COMPARATIVE ASPECTS OF THE STATUTORY PROVISIONS REGARDING PIERCING OF VEIL

Anshu Priya Patel, ICFAI Law School, The ICFAI University, Dehradun

Dr. Suneel Kumar, Assistant Professor, ICFAI University, Dehradun

ABSTRACT

The statutory provisions pertaining to the idea of piercing the corporate veil in different countries are examined in this research study. Under some situations, a legal notion known as the "piercing of the corporate veil" permits courts to hold directors or shareholders personally accountable for the debts or conduct of the organization.This study aims to provide a comparative analysis of the factors taken into consideration, procedures followed, and outcomes observed in cases involving the piercing of the veil by analyzing the statutory frameworks in various nations, including the United States, the United Kingdom, and other common law and civil law jurisdictions.

Keywords: Piercing the veil, Corporate law, Shareholder liability, Statutory provisions.

Introduction

The concept of the "corporate veil" in both the UK and India refers to the legal distinction between a corporation and its shareholders[1]. This principle protects shareholders from being personally liable for the company's debts and obligations. However, under certain circumstances, courts can "pierce" or "lift" this veil to hold the shareholders personally liable. The statutory provisions and the judicial approach to piercing the corporate veil in the UK and India show both similarities and differences.

UK Corporate Veil

In the UK, the corporate veil doctrine is entrenched in common law and statutory law, particularly under the Companies Act 2006[2]. The Act itself does not explicitly discuss piercing the corporate veil but does establish that a company is a separate legal entity. The UK courts have established grounds for piercing the corporate veil through case law, focusing mainly on scenarios involving fraud, sham or facade, or where the company is merely an agent of its shareholders[3].

Case Studies -

Key cases such as Salomon v. A Salomon & Co Ltd (1897)[4] established the principle of corporate personality, and later cases like Prest v Petrodel Resources Ltd (2013)[5] have affirmed that the veil can only be pierced in exceptional circumstances where there is evidence of impropriety intended to evade the law.

Indian Corporate Veil

In India, the concept of a corporate veil is similarly grounded in the Companies Act, 2013, which recognizes companies as separate legal entities. Indian courts have also developed a

[1]https://www.lawctopus.com/academike/corporate-veil/#:~:text=Corporate%20veil%3A-,A%20legal%20concept%20that%20separates%20the%20personality%20of%20a%20corporation,company's%20debts%20and%20other%20obligations.
[2] https://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/2006/46/notes
[3] https://www.law.cornell.edu/wex/piercing_the_corporate_veil
[4] https://citylawtutors.co.uk/law-journal/lifting-of-the-corporate-veil-and-salomon-v-salomon
[5] https://www.careyolsen.com/insights/briefings/piercing-corporate-veil-new-era-post-prest-v-petrodel

body of case law regarding when the corporate veil can be lifted. Similar to the UK, the reasons include fraud, improper conduct, or where the company acts as an alter ego of its shareholders.

Case Studies -

Indian courts often refer to landmark cases such as Tata Engineering Locomotive Co. Ltd. v State of Bihar & Ors (1964)[6], where the Supreme Court outlined circumstances under which the corporate veil could be pierced. The doctrine is also applied in cases of tax evasion, fraud, or when statutory requirements are ignored.

Comparative Aspects

Similarities:

Statutory Recognition:

Both India and the UK statutorily recognize the concept of the corporate veil within their respective corporate laws[7]. In the UK, the Companies Act 2006 provides the legislative framework, while in India, the Companies Act 2013 governs corporate entities.

1. Legal Framework for Corporate Entity

Both India and the UK have comprehensive laws that establish and govern the status of corporations as separate legal entities. This is the cornerstone of the corporate veil.

UK: The primary statute is the Companies Act 2006, which codifies much of the corporate law in the UK. It explicitly states that a company is a separate legal person, distinct from its shareholders and directors[8]. This separation is fundamental as it allows the company to own property, incur debts, and enter into contracts independently of the individuals associated with it.

India: Similarly, the Companies Act 2013 in India stipulates that a company formed under the

[6] https://www.legalauthority.in/judgement/tata-engineering-and-locomotive-co-ltd-vs-state-of-bihar-and-others-36788
[7] https://www.corpseed.com/knowledge-centre/lifting-of-corporate-veil-under-the-companies-act-2013
[8] https://www.accaglobal.com/content/dam/acca/global/PDF-technical/business-law/rr-125-001.pdf

Act is a distinct legal entity separate from its members[9]. This act is a critical component of corporate law in India and provides the legal basis for the corporate veil, ensuring that the liabilities of the company are its own and not those of its members unless explicitly provided by law.

2. Limited Liability of Shareholders

A key element of the corporate veil is the protection it offers to shareholders, limiting their liability for the debts of the corporation to their investment in the company[10].

UK: The concept of limited liability is a principal feature in the UK's Companies Act. When a company is limited by shares, a shareholder's financial liability is limited to the amount, if any, unpaid on the shares they hold. This provision effectively enforces the corporate veil by preventing creditors of the company from seeking repayment of the company's debts from the shareholders' personal assets.

India: The Companies Act 2013 in India similarly provides for limited liability for the shareholders. The personal assets of the shareholders are protected from corporate liabilities, aligning with the principle that the company is a separate legal entity.

3. Corporate Veil as a Statutory Principle

In both jurisdictions, the concept of the corporate veil is not just a judicial interpretation but a statutory principle embodied in their respective corporate laws.

UK: The incorporation of the corporate veil in statutory law means that courts and regulatory bodies recognize and respect the separateness of the corporate entity in their rulings and enforcement actions, except in cases where the law specifically provides for liability or where judicial exceptions apply (like fraud)[11].

[9] https://www.taxmann.com/post/blog/companies-act-2013#:~:text=3.1%20Meaning%20of%20a%20Company&text=Under%20Law%20a%20company%20is,existing%20law%20of%20a%20country.
[10] https://www.erdem-erdem.av.tr/en/insights/lifting-the-corporate-veil-an-exceptional-concept-of-the-shareholders-limited-liability-principle
[11] https://www.vedantu.com/commerce/corporate-veil-theory

India: Similarly, in India, while the principle is rooted in statutory law, courts have the discretion to pierce the veil in cases of abuse of the corporate form, under certain conditions laid out in various sections of the Companies Act and interpreted in judicial decisions.

4.Protection of Shareholders:

Both jurisdictions primarily use the corporate veil to protect shareholders from the debts and obligations of the corporation[12]. Shareholders are typically liable only to the extent of their investment in share capital.

The protection of shareholders in both India and the UK is a key aspect of corporate governance and is rooted in the broader legal concept of limited liability[13]. This principle is fundamental to corporate law in both jurisdictions, ensuring that shareholders are only financially liable up to the amount of their investment in the company. This means that if a company goes bankrupt or faces legal claims, the personal assets of the shareholders are protected from being used to settle the company's debts. Here are the detailed similarities in how shareholder protection is implemented in both India and the UK:

a. Limited Liability

Definition: In both India and the UK, the concept of limited liability means that the financial risk borne by shareholders is limited to their investment in shares. Shareholders are not personally liable for the company's debts beyond the amount of capital they have contributed.

Statutory Framework: This principle is enshrined in the UK's Companies Act 2006 and in India's Companies Act 2013. Both Acts provide the legal foundation that defines and protects shareholders through the concept of limited liability.

b. Corporate Personality

Separate Legal Entity: Both jurisdictions recognize a corporation as a separate legal entity from its shareholders. This separation is the basis for protecting shareholders' personal assets from

[12] https://www.law.cornell.edu/wex/piercing_the_corporate_veil
[13] https://assets.kpmg.com/content/dam/kpmg/in/pdf/2024/01/corporate-governance-in-india-and-the-uk-a-regulatory-contrast.pdf

corporate liabilities[14].

Legal Precedents: In landmark cases, such as Salomon v. Salomon & Co. Ltd. (1897) in the UK and several High Court and Supreme Court rulings in India, the courts have upheld the principle that a company is a distinct legal entity separate from its shareholders.

c. Role of the Corporate Veil

Protection Tool: The corporate veil acts as a shield protecting shareholders in both countries. It is only in exceptional circumstances, such as fraud or abuse of the corporate form, that this veil might be "pierced" to hold shareholders personally liable[15].

Judicial Consistency: Both Indian and UK courts are generally reluctant to pierce the corporate veil, thereby reinforcing the protection offered to shareholders under normal operating conditions.

d. Regulatory Framework

Compliance and Enforcement: Both countries have regulatory bodies, such as the Companies House in the UK and the Ministry of Corporate Affairs in India, which oversee corporate compliance with laws and regulations. These institutions help ensure that the protections afforded to shareholders are maintained.

Disclosure Requirements: Companies in both India and the UK are required to maintain transparency through regular filings, annual reports, and disclosures of financial statements. These requirements help protect shareholders by ensuring they have access to essential information about the company's performance and risks.

e. Rights and Remedies

Shareholder Rights: Shareholders in both jurisdictions enjoy rights such as voting at general meetings, receiving dividends, and participating in the distribution of assets upon liquidation. These rights are protected by law and facilitate shareholder engagement and protection.

---

[14] https://www.investopedia.com/terms/c/corporation.asp
[15] https://www.law.cornell.edu/wex/piercing_the_corporate_veil

Legal Remedies: Shareholders in both countries have legal remedies available to them if their rights are violated. These include rights to sue for damages, apply for injunctions, and seek other forms of legal redress through the courts.

Piercing the Corporate Veil:

In both countries, the courts have established circumstances under which the corporate veil can be pierced, i.e., looking beyond the legal entity to hold shareholders or directors personally liable. This usually occurs in cases of fraud, misrepresentation, or improper conduct.

"Piercing the corporate veil[16]" refers to a legal decision to treat the rights or liabilities of a corporation as the rights or liabilities of its shareholders or directors. This is typically done when the corporation is used to circumvent the law, perpetrate fraud, or for similar wrongful purposes. Although the basic principle behind piercing the corporate veil is broadly similar in many jurisdictions, including India and the UK, each country has its specific legal doctrines and precedents that influence how this principle is applied.

Legal Basis for Intervention:

Both India and the UK recognize piercing the corporate veil as an exceptional measure, reserved for circumstances where sticking strictly to the separation of the corporation and its members would promote injustice or inequity. This principle is not codified extensively in statutes but has been developed through case law.

Circumstances for Piercing the Veil:

Fraud or Improper Conduct: In both countries, courts have pierced the corporate veil when the company is found to be a façade concealing true facts, thereby being instrumental in fraud or improper conduct. For example, when a company is deliberately interposed to evade legal obligations or to shield a crime[17].

Agency or Sham Companies: If a company is essentially acting as an agent of its shareholders or its parent company, both Indian and UK courts may decide to pierce the veil, especially if

[16] https://www.lexology.com/library/detail.aspx?g=4ff8ebf0-4bca-426e-8273-758140f6d0eb
[17] https://www.moorebarlow.com/blog/the-corporate-veil-an-overview-and-update-from-recent-cases/

the company was created for the sole purpose of shielding the real actors from liability.

Judicial Reluctance and Restraint:

Courts in both jurisdictions treat the piercing of the corporate veil as a remedy of last resort. The general rule remains that a company is a separate legal entity from its shareholders, and this principle is upheld unless clear justification is provided[18]. This judicial restraint underscores the importance of the corporate form and the predictability it offers in commercial relations.

Case Law as Guidance:

Judicial decisions play a crucial role in shaping the contours of when and how the corporate veil can be pierced. In the UK, landmark cases such as Salomon v. A Salomon & Co Ltd (1896) and more recently, Prest v Petrodel Resources Ltd (2013), have set important precedents. Similarly, Indian courts refer to seminal cases like Tata Engineering Locomotive Co. Ltd. v State of Bihar & Others (1964) and others to guide their decisions.

Fraudulent or Improper Conduct:

Both legal systems allow for the corporate veil to be pierced in cases of fraud or improper conduct. This is often linked to the misuse of the corporate form to evade legal obligations or to commit wrongdoing.

When discussing the similarities between India and the UK regarding the treatment of fraudulent or improper conduct in relation to the corporate veil, it's essential to understand how both jurisdictions approach the concept of "piercing the corporate veil." This legal mechanism is invoked to hold directors, shareholders, or the corporation itself accountable for actions that abuse the corporate structure to evade legal obligations, engage in fraud, or commit other wrongful acts.

[18] Dr Edwin C. Mujih, Piercing the Corporate Veil as a Remedy of Last Resort after Prest v Petrodel Resources Ltd: Inching towards Abolition?, https://repository.londonmet.ac.uk/4910/6/Article-on-veil-piercing-in-Prest-case.pdf

Legal Basis for Piercing the Corporate Veil:

UK: The UK courts have established through case law that the corporate veil can be pierced when a company is used as a façade to conceal true facts or evade legal obligations. Landmark cases such as Salomon v. A Salomon & Co Ltd laid the foundational principles, but later cases like Prest v. Petrodel Resources Ltd further clarified that the veil can only be pierced to prevent misuse of corporate legal personality for fraud or similar improper conduct.

India: Similarly, Indian courts also follow the principle that the corporate structure should not be misused for wrongful purposes[19]. In cases like Vodafone International Holdings B.V. vs Union of India, the Indian judiciary has demonstrated its willingness to look beyond the corporate structure to address matters involving tax evasion or circumvention of statutory provisions.

Criteria for Action:

Both jurisdictions require clear evidence of intent to defraud or evade lawful obligations before considering piercing the corporate veil. The courts look for direct involvement or misuse by the company's controllers (directors or shareholders) in the wrongful acts.

The action of piercing the veil is generally considered a last resort, used sparingly and only when no other legal remedy adequately addresses the misconduct.

Judicial Discretion:

In both the UK and India, the decision to pierce the corporate veil rests on judicial discretion, guided by precedents and the specific circumstances of the case. The courts maintain a high threshold for evidence, ensuring that the corporate veil is pierced only in clear cases of abuse.

Protection Against Fraud and Misuse:

Both legal systems aim to balance the benefits of limited liability (which promotes entrepreneurship and investment) against the need to protect public interest and ensure fair business practices. This is evident in their approach to handling cases of fraud or improper

[19] https://articles.manupatra.com/article-details/Pardey-ke-Peechey-kya-hai-A-Comprehensive-Analysis-of-the-Evolution-of-the-Corporate-Veil-Doctrine-in-India

conduct where they ensure that corporate entities are not used as instruments to commit wrongdoing.

Enforcement and Remedial Measures:

Once the decision to pierce the corporate veil is made, both jurisdictions allow for remedial measures that may include holding individuals personally liable for debts or obligations of the corporation, reversing transactions, or imposing financial penalties[20].

Differences:

1. Statutory Explicitness:

The UK's Companies Act 2006 doesn't explicitly state conditions under which the corporate veil can be pierced, relying more on judicial precedents. The Indian Companies Act, 2013, while also not explicit, is often interpreted in conjunction with judicial precedents that are somewhat more direct about the circumstances involving statutory obligations and misconduct[21].

UK: Case Law-Driven Approach

In the UK, the principles governing the corporate veil and its exceptions are not explicitly outlined in statutes. Instead, they have been primarily developed through case law. The UK legal system, being a common law system, relies heavily on judicial decisions to set precedents that guide future rulings.

Case Law Dominance: Key rulings such as Salomon v. A Salomon & Co. Ltd (1897) established the basic principle of corporate personality and limited liability. Later cases, such as Gilford Motor Co Ltd v Horne (1933) and Prest v Petrodel Resources Ltd (2013), further explored conditions under which the veil might be pierced, focusing on misuse of the corporate form to avoid legal obligations or hide wrongdoing.

Limited Statutory Guidance: The Companies Act 2006, which is the primary statute governing corporate affairs in the UK, does not provide detailed provisions on when and how the

[20] https://www.baylor.edu/content/services/document.php/187922.pdf
[21] https://www.livelaw.in/know-the-law/lifting-or-piercing-of-corporate-veil-216786

corporate veil can be pierced. Instead, it leaves much of the interpretation and application to judicial discretion.

India: Combination of Statutory and Judicial Approaches

Unlike the UK, India’s approach to the corporate veil includes both statutory provisions and judicial interpretations. The Indian Companies Act, 2013, contains explicit provisions that address fraud and improper conduct, in addition to the courts' powers to pierce the corporate veil.

Statutory Provisions: The Indian Companies Act, 2013, incorporates specific sections that deal with fraud and misrepresentation. For instance, Sections 447 and 448 provide definitions and punishments for fraud, significantly influencing how courts handle cases of improper conduct involving corporations.

Judicial Interpretation: Indian courts also rely on judicial precedents for guidance but are additionally influenced by explicit statutory mandates. Cases such as Vodafone International Holdings B.V. vs Union of India illustrate how Indian courts interpret these statutes alongside common law principles to make decisions on piercing the corporate veil[22].

Distinctive Implications

Clarity and Predictability: The UK’s reliance on case law can sometimes lead to less predictability in how the corporate veil principles are applied, as it heavily depends on the specific circumstances of each case and judicial interpretation[23]. In contrast, the explicit statutory provisions in India provide clearer guidelines which can offer more predictability.

Flexibility vs. Rigidity: The UK's case law approach allows for a high degree of flexibility, enabling courts to adapt to the specifics of each case without being strictly bound by statute. Meanwhile, India’s statutory approach, while clear, can sometimes be rigid, limiting judges' ability to move beyond the explicit provisions of the law.

[22] https://indiankanoon.org/doