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

Understanding Shareholder Rights in India: Legal Framework, Developments, and Challenges

Ansh Goel[1], Dr. Sonia Rajoria[2]

[1]LLM (Corporate Law), GIBS, GGSIPU
[2]Assistant Professor, GIBS, GGSIPU

ABSTRACT
The protection of shareholder rights is a cornerstone of effective corporate governance, vital for investor confidence and capital market integrity. In India, these rights have evolved through legislative actions, regulatory oversight, and judicial decisions. The Companies Act, 2013 significantly enhances shareholder protections, codifying rights related to voting, information access, dividend entitlements, and avenues for redress. Additionally, the Securities and Exchange Board of India (SEBI) plays a crucial role in regulating listed companies to ensure transparency, accountability, and fair treatment of shareholders.This paper examines the legal and regulatory framework governing shareholder rights in India, analyzing their scope and practical effectiveness. Key areas of focus include the protection of minority shareholders, mechanisms for addressing oppression and mismanagement, the rise of shareholder activism, and the growing influence of institutional investors on corporate governance. The role of proxy advisory firms and the expanding scope of derivative and class action suits are also discussed.Through doctrinal analysis and an exploration of recent legal developments, this paper highlights the challenges in enforcing and realizing shareholder rights and offers recommendations for reform. The aim is to contribute to the broader discourse on corporate accountability and participatory governance in India's evolving economic environment.

Keywords: Shareholder rights, Corporate governance, Minority protection, Institutional investors, SEBI.

1. INTRODUCTION

The rights of shareholders lie at the core of corporate law, encapsulating the essential balance between the authority wielded by corporate managers and the interests of the owners of capital. Shareholders, as residual claimants, entrust management with the operation of the company while retaining the right to monitor, influence, and, where necessary, intervene in corporate affairs. Their rights ensure that the foundational principles of accountability, transparency, and fairness are upheld in the functioning of a company.

In the Indian corporate landscape, the relevance of shareholder rights is particularly pronounced. The dominance of family-run businesses, coupled with concentrated promoter shareholding, often leads to asymmetries of power that can sideline minority shareholders and distort corporate decision-making. Simultaneously, the liberalization of the Indian economy and the rise in retail and institutional investment

have dramatically increased public participation in the capital markets. This shift underscores the urgent need to strengthen and safeguard shareholder rights to preserve market integrity and investor confidence.
The legal framework for shareholder rights in India has seen significant evolution, especially with the enactment of the Companies Act, 2013[1], which introduced a more robust governance regime. Supplemented by the regulations of the Securities and Exchange Board of India (SEBI), this framework now codifies a wide array of rights, from voting and dividend entitlements to remedies against oppression and mismanagement.
This paper undertakes a comprehensive examination of the historical evolution, legal underpinnings, and practical enforcement of shareholder rights in India. It also explores the ongoing challenges in their realization and offers policy recommendations aimed at creating a more equitable and transparent corporate governance environment.

2. CONCEPT AND CLASSIFICATION OF SHAREHOLDERS

A shareholder, also referred to as a member of a company, is any individual or institution that owns at least one share in a company's equity capital. Shareholders are the ultimate owners of the company, and their rights are determined by the extent and nature of their shareholding. Based on their shareholding patterns and investment profiles, shareholders in Indian companies can be broadly classified into four categories: majority shareholders, minority shareholders, institutional shareholders, and retail shareholders.

- **Majority shareholders** are those who hold more than 50% of a company’s share capital, thereby enjoying a controlling interest in the company. With such influence, they can shape board composition, influence strategic decisions, and in some cases, dominate shareholder meetings. While their involvement is essential for stability, unchecked power can sometimes lead to the suppression of minority interests.
- **Minority shareholders**, by contrast, hold less than 50% of the company’s shares. Lacking substantial control, they are more vulnerable to decisions made by the majority, particularly in closely held or promoter-driven firms. Consequently, minority shareholders rely heavily on legal safeguards to protect their rights and financial interests.
- **Institutional shareholders** include entities such as mutual funds, insurance companies, pension funds, and banks. Owing to their substantial financial resources and professional expertise, they often play a pivotal role in influencing corporate governance practices and shareholder activism.
- **Lastly, retail shareholders** are individual investors, typically holding smaller stakes. While they may lack influence individually, their collective interests represent a significant portion of the market and merit robust regulatory protection.

