Corporate Fraud: Surfing the Legal Tides of Section 447 of the Companies Act, 2013

Sep 14, 202410 min read

Introduction

Fraud in the business world is much like infidelity in marriage or plagiarism in scholarly work – it breaks trust at its core. While s. 17 of the Indian Contract Act, 1872, defines fraud as any act committed with the intent to deceive or persuade a party into entering a contract, the Companies Act, 2013 ('**Act**') goes a step further by offering a more specific and comprehensive definition under s. 447. According to the explanation in this section, fraud includes any act, omission, concealment of facts, or abuse of position with an intent to deceive, gain an unfair advantage, or cause harm to a company, its shareholders, or the public at large. This definition reflects the legislature's recognition of the potential harm corporate fraud can cause to businesses, the economy, and society.

Interestingly, although the Indian Penal Code, 1860 ('**IPC**') or now the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 ('**BNS**'), do not expressly define fraud, many of its provisions, such as those dealing with cheating, forgery, and criminal conspiracy, align closely with the concept of fraud.

Background

Before India's independence, corporate fraud was relatively rare due to a controlled economy and limited international trade. However, as India opened its economy in the late 1990s with the LPG (Liberalization, Privatization, and Globalization) reforms, the incidence of corporate fraud increased significantly. The infamous Harshad Mehta Scam of 1992 was an early sign of this trend. The rise of technology and globalization created new opportunities for fraud, with many companies exploiting regulatory loopholes.

Common types of corporate fraud in India include falsifying financial records and using confidential company information for personal gain. The Satyam scandal, which emerged around the year 2000, highlighted severe vulnerabilities in corporate governance. Initially, such crimes were investigated under the IPC/BNS because the Companies Act, 1956 ('**erstwhile Act**') lacked a specific definition of fraud.

Then came the Act, which addressed this gap by defining corporate fraud and establishing the Serious Fraud Investigation Office ('**SFIO**'). The Joint Parliamentary Committee[i] ('**JPC**') on the stock market scam noted that penalties under the erstwhile Act were nominal and easily compoundable. Thus, serious offences were kept non-compoundable under the Act, with s. 447 being a key provision.

This provision, which was not part of the original draft based on the Irani Committee Report constituted in 2005, introduced strict punishments for corporate fraud, encompassing offences such as breach of trust, cheating, forgery, and falsification of accounts. However, it was later recognized that not all corporate frauds warranted such severe penalties. As a result, the 2017 Amendment[ii] allowed for the compounding of frauds below a certain financial threshold that did not affect public interest.

Cracking the Code: S. 447 Simplified

If someone is found guilty of fraud under s. 447 of the Act:

- **For large-scale fraud** (involving at least Rs. 10 lakhs or 1% of the company's turnover), the punishment ranges from **6 months** to **10 years** of imprisonment, along with a fine of **at least** the amount involved in the fraud and **up to 3 times** that amount. If the fraud affects the public, the minimum imprisonment is 3 years.
- **For smaller-scale fraud** (less than Rs. 10 lakhs or 1% of the company's turnover) that does not affect the public, the punishment is up to **5 years** of imprisonment or a fine of up to **Rs. 50 lakhs**, or both.

Corporate Fraud: Unmasking the Tricks of the Trade

Corporate fraud involves a range of deceptive practices, from embezzlement to accounting scandals. These illegal activities erode trust, harm the economy, and damage businesses. Below are some common methods employed by corporate fraudsters.

1. Empty Pockets: The Art of Asset Misappropriation

Asset misappropriation refers to the theft of company resources by anyone, from top executives to lower-level employees. This fraud involves the unauthorized use of assets for personal gain, whether they are tangible or intangible. Common schemes include fictitious sales, inventory fraud, and falsifying asset requisitions and transfers.

In the notable case of *Ganga Prakash v. Union of India*[iii], Ganga Prakash, the former General Manager of the Indian Security Press (ISP), a subsidiary of the Security Printing & Minting Corporation of India Limited, was heavily involved in the infamous Telgi stamp paper scam. His involvement in the misappropriation of assets, such as the supply of special paper for stamp printing, gummed papers, perforating machines, inks, and other materials, led to his dismissal under a. 311(2)(c) of the Constitution of India ('**Constitution**'). The material evidence on record was deemed sufficient to remove him from service without further inquiry into the matter. Prakash converted company resources for personal benefit, and the severity of his actions was such that additional charges under s. 447 of the Act (if applicable at the time) could have been brought for asset misappropriation.

