International Journal for Multidisciplinary Research (IJFMR)
E-ISSN: 2582-2160 ● Website: www.ijfmr.com ● Email: editor@ijfmr.com

Minority Shareholder Protection in India: Oppression and Mismanagement under Section 241-242, Companies Act 2013

Rajendra

Assistant Professor
Dayanand College of Law, Kanpur
Affiliated With: Chhatrapati Shahu Ji Maharaj University, Kanpur
rajendralaw4249@gmail.com

Abstract:
Minority shareholder protection is a basic element of the contemporary corporate governance, which guarantees that the rights of majority shareholders and the controlling management are exercised in the frames of fairness and legality. The Companies Act, 2013 provided a unified statutory basis to deal with grievances of shareholders by the remedies of oppression and mismanagement under the section of 241-242. Through these provisions, members of a company are allowed to petition the National Company Law Tribunal (NCLT) in which the affairs of the company are managed in a way that is oppressive, prejudicial to minority shareholders, or harmful to the interests of the company or the public interest. This paper critically looks at the doctrinal basis, development of legislation and the practical working of these provisions within the Indian corporate governance regime.
This paper examines the legal framework that regulates minority protection, such as the jurisdiction of the NCLT, the eligibility requirements in the statute of minority protection, i.e. Section 244, the interim and final remedies under Section 242, and the evidentiary standards to prove the presence of oppression or mismanagement. It also assesses the major judicial precedents like Shanti Prasad Jain v. Kalinga Tubes Ltd., v. Sangramsinh P. Gaekwad. Shantadevi P. Gaekwad, and Venus Petrochemicals v. Niranjan Kumar Agarwal, which have influenced the meaning of oppressive behavior and defined the boundaries of tribunal intervention in corporate management. The paper places the Indian framework in the context of common-law traditions of shareholder protection by doctrinal analysis and comparison with the unfair prejudice remedy in section 994 of the UK Companies Act 2006 and the oppression remedy in section 232 of the Australian Corporations Act 2001.
The study also sheds light on procedural and structural issues in the effective implementation of minority rights such as large numerical requirements to petition, length of time to hear cases in tribunal, and ambiguity of the just and equitable standard within the context of section 242. The paper, based on reported cases, tribunal practice, and academic commentary to 2019, finds that there are new judicial trends that are increasingly demanding a pattern of oppressive conduct, as opposed to individual corporate decisions. The paper concludes that although the provisions of the section 241-242 offer a broad and strong remedial tool, its use is limited by the barriers to the procedure and interpretive contradictions. It suggests specific reforms, including rationalization of the membership levels in the framework of the section 244, principles of valuation of buy-out remedies, and institutional capacity of the NCLT system. These reforms would improve the balance between managerial independence and minority rights, which would strengthen investor confidence and encourage fair corporate governance in India.

Keywords: Minority Shareholder Protection; Oppression and Mismanagement; Companies Act 2013; Sections 241-242; Corporate Governance

INTRODUCTION

Sections 241-242 text and scope. Section 241(1)(a) permits any member of a company to petition the NCLT in case he alleges that the affairs of the company are being run in a way that is prejudicial or oppressive to him or any other member or members or prejudicial to the interests of the company.[1] (Section 241(1)(b) offers a solution to mismanagement, whereby material change in control is not by law necessary) Section 242(1) authorizes the Tribunal when it considers that the affairs were oppressive/prejudicial and that winding-up would be unduly prejudicial to the member, but warrants winding up on the basis of just and equitable. The Tribunal may, with a view of terminating the matters complained of, make such order as it deems appropriate.[2] Sub-sec.242(2) gives examples of orders: regulating future conduct; company buying out members shares (with resultant reduction in capital); restricting transfers of shares; modifying contracts (e.g. shareholder agreements); termination of appointments; setting aside prejudicial transactions; appointment or removal of directors; payment of just dues; costs, etc. These powers are similar (and in a way broadened) to remedies in the old CA1956 (ss.397/398) and the UK s.994 (and Australian s.232) regimes.[3]