3. EVOLUTION OF THE LEGAL FRAMEWORK GOVERNING SHAREHOLDER RIGHTS IN INDIA

India's legal regime governing shareholder rights has undergone a significant transformation over the past few decades. Initially, these rights were primarily codified under the Companies Act, 1956, which provided the foundational structure for corporate governance and shareholder participation. However, over

[1] The Companies Act, 2013 passed by the Parliament has received the assent of the President of India on 29th August, 2013. The Act consolidates and amends the law relating to companies. The Companies Act, 2013 has been notified in the Official Gazette on 30th August, 2013.

time, the limitations of the 1956 Act became apparent, particularly in its inadequate mechanisms for ensuring transparency, accountability, and protection of minority interests.

The turning point came with a series of high-profile corporate scandals, most notably the Satyam Computers scandal in 2009[2], which exposed systemic weaknesses in governance practices and highlighted the urgent need for reform. In response, the Indian legislature undertook a comprehensive overhaul of corporate law, culminating in the enactment of the Companies Act, 2013. This new legislation marked a paradigm shift by emphasizing stronger governance norms, increased transparency, stricter compliance obligations, and enhanced protections for shareholders. Key provisions include statutory recognition of shareholder voting rights, class action suits, board accountability, and mandatory disclosures.

Complementing this statutory framework is the Securities and Exchange Board of India Act, 1992. SEBI, as the principal regulatory authority for securities markets, has issued various regulations to ensure market integrity and protect investor interests. Chief among these are the Listing Obligations and Disclosure Requirements (LODR) Regulations, 2015, which impose rigorous disclosure norms, mandate corporate governance practices for listed companies, and reinforce the rights of shareholders to timely and accurate information.

Together, the Companies Act, 2013 and SEBI's regulatory framework have created a more comprehensive and enforceable structure for shareholder protection, aligning Indian corporate governance standards more closely with global best practices

4. SHAREHOLDER RIGHTS UNDER THE COMPANIES ACT, 2013

The Companies Act, 2013 recognizes a comprehensive set of shareholder rights, broadly classified into **statutory**, **contractual**, and **remedial** rights.

1. **Statutory Rights**

   These are granted by virtue of law and include:

- **Right to Vote:** Shareholders can vote on matters such as appointment/removal of directors, mergers, and winding-up (Section 47).
- **Right to Receive Dividends:** When declared by the board (Section 123).
- **Right to Attend General Meetings:** Shareholders are entitled to receive notice and participate (Section 101-107).
- **Right to Information:** Through inspection of statutory registers, financial statements (Section 92, 129).
- **Right to Transfer Shares:** Subject to restrictions in private companies (Section 58).

2. **Contractual Rights**

These arise from the company's Articles of Association (AoA) or shareholder agreements, such as tag-along or drag-along rights, pre-emptive rights, etc.

3. **Remedial Rights**

To protect against oppression and mismanagement, shareholders may approach:

- **National Company Law Tribunal (NCLT):** Under Section 241 for oppression and mismanagement.
- **Class Action Suits:** Under Section 245, enabling collective redress against directors, auditors, or advisors.

[2] The Satyam Computer Services scandal was India's largest corporate fraud until 2009

- **Derivative Actions:** Though not codified, permitted under judicial precedent to allow shareholders to sue on behalf of the company.

5 RIGHTS OF MINORITY SHAREHOLDERS

Minority shareholders—those who do not hold significant control or influence over the affairs of a company—are inherently susceptible to oppression by majority shareholders or controlling promoters. In India, where ownership structures are often highly concentrated and family-run enterprises dominate the corporate landscape, the risk of marginalization and unfair treatment of minority interests is particularly acute. Recognizing this, the **Companies Act, 2013** incorporates several targeted provisions to safeguard the rights and interests of minority shareholders.

Sections 241 and 242 of the Act provide recourse in cases of oppression and mismanagement. These provisions empower shareholders, holding a minimum threshold of shareholding (e.g., 10% for private companies or 100 members for public companies), to approach the National Company Law Tribunal (NCLT) when corporate conduct is prejudicial, oppressive, or contrary to the interests of the company or public. The Tribunal is vested with wide-ranging powers to provide relief, including modifying the board structure, cancelling resolutions, or even winding up the company.

