law was acquired concurrency with different corrections made to the English Companies Demonstration of 1862 until it was supplanted by the Companies Act, 1913, which was passed following the English Companies Combination Act, 1908. The Demonstration of 1913 was exposed to corrections in the years 1914, 1915, 1920, 1926, 1930, 1932, 1936 on the lines of the English Companies Act, 1929 and stopped to exist in the year 1956., the business organizations in India were managed by this Act of 1913.

In the year 1950, the Public authority of India named a Board of trustees under the Chairmanship of Shri H.C. Bhaba changed the Indian Companies Act to align it with the advancement of exchange and industry in India, and the Board of Trustees presented its report in Walk 1952. Depending on the proposals of the Board, a bill to order the Companies Act, 1956 was presented in Parliament. This Demonstration, by and by generally followed the English Companies Act, 1948. The significant changes to the Act of 1956 were presented in the years 1960, 1962, 1963, 1964, 1965, 1966, 1967, 1969, 1974, 1977, 1985, 1988, 1991.

Post-July, 1991 onward, the Public authority perceived that numerous arrangements of the Companies Act were non-helpful for the development and advancement of the Indian corporate area in a state of harmony with the financial changes. The Companies Bill, 1993 was drafted yet it was in this manner removed. As a feature of proceeding with changes in measure and in the wake of the order of the Depositories Act, 1996, certain corrections were, notwithstanding, fused by the Companies (Revision) Act, 1996.

In the year 1996, following a declaration made by the then Union Minister for Account in his Spending Discourse, a Functioning Gathering was composed to revamp the Companies Act. It was the need of great importance to permit sound development of the Indian corporate area under a changed, quick changing, and profoundly aggressive business climate. Based on the report arranged by the Functioning Gathering and other companies and the administrative structure the overall Company Bill, 1997 was presented in Rajya Sabha on August 14, 1997. In the meantime, on October 31, 1998, the President of India declared the Companies (Revision) Ordinance, 1998 which was subsequently supplanted by the Companies(Alteration) Act, 1999. The arrangement changes were in the years 2000, 2001, 2002 (two Companies (Alteration) Acts were passed in December 2002), 2006.

The Companies Act, 1956 later supplanted by the Companies Act, 2013, a more contemporary, improved, and justified enactment which carried our company law at standard with the best worldwide practices by including rehearsals like Corporate Social Rule (CSR), class activity suits, and a fixed term for autonomous chiefs. As of late, the Companies (Revision) Act, 2015 which got the official consent on 25th May 2015 and became employable w.e.f. 29th May 2015 is intended to address a few issues raised by partners like Chartered Accountants and different experts, and so forth.

Company: The historical backdrop of companies extends back to Roman occasions and manages relationships of individuals shaped to maintain a business and beneficent or recreation purposes. A partnership is one sort of company and alludes to an element that has a different legitimate personality from the individuals who do its exercises and the individuals who have rights to its property. Initially, partnerships were exclusively ready to be set up through a demonstration of the state, for instance through an imperial contract or an Act of Parliament.

During the nineteenth century, the first being through the Joint Stock Companies Act 1856 in the UK, private people could, through a basic enrollment technique, be considered to have set up a company with restricted obligation. Companies today overwhelm financial life in totally created nations and the worldwide economy.

Shareholder: A unit of proprietorship that addresses an equivalent extent of a company's capital. It entitles its holder (the investor) to an equivalent case on the company's benefits and an equivalent commitment for the company's obligations and misfortunes.

Two significant sorts of offers are:

(1) conventional offers (basic stock), which qualifies the investor for share in the profit of the company as and when they happen, and to cast a ballot at the company's yearly comprehensive gatherings and other authority gatherings, and

(2) inclination shares (favored stock) which qualifies the investor for a fixed occasional pay (premium) yet by and large don't give that person casting a ballot rights

Share: An individual, gathering, or association that claims at least one share in a company, and in whose name the share testament is given. Investors can likewise be called Shareholders.

II RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

2.1 Doctrinal Research

Doctrinal procedure alludes to a method of leading examination that is generally considered as "run of the mill lawful exploration". A doctrinal approach will zero in on case law, rules, and other legitimate sources. It varies from different procedures in that it takes a gander at the law inside itself; an absolutely doctrinal methodology doesn't endeavor to take a gander at the impact of the law or how it is applied however rather inspects law as a composed assemblage of rules that can be recognized and investigated utilizing just lawful sources.

