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

The Jurisprudence of Lifting the Corporate Veil

Agrim Singh Bishen[1], Ashutosh Rathore[2], Mr Tej Bahadur[3]

[1,2]Student, Law, Amity University
[3]Assistant professor Law, Amity University

Abstract
The development of the modern commercial law is characterized by the conflict between the need of insulating corporations and the requirement to be ethically accountable. This tension centers around the doctrine of separate legal personality, one of the areas of legal fiction holding corporations to be separate juristic personalities, which overlooks the fact that the people who own them are not the parties to the legal entity, but are mere members of it.1 As much as this is the core of innovation and bringing together of capital, it is equally the root cause of a so-called veil, which can be used to commit fraudulent or otherwise unlawful actions, as well as to cover up such actions.

The Salomon v. A. Salomon and Co. Ltd. Doctrinal Genesis
The modern concept of corporate personhood traces its ultimate point of origin to the English case of Salomon v. A. Salomon and Co. Ltd. AC 22.1 in the nineteenth century in which the legal difference between a business owner and the business was frequently ambiguous, which would put the entrepreneur at considerable risk of the entire range of business liability and endangered their own personal assets.

The Factual Situation of the Salomon Controversy
Aron Salomon was a prosperous maker of leather goods and boots in Victorian England, whose business was a sole proprietorship, which he had operated more than thirty years until he wished to use the formal requirements of the Companies Act of 1862, creating the company A. Salomon and Co. Ltd.1 To meet the statutory requirement of seven shareholders, Salomon issued one share to his wife and five children, with him retaining all 20,001 shares and in debentures, which served as a secured lending against the company assets.7
The main claim was that the company was simply an alias, agent, or a trustee of Salomon and that the incorporation was a sham designed to defraud the legitimate creditors.7 When the company later became insolvent in financial matters because of a revenue crunch in the boot trade, the liquidator, representing unsecured creditors, argued that Salomon should be held personally liable to the company.

The Court of Law Clash: Form vs. Substance
The Court of Appeal, who concurred with the liquidator, held that Salomon had misused the privileges of incorporation by interfering with the intention of the legislature, which was to grant the benefits of limited liability to independent shareholders rather than counterfeit members who were puppets of one dominant shareholder.7
But the House of Lords made a unanimous overruling that changed the face of business law that once the necessary requirements of the Companies Act had been satisfied the company was a different person altogether to its subscribers. 3

Feature of Distinction	Individual (Aron Salomon)	Corporate Entity (A. Salomon & Co. Ltd.)
Legal Status	Natural Person	Artificial Juristic Person [10]
Asset Ownership	Personal ownership	Assets belong to the company [3]
Liability Exposure	Unlimited for sole traders	Limited to share capital [2]
Life Span	Subject to mortality	Perpetual Succession [11]
Debt Priority	Personal liability to creditors	Secured priority via debentures [7]

The Salomon case set the legal principles on which any company debt is debts of the company and that its form is not a name, mask, or cloak.1 The case allowed businesspersons the freedom to innovate without the threat of personal bankruptcy.

The (Considered) Conceptual Framework of the Corporate Veil

The concept of corporate veil is a metaphor in law that is used to explain the distinction between the rights, obligations and liabilities of a corporation and the rights, obligations, and liabilities of its shareholders and directors.3 In the Indian legal system, the concept has been made explicit by Section 9 of the Companies Act, 2013, which acknowledges a company as an independent legal person when the company is formed.

The Theoretical Justification of Being Unmindful

Although the Salomon principle is still the most general rule, it is not an absolute one.5 The judiciary and legislature understand that the corporate form may be abused to pursue illegal or unethical purposes.5 The lifting of the veil is an intervention based on two major theories:

The Alter-Ego Doctrine: The doctrine is used when unity of interest and ownership becomes such that the distinct personality of the corporation and the individual no longer exists.17 Things like failure to keep corporation books, mixing funds or undercapitalization have frequently been quoted as evidence that the company is merely an extension of the individual.17

The Instrumentality Theory: This is used when the controller took over the finances and policy of the company to the point that the company lacked any separate mind and was being exploited to contravene a law or legal obligation.18

There are judicial reasons on lifting the veil of incorporation

The reasons to intervene by the courts are not written down in one exhaustive list but have developed over time through case law in order to respond to a particular incident of abuse.6 Courts tend to be very timid and the veil is only lifted in exceptional cases where justice dictates it.

