BETWEEN COMPLIANCE AND CAPITAL: THE FUNDRAISING PARADOX OF SECTION 8 COMPANIES

Ms. Sharayu Kadam, LL.B., New Law College in Mumbai.

ABSTRACT

Section 8 companies in India hold a peculiar place straddling the nonprofit and corporate worlds they are obliged to pursue social objects but can't distribute profits. This dual nature creates a paradox in their fundraising competing in the corporate form bestows on them credibility and regulatory identification; yet, cumbersome governance structures discourage potential donors and investors. The article studies the "fundraising paradox of Section 8 companies" when considering compliance-type requirements, restrictions on capital raising, and perceptions among stakeholders. Using a mixed-method methodology involving a review of statutory provisions, interviews with trustees and directors, and comparative insights from global nonprofit arenas, this study brings out how compliance-related constraints curb resource mobilization whereas in theory a corporate form is expected to enable it. The analysis brings forth three major tensions (1) regulatory credibility versus rigidity in administration, (2) donor's trust versus capital market inaccessibility, and (3) social mission versus financial sustainability. By unpacking these dynamics, the paper contends that the Section 8 companies' opted fundraising capacity depends not only on legal reforms but also on innovative financial instruments, hybrid models, and a stronger institutional ecosystem. The findings add to the wider debate on non-profit governance to suggest ways of bridging compliance and capital for social sustainability.

Keywords: Non-profits, companies act, charitable, dividend, fundraising, financial regulatory, investment.

INTRODUCTION

Non-profits, regardless of location, face the dichotomy of accomplishing mission-driven goals while engaging in the practicalities of fundraising. In the Indian scenario, this contradiction assumes a special connotation through Section 8 companies, a structure set up under the Companies Act intending to promote charitable causes with the credibility of corporate governance. Section 8 companies have thus emerged in the last decade as an attractive vehicle for social enterprises promising transparency and far more statutory recognition than the old-style trusts or societies.

Here lies an apparent paradox within this pledge. These very special regulatory compliance mechanisms that intend to prevent fraud may restrict nonprofit organizations from fundraising activities, which are essential for their mere survival and enrichment. Section 8 companies are plagued with rigid legal and financial reporting requirements, which may ensure safe acceptance of trusts although potentially alienating prospective investors and put chilling effects on alternative financing models.

This study looks into the dynamics of this paradox referencing how Section 8 companies deal with dual pressures of accountability and capital acquisition. By examining the regulatory frameworks, fundraising strategies, and case evidence, the study intends to address the question as to whether compliance strengthens or weakens net financial sustainability. Findings from this study would feed into the ongoing discourse of nonprofit governance and resource mobilization, yet would equally provide insights to policymakers, practitioners, and donors. Ultimately, the study expounds the thin line between credibility through compliance and survival through capital, this balance leading to the shape of Section 8 companies in India's social sector.

Research Methodology.

This paper is of descriptive nature and the research is based on secondary sources for the deep analysis of the separation of powers and judicial activism in India. Secondary sources of information like newspapers, journals, and websites are used for the research.

Review of Literature.

Numerous entrepreneurs established and budding have always had a strong inclination towards philanthropic work. Social entrepreneurship quite often assimilated in regular business courses, enables individuals to be socially responsible and remain dedicated to promote welfare of all. Elaborating Lao Tzu's noteworthy words give a man a fish and you feed him for a day. Teach him how to fish and you feed him for a lifetime; but a great thing it is to much educate, train and impart knowledge and skills about a fishing business to an otherwise illiterate and uneducated man, as to enable him not only to perform a valuable trade but to generate an operation that provides employment to several hundreds or thousands.

In India, a not for profit organisation may be registered as a Trust by executing a Trust deed or as a Society under the Registrar of Societies, or as a private limited non-profit company under the Companies' Act, 2013. A private limited non-profit company is the most popular form of non-profit organisation in India. As per section 8 (1a,1b and 1c) of the Companies Act, 2013, establishing of private limited non-profit colloquially known as *sec 8 companies*, depends upon the objective of the company. Sec 8 companies are exclusively established for the purpose of *"promotion of commerce, art, science, sports, education, research, social welfare, religion, charity, protection of environment or any such other object"* provided it *"intends to apply its profits, if any, or other income in promoting its objects"* and **"intends to prohibit the payment of any dividend to its members."**.