Undertaking doctrinal research regularly includes source-based exploration and it is surprising to embrace subjective or quantitative examination under the doctrinal strategy. The doctrinal research will zero in on customary lawful sources, for example, case law. Notwithstanding this, it isn't difficult to prohibit doctrinal investigation from different strategies.

III THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

3.1 Minority Shareholder And Its Protection

A shareholder whose extent of offers is too little to even think about presenting any ability to apply control or impact over corporate activity. A minority shareholder has certain legal rights, contingent upon the size of its stake in the company. Rule enables the investor to impede the death of exceptional or phenomenal goals, which covers a restricted yet significant number of issues. In any case, a minority shareholder can't hinder standard goals, which are chosen by larger party vote and are needed for most choices of the company. A minority shareholder may likewise, in outrageous conditions, have the option to apply to the court based on lead which adds up to ridiculous bias by greater part investors, yet the cure is restricted and infrequently a type of agreeable assurance.

Given the impediments of the insurance managed by rule, minority investors will look for express legally binding securities in the investors' arrangement as well as articles of relationship of the company. A minority shareholder with a huge stake or in a solid bartering position may look for an option to designate a chief upheld by a prerequisite that its delegate is an essential piece of a majority. It is likewise essential to have blackball rights over certain significant issues (known as saved issue) which would then be able to be settled in at board or investor level, through the prerequisite that they be dependent upon consistent or super-lion's share endorsement.

Extra insurances for minority shareholders may incorporate tag-along rights, and build up a put alternative, whereby larger part shareholders can be obliged to buy the portions of the minority shareholders as per a pre-decided value equation and at a characterized stage.

3.2 General Principals Of majority Rule And Its Exceptions

As indicated by section 47 of the Companies Act, 2013, holding any value shares will have an appropriate vote regarding such capital on each choice set before the company. Part's appropriate to cast a ballot is perceived because the legitimacy of resources and the investor can likewise exercise it as he might suspect fit steady with his premium and inclination. A unique goal requires a majority of 3/fourth of these votes at the gathering. Thus, wherein the demonstration or the articles require a one-of-a-kind goal for any reason, a 3/fourth majority part is significant and a basic Majority isn't adequate. The goal of a larger part of investors gave at an appropriately assembled and held regular gathering, upon any inquiry with which the business venture is lawfully able to bargain, is restricting upon the minority and therefore upon the company.

The rule that the desire of the majority ought to beat the desire of the minority in the issue of inside organization of the company was established on account of Foss v. Harbottle which is today known as the standard in Foss v. Harbottle.

As indicated by this guideline, the courts won't intercede at the example of the investors, in the administration of a company it's immediate insofar as they are acting inside the forces have on them by the articles of the company.

In nutshell, the company can't affirm, Any Act which is ultra vires the company or illicit, Any Act which is extortion on the minority, Any Act passed with a basic majority which requires a unique majority, Any off-base Act was finished by the individuals who are in charge, Any Act encroaches the individual participation rights, Any Act which adds up to a penetrate of obligation by chiefs, Any Act which adds up to the persecution of minority or bungle of the company to, of despite.

3.3 The Rule's Exceptions

For the majority, the rule is not absolute; the minority has some safeguards as well. The concept of non-interference does not apply to the following:

1. The Ultra Vires Act is a federal law that prohibits the transmission

If an individual shareholder discovers that the majority has committed an illegal or extremely criminal act, he or she can take legal action. Individual shareholders have the ability to impose restrictions on the corporation. This is made feasible by a court order or an injunction.

2.Fraud Against Minorities

If the majority defrauds the minority, the minority has the right to take action. If the concept of minority fraud is ambiguous, the court will resolve the issue based on the facts.

3. Controlling the Wrongdoer

If the corporation is in the hands of a wrongdoer, the minority of shareholders might file a fraudulent representation act. If the minority does not have the legal right to sue, the majority will prohibit them from suing the corporation, and their complaint will be dismissed.

A firm was controlled equally by the two defendants and the two plaintiffs in Glass v. Atkins (1967). The plaintiff filed suit against the defendants, saying that they had illegally transferred the company's assets for their own personal advantage. The court agreed to the suit and kept an eye on it. While the fundamental concept was for the firm to initiate an action where it had a stake, this was not always the case.