Sections 235 and 236 relate to corporate takeovers and mergers, and offer exit options to minority shareholders when a majority shareholder or acquirer gains 90% or more of the share capital. These sections ensure that minority shareholders receive fair value for their shares and are not coerced into remaining in a company where they no longer have a meaningful say.

Section 245, a significant innovation under the 2013 Act, introduces the concept of **class action suits**. This allows a group of shareholders or depositors to jointly initiate legal proceedings against the company, directors, auditors, or advisors for acts that are fraudulent, unlawful, or prejudicial to their interests.

Judicial pronouncements have further reinforced minority rights. **In *Needle Industries (India) Ltd. v. Needle Industries Newey (India) Holding Ltd.* (1981)[3],** the Supreme Court held that majority shareholders owe a **fiduciary duty** to act in good faith and in the best interest of the company and all shareholders, not just their own. The case laid down important precedents on fairness in decision-making and equitable treatment, which continue to influence Indian corporate jurisprudence.

Together, these statutory and judicial safeguards form a crucial bulwark against the misuse of majority power and contribute to a more equitable corporate governance framework.

6. SEBI'S ROLE IN PROTECTING SHAREHOLDER RIGHTS

The **Securities and Exchange Board of India (SEBI)** plays a pivotal role in safeguarding shareholder rights, especially in the context of listed entities. As the primary regulator of the securities market in India, SEBI is entrusted with the mandate to ensure transparency, fairness, and investor protection. Over the years, SEBI has introduced and enforced a comprehensive regulatory framework that strengthens corporate governance and enhances the accountability of listed companies to their shareholders.

One of SEBI's most significant contributions is the implementation of the SEBI (Listing Obligations and Disclosure Requirements) Regulations, 2015 (LODR). These regulations impose stringent disclosure norms, mandate the presence of independent directors on company boards, and establish grievance

[3] Needle Industries (India) Ltd. v. Needle Industries Newey (India) Holding Ltd. is AIR 1981 SC 1298.

redressal mechanisms. By requiring timely and accurate disclosures, LODR ensures that shareholders are well-informed and capable of making rational investment decisions.

The **SEBI (Substantial Acquisition of Shares and Takeovers) Regulations, 2011 (SAST)**, commonly known as the Takeover Code, is another critical regulation aimed at protecting minority shareholders during mergers, acquisitions, and changes in control. The regulations mandate open offers to minority shareholders at fair prices, thereby preventing coercive takeovers and ensuring equitable treatment.

In addition, the **SEBI (Issue of Capital and Disclosure Requirements) Regulations (ICDR)** govern public offerings, rights issues, and preferential allotments. These regulations protect shareholders by ensuring transparency in pricing, allocation, and disclosure of material information.

SEBI has also introduced progressive reforms such as **stewardship codes for institutional investors** and mandatory **voting disclosures by mutual funds**, aimed at increasing transparency in voting behavior and promoting long-term shareholder value. These initiatives reinforce the alignment between investor interests and corporate decision-making, further empowering shareholders in the governance process.

7. SHAREHOLDER ACTIVISM IN INDIA

Historically, shareholder activism in India has been relatively subdued, with limited instances of shareholders actively challenging corporate decisions or seeking significant reforms. However, in recent years, there has been a noticeable surge in shareholder activism, driven by several key factors.

One of the primary drivers is the **rise of institutional investors**. These investors, such as mutual funds, pension funds, and foreign institutional investors, now hold significant stakes in Indian companies. With their substantial financial power and expertise, institutional investors are increasingly voicing concerns over corporate governance, executive compensation, and other strategic decisions, thereby influencing company policies and operations.

The **increased participation of retail investors**, facilitated by the proliferation of **digital platforms**, has also played a crucial role. Online trading and investment platforms have democratized access to capital markets, enabling a broader base of individual investors to participate in shareholder meetings, vote on resolutions, and engage in corporate governance. This shift has led to a more active and vocal retail investor community, demanding transparency and accountability from the companies they invest in.

Additionally, **enhanced regulatory mandates on disclosures** under the SEBI regulations have empowered shareholders with timely, accurate, and comprehensive information, making it easier for them to identify issues and take action.