2. Grease Palms, Line Pockets: The Corrupt World of Corporates

Bribery and corruption are serious offences that significantly damage a company's financial health. These practices not only constitute crimes but also act as cancers that undermine corporate integrity. Bribery, the lubricant of corruption, facilitates unethical deals, while corruption infects all levels of the corporate hierarchy, from the boardroom to the mailroom. They create a toxic environment that stifles innovation, erodes trust, and drains a company's resources.

While the Prevention of Money Laundering Act, 2002 ('**PMLA**') addresses corporate fraud through bribery and corruption under the category of 'proceeds of crime', s. 447 of the Act serves as a vital tool in prosecuting corporate fraud. S. 447 prohibits any individual from committing corporate fraud, with penalties that include imprisonment, especially when the fraud impacts the general public.

For instance, imagine a senior executive at a large corporation being offered a substantial bribe to secure a lucrative contract for the company. If the executive accepts the bribe and manipulates the decision-making process to favour the bribing party, despite other qualified bidders, they could face charges of bribery, fraud, and misuse of their position under s. 447 of the Act.

3. Behind the Numbers: Unmasking Financial Fraud

Financial statement fraud involves intentionally misrepresenting a company's financial position, with devastating consequences for internal and external stakeholders. Fraudsters may manipulate accounting records, inflate assets, understate liabilities, or conceal critical financial information. Under s. 90(12) of the Act deals with significant beneficial owners, and any person who knowingly provides false or misleading information or suppresses material facts can face penalties under s. 447.

In the case of *Union of India v. Deloitte Haskins and Sells LLP*[iv], the SFIO initiated proceedings against the auditor under s. 140(5) for falsifying accounts, with additional charges under s. 447. The Court found the auditor ineligible to serve in that capacity for 5 years. The petitioner argued that since the auditor had resigned, proceedings should be dismissed. The High Court affirmed this contention, which was challenged before the Supreme Court, where the petitioner also contended that charges under both ss. 140(5) and 447 of the Act constituted 'double jeopardy'. However, the Supreme Court ruled that separate proceedings by different authorities did not amount to double jeopardy and that ss. 132, 141, 147, 245, and 447 of the Act operate in different fields.

4. Related Party Transactions: Where Corporate Loyalty Collides with Greed

Companies often engage in transactions with related parties, as defined in s. 2(76) of the Act. However, these dealings must be transparent, and significant transactions require shareholder approval. A single misstep can lead to serious consequences.

Related party transactions are governed by s. 188 of the Act, which imposes strict disclosure requirements and mandates shareholder approval for major transactions. The aim is to prevent conflicts of interest, safeguard investor interests, and ensure transparency. Non-compliance can lead to severe penalties under s. 188(5), and if any party gains undue advantage, s. 447 may also be invoked. The legislative intent behind s. 447 is to ensure that any act performed on behalf of a company is carried out without personal benefit and to prevent fraudulent activities.

In the case of *Sunil N. Godhwani v. State*[v], the petitioner was charged with siphoning investor funds worth Rs. 2000 crores. As Chairman and Managing Director (CMD) of the company, he approved loans to shell companies despite knowing their lack of creditworthiness. The Court found a deep-rooted conspiracy involving the petitioner, company promoters, and others. Although the companies to which loans were granted provided security, there was a breach of disclosure regarding related-party transactions. The Court denied bail to the petitioner due to the complexity of the case, the risk of tampering with evidence, and witness intimidation. The petitioner was charged under s. 409 of the IPC due to the involvement of public funds.

One Bite or Two? The Battle between S. 447 and IPC/BNS Fraud: Does Double Jeopardy Protect Corporate Wrongdoers?

As mentioned earlier, the answer is negative: an individual can be charged under both s. 447 of the Act and relevant sections of the IPC/BNS for the same fraudulent act. This does not constitute double jeopardy, which is the legal principle preventing a person from being tried twice for the same offence.

