THE COMPANIES ACT OF 2013 : A STUDY ON CORPORATE GOVERNANCE

Dr. Hiren B Patel

Assistant Professor, Maneklal Nanavati Law College, Ahmedabad, Gujarat, India.

ABSTRACT

The word "corporation" comes from the Latin word "corpus," which means "body." Governance entails directing the procedures and frameworks in place to meet the needs of partners. When consolidated Corporate Governance is used, it refers to a set of structures, processes, rules, and practises put in place by a company to ensure that relationships with various partners are maintained in a transparent and legal manner. India's corporate governance system includes a variety of mechanisms that promote governance accountability and the transparency of financial and other data. The Indian government has attempted to make changes to the administrative structure of corporate governance in order to improve the transparency of financial data and to update accounting requirements. The Companies Act of 2013 deserves a mention when it comes to corporate governance authorization. The new Act, which replaces the Companies Act of 1956, aims to improve corporate governance standards, streamline directions, and protect minority investors' interests. The purpose of this article is to examine the arrangement and various changes in corporate governance in India as a result of the Companies Act, 2013.

KEYWORDS: Corporate Governance, Companies Act, CSR.

INTRODUCTION:

Corporate governance entails competent company management, a commitment to morality, and adequate and timely disclosure of all material issues in order to generate general partner confidence, which will lead to good capital allocation and supported monetary growth. Governance is linked to the operation of the organisation, but great governance is linked to ensuring that it is run in a reasonable and straightforward manner (du Plessis, Varottil, & Veldman, 2018). The Rajya Sabha passed the Companies Act, 2013, on August 8, 2013, paving the way for another organisation law, which received the president's approval on August 29, 2013. (du Plessis et al., 2018; Hathi, 2014). The Act of 2013 replaces the Companies Act of 1956, which was passed 57 years ago. Apart from creating the fundamental condition for development in the current global structure, the new Act aims to establish more transparency and governance in corporate entities (Jhunjhunwala & Deepa, 2013). It has the potential to be a noteworthy point of reference, as it aims to increase corporate governance, detangle directions, raise the premiums of minority financial specialists, and express the role of whistleblowers out of the blue (Sekar & FCA, 2014). The Act encourages good governance practises by putting the onus on free executives to monitor the Board's activities and ensure minority investors' support (Vijay, BBA.LLB, Year, School, & PUNE, 2011). The new Act is a significant point of reference in India's corporate governance circles, and it is likely to have a significant impact on the country's organisational governance.

“Corporate governance is a framework for coordinating and controlling businesses. Executives' sheets are in charge of their companies' governance (Rakesh, 2014). The role of the investor in governance is to delegate the executives and reviewers to ensure that a robust governance system is in place (Mittal & Jain, 2015). The board's responsibilities include establishing the organization's major points, granting authorization to put them into action, directing the business's administration, and reporting to investors on their stewardship. The board's actions are subject to laws, directives, and the investors as a whole." Jhunjhunwala & Deepa (Jhunjhunwala & Deepa, 2013)

Corporate Governance is the administration's acknowledgement of investors' inevitable rights as true owners of the partnership and of their own part as trustees for the benefit of the investors (Vijay et al., 2011). It's about committing to ideals, taking a moral business stance, and establishing a distinction between private and corporate finances in an organization's management (Report of N.R. Narayana Murthy Committee on Corporate Governance constituted by SEBI, 2003).

Financial experts from developed countries are urging Indian companies to follow international best practises, with a focus on corporate governance (Monks & Minow, 2011). According to a McKinsey report from 2002, speculators were willing to pay a premium of up to 25% for a well-represented company. The outrages associated with the Indian markets, the global financial crisis of 2008, and the subsequent corporate extortion at Satyam have created a lot of concerns about India's administration practises. As a result, both controllers and partnerships have increased their efforts around corporate administration structures and instruments (Gugler, 2001; Sabri & Khuong, 2014). Because it is widely assumed that an economy's institutional setting, i.e. the mix of formal guidelines, informal imperatives, and authorization qualities, varies significantly across nations and has an effect on corporate financial and administration structures, understanding the state of corporate administration research in the Indian setting is along these lines of explanatory. The purpose of this paper is to comprehend the notion of corporate governance, evaluate corporate governance rules under the Companies Act, 2013, and analyse various changes and the current framework in India.

OBJECTIVES:

1. To understand the concept of Corporate Governance.

2. To examine Corporate Governance Rules under Companies Act, 2013

LITERATURE REVIEW:

The Act establishes significant advances in the nation's corporate governance structure and demonstrates the legislature's intention of moving away from control and coercive administration and placing the onus on people charged with the organization's governance. Indian businesses have a long way to go before adopting best practises in governance (Vijay et al., 2011). The Companies Act of 2013 is a good step forward. Various agreements relating to executive and evaluator freedom, strict disclosure standards, and speculator protection will have far-reaching ramifications, resulting in greater transparency and responsibility in the organization's operations while also limiting instances of corporate fraud ((Agrawal, 2016; Borad, 1981*). Companies and partners should begin evaluating their current situation in comparison to the new administration's requirements, and develop techniques as needed (Agrawal, 2016; Borad, 1981*). The Act is forward-thinking and follows internationally recognised procedures. Regardless, the viability of this act, like all others, will be determined by how it is used (Pulbrook, 1865). To ensure smooth use of the arrangements, the Ministry of Corporate Affairs should publish pamphlets and illuminations. Corporates should ensure that they follow the law not just in writing but also in spirit, as the true value of Corporate Governance lies beyond conformity (Agrawal, 2016).

D'Erasmo (2010) examined "A More Responsive System of Governance" and concluded that "The Companies Act 2013 is a remarkable achievement in the history of company law" (D'Erasmo, 2010). Many agreements relating to good corporate governance have been established, and businesses and their employees have no choice but to follow them and ensure strong governance (Taylor, 2009). The term "independent directors" was coined out of nowhere and is now part of the Act (Dravis, 2016). Furthermore, the concept of corporate social responsibility is enshrined in the Act. Because the previous Act had flaws in terms of corporate governance, the new Act has a superior instrument of governance that ensures transparency between the company and those associated with it (Zhao, 2011). As a result of the inclusion of new provisions in the Act relating to corporate governance, partners can expect greater accountability, transparency, and responsibility from the Board and the organisation (Sheikh & Rees, 1995).

CORPORATE GOVERNANCE UNDER THE COMPANIES ACT, 2013:

The Companies Act, 2013 spotlights on great corporate governance hones by expanding the parts and duties of the Board, securing investors' enthusiasm, acquiring a revelation based administration and inherent prevention through self direction. The 2013 Act fundamentally changes the way companies are represented. The Act accommodates the accompanying arrangements:

Appointment of Board:

According to the Companies Act of 2013, an open and also a privately owned corporation can have a maximum of fifteen executives on the Board, and designating more than fifteen executives would necessitate investor approval through an exceptional decision in the General Meeting. It also allows for the appointment of at least one female executive to the Board of Directors for any class or classes of enterprises that may be nominated. The Act mandates that a company have at least one executive who has spent at least 182 days in the country in the previous calendar year.

Disqualification of Directors:

The Companies Act of 2013 tightens the criteria for executive exclusion and expands the scope of examination into linked gathering exchanges. The following additional grounds of exclusion are included in the 2013 Act: (I) A person who has been convicted of a crime involving relevant gathering exchanges in the preceding five years. (ii) Non-documentation of yearly money related explanations or yearly returns for a period of three years, or inability to reimburse retailers for more than a year, has also been brought inside the scope of exclusion for directors in privately owned firms.

Number of Directorships:

A guy can't become an executive of more than 20 companies, rather than the 15 allowed by the Firms Act 1956, and out of those 20, he can't be the CEO of more than 10 open companies, according to the Companies Act, 2013.

Independent Directors:

The majority of the features of the posting understanding are contained in the definition of independent executive established in the Companies Act, 2013. An independent chief should be a guy of integrity with considerable skill and experience. The Act specifies that independent heads should have no tangible financial ties to the organisation, its promoters, executives, or auxiliaries that could influence the executive's autonomy in the current fiscal year or within the next two years. The following arrangements for independent chiefs are included in the Act: According to the Companies Act of 2013, each registered organisation must have at least 33 percent of its total number of executives be independent chiefs, with any portion being adjusted off as one. The central government will be able to recommend the fewest number of independent CEOs in various open company classes.

Code of Conduct for Independent Directors:

A Code for Independent Directors is included in Schedule IV of the Act, which an independent executive must follow. The "Code for Independent Executives" establishes clear guidelines for professional leadership, roles, and responsibilities. Professional Conduct; Seek enlightenment of facts; Protect the interests of all partners; Exercise obligations and duties in a real-world manner; and Evaluation of board and administration execution, among other things.

Liabilities of Independent Director:

Under the Companies Act of 2013, an independent chief executive and a non-official executive who is not a promoter or KMP will be held liable for such demonstrations of oversight or commission by an organisation that occurred with his knowledge, as inferable from board forms, and with his consent, or where he had not acted decisively.

Audit Committee:

Review panels are required for recorded businesses and other recommended classes of companies under Section 177 of the Companies Act, 2013. According to the Act, a review panel should consist of at least three chiefs, with independent executives playing a significant role. Executives were not required to have any academic or professional qualifications under the 1956 Act. The 2013 Act stipulates that the majority of members of the Audit Committee, including the Chairperson, must be able to read and comprehend financial statements (Ramaiya, 2013).

Nomination and Remuneration Committee:

Review boards are required for recorded companies and other recommended classes of companies under Section 177 of the Companies Act, 2013. According to the Act, a review panel should consist of at least three executives, with independent heads taking the lead. Executives were not required to have any scholarly or professional skills under the 1956 Act. According to the 2013 Act, the majority of members of the Audit Committee, including the Chairperson, must be able to read and comprehend the directors.

The Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) Committee:

The Act gives that an organization meeting certain conditions ought to constitute a Corporate Social Responsibility Committee of the Board, comprising of least of three executives. The CSR Committee should comprise of at least one independent executive. The CSR advisory group should plan and screen CSR strategies and talk about the same in the Board's report. Board needs to endorse CSR strategy and reveal the substance in the board report and place it on the organization site.

Stakeholders Relationship Committee:

The Act ensures all security holders notwithstanding value speculators. It requires that an organization with in excess of 1000 investors, debenture holders, store holders and other security holders whenever amid the monetary year should constitute a Stakeholders Relationship Committee. It will be led by a non-official executive and comprise of such different individuals as might be chosen by the board. The board will consider and resolve the grievances of security holders of the organization.

FINDINGS AND SUGGESTION:

Grants in the subject of business administration have been routinely completed throughout the last two decades. Between the years 1993 and 2007, the field of corporate administration research has progressed significantly. Articles published in prestigious journals in the field of business administration are more methodologically detailed and multi-disciplinary in nature. The major fault in the global corporate administration inquiry, on the other hand, appears to be its primarily US introduction. In a review of global research on corporate administration, it was determined that the US institutional environment was the focus of the vast majority of the studies. There were few cross-national investigations identified, and the findings in the single-nation research were unambiguous that the speculations were false in other European settings. On this foundation, it is claimed that the state of corporate administration investigation in the emerging company sector will most likely be diversified due to its unique institutional circumstances. This work seeks to determine if global research on corporate administration published in top-tiered international journals reflects growing interest in India, and whether research published in India's best journals reflects differences from global corporate administration discourse. Is there a rise in "setting specific" speculations in India that reflect the unique institutional framework in which the companies are based?

CONCLUSION:

The role of the Board of Directors becomes extremely important under the Companies Act of 2013, in terms of greater Corporate Governance motivation. Various agreements relating to chiefs' autonomy, inspectors' strict exposure standards, and financial specialists' insurance will have far-reaching ramifications, acquiring greater transparency and responsibility in the organization's operations while also limiting the occurrences of corporate cheating. Its main goal is to ensure the Board's responsibility in dealing with the organisation in a simple manner in order to increase partner esteem, rather than the minor compliance of legal requirements. In any case, good corporate governance goes beyond the tenets and regulations that the government can impose. It should come from within, allowing the company to build a profitable relationship with its internal clients and a long-term business relationship with its external clients. The true responsibility for achieving desired levels of corporate governance lies with firms themselves, not with external measures.

REFERENCES:

I. Agrawal, R.K. (2016). A Comparative Study of Indian Companies Act, 2013 and Companies Act of Republic of Maldives, 1996. IRA-International Journal of Management & Social Sciences (ISSN 2455-2267), 4(1).

II. D'Erasmo, A. J. (2010). The Companies Act 2006. SSRN Electronic Journal.

III. Dhar, K. (2012). SEBI and Collective Investment Schemes. SSRN Electronic Journal.

IV. Dravis, B. F. (2016). The Role of Independent Directors in Corporate Governance.

V. Plessis, J. J., Varottil, U., & Veldman, J. (2018). Globalisation of Corporate Social Responsibility and its Impact on Corporate Governance. Springer.

VI. Gugler, K. (2001). Corporate Governance and Economic Performance. Oxford University Press on Demand.

VII. Hathi, U. (2014). Indian Companies Act 2013 Highlights and Review.

VIII. Jhunjhunwala, S., & Deepa, B. (2013). Corporate Governance Law in India: An Update Comparative Analysis of Companies Act 2013 and Companies Act 1956. Indian Journal of Corporate Governance, 6(2), 52–114.

IX. Mittal, A., & Jain, A. (2015). Indian Companies Act, 2013 – Changing the face of CSR in India. In Proceedings of the 7th International Conference on Business and Finance.

X. Monks, R. A. G., & Minow, N. (2011). Corporate Governance. John Wiley & Sons.

XI. Rakesh, V. (2014). Corporate Social Responsibility Under Companies Act 2013: An Overview.

XII. Ramaiya, A. (2013). Guide to the Companies Act: Secs. 146 to 377.

XIII. Sabri, B., & Khuong, N. D. (2014). Corporate Governance and Corporate Social Responsibility: Emerging Markets Focus. World Scientific.

XIV. Sekar, S. G., & FCA. (2014). The Companies Act 2013: Companies Act 2013 (New Companies Act). Shree Guru Kripa's Institute of Management.

XV. Taylor, C. (2009). "Companies Act 2006: A Guide for Private Companies"

XVI. Vijay, G., BBA.LLB, Year, 3rd, School, S. L., & PUNE. (2011). Corporate Governance Under the Companies ACt 2013: A More Responsive System of Governance. Indian Journal of Applied Research, 4(4), 1–3.

XVII. Zhao, Y. (2011). Corporate Governance and Directors' Independence. Kluwer Law International.