Not being able to provide financial returns is a big roadblock for investors in Section 8 companies and kindred non-profit entities. Since these organizations cannot share their earnings or distribute dividends under the law, the good old investors have no good reason to pour money into them, for they cannot expect those investment projects to give them measurable gains profit-wise or fairly practical exit options. The non-monetary rewards therefore demote their potential funders from investors to philanthropists, thereby reducing their pool of support and essentially turning financial intervention into a social obligation rather than an economic option. As such, risk becomes another factor dissuading private investors that bear out beyond a financial gain.

Given such restrictions, Section 8 companies find themselves depending on a rather cash-strapped kit of fundraising avenues. At the very forefront of these opportunities are things like donations and grants, whether from domestic philanthropy sources, international development agencies, or government programs. Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) contributions, as laid down in the Indian Companies Act, have become the secured funding option which requires due payment. Other ways comprise membership fees, subscriptions, and crowdfunding platforms that solicit small donations from larger numbers of people. A few organizations may actually earn some revenue under programmatic activities like training, consultancy, or publication so that their activities would not go against their nonprofit status. Although these channels provide essential funding, they are unstable and inadequate for guaranteeing long-term sustainability.

In response to this, scholars and practitioners have proposed intervening models for alternative financing and structure. For example, hybrid approaches would require setting up for-profit social enterprises in parallel with the non-profits, so the for-profit social enterprise can cross-subsidize the non-profit operations while keeping everything legally compliant. Impact investment tools like Social Impact Bonds and Development Impact Bonds provide returns linked to the achievement of social outputs and thus attract investors focused on funding outcomes. Building endowment funds can be yet another way to secure steady income exits through returns on investments while minimizing heavy reliance on grants from outsiders. Other methods of revenue diversification include earned-income approaches or the licensing of intellectual property for better financial resilience. More so, a working partnership model based on federations and consortiums allows organizations to pool resources and reduce operational costs. At the policy level, incentives such as enhanced tax rewards or acknowledgment of capped-return quasi-equity instruments could spur-induced investment for social causes. All these highlighted innovations can provide possible paths that accord social purpose with financial sustainability.

Section 8 companies in India encounter their own set of challenges in mobilizing resources derived from regulatory issues and structural limitations of the legal form. Meant to bring in transparency, accountability, and credibility in the nonprofit world, these requirements instead create some unintended hurdles toward successful fundraising and sustenance of the organization. Four interrelated challenges-compliance burdens, investor reluctance, conditional funding sources, and the underdevelopment of alternative financing models-make up what can be termed as the fundraising paradox of Section 8 companies.

A serious impediment that tops the list and faces serious challenges to mobilization would be compliance issues. Section 8 companies have to comply with multiple regulatory requirements, filing annual returns, undergoing statutory audits, and disclosing governance information, all having been set by the Companies Act. If foreign contributions are received, then the FCRA sets forth an additional layer of control and governance, wherein approval is required and there are reporting requirements and monitoring of such inflows.

Such requirements are further compounded by the obligation of reporting to multiple authorities such as the Ministry of Corporate Affairs and the Income Tax Department. While these compliance mechanisms act as bulwarks to uphold public confidence and ensure accountability, they have at times become an onerous administrative burden for smaller bodies with hardly any personnel and resources (Sharma & Gupta, 2021; MCA Annual Report, 2022). And this diversion of attention and money to satisfy compliance demands distracts from undertaking program work and innovation. This gets aggravated with Section 8 companies being structurally incapable of giving cash returns to investors. Under law, these entities are barred from distributing profits to members or issuing equity shares, which means there can be no dividends, ownership interests, or capital gains. Hence, Section 8 companies are an unattractive option for venture capitalists, angel investors, and funds that seek return on investment; such companies, too, find it challenging to raise credit from traditional lenders like banks and NBFCs (Bhattacharya, 2020; IIC Report, 2022).

Exclusion from the near-true flight of capital markets puts Section 8 companies in a position of financial dependency wherein philanthropic giving and CSR-mandated grants remain basically their primary and often the sole reliably assured funding. In the philanthropic ecosystem itself, funding may be less and conditional. Thus most philanthropic gifts are given to an activity or set of activities with specific goals or outcomes in mind, as opposed to any and unrestricted use by the organization. CSR grants, domestic and international grants, and crowdfunding campaigns usually fund activities and rarely are used toward administrative costs, staff training, or long-term capacity building (Dasra, 2021). Here begins what is called a "starvation cycle" the NGO succeeds well in getting programs successfully implemented but does not stand there growing institutionally to support and scale such programs. In other words, Section 8 companies may appear well-funded on paper but under-resourced in a very structural way.