Several reasons support the conclusion that both charges can be levied without violating the double jeopardy principle:

a) **Nature of Offences**: Offences under s. 447 pertains specifically to corporate fraud, such as misrepresentation, concealment of facts, and abuse of position within a company. In contrast, the IPC deals with fraud more generally, covering offences like cheating (s. 415 IPC/s. 318(1) BNS), forgery (s. 463 IPC/s. 336(1) BNS), and criminal conspiracy (s. 120B IPC/s. 61(2) BNS).

b) **A. 20(2) of the Constitution**: The principle of double jeopardy is enshrined in a. 20(2) of the Constitution, protecting individuals from being prosecuted for the same offence more than once. However, charges under s. 447 of the Act and the IPC/BNS address different aspects of the same fraudulent conduct, so they do not constitute the 'same offence'.

In the case of *Maqbool Hussain v. State of Bombay*[vi], the appellant was caught smuggling gold into India and was initially penalized under s. 167(8) of the Sea Customs Act, 1878. When no one claimed the gold, he was later charged under s. 8 of the Foreign

Exchange Regulation Act, 1973 (FERA). The appellant argued that this violated a. 20(2) of the Constitution, citing double jeopardy. However, the Court analysed the scope of a. 20(2) and clarified that 'prosecution' under this article must occur before a court of law or judicial tribunal. Since the customs authorities were not a judicial tribunal, the plea of double jeopardy was dismissed. The Court emphasized that for double jeopardy to apply, both charges must have the same ingredients. In other words, the facts constituting one offence should be sufficient to justify a conviction for the other – not simply that the facts are relied upon in both trials.

S. 447, on the one hand, aims to protect the interests of shareholders, creditors, and the company itself, while other fraud-related provisions primarily aim to protect the public. Additionally, in *Mr. Nekkanti Venkata Rao v. Jakka Vinod Kumar Reddy*[vii], the Telangana High Court emphasized that s. 212(6) of the Act requires an investigation before prosecution under s. 447 can begin, preventing frivolous cases from burdening the courts. This provision ensures that not every complaint automatically results in a court case, thereby setting a higher threshold for legal action.

SFIO: The Corporate Crime Busters

S. 211 of the Act provides for the establishment of the SFIO under the Ministry of Corporate Affairs (MCA). The SFIO is tasked with investigating and prosecuting white-collar crimes, and it was granted statutory authority for the first time under the Act. This section outlines the purpose and functions of the SFIO, which primarily investigates serious frauds committed by companies. S. 212(1) of the Act empowers the SFIO to investigate a company's affairs upon receiving a complaint. Under s. 212(6), bail cannot be granted until twin conditions are met and other authorities constituted under different laws are required to facilitate the SFIO's investigation.

S. 212(3) mandates that once the Central Government assigns an investigation to the SFIO, it must conduct the investigation and submit its report within the period specified in the government's order. However, the Act does not impose a specific time limit for the completion of the investigation. In *SFIO v. Rahul Modi*[viii], the Supreme Court addressed this issue, ruling that while s. 212 of the Act does not prescribe a time frame for the submission of the report. The SFIO's authority to investigate does not automatically cease once the period mentioned in the Central Government's order expires. The Court held that the time specified in the order is a directory, not mandatory, meaning the SFIO retains its investigative authority even after the deadline.

Closing the Book on Corporate Fraud

The long-awaited amendment addressing corporate fraud is a significant step forward. It clearly defines the punishments based on the severity of the offence, distinguishing between fraud affecting public interest and other types. S. 447's broad scope, which covers non-compoundable offences such as false information during incorporation, fraud related to duplicate share certificates, and fraudulent removal of company names, demonstrates its comprehensive approach. The BNS now reinforces this framework by clearly distinguishing between economic and corporate offences. A close examination of the definition of ‘economic offence’ under explanation (iii) to s. 111(1) of the BNS reveals that it acknowledges the link between corporate misconduct and underlying economic crimes. This distinction highlights the understanding that corporate fraud frequently originates from broader economic offences.

While the inclusion of ss. 212 and 447 in the Act is a positive development. It is essential to integrate these provisions with Securities and Exchange Board of India (SEBI) regulations, taxation laws, Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) policies, whistleblower protections, and other statutes governing corporate conduct to ensure that the amendment has a meaningful and comprehensive impact. While s. 447 holds significant promise in curbing corporate fraud, continuous judicial and regulatory oversight is essential to ensure that it serves its intended purpose of maintaining corporate integrity and accountability.