Fraud and Improper Conduct Prevention

The most common basis to lift the veil of incorporation is the existence of fraud.6 Courts will not permit

the use of Salomon principle as an engine of fraud or cloak to fraudulent actions.
In Gilford Motor Co Ltd v. To avoid this, Horne (Ch 935) signed a restrictive covenant with a former managing director of his former employer, Mr. Horne; that he should not solicit the customers of his ex-employer upon leaving.22 To have it avoided, Horne (Ch 935) made the company, named J.M. Horne and Co Ltd, whose shareholders were his wife and a friend, and used the company to compete with Gilford Motor.22 The Court of Appeals ordered an injunction to be granted against both Horne and the new company,
Similarly, in Jones v. Lipman 1 WLR 832, a defendant over whom a specific performance order had been granted, transferred the property in which he had contracted, to a company which he controlled, to evade the eye of equity discovering the face, and ordered the sale to be made by the company.6

Identification of Character of the Enemy
In Daimler Co Ltd v., the corporate personality doctrine is not exempted to the requirements of national security. Continental Tyre and Rubber Co. The case, (Great Britain) Ltd. 2 AC 307, saw the House of Lords deal with a dispute falling on World War I times which involved an English-registered company which was nearly fully owned and managed by German nationals.28
This case provided that though a company is an artificial person, it is run by the brains and will of the human controllers, and therefore, where those controllers are citizens of an enemy state, the company has an enemy face, irrespective of its incorporating state.13

The Revenue Protection and Tax Evasion
The evasion of tax through the use of corporate vehicles is a key cause of veil-lifting in the case of Sir Dinshaw Maneckjee Petit, Re (1927): a rich assessee created four private companies and transferred to the companies all the income that he was taxed on.10 The companies were just paper companies that did no business; the assessee treated the income received by the companies as a loan by him to himself in order to obtain a reduced tax liability.
There was a pivotal development in Vodafone International Holdings BV v. Where the Supreme Court of India considered a billion offshore transaction, Union of India (2012).31 The Revenue authorities argued that the use of a Cayman Island holding company was a sham to evade Indian capital gains tax.31 The Supreme Court however made a distinction between legitimate tax planning and a colorable device.34 In the case of Vodafone, the structure had been in place over 10 years and had been a bona fide investment structure, so the veil was not lifted.

Case Comparison	Primary Rationale for Veil Lifting	Judicial Outcome
Gilford Motor v. Horne	Evasion of a restrictive covenant	Injunction granted against the company [22]
Daimler v. Continental Tyre	National security/Enemy character	Company barred from bringing legal action [27]
Sir Dinshaw Petit	Systematic tax evasion	Income attributed directly to

		the individual [10]
Vodafone v. Union of India	Alleged tax avoidance	Veil maintained; structure held bona fide [34]

Group Structures and the Single Economic Entity Doctrine

In contemporary business, organizations may be structured as a parent-subsidiary organizational structure.37 This has seen the emergence of the doctrine of the Single Economic Entity that holds that a group of companies ought to be considered to constitute a single entity in case they have the same interest in their economic interests.

The Emerging and Declining of the Denning Approach.

DHN Food Distributors Ltd v. The position of Lord Denning MR in Tower Hamlets LBC 1 WLR 852, was that two wholly owned subsidiaries and a parent company were bound hand in hand, and ought to be regarded as one economic entity in terms of compensation.40He said that it would be a technical point of law to part the entities in such a case, and that would be an ignoring of commercial reality.

This liberalism was subsequently checked. In Woolfson v. The House of Lords, Strathclyde Regional Council, came out to doubt DHN and said that the veil should not be pierced unless the company is a mere facade.42 This limitation was cemented when Adams v.was decided. Cape Industries plc Ch 433.42 The Court of Appeal held that Cape Industries would not be liable on the claims of its subsidiaries as a result of asbestos although the parent company had substantial control over the structure of its groupings, as long as the structure was not a sham.

Indian Competition and Revenue.

The Single Economic Entity doctrine has been commonly applied in the law in India in the area of regulation.38 Competition Act 2002, states an enterprise as such that includes its units, divisions or subsidiaries, therefore ensuring that such companies in the same group are not punished on collusion grounds but are regarded as one economic entity.39 The case of State of U.P v Renusagar Power Co. (1988) set the veil aside and allowed a parent company (Hindalco) to claim an exemption on the generation of power by its wholly owned subs

The India Incorporation The reasons to Lift the Corporate Veil are Statutory.