Notable instances of shareholder activism in India include the 2017 **Infosys** case, where shareholders opposed excessive executive remuneration, and the 2016 **Tata Sons** debacle, where institutional shareholders called for governance reforms. While activism fosters corporate accountability and better governance, it also raises concerns about potential disruptions to board autonomy and the long-term stability of companies.

- **INSTITUTIONAL INVESTORS AND PROXY ADVISORY FIRMS**

Institutional investors such as **Life Insurance Corporation of India (LIC)**, **SBI Mutual Fund**, and **foreign portfolio investors (FPIs)** hold substantial voting power in Indian companies. Collectively, these institutional investors control a significant portion of the equity capital in many listed companies, giving them considerable influence over corporate governance, strategic decisions, and shareholder resolutions. As their stakes have grown, so has their involvement in shareholder meetings and decision-making processes. This increased participation has contributed to a stronger emphasis on corporate accountability, as institutional investors are typically more proactive in ensuring that management adheres to good governance practices, transparency, and shareholder value maximization.

The influence of institutional investors is further amplified by their capacity to pool resources and collaborate, thereby strengthening their voice in corporate governance matters. These investors often demand clearer disclosures, better management practices, and reform in areas such as executive compensation, environmental sustainability, and social responsibility.

Alongside institutional investors, **proxy advisory firms** like **Institutional Investor Advisory Services (IiAS)** and **Securities and Exchange Services (SES)** play an increasingly important role in guiding shareholders, especially institutional investors and retail shareholders, on voting matters at annual general meetings (AGMs) and extraordinary general meetings (EGMs). Proxy advisory firms provide detailed research, analyses, and voting recommendations on resolutions, enabling shareholders to make informed decisions. These firms help ensure that investors understand the governance issues at stake and encourage better oversight and scrutiny of company management.

While SEBI has encouraged the functioning of proxy advisory firms to enhance shareholder engagement and market transparency, it has also proposed regulatory measures to ensure their impartiality. These measures are aimed at preventing conflicts of interest, ensuring the independence of recommendations, and protecting shareholder interests from biased or self-serving advice.

Through their combined efforts, institutional investors and proxy advisory firms are playing a critical role in fostering a more transparent and accountable corporate governance framework in India.

- **COMPARATIVE PERSPECTIVE: INDIA AND GLOBAL STANDARDS**

India's shareholder rights regime compares favorably with global standards, particularly post-2013 reforms. However, certain gaps remain:

Parameter	India	UK/US
Class Action	Available (Section 245 of Companies Act, 2013)	Stronger tradition in the US (Derivative suits)
Independent Directors	Mandated for listed companies, but often influenced by promoters/family control	Extensive and stringent requirements in US (Sarbanes-Oxley Act, Dodd-Frank Act) and UK (Corporate Governance Code)
Shareholder Proposals	Limited scope for proposals (typically routine matters)	More accessible in US proxy system; UK allows for more significant proposals
Cumulative Voting	Not mandatory, but some companies use it in charters	Used in certain US states for director elections
Enforcement and Implementation	Codified rights, but challenges in implementation due to cultural resistance, power asymmetry, and judicial delays	Stronger enforcement frameworks with better judicial infrastructure and shareholder engagement practices
Judicial Oversight	Judicial delays undermine effective resolution of disputes	Faster and more efficient dispute resolution through courts and regulatory bodies in the US and UK

India's shareholder rights regime has made significant progress, particularly with the Companies Act, 2013, and SEBI regulations. However, compared to the US and UK, there are some notable gaps—especially in areas like class actions, shareholder proposals, and the independence of directors. The cultural landscape and judicial delays further complicate the effective exercise of shareholder rights in India. In contrast, the US and UK have stronger traditions of shareholder activism, derivative actions, and more comprehensive frameworks for corporate governance.

- **CHALLENGES IN THE EFFECTIVE EXERCISE OF SHAREHOLDER RIGHTS**

Despite the considerable progress made in strengthening shareholder rights through legislative reforms such as the **Companies Act, 2013**, and regulations by **SEBI**, several challenges persist that hinder the effective exercise of these rights by shareholders in India.