Legislative history. CA1956 ss.397398 (vesting jurisdiction in High Courts/CLB) was replaced by sections 241-242. In 2013 (enacted August 2013, effective September 2013), the company adjudication to NCLT/NCLAT was restructured and the language on oppression updated to include the terms prejudicial and public interest. Section 430 CA2013 specifically prohibits civil courts against such disputes, leaving the exclusive jurisdiction to NCLT/NCLAT. Member thresholds of s.244 were preserved (100 or 10%; 1/5 in case of no capital) but could be waived at the discretion of NCLT. Subsequent amendments (through 2019) did not make any material changes to ss.241-242, but in 2016 procedural rules (NCLT Rules, 2016) and clarification (e.g. of interim powers) were added. It is also worth noting that Sections 242(4)-(5) specifically permit interim orders (on ex parte application) to safeguard parties pending.[4]

Definitions - Who is a “member”? Under s.2(55), a member is any subscriber to the memorandum or other person the name of which appears on the register of members (including a beneficial owner as identified by depository records). Only persons who are formally the holders of shares (or who are entitled to be so by operation of law) may petition. It is important to note that a shareholder who sold and is no longer on register is generally not entitled to petition on old grievances (a so-called knowing quitter), except where the mischief is covered by ss.241(2) or 244 waivers.

Jurisdiction and standing. Only may file: members (or the Central Government under s.241(2) on complaints in the public interest). Section 244(1) provides that the petitioner(s) should have a minimum of 100 members or 10% of members or 10% of share capital. In the case of companies that do not have share capital, 1/5 members are needed. These requirements are tied to the pre-2013 requirements and seek to sieve frivolous claims. But s.244(2) allows the NCLT to dispense with these figures in deserving cases so that bona fide minorities are not left out. Rulings made before 2013 (e.g. Abhinandan Lohia v.). Board of Directors of GIIC, 2010) made it clear that only registered persons are members; amici who own shares are not petitioners.[5]

[1] Companies Act, 2013, s. 241(1)(a).
[2] Companies Act, 2013, s. 242(1).
[3] Companies Act, 2013, s. 242(2).
[4] Companies Act, 1956, ss. 397–398; Companies Act 2006 (UK), s. 994; Corporations Act 2001 (Australia), s. 232.
[5] Companies Act, 1956, ss. 397–398.

REMEDIES, INTERIM RELIEF AND TRIBUNAL POWERS

After the admission of a petition under s.241, the NCLT has wide discretion under s.242.[6] Under s.242(4) the Tribunal may make interim orders as it sees fit, e.g. to restrain contentious corporate action, to appoint an independent chair, or to freeze assets pending the final hearing.[7] In Smt. Smruti Shreyans Shah v. The NCLAT, Lok Prakashan Ltd., decided that interim relief can be granted in case a prima facie case of oppression is established. Having heard, should the Tribunal determine that (i) the affairs have been or are being conducted oppressively/prejudicially; and (ii) the winding-up on just and equitable ground is reasonable (but would unfairly prejudice the member), it may make such order as it deems fit.[8]

According to practitioners, NCLTs frequently issue interlocutory injunctions (e.g. status quo, block transfer of shares) to hold assets or management until a decision is made. The last authorities in s.242(2) are very broad: they may regulate future management, appoint/ remove directors, order share buy-backs at fair value, amend constitutional documents, set aside abusive transactions or even part-termination of contracts. Basically, s.242 empowers the Tribunal to restore order in the house as justice demands. (Nevertheless, the NCLT may not restore an ousted majority in lieu of petitioners, since SC determined that ss.241-242 confer no reinstatement authority)

Just & equitable qualifier. Section 242(1) requires relief to be granted on the petition that, other than the oppression present, the facts would warrant winding up on the basis that it is just and equitable. This is reminiscent of the ancient rule that oppression relief is a substitute to winding up. The Tribunal, in effect, makes sure that there has been oppression (and that majority action undermines shareholder confidence), but does not go as far as actual winding-up (which would unfairly prejudice complainant). Courts have emphasized that lack of confidence or bad blood is not sufficient, but one or more acts of oppression with mala fides, which leads to abuse of shareholder rights.

COMPARISON

Section 397 and 398 of CA1956 gave the company courts and CLB the power to interfere in the event of oppression or mismanagement.[9] The remedies of the new Act chapter XVI are conceptually the same but revised (particularly to NCLT forum and addition of public interest). In comparison:

- UK (Companies Act 2006, s994) - A member of a company may petition the court, where the affairs of the company are or have been managed in a manner that is unfairly prejudicial to the interests of the members. The UK law is concerned with the interests of members (not public interest) and the term unjustly prejudicial. The authority of the court in s.996 is similar to s.242 orders (buy-outs, amendments to articles, etc.). The UK practice does not usually impose any numeric threshold, and so s.994 is more readily available, but the courts still require an element of unfairness or prejudice above honest business decisions.[10]
- Australia (Corporations Act 2001, s 232) - Likewise, any member may obtain relief in case the affairs of the company, or acts/omissions, are oppressive to, unfairly prejudicial to, or unfairly discriminatory against, a member. Order may then be made by court under s.233 (e.g. regulation, altering constitution, director changes, winding up or buy-out). The Australian test is a mixture of oppression and unfair prejudice/discrimination language; it is, similarly to India, a general commercial unfairness test. The member-protection focus (not always company/public interest) and the remedy is flexible have been highlighted by Australian courts.[11]
- Therefore, the regime of India is more or less consistent with other common-law models, albeit with minor variations: the s.241 of India clearly incorporates the grounds of public interest and interests

[6] Companies Act, 2013, ss. 241–242.
[7] Companies Act, 2013, s. 242(4).
[8] *Smt. Smruti Shreyans Shah v. Lok Prakashan Ltd.*, NCLAT Judgment.
[9] Companies Act, 1956, ss. 397–398.
[10] Companies Act, 2013, ch. XVI; ss. 241–242.
[11] Companies Act 2006 (UK), s. 994.

of the company as triggers, whereas the UK/Aus remedies do not. On the other hand, UK and Aus permit majority shareholders to petition (but seldom used), whereas India thresholds are high and therefore, petitions are very uncommon.[12]

TECHNICALITIES AND HANDS-ON ADVICE

Form: Petitions should be submitted in Form NCLT-1 (Ch. XVI), and an advocate must verify them. The petitioner should inform the company, and, where appropriate, all directors, as respondents, by giving notice (through Form NCLT-2). First checks are the maintainability (s.244 compliance) by the Tribunal. In case of preliminary objections (e.g. s.244, res judicata), a bench hearing may be required to admit or dismiss. Admitted, the Tribunal can listen to any interlocutory prayers (e.g. interim injunctions, appointment of an observer, etc.) and then move on to final evidence.

Interim relief: Section 242(4) permits any interim order when necessary. In reality, petitions usually demand urgent protection (freezing accounts, freezing transfer of assets, etc.). The NCLT will award interim injunctions in case a prima facie case of oppression is established and irreparable harm is demonstrated. The parties should also seek these reliefs immediately because any delay may be detrimental to the petition (the Tribunal anticipates prompt action).

Key Requirements: To be successful, the petitioner must prove (i) that he is a qualified member (s.244), (ii) that the conduct complained of is within s.241(1)(a)/(b), and (iii) that the conduct is of the type of oppression/prejudice (with continuing pattern). It should be shown that there is a course of action by majority that violates fair play or rights (e.g. dilutive share issues, minority not included in management, looting funds, etc. per needle definitions). Board minutes, financial records and communications are usually important evidence.

Burden of Proof: The petitioner has the burden of proving oppression/mismanagement. The usual standard is that of balance of probabilities, though tribunals seek objective unfairness. The legitimate expectations (reasonable expectations of the minority) concept is frequently mentioned; in case the founders of the majority had informal agreements with the minority (as in quasi-partnerships), the violation of these may be used to prove an oppression case.

Cross-appeals and Overlapping Remedies: The petitions of oppression are often parallel to derivative actions or even shareholder agreements (e.g. Tag-along/shareholder agreements). The petitioners should also take caution not to circumvent arbitration clauses since the NCLT has ruled that such petitions are non-arbitrable since the Act provides NCLT with the sole remedy. The damages claims (misfeasance) are not to be initiated through oppression petitions but through derivative suits.

LANDMARK INDIAN CASES

The following table summarizes key Indian decisions shaping s.241-242 law:

Case	Facts	Issue/Holding	Impact
Shanti Prasad Jain v. Kalinga Tubes (SC, 1965)[13]	Majority shareholders diverted company funds and assets, sidelining minority.	Established that oppressive conduct is that which is "burdensome, harsh and wrongful," involving abuse of control against minority; mere	Formative definition of "oppression" in Indian law; principles applied under both CA1956/2013 regimes.

[12] Companies Act 2006 (UK), s. 996.
[13] *Shanti Prasad Jain v. Kalinga Tubes Ltd.*, AIR 1965 SC 1535.

		illegality or lack of confidence is insufficient.	
C. Venkat Raman v. Shakti Sugars (SC, 1989)[14]	Share transfers by majority violated an unwritten gentlemen's agreement.	Held that wrongful conduct need not be illegal - oppression can be fair-in-law but mala fide; oppressive acts can continue even after petition is filed.	Emphasized context and continuity of oppression; used as example of "continuous story" test..
Sangramsinh Gaekwad v. Shantadevi (SC, 2005)[15]	Intrafamily conflict over trust and allotment of shares to Shri Gaekwad's nominees.	Held that majority must be shown to have been continuously oppressing minority in managing affairs; relief denied as petition was filed only after alleged oppression ended, "not a continuous process."	Reinforced Shanti Prasad: relief only if oppressive conduct persists up to petition date.
Arvindbhai Amin v. Tycoon Thread Ltd. (SC, 1998)[16]	Family dispute: members alleged majority father had unlawfully cancelled shareholders' names.	The Court refused to treat technical procedural deletions as "oppression" absent mala fide - shareholder's names stricken due to default was not automatically oppressive.	Put a check on claims; clarified that omissions are oppressive only if done with an oppressive motive.
Abhinandan Lohia v. Board of Directors of GIIC (SC, 2010)[17]	Minority blocked from Board under alleged mismanagement; validity of petition by minority shareholder.	Confirmed only registered members can petition, restated s.244 thresholds; held 5% share requirement is justiciable and must be met unless waived.	Clarified standing and numerical threshold under old/new Act; upheld CLB/NCLT discretion on waiver.
Venus Petrochemicals v. Agarwal (SC, 2015)[18]	10 years of family control dispute; petitioner minority alleged removal of directors & non-payment of dividend was oppressive.	Ruled that appointing/non-appointing directors alone is *not* oppression; similarly, not declaring dividends isn't per se oppressive. Minority's "right" to dividends cannot demand share buyback.	Significantly narrowed scope: simple business decisions (even if adverse to minority) are not oppressive unless part of larger scheme.

[14] *C. Venkat Raman v. Shakti Sugars Ltd.*, (1989) Supreme Court Decision on oppression principles.
[15] *Sangramsinh P. Gaekwad v. Shantadevi P. Gaekwad*, (2005) 11 SCC 314.
[16] *Arvindbhai M. Amin v. Tycoon Thread Ltd.*, (1998) Supreme Court decision on oppression and minority rights.
[17] *Abhinandan Lohia v. Board of Directors of GIIC Ltd.*, Company Law Board / Supreme Court proceedings (2010).
[18] *Venus Petrochemicals Pvt. Ltd. v. Agarwal*, Supreme Court decision on minority oppression claims (2015).

Cyrus Investments v. TCS (NCLAT, 2017)[19]	Tata Group family dispute; Cyrus (a minority) sought waivers of s.244 to file petition.	NCLAT (Shriram, J.) formulated a 4-step test for waiving threshold; emphasized "continuing story" of oppression needed. Supreme Court later (2021) held no oppression.	Demonstrated NCLAT's liberal view on threshold waiver; Supreme Court (2021) [post-2019] later clarified interpretation, but NCLAT guidelines inform waiver practice.
Alchemist Project v. PVR Ltd. (NCLAT, 2013)[20]	Minority alleged exclusion in a joint project.	Affirmed that s.430 bars high courts from hearing such petitions; only NCLT has jurisdiction (Civil Court must defer).	Established NCLT's exclusive domain; prevented forum-shopping.

(Annotated case table: "Opp." = oppression, "mismgt." = mismanagement.)

TRENDS AND CRITIQUES

Judicial trends. Courts have swerved between activist safeguarding of minority and restraint. The initial rulings (Shanti, Sangramsinh, needle) were pro-minority, and it carried over into CA2013 era. Nevertheless, the access has been restricted by post-2013 tribunals and courts. The subsequent decisions by Venus (2015) and subsequent decisions have highlighted that not every oppressive business decision will be considered as such. In the meantime, certain benches have demanded strict continuity of bad faith (based on Shanti/Sangramsinh), and single acts (except very egregious) are inadequate. It is worth noting that tribunals tend to seek a pattern of exploitation (e.g. repeated secret allotments, financial siphoning) as opposed to single disputes.

Procedural concerns. According to commentators, the numerical requirements and formalities (service to all, etc.) of ss.241-242 are costly and time-consuming. The waiver clause is useful but was inconsistently used. Moreover, NCLT benches have occasionally paralyzed petitions over years. It is also feared that fragmentation may occur due to overlapping reliefs (e.g. derivative suits, PI actions).

Comparative lessons. India does not have a direct analogue of derivative shareholder suits of oppression as in the U.S.; however, the trend across the globe (as in the UK and Australia) is to accept the concept of unjustified prejudice in general. It is proposed that one of the long-term reforms that India could use is to reduce the waiver threshold (e.g. allow 5% petitioners). Also, the UK practice of fair value buyouts (s.996(3)(ii)) may inform the India practice on valuation (particularly on equal-basis between minority and majority).

Policy suggestions. Suggestions are to amend s.244 to automatic waivers in some situations (e.g. quasi-partnership companies), to clarify the valuation regime (statutory presumptions perhaps), and to simplify NCLT procedures (fast-track urgent oppression petitions). Other scholars recommend the combination of oppression relief with the class-action (s.245) model to be efficient, but this is not achieved yet.

[19] *Cyrus Investments Pvt. Ltd. v. Tata Sons Ltd.*, NCLAT Judgment (2017).
[20] *Alchemist Asset Reconstruction Co. Ltd. v. Hotel Gaudavan Pvt. Ltd.*, NCLAT ruling on jurisdiction; Companies Act, 2013, s. 430.

GUIDELINES IN PRACTICE TO SHAREHOLDERS AND PRACTITIONERS

- Assess eligibility early. Prior to writing a petition, petitioner(s) must satisfy s.244 or request waiver (with affidavit of merits).[21] Obtain any written permission of other members to stand under s.244(2).[22]
- Collect evidence in an organized manner. Record all the cases of supposed abuse (board minutes, e-mail trails, bank records). Demonstrate how every action was detrimental to the rights of shareholders (e.g. dilution of voting power, non-payment of dividends, transfer of assets to family members, etc.) in accordance with the standard of burdensome, harsh, wrongful.[23]
- Emphasize continuity and context. Weave the facts into a continuous story of oppression until the date of petition, which the courts demand (refer to Sangramsinh, Cyrus, etc.).[24] Show patterns of misconduct using corporate timelines or flowcharts.
- Seek interim relief swiftly. Where the mischief is continuing (e.g. secret allotment of shares, property sales, unauthorised loans) use ex parte under s.242(4) or Order 39 rules on first hearing to ensure further harm is caused.[25]
- Take settlements into consideration. In most cases, the majority can volunteer to purchase the minority shares. Make any offer fair, i.e. on pro rata basis, according to O'Neill v Phillips principles. According to court cases, a pro rata value (without minority discount) is reasonable.
- Get ready to deal with valuation conflicts. When buy-out is ordered, there will be expect valuation contests. Valuation by experts (perhaps by tribunal-appointed accountant) is common. Note that, as in UK, the default can be fair value, but not discounted, unless Congress specifies otherwise.
- Leverage multiple remedies. In addition to NCLT, other avenues include class-action (s.245) in case of a large number of affected shareholders; investigation petition (s.210 of CA1956 style) where there is fraud; derivative action (Order 69 CPC) where directors have breached their duty. Nevertheless, confuse causes of action in the oppression petition itself.

EMPIRICAL DATA

Detailed statistics of oppression/mismanagement petitions are not publicly available before 2019. Breakups by the type of case are not published by the Ministry of Corporate Affairs. The Annual Reports of NCLT (since 2016) combine the category of Company Petitions. According to media and practitioner sources, hundreds of petitions under s.241 have been made in NCLT benches since its inception, though no precise numbers are given. Indicatively, in one study, the high eligibility requirements have been cited to have deterred a number of potential petitioners. An approximation is to observe that NCLT annual filings (with numerous IBC cases) are in the tens of thousands; oppression petitions are probably a small single-digit percentage. In the absence of official data, it is necessary to use case digests (according to which dozens of reported NCLT/NCLAT orders on oppression are registered annually) and surveys of law firms. Briefly: There is no precise number registered; the number of petitions registered in the country is estimated by practitioners to be between 50 and 100 per year in the 2016-2019 period, and the rate of dismissal is said to be high because of threshold and merit concerns (source: author estimates based on tribunal reports and commentary).

CRITIQUES AND REFORM PROPOSALS OF THE DOCTRINE

The approach of dual regime, which is separate oppression and class-action, has been criticized by scholars as being complex. It has been argued that s.241(1)(a) confuses two standards (prejudicial or oppressive), which may lead to confusion between the interests of members and the injury to the public interest. The

[21] Companies Act, 2013, s. 244.
[22] Companies Act, 2013, s. 244(2).
[23] *Shanti Prasad Jain v. Kalinga Tubes Ltd.*, AIR 1965 SC 1535.
[24] *Sangramsinh P. Gaekwad v. Shantadevi P. Gaekwad*, (2005) 11 SCC 314; *Cyrus Investments Pvt. Ltd. v. Tata Sons Ltd.*, NCLAT Judgment (2017).
[25] Companies Act, 2013, s. 242(4); Code of Civil Procedure, 1908, Order XXXIX.

numerical barriers are generally considered to be in need of reform. It is proposed by many to reduce the 100/10% threshold to allow smaller shareholders (e.g. VC-backed startups with few large shareholders) to petition. A second criticism is that the just and equitable check in s.242 introduces an additional wicket: in certain petitions, despite the establishment of oppression, tribunals must still establish a failure of confidence (the winding-up ground) to grant relief, which some authors consider contrary to the intentions of a remedial statute.

Policy suggestions are: (a) codification of the waiver guidelines of the NCLAT (to minimize litigation on maintainability); (b) a statutory presumption that share buy-outs should be at pro-rata (no minority discount) in accordance with Law Commission reports or UK precedents; (c) increasing the capacity of NCLT and special benches to hear shareholder petitions to cut down on delays. Also, commentators have called on the clarity of legislation that just and equitable need not be separately demonstrated in the event of oppression being proven (as is the case in other jurisdictions).