The Companies Act, 2013, introduces a number of clauses that permit the enforcement of the corporate personality to be overlooked by the regulating authorities and the judiciary in particular cases of negligence.4 These legal provisions furnish the clear legal framework on which the discharge of the corporate personality can be disregarded in specific situations of misconduct by the officers.

Fraudulent Incorporation and Misrepresentation.

- Section 7(7): Where a company is incorporated by providing false or wrongful information or by omitting a material fact, the National Company Law Tribunal (NCLT) may issue orders to remove the name of the company or to provide that the liability of its members is unlimited.5
- Part 34 and 35: Part 34 and Part 35 deal with criminal and civil liability relating to misstatements on a prospectus.4 All the directors, promoters and persons who authorized a misstatement in a prospectus

may be held personally liable as to loss suffered by subscribers who acted in reliance on the misstatement.

Failure of Financial Integrity.

- Part III.9: Where there is a public issue, the money obtained on the minimum subscription is not received within the allotted time, the application money shall be returned, otherwise, the directors and officers shall be personally liable to refund it with interest.4
- Section 127: Directors who are aware of not paying the declared dividends or not writing dividend warrants within 30 days are liable personally as regards to fines and imprisonment.

Investigation and Fraudulent Conduct.

- Section 216: It is a section that enables the Central Government to appoint inspectors to enquire about the membership of a company to identify the true persons that have financial interest in it or those that control its policy.15 This is critical in revealing who the beneficial owners of shell companies are.10
- Section 251: This section is specifically aimed at fraudulent applications to remove the name of a company off the register.20 In case an application is made aiming at getting off the hook or defraud the creditors, the persons in charge are personally liable.20
- Section 339: When a company is being wound up, in case it is found out that the business has been carried on with the intention of defrauding the creditors, the Tribunal may declare that the persons who knowingly were liable to the fraud shall bear all the debts of the company without any limitation of liability.
- Section 447: This is the umbrella clause to punish fraud.20 It will impose harsh punishments or imprisonment and fines up to three times the amount of the fraud itself to ensure that the corporate veil is not a shield to crime.

Statutory Provision	Mischief Addressed	Legal Consequence
Section 7(7)	Fraudulent Incorporation	NCLT may order unlimited liability [5]
Section 34	Misstatement in Prospectus	Criminal liability for the authorizers [15]
Section 39	Failure to Refund Money	Personal liability of directors for repayment [4]
Section 127	Failure to Distribute Dividends	Fines and imprisonment for directors [15]
Section 216	Concealed Ownership	Appointment of inspectors to unmask owners [45]

Section 339	Fraudulent Winding Up	Unlimited liability for company debts [4]

The Prest v. Petrodel Framework: Evasion vs. Concealment
In the modern law of corporate, one of the landmark developments was the case of Prest v. by the UK Supreme Court. Petrodel Resources Ltd UKSC 34.46 This case narrowed the doctrine of the corporate veil piercing by providing an articulate line between the principle of evasion and the principle of concealment.46

The Concealment Principle
In Prest, the court did not technically lift the veil, but peeped behind and declared that the real actors were the husband, albeit bearing an equitable presumption that the companies held the assets on behalf of the husband, rather than in their own right.46

The Evasion Principle
The evasion principle only provides that true piercing will be achieved.46 This is the case when a legal right exists against a person who is in control of a company that does not depend on the company to achieve what ought to be done.46 Lord Sumption pointed out that although this principle has been established, it is a last resort remedy.

Piercing the Corporate Veil Reverse
Although traditional piercing would make a person liable to the actions undertaken by the corporation, reverse piercing will result in a personal controller being liable to the corporation.49 In this way, creditors of a shareholder can obtain the assets of a corporation to clear personal debts.