4. Resolution with a Special Majority Requirement

An individual shareholder can take action if the act required a special majority yet is passed by a simple majority.

5. Personal Initiative

Individual membership rights are always respected by the majority of shareholders. Individual members have the right to demand a majority in order to comply with legislative laws and legal standards.

6. Duty Violation

If the majority of shareholders and directors fail to fulfil their obligations, the minority shareholder has the right to sue.

7. Oppression and Mismanagement Prevention

The minority can take action against the majority of shareholders to avoid tyranny and mismanagement.

Piggybacking – This rule specifies that if the majority sells their shares, the minority shareholder's rights must also be sold. Furthermore, "Piggy Backing" necessitates the party contemplating the purchase of the firm to sell all of the remaining shares.

3.4 The Unfair Prejudice Remedy

In India, corporate structures are highly unique, with the majority of companies having the same owner and manager. This is due to the fact that many Indian corporate organisations are privately owned by business dynasties with tight control. Western firms, on the other hand, have distinct management and owners. As a result of India's distinct corporate structures, it has its own set of corporate governance concerns. The most well-known is the battle between a corporation's majority and minority shareholders. Unlike in Western corporations, where the major challenge of governance is conflict between owners and management, in India, the key challenge is continual discipline of dominant shareholders while safeguarding the interests of smaller shareholders. The “majority will rule” rule of corporate democracy was established in the case of Foss v. Harbottle. This rule gives the majority the power to impose and maintain its will on the minority. There are certain exceptions to this norm, and one of them is the legislation against minority shareholder oppression and corporate mismanagement.

The alleviation for abuse and fumble discovers its starting point under area 210 of Britain ("UK") Companies Act, 1948. The said arrangement was embraced in the Companies Act, 1956 of India under section 397. By and by section 241-244 of the Companies Act, 2013 accommodates alleviation against such persecution. Nonetheless, the language under the new Demonstration has gone through a little adjustment. The recent Act accommodated situations when the undertakings of the company are being led "biased" to the public interest or "harsh" to the individual from the company. Then again, the new Act of 2013 accommodates situations where the issues of the organization are being directed "biased" to the public interest or "biased" or "severe" to the individual from the company, giving more extensive help to the minority investors. An equal can be drawn from the English company law statute where the language under section 210 of the 1948 Act went through a comparable change yet not actually like that of India. The past English Act gave help against "abusive" lead which was deciphered broadly and which eventually prompted its replacement by "unfair prejudice remedy" to give significantly more extensive alleviation to the minority investors by giving sufficient space for court obstruction.

IV Rights And Duties Of Individual Shareholder

4.1 Rights

- Right to Vote:

The option to vote is the main right an investor has. Companies Act 2013 perceives the accompanying sorts of voting: Voting by showing hands, Voting is finished by surveying, voting is done in electronic methods, voting is done through the postal voting form. This privilege empowers investors to take part in the corporate dynamic. Their democratic force incorporates the option to name directors, the option to make recommendations, the option to decide in favor of primary changes like consolidations and acquisitions, or liquidation. Following a methodology referenced in the Companies Act 2013, the investor additionally has an option to choose an intermediary for his benefit when he can't go to the gathering. Despite the fact that the intermediary isn't permitted to be remembered for the majority of the gathering if there should be an occurrence of voting.

- Legal Action against Directors:

As per the standards set down in the Companies Act 2013, investors can bring legitimate activity against a chief if any demonstration was finished by the director in any way which is biased against the issues of the company, submits misrepresentation, any demonstration is done which is past the law or against the constitution, when the resources of the company are being moved at an underestimated rate, act done in mala fide way, when there is a redirection of assets of the company.

- Right to call for General meetings:

Shareholders reserve the option to assemble an overall conference. A yearly Comprehensive gathering is a yearly assembling of a company's investors. Here, the heads of the company present the shareholders of the company's yearly report and remark on its presence throughout the year. Here, investors may choose new directors, talk about directors' compensation, and pose inquiries in regards to the company pushing ahead. They additionally can move toward the Company Law Board for the conduction of general body meetings on the off chance that it isn't finished by the legal necessities.

- Right to the Dividend:

The Company's shareholders reserve the privilege to an offer in the benefit reflected in the yearly, independent fiscal summaries evaluated by a free inspector and supported by a goal of the Comprehensive gathering to be paid out to the Company's shareholders (the privilege to profit).