Tracking these challenges, a bunch of literature has emerged on new financing models that could theoretically relieve constraints on Section 8 companies. Mechanisms such as Social Impact Bonds, blended finance, and government guarantees bring about a different deal between investors, governments, and non-profits by conditioning financial flows on socially verifiable outcomes. For instance SIBs allow investors to recover investment principal plus interest, contingent upon agreed social outcomes having been achieved, in order to maintain balance between incentive and accountability. Blended finance, similarly, uses concessional capital to de-risk investments and attract private capital towards socially impactful projects. Although very promising, these remain nascent concepts in the Indian context, facing regulatory ambiguity, a lack of institutional awareness, and an enabling financial infrastructure (Bridgespan, 2021).

Taken together, these challenges bespeak that tension inherent in the Section 8 framework. High compliance requirements, investor disincentives, restricted funding patterns, and disarticulated alternatives form one contradictory situation-a situation in which compliance enhances credibility yet restricts flexibility and growth; philanthropy does provide resources, yet it continues the theory journey of dependency; innovation exists but struggles to scale. Appreciating this whole matrix is therefore crucial for policymakers and practitioners working to financially fortify and build the long-term sustainability of Section 8 companies in India.

One can glean from the literature about this central tension in the Section 8 company paradigm on the one hand, investors look for financial returns, on the other, these entities are bound by a stringent non-profit stipulation, which bars the distribution of earnings among shareholders. This legal prohibition makes the company unattractive in the eyes of venture capitalists, angel investors, and impact funds that pursue monetary benefits, and so restrict these entities from capital markets, limiting them to philanthropy, CSR contributions, and random grants all of which are very narrow, directed, and unsustainable.

Such funding impediments are exacerbated by an onerous regulatory framework. They are also expected to procure foreign contribution approvals (FCRA), carry out annual audits, and submit regulatory disclosures to the government authorities-these would likely be MCA and Income Tax Department. While such legal provisions help in upholding transparency and credibility to some extent, they weigh quite heavily on the smaller organizations for lack of administrative capacity. Such an overemphasis on compliance may defeat the very purpose of such organizations, stifling innovations and diverting funds from real mission-driven programming.

Given the constraints at a more fundamental level, Section 8 companies do offer some advantages corporate governance, professional management, and an avenue to establish somewhat more credibility than the usual trust. However, due to legal restrictions on these entities, their capacity to scale and have a macro-level social impact is hampered, further discouraged by the stringent specifications on the usage of funds and investor distrust, which permanently cements their undercapitalization, resulting in further instability.

The literature calls upon several strategic solutions to corroborate mission integrity and financial viability. Among these is the hybrid form, with a Section 8 entity owning or partnering with a for-profit half (e.g., an LLP), so revenue generation and equity investment do not interfere with non-profit mission control. Another route includes public-private partnerships (PPPs) in order to open possibilities for non-traditional funding, technical know-how, and infrastructural assistance. Also, CSR reform has increasingly been advocated to divert CSR away from short-term, outcome-tied spending towards flexible, multi-year support for indirect costs. Such reform could become a driver in releasing financial pressures on non-profits while simultaneously enhancing their institutional resilience efforts.

Section 8 companies are ripe for sustainability through structural innovation and reforms in the regulatory environment, along with ecosystem nurturing. Hybrid models along with PPPs open avenues for capital access, while reforms in the CSR regime could halt the "starvation cycle" that consigns these organizations to neglect. However, these needs require careful balancing so that the social enterprises do not face mission drift as they juggle compliance with capital and social mission.

The literature review hence provides an effective splash of light upon the challenges that Section 8 companies undergo in India, and especially the difficulty in completing raising investment capital and the heavy burden of regulatory compliance. Further, it brings into sharp focus the issue of sustainable funding mechanisms whose absence threatens the very long-term existence of these organizations. However, several further critical gaps remain in the extant literature. For one thing, there is limited quantitative data systematically measuring either the success or failure rates of Section 8 companies, and particularly in relation to financial constraints. Third, there is an obvious lacuna when it comes to technically informed research studies, precisely in the domain of how digital platforms and financial technologies might help in construction of new fundraising avenues. The research gaps emphasize a need for research into policy reforms, technological interventions, and case-based evidence which would aid the development of sustainable models of non-profit growth.

Case laws

In the matter of *Suraj Mahato v. Department of Science & Technology, Second Appeal No. CIC/MSTCH/A/2023/604366 (CIC Oct. 4, 2024)*, the Central Information Commission again held that public authorities can provide only such information as exists on record; they are not bound to create or interpret information for applicants. Although the case arose out of an RTI request, its rationale has repercussions for Section 8 companies engaged in scientific or charitable objects many are dependent on governmental grants or regulatory clearances. Transparent accreditations of pre-existing documents are the basis of their credibility and fundraising ability, but this ruling brings to light the structural limitation on information disclosure under the RTI Act. For Section 8 companies, this in turn presents an issue they need financial transparency so that donors can come through but are *legally barred* from asking for too much information from any government agency.

In the case of *Mohanram Sastry v. Swadharma Swarajya Sangha, [1995] 83 Comp Cas 272 (Mad) (India)*, members of a Section 25 (Companies Act, 1956) company alleged oppression and mismanagement for alleged failures to convene annual general meetings punctually, improper acceptance of donations, and misappropriation of funds. The downtrend in their claims was accordingly established by the Madras High Court emphasizing that there were no arrests of mere irregularities, absent any punitive prejudice, on oppression under section 397–398 of the *Companies Act, 1956*. The High Court, however, refused to rectify the register of the company since members of charitable or nonprofit companies face *limited remedies* when contrasted with cure provided in case of profit companies. This pronouncement highlights a *structural problem that still exists under Section 8 of the Companies Act, 2013* members of nonprofit companies have, to some extent, less places to go for redress of governance disputes, probably weakening the organization's credibility and thereby possibly harming fundraising.

Conclusion

Exploring the realm of Section 8 companies in India unearths a very complex interplay between regulatory compliance and the urgent need for sustainable fundraising mechanisms. These organizations have been legally created as institutions serving social objectives, wherein their structuring provides safeguards against being otherwise transformed into profit-making organizations, thereby essentially *restricting their ability to seek the usual forms of investment.* Yet these same structural safeguards that maintain their nonprofit sanctity make it awkward for these entities to attract investments. Thus, too much compliance along with less financial reward puts many Section 8 organizations in a paradox that *undermines their sustainability* in the long run.

The study further reiterates that the excessive dependence on donations and CSR allocations leaves the organizations *exposed to changes in donor priorities and corporate giving cycles.* Comparative views from the international nonprofit world indicate that more flexible regulation, coupled with stronger tax incentives and innovative financing structures, would go a long way toward opening up fundraising avenues. While, here in India, the untapped promise of digital platforms, fintech solutions, and hybrid revenue models bring hope for solving the current pressing limitations.

To bridge the gaps, one needs a multi-pronged approach. Policymakers will have to consider reforms to ease compliance and strengthen *fiscal incentives to donors*, whereas the nonprofit leaders should actively seek the *digital space for innovation and increase the diversification of their funding sources*. Investors and philanthropists must also embrace a long-term perspective focused on impact, closely related to the mission orientation of Section 8 entities.

Thus, there are many faces of the fundraising paradox the financial and regulatory, but it also has a much broader dimension that concerns the sustenance of India's entire social-development ecosystem. Enhancing the financial capability of the Section 8 companies will enable them to better fulfil their mandates, generate greater public trust, and foster inclusive sustainable development.

Citations.

- A.R. Lakshmanan (no date) Mohanram Sastry and Others vs Swadharma Swarajya Sangha and Others on 22 February, 1995, Indian Kanoon. Available at: https://indiankanoon.org/doc/669656/.

- Garg, R. (2023) Section 8 of companies act, 2013, iPleaders. Available at: https://blog.ipleaders.in/section-8-of-companies-act-2013/ (Accessed: 17 August 2025).

- Can a section 8 company earn profit? (2025) AURIGA ACCOUNTING PRIVATE LIMITED. Available at: https://aurigaaccounting.in/can-a-section-8-company-earn-profit/ (Accessed: 17 August 2025).

- Which one should you choose: A society, Trust, or Section 8 company? (no date) cleartax. Available at: https://cleartax.in/s/society-trust-section-8-company-comparison (Accessed: 17 August 2025).

- Themefisher and Jananimohan (2024) Understanding section 8 company: Features and benefits, efiletax. Available at: https://www.efiletax.in/blog/section-8-company-a-comprehensive-guide-to-indias-non-profit-organizations/ (Accessed: 17 August 2025).

- (No date) Can section 8 company make profit? - indiafilings. Available at: https://www.indiafilings.com/learn/can-section-8-company-make-profit/ (Accessed: 17 August 2025).