Reluctance and Indian Jurisprudence
Reverse piercing doctrine is one that is quite controversial since it puts the interests of innocent minority shareholders at risk and may interfere with the priority of claims in bankruptcy recovery.50 In Balwant Rai Saluja v. The Supreme Court of India, which dealt with an appeal by canteen workers who wanted to be considered as employees of the parent company (Air India) since they were being employed by its subsidiary (HCI), was asked to lift the veil but it declined on the ground that HCI was not a sham and because the fact that Air India was the parent company and owned and controlled HCI did not warrant a disregard to the separate legal personality of the subsidiary company (Air India) (Air India Limited 2013). The concept has been used however in situations involving alter egos. The Supreme Court applied a reverse piercing rationale to have several shell companies which were owned and operated by the same person who had defrauded homebuyers to have the assets of the companies to bear the debt of his misconduct in fraud.20 Skipper Construction Company (P) Ltd.

Recent Frontier: Jurisprudence in 2024-2025
The doctrine has been used with fresh vitality in the recent developments in India in regard to large-scale infrastructure and insolvency fraud.56

Fraud in the Arena Superstructures and Sports City

M/s arena superstructures pvt. ltd. and Another vs. 2025 judgment was a landmark case. The Allahabad High Court was dealing with an elaborate fraudulent arrangement in State of U.P. and Others (Writ C Nos. 6041 and 8447 of 2024).56 That was a scheme of a NOIDA Sports City in which land was allocated at a subsidized rate on the understanding that 70 percent of the land would be utilized as sports facilities.

The court was of the opinion that the promoters had embezzled over crores of money of homebuyers, sold marketable land to other parties and were not developing any sports infrastructure, which led to the court piercing the corporate veil and holding the real culprits accountable.56 more importantly, the developers, with the aim of evading their statutory obligations, had initiated the insolvency proceedings maliciously, and in that case, the veil of incorporation must be lifted to find the actual culprits.56

Prevention of IBC Abuse and NCLAT

The National Company Law Appellate Tribunal (NCLAT) has also augmented the rationale to look behind the incorporation in an insolvency process under Section 65 of the IBC where the initial application was determined to be made fraudulently with a bad faith to halt legal petitions before it.56

Summation: The Future of the Corporate Veil

The doctrine of lifting the corporate veil is still among the most vibrant fields of corporate law.6 The move towards the absolute inflexibility of the early Salomon period to the reality-based, practical evaluations of the 2020s is indicative of a legal system that has grown into maturity.2

The Balancing Act

The judiciary remains in a dilemma of whether to offer commercial certainty or to stop systemic abuse11 in case the veil is lifted too often, it will destroy investor confidence and put economic development on hold.11 on the other hand, in case the veil is never lifted, then the corporate form will be used to perpetrate financial crimes and environmental disregard.14

The Effect of Evolution of Regulations

The interaction between the Companies Act, 2013, and the Competition Act, and the active application of Section 216 to probe corporate control, in India, is a positive move towards disclosure.15

According to the jurisprudence of 2024 and 2025 and especially in such cases as that of Arena Superstructures, the courts are becoming more disposed to invoke the justification of the veil of incorporation by reference to the public interest and the public trust, i.e. when addressing the case of essential infrastructure and the welfare of thousands of consumers.21

Conclusion

The notion of the corporation as a separate legal person, which came up with a century ago in Salomon v. Salomon, is the traditional cornerstone of international trade.2, it is a fiction that needs to be exploited in order to have risk taken, and businesses last.1, but, as human ingenuity succeeds in devising methods to further exploit this fiction to commit fraud, evade taxation and avoid the statutory requirements, the doctrine of the lifting of the corporate veil has changed into an infrequent exception into a structured legal requirement.5

The current law, with all the statutory rigour of the Companies Act, 2013, and the judicial refinements of the principles of evasion and concealment, makes it clear that, in the face of a scheme of organized fraud, the law will not shy to lift the mask and bring the persons actually committing the fraud to book.56

References

1. Salomon v Salomon Case Summary A Corporate Law Deep Dive - Draft Bot Pro, accessed March 24, 2026, https://www.draftbotpro.com/post/salomon-v-salomon-case-summary-a-corporate-law-deep-dive
2. A Company as a Separate Legal Entity: Analysis of Salomon v Salomon & Company Ltd [1897] AC 22 | Uniwriter, accessed March 24, 2026, https://www.uniwriter.ai/law/a-company-as-a-separate-legal-entity-analysis-of-salomon-v-salomon-company-ltd-1897-ac-22/
3. Salomon v. Salomon & Co Ltd: Establishing Corporate Personality and Limited Liability, accessed March 24, 2026, https://www.casemine.com/commentary/uk/salomon-v.-salomon-&-co-ltd:-establishing-corporate-personality-and-limited-liability/view
4. Lifting Corporate Veil: Companies Act 2013 | PDF - Scribd, accessed March 24, 2026, https://www.scribd.com/document/816842754/Lifting-Of-Corporate-Veil-Under-Companies-Act
5. Corporate Veil: Separating Members from the their Company - BizRegime, accessed March 24, 2026, https://www.bizregime.in/2025/05/lifting-corporate-veil.html
6. Doctrine of lifting of corporate veil : an analysis - iPleaders Blog, accessed March 24, 2026, https://blog.ipleaders.in/doctrine-of-lifting-of-corporate-veil-an-analysis/
7. Salomon v A Salomon & Co Ltd - Wikipedia, accessed March 24, 2026, https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Salomon_v_A_Salomon_%26_Co_Ltd
8. Salomon v. A. Salomon Case Overview | PDF - Scribd, accessed March 24, 2026, https://www.scribd.com/document/819096591/Salomon-Case
9. LIFTING OF THE CORPORATE VEIL UNDER THE COMPANIES ACT, 2013: A CRITICAL STUDY, accessed March 24, 2026, https://doi-ds.org/doilink/10.2021-41248883/IJLLR/V3/I1/A77
10. Doctrine of Corporate Veil and Lifting of Corporate Veil - Legal Window, accessed March 24, 2026, https://legalwindow.in/doctrine-of-corporate-veil-and-lifting-of-corporate-veil/
11. Understanding the Corporate Veil in Indian Company Law: A Comprehensive Guide to Legal Protection and Business Structure, accessed March 24, 2026, https://esploralegal.com/understanding-the-corporate-veil-in-indian-company-law/
12. LIC v. Escorts and Beyond – Lifting the Corporate Veil | India ..., accessed March 24, 2026, https://corporate.cyrilamarchandblogs.com/2018/01/lic-v-escorts-beyond-lifting-corporate-veil/
13. Case Study: Daimler Company Ltd. v. Continental Tyre and Rubber Co. (Great Britain) Ltd., accessed March 24, 2026, https://legal-wires.com/case-study/case-study-daimler-company-ltd-v-continental-tyre-and-rubber-co-great-britain-ltd/
14. Public-Interest-and-Lifting-of-Corporate-Veil-under-Companies-Act-1.pdf - INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF LAW MANAGEMENT & HUMANITIES, accessed March 24, 2026, https://ijlmh.com/wp-content/uploads/Public-Interest-and-Lifting-of-Corporate-Veil-under-Companies-Act-1.pdf
15. Lifting of Corporate Veil on Judicial and Statutory Grounds - Judex Tutorials, accessed March 24, 2026, https://judextutorials.com/blog/lifting-of-corporate-veil-on-judicial-and-statutory-grounds
16. Lifting of the Corporate Veil Essay | LawTeacher.net, accessed March 24, 2026, https://www.lawteacher.net/free-law-essays/business-law/article-on-lifting-of-the-law-essays.php

17. disregarding the corporate entity | Wex - Law.Cornell.Edu, accessed March 24, 2026, https://www.law.cornell.edu/wex/disregarding_the_corporate_entity
18. Lifting the Corporate Veil, accessed March 24, 2026, https://www.advocateshrutigoyal.com/lifting-the-corporate-veil/
19. What is "Lifting the Corporate Veil" in Company Law? - Swiecicki Muskett, LLC, accessed March 24, 2026, https://swiecickilaw.com/2023/05/what-is-lifting-the-corporate-veil-in-company-law/
20. LIFTING THE CORPORATE VEIL UNDER THE COMPANIES ACT ..., accessed March 24, 2026, https://ijirl.com/wp-content/uploads/2024/11/LIFTING-THE-CORPORATE-VEIL-UNDER-THE-COMPANIES-ACT-2013.pdf
21. Lifting Corporate Veil: Key Indian Judgments - Supreme Today AI, accessed March 24, 2026, https://supremetoday.ai/issue/lifting-corporate-veil-india-judgments
22. Gilford Motor v Horne [1933] - UOLLB, accessed March 24, 2026, https://uollb.com/blogs/uol/gilford-motor-v-horne-1933
23. GILFORD MOTOR COMPANY, LIMITED v. HORNE - Record Of Law, accessed March 24, 2026, https://recordoflaw.in/gilford-motor-company-limited-v-horne/
24. Gilford Motor Co Ltd v Horne - Wikipedia, accessed March 24, 2026, https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Gilford_Motor_Co_Ltd_v_Horne
25. Doctrine of Corporate Veil in Gilford Motor Co Ltd v Horne - Uniwriter, accessed March 24, 2026, https://www.uniwriter.ai/law/doctrine-of-corporate-veil-in-gilford-motor-co-ltd-v-horne/
26. Lifting the Corporate Veil | B&B Associates LLP, accessed March 24, 2026, https://bnblegal.com/article/lifting-the-corporate-veil/
27. DAIMLER CO. LTD. V. CONTINENTAL TYRE AND RUBBER CO. - Vintage Legal, accessed March 24, 2026, https://www.vintagelegalvl.com/post/daimler-co-ltd-v-continental-tyre-and-rubber-co
28. Daimler v. Continental Tyre Case Summary | PDF | Piercing The Corporate Veil - Scribd, accessed March 24, 2026, https://www.scribd.com/document/666307710/Vidhi-Tyagi-10-8-23-Work
29. Diamler Co Ltd vs Continental Tyre & Rubber - Academia.edu, accessed March 24, 2026, https://www.academia.edu/38522620/Diamler_Co_Ltd_vs_Continental_Tyre_and_Rubber
30. Lifting the corporate veil on tax planning - International Tax Review, accessed March 24, 2026, https://www.internationaltaxreview.com/article/2bembb6nu4njz9ljg5wjk/lifting-the-corporate-veil-on-tax-planning
31. Vodafone International Holding v. Union of India Case Review - Law Senate, accessed March 24, 2026, https://www.lawsenate.com/case-studies/vodafone-international-holding-vs-union-of-india.html
32. Vodafone International Holdings BV - Supreme Court of India, accessed March 24, 2026, https://api.sci.gov.in/jonew/judis/39003.pdf
33. Analysis of the Vodafone Supreme Court Order, accessed March 24, 2026, https://www.hariani.co.in/newsletters/newsletter_january_12.pdf
34. ISSUE XVIII : The path-breaking Vodafone judgement – Ringing in new tunes, accessed March 24, 2026, https://psalegal.com/issue-xviii-the-path-breaking-vodafone-judgment-ringing-in-new-tunes/
35. Vodafone's Supreme Court Victory in India, accessed March 24, 2026, https://taxbar.com/wp-content/uploads/2016/01/Vodafone_Supreme_Court_Victory_in_India_Nikhil_Mehta_and_Gareth_Miles-1.pdf-1.pdf

36. COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF 'REVERSE PIERCING OF CORPORATE VEIL' WITH THE TRADITIONAL VEIL LIFTING CONCEPT - indian journal of legal review, accessed March 24, 2026, https://ijlr.iledu.in/wp-content/uploads/2025/04/V5I568.pdf
37. The Doctrine of Single Economic Entity And The Direction & Control Test - Supreme Court, accessed March 24, 2026, https://www.livelaw.in/articles/doctrine-single-economic-entity-direction-control-test-256529
38. Single Economic Entity Doctrine in India | Request PDF - ResearchGate, accessed March 24, 2026, https://www.researchgate.net/publication/327892078_Single_Economic_Entity_Doctrine_in_India
39. Application of the Single Economic Entity Doctrine to Anticompetitive Agreements, accessed March 24, 2026, https://indiacorplaw.in/2018/02/09/application-single-economic-entity-doctrine-anticompetitive-agreements/
40. DHN Food v Tower Hamlets - LawTeacher.net, accessed March 24, 2026, https://www.lawteacher.net/cases/dhn-v-tower-hamlets.php
41. DHN Food Distributors Ltd v Tower Hamlets LBC - Wikipedia, accessed March 24, 2026, https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/DHN_Food_Distributors_Ltd_v_Tower_Hamlets_LBC
42. Adams v Cape Industries | LawTeacher.net, accessed March 24, 2026, https://www.lawteacher.net/free-law-essays/business-law/adams-v-cape.php
43. Case of Adams v Cape Industries | Uniwriter, accessed March 24, 2026, https://www.uniwriter.ai/law/case-of-adams-v-cape-industries/
44. Summary | Session-2 | Corporate Law - Law And Policy, accessed March 24, 2026, https://lawandpolicy.law.blog/2025/09/28/summary-session-2-corporate-law/
45. Principle of Lifting of Corporate Veil under Companies Act, 2013-Enterslice, accessed March 24, 2026, https://enterslice.com/learning/principle-of-lifting-of-corporate-veil-under-companies-act-2013/
46. Piercing Or Peeping Round The Corporate Veil | Appleby, accessed March 24, 2026, https://www.applebyglobal.com/publications/piercing-or-peeping-round-the-corporate-veil/
47. Why the Supreme Court decision in Prest v Petrodel - King's Blogs, accessed March 24, 2026, https://blogs.kcl.ac.uk/kslr/wp-content/blogs.dir/86/files/2014/12/Liew-Adam.pdf
48. Piercing v. lifting the corporate veil: understanding the key differences - Dentons, accessed March 24, 2026, https://www.dentons.com/en/insights/articles/2025/may/29/piercing-v-lifting-the-corporate-veil-understanding-the-key-differences
49. Redefining Corporate Liability: An Analysis Of Reverse Piercing Of The Corporate Veil In Indian Law - Indian Journal of Law and Legal Research, accessed March 24, 2026, https://www.ijllr.com/post/redefining-corporate-liability-an-analysis-of-reverse-piercing-of-the-corporate-veil-in-indian-law
50. SOLVING THE BAD LOAN CRISIS IN THE UNCONVENTIONAL WAY: IS REVERSE PIERCING THE CORPORATE VEIL A SOLUTION? - NUJS Law Review, accessed March 24, 2026, https://nujslawreview.org/wp-content/uploads/2019/12/12-2-Naman-Kamdar-Akash-Srinivasan-1.pdf
51. a study of the effectiveness of reverse lifting of corporate veil in india by - kriti arora - INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL FOR LEGAL RESEARCH AND ANALYSIS, accessed March 24, 2026, https://www.ijlra.com/details/unveiling-corporate-responsibility-a-study-of-the-effectiveness-of-reverse-lifting-of-corporate-veil-in-india-by-kriti-arora

52. Balwant Rai Saluja v. Air India Limited: Establishing Precedents in Principal-Employee Relationships - CaseMine, accessed March 24, 2026, https://www.casemine.com/commentary/in/balwant-rai-saluja-v.-air-india-limited:-establishing-precedents-in-principal-employee-relationships/view
53. Balwant Rai Saluja & Anr Etc.Etc vs Air India Ltd.& Ors on 25 August, 2014 - Indian Kanoon, accessed March 24, 2026, https://indiankanoon.org/doc/184584358/
54. The Indian Supreme Court on Lifting the Corporate Veil - IndiaCorpLaw, accessed March 24, 2026, https://indiacorplaw.in/2014/09/29/the-indian-supreme-court-on-lifting/
55. A COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF THE DOCTRINE OF PIERCING THE CORPORATE VEIL: A PERSPECTIVE FROM INDIA, accessed March 24, 2026, https://thelawbrigade.com/wp-content/uploads/2023/12/Ananyaa-Varma-JLSR.pdf
56. Recent Supreme Court and NCLAT Judgments 2025 | Updates - Anirudh Associates, accessed March 24, 2026, https://anirudhassociates.com/february-legal-insights-recent-supreme-court-and-nclat-judgments-2025/
57. into keeping in view the object of the State's policy to promote ..., accessed March 24, 2026, https://www2.allahabadhighcourt.in/files_ilr/english/splitted/2221238%202024_24-02-2025_english.pdf
58. 21.11.2024 Delivered on : 24.02.2025 Court No. - 42 Case :- WRIT - C - eLegalix, accessed March 24, 2026, https://elegalix.allahabadhighcourt.in/elegalix/WebDownloadOriginalHCJudgmentDocument.do?translatedJudgmentID=48734
59. 2025 Annual Review | NCLAT Case Digest on IBC | Part-I, accessed March 24, 2026, https://ibclaw.in/2025-annual-review-nclat-case-digest-on-ibc-part-i/
60. Corporate Veil and Group Liability in India: A Critical Study of the Group of Companies Doctrine - Journal of Informatics Education and Research, accessed March 24, 2026, https://jier.org/index.php/journal/article/download/4015/3169/7059
61. Reverse Piercing of Corporate Veil - IP and Legal Filings, accessed March 24, 2026, https://www.ipandlegalfilings.com/reverse-piercing-of-corporate-veil/