- Appointment of Directors:

A standard goal is needed to be passed by the shareholders for the arrangement of directors. Investors likewise can challenge any goal passed for the arrangement of a director in the overall body meeting.

- Right to dispose of Shares:

The Company's shareholders reserve the option to discard Offers. The removal of Offers incorporates the deal (move of proprietorship) and different types of removal, including the foundation of a vow, the privilege of utilization, or rent of Offers.

- Right to inspect register:

Shareholders are the principal partners in a company, they reserve the option to investigate the records register and furthermore the books of the firm and can pose inquiries about the equivalent in the event that they feel so. investors reserve the option to assess a company's books and records. This is so the investor realizes how well the company is getting along. The company may do this by giving reviewed fiscal summaries or monetary reports to the shareholders.

- Pre-emptive Right:

The Company's shareholders have the need option to buy in for new offers in the Company likewise on account of an issue of protections convertible into shares in the Company or fusing the option to buy in for portions of the Company. A goal received to build the Company's offer capital should mark the calendar of deciding the Company's shareholders' preemptive option to new Offers (the pre-emptive right record date)

- Winding up the Company:

Before the company is ended up the company needs to advise every one of the shareholders about the equivalent and furthermore, all the credit must be given to every one of the shareholders.

4.2 Duties:

Duty to be in contact with different individuals from the company so they can see the work improvement of the company.

1. Shareholders are not qualified for anything aside from their possession premium in the company.
2. Shareholders ought to counsel on the questions of the account and different themes.
3. Shareholders are additionally not answerable for the company's duties. Notwithstanding, if a company is sold, banks are preferred to have their duties paid, at that point bondholders, and afterward basic investors. Nonetheless, an exclusion to this is that an investor is at risk to pay the company for any sum neglected on their offers.
4. Shareholders ought to take an interest in the overall body gatherings with the goal that they can see and furthermore can prompt on the issue which they feel isn't working out positively

V RECOMMENDATIONS

While it is necessary that the relevant prejudice was generated unfairly, the test is quite broad and permits the court to examine any factors that it deems relevant. It's impossible to know how the court will use its discretion. Any of the following considerations can be considered by the court:

- Any wrongdoing on the petitioner's behalf.
- The court is finding that the petitioner has another, more acceptable remedy by forcing a petitioner to accept a reasonable offer for his shares or to accede to the procedure of pre-emption provisions in the articles.
- Any offer that has been offered to the petitioner.
- The motivations of people in charge of the business. Although discrimination between shareholders, whether intentional or not, is an essential ingredient of unfairness, many types of conduct will be unfairly prejudicial if the purpose or effect is discriminatory in some way between shareholders, but this will not be the case if those concerned have made a bona fide commercial decision in the company's best interests.
- There will be a delay in presenting the petition. The petitioner's delay may be a factor in getting relief. For the sake of justice, a fair amount of time may be granted in consideration of the delay.

  The substance of the rule, i.e., a company's Memorandum and Articles of Association, as well as any shareholders' agreement, will be established by the facts of each case and the parties' negotiating position. To that aim, based on my study findings, I'd like to provide the following recommendations for the concerns:

The memorandum can be used to enshrine norms and regulations that would otherwise be subject to change if they were incorporated in the articles. If, on the other hand, it is intended to provide some protection to minority shareholders while allowing for future change of circumstances, it may be preferable to make provisions for that protection in the articles by creating a class right, rather than in the memorandum or a shareholders' agreement.

Things to Look for in a Shareholder's Agreement as a Minority Shareholder:

- Right to nominate a director or a group of directors: The right to nominate a director or a group of directors safeguards your stake in the firm as it expands.
- As a minority shareholder, knowing the total number of outstanding shares and the percentage of ownership owned by other shareholders is important.
- Specific Management Difficulties: If someone has a unique perspective on the company, utilise the shareholder agreement to outline specific issues that might arise in the future.
- Pre-Emptive Rights: A minority shareholder with pre-emptive rights is granted the right to acquire any new shares issued.
- If no one can settle a dispute with the company's operations or sale, a shotgun clause offers you the opportunity to sell or acquire your shares to another shareholder.
- Right of First Refusal: A right of first refusal is analogous to a right of preemption. Right of first refusal, on the other hand, applies to existing stock rather than new stock. To retain percentage ownership, any stock sold by an existing shareholder must first be offered to other existing shareholders on a pro-rated basis.
- When a dominant shareholder sells his stock, a minority shareholder has the right to participate in the transaction. This is referred to as "piggybacking." It safeguards your investment in the event that the firm is sold. Piggybacking demands that any entity interested in buying the company be able to purchase all of the outstanding shares.
- Method of Valuation: When it comes time to sell the stock, a fair valuation is important to a smooth transfer of the shares, especially in a private, family-run corporation. To preserve your interests when you or your heirs are ready to sell, include the valuation method in the shareholder agreement.
- Approval of Capital Expenditures: Capital expenditures bind substantial quantities of money. Minority shareholders in a small firm may be required to approve any large capital expenditure in order to safeguard their investment.

VI Conclusion

A minority shareholder is a person who owns less than half of a corporation. As a result, if a disagreement occurs over the sale or distribution of assets, or any other matter needing shareholder votes, a minority shareholder lacks voting power. This sort of shareholder connection is most common in small businesses where the initial investment is provided by a group of friends or relatives. A business owner will give you a portion of ownership in exchange for your investment in the form of stock. The value of your investment increases as the firm expands. Minority shareholder rights, on the other hand, must be expressed in the shareholder agreement initially in order to safeguard the minority shareholder's original investment.

Unfortunately, filing a court petition is a time-consuming process. From the filing of the petition until the full trial, it can take a year or more, but different interlocutory orders may be obtained in the interim. However, particularly in the case of a petition for forced winding up, they constitute a powerful way of applying pressure for a negotiated solution.

Litigation in this area must continue to be a risky and costly endeavour. Even if a petitioner's claim is valid, the resulting interruption may only be harmful to the firm. It is advisable to spell forth a minority's unique rights of participation in a company in a well-drafted Shareholders' Agreement if it is desired that a minority have certain unique rights of participation in a firm. This might benefit the majority as well as the minority because a Shareholders' Agreement is typically said to be an exclusive settlement of the rights and

Except under exceptional circumstances, the parties' duties and the court's ability to intervene with such agreement are doubtful. A Shareholders' Agreement may also grant rights that aren't required to be used. This would allow a shareholder to waver in his or her interest in the company's operations.

The existence of a Shareholders' Agreement or specially drawn articles may, however, have an impact on the statutory remedies, i.e.,

- where the parties have spelled out in detail agreements all the matters that are to govern their relationship, it is unlikely that the court will find that a shareholder has any legitimate exception beyond these rights under those agreements; where the parties have spelled out in detail agreements all the matters that are to govern their relationship, it is unlikely that the court will find
- If a petitioner already has an appropriate remedy under an existing agreement, it is unlikely that his petition will be allowed to proceed; and
- if a mechanism for valuing petitioner's shares on a transfer to another member exists, he may have to accept it if it is fair in the circumstances.

Finally, it should be noted that a right granted by a Shareholders' Agreement is far easier to enforce than statutory remedies. The plaintiff just needs to establish that the clause in issue was violated; there is no need to establish unjust prejudice or pass any other standard.

References

[1] Sahu, Manjeet Kumar, Rights of Minority Shareholders in India Under the Companies Act, 1956 (April 1, 2013). Available at SSRN: https://ssrn.com/abstract=2564925 or http://dx.doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.2564925

[2] Raza, Aqa & Talib, Prof. (2016). Rights of Minority Shareholders under the Companies Act, 2013: A Jurisprudential Analysis. Vol. XXII. 30-64.

[3] Varottil, Umakanth. (2020). Minority Shareholders' Rights, Powers and Duties: The Market for Corporate Influence. SSRN Electronic Journal. 10.2139/ssrn.3543246.

[4] A Study on the Oppression of the Minority Shareholders in India with Reference to the Majority Rule 1S. Sadhana and 2M. Kannappan 1Saveetha School of Law, Saveetha Institute of Medical and Technical Sciences, Saveetha University, Chennai. sadhanamadhavan1997@gmail.com 2Saveetha School of Law, Saveetha Institute of Medical and Technical Sciences, Saveetha University, Chennai. kannappanm.ssl@saveetha.com

[5] Rights of Minority ShareholdersGeneral Report By:Evanghelos Perakis Professor of Law at the University of Athens