1. **Awareness and Access**

One of the primary barriers to the exercise of shareholder rights is the **lack of awareness** among a significant portion of investors, particularly retail shareholders. Many shareholders, especially those holding small stakes, are either unaware of their rights or do not know how to utilize mechanisms for redress. The **complexity of legal provisions**, combined with **language barriers** in official documents and proceedings, further deters participation in shareholder meetings and disputes. As a result, shareholders often miss opportunities to vote, voice concerns, or protect their interests effectively.

2. **Delay in Dispute Resolution**

The **National Company Law Tribunal (NCLT)** and **National Company Law Appellate Tribunal (NCLAT)**, which are tasked with resolving corporate disputes, are frequently burdened with a backlog of cases. This delay in adjudication means that **shareholder disputes**, especially those relating to oppression and mismanagement, often take years to resolve, leaving aggrieved shareholders without timely redress. The slow pace of justice significantly diminishes the deterrence effect of legal remedies and limits the ability of shareholders to protect their interests.

3. **Dominance of Promoters**

In India, many publicly listed companies are **promoter-driven** with promoters holding **significant control** (often over 50% of the company's shares). This concentration of power limits the effectiveness of minority shareholders in influencing corporate decisions or governance reforms. The dominance of promoters often results in **a lack of balance in decision-making** and the marginalization of the interests of minority shareholders.

4. **Weak Enforcement of Class Actions**

Although **Section 245** of the Companies Act, 2013, allows for class action suits, its invocation has been **limited**. Procedural complexities, along with **concerns over high legal costs** and the fear of **lengthy litigation**, discourage shareholders from pursuing class actions. Consequently, despite having the legal tools, shareholders are reluctant to challenge mis-governance collectively.

5. **Limited Say in ESG Matters**

Unlike in some **Western economies**, shareholders in India generally have limited influence over **Environmental, Social, and Governance (ESG) matters**. While global investors are increasingly focusing on **ESG factors**, Indian shareholders often lack mechanisms to push for sustainability initiatives, leaving companies with minimal accountability in this regard. This gap undermines the broader role of shareholders in influencing corporate social responsibility (CSR) and long-term value creation.

- **RECENT DEVELOPMENTS AND REFORMS**

India has witnessed several significant reforms in recent years aimed at strengthening shareholder rights and improving corporate governance. These reforms reflect the growing importance of shareholder engagement, transparency, and the need to address gaps in enforcement and dispute resolution.

1. SEBI's Revised Stewardship Code (2020)[4]

In 2020, the **Securities and Exchange Board of India (SEBI)** introduced a **revised Stewardship Code** that aims to encourage institutional investors to play a more active role in corporate governance. The code mandates institutional investors, such as mutual funds and insurance companies, to adopt a formalized approach to engaging with the companies they invest in. This includes monitoring corporate governance practices, voting on shareholder resolutions, and engaging in dialogue with company management to ensure that shareholder interests are protected. This code is a crucial step in aligning Indian corporate governance standards with global best practices, as institutional investors have a significant influence on corporate policy and strategic direction.

2. Dematerialization and E-Voting

Another significant reform has been the push for **dematerialization** and **e-voting**. By converting physical share certificates into electronic form, **dematerialization** has enhanced the efficiency and transparency of shareholder records. **E-voting** systems, introduced by SEBI, have made it easier for shareholders to participate in Annual General Meetings (AGMs) and vote on important resolutions without needing to be physically present. This has greatly increased **shareholder participation**, especially among retail investors, by removing geographical and logistical barriers.

3. SEBI's Proposal for a Uniform Dispute Resolution Mechanism (2023)

In 2023, SEBI proposed a **uniform dispute resolution mechanism** to simplify and streamline the process of resolving shareholder disputes. This proposal aims to reduce the time and cost involved in resolving issues related to mismanagement, oppression, and other corporate governance concerns. By centralizing the process and creating clearer pathways for dispute resolution, this mechanism seeks to ensure faster and more efficient justice for aggrieved shareholders.

4. Further Reforms Under Consideration

Looking ahead, several other reforms are being considered, including **easing class action procedures** to make it more accessible for shareholders to initiate collective legal action. There is also the need for a more robust **regulatory framework for proxy advisors**, ensuring their independence and accountability. Finally, **enhanced disclosures on ESG** matters are under consideration, enabling shareholders to make more informed decisions based on companies' environmental, social, and governance practices.

CONCLUSION

India has made significant strides in recognizing and codifying the rights of shareholders, particularly following the enactment of the **Companies Act, 2013**, and subsequent reforms in corporate governance. These reforms have created a legal framework designed to protect shareholders and ensure greater transparency, fairness, and accountability in corporate decision-making. The introduction of provisions such as **Section 245** for class action suits, mandatory **independent directors**, and increased **disclosures** by companies have all contributed to a more shareholder-friendly environment.

However, despite these advancements, the **effective exercise** of shareholder rights remains inconsistent. The legal framework is often hindered by several **practical challenges**, including **awareness gaps** among retail investors, **delays in dispute resolution**, and the **dominance of promoters** in family-controlled

[4] **Circular No.: CIR/CFD/CMD1/ 168 /2019**

businesses. Additionally, while the legal provisions are strong on paper, **enforcement** remains a challenge due to issues like procedural complexities, **judicial delays**, and insufficient shareholder activism.
India's corporate governance culture still reflects the influence of traditional **family-owned businesses** where the interests of minority shareholders are often subordinated to the wishes of the dominant promoters. This power asymmetry undermines the ability of minority shareholders to effectively protect their interests. Therefore, while India has made substantial legal progress, the path to meaningful empowerment of shareholders requires more than just legal reforms—it calls for **cultural change** within the corporate sector, promoting a **participatory governance** model where shareholders, regardless of their size, can actively influence corporate decision-making.
Ultimately, achieving true shareholder empowerment requires **enhancing the institutional capacity** for dispute resolution, **improving shareholder awareness**, and creating more **inclusive** and **transparent corporate practices**. These efforts must go hand-in-hand with reforms in **corporate culture**, so that shareholders are not just empowered in theory but also in practice.

RECOMMENDATIONS

To ensure that the rights of shareholders are fully realized and that corporate governance is genuinely participatory and accountable, several key reforms are needed:

1. Strengthen NCLT Capacity

One of the most pressing challenges is the backlog of cases at the **National Company Law Tribunal (NCLT)** and **National Company Law Appellate Tribunal (NCLAT)**. This severely impacts the timely resolution of shareholder disputes. To address this issue, it is essential to **expand the capacity of NCLT** by establishing more **benches** and improving **digital infrastructure** for case management. This will reduce delays and ensure faster delivery of justice in shareholder-related disputes, enhancing confidence in the legal system.

2. Enhance Investor Education

A key barrier to the effective exercise of shareholder rights is the lack of awareness among retail investors about their rights and the processes involved in asserting them. **Investor education** is crucial to fostering active participation in corporate governance. **SEBI's Investor Education and Protection Fund (IEPF)** can collaborate more closely with **NGOs** and other organizations to conduct nationwide campaigns to educate investors about their rights, the importance of voting at AGMs, and how to engage with management. This will not only empower retail shareholders but also encourage them to demand better governance practices from companies.

3. Regulate Proxy Advisors

The influence of **proxy advisory firms** is increasing as institutional investors seek guidance on voting matters. However, there is a growing concern over their **independence** and **potential conflicts of interest**. To mitigate these concerns, it is essential to **regulate proxy advisors** to ensure transparency and impartiality in their recommendations. SEBI could establish clear guidelines regarding their functioning, ensuring that they operate in the best interests of all shareholders and do not become an avenue for undue influence by corporate insiders.

4. Incentivize Shareholder Participation

Shareholder participation in AGMs is often limited, particularly among retail investors. To enhance attendance and engagement, companies could be incentivized to offer **dividend-linked perks** for attending AGMs, such as **additional dividend shares** or other forms of compensation. Such initiatives would encourage more shareholders to participate in the decision-making process and hold management accountable for their actions.

5. Mandate ESG Disclosures

The increasing importance of **Environmental, Social, and Governance (ESG)** factors in global investment decisions means that shareholders are becoming more interested in holding companies accountable for their ESG practices. India should mandate comprehensive **ESG disclosures** by listed companies, enabling shareholders to make informed decisions based on a company's sustainability practices. Additionally, allowing **non-binding shareholder resolutions** on ESG matters would empower shareholders to influence corporate policies on environmental and social issues, even if they are not binding. This would foster greater corporate responsibility and align corporate actions with the interests of all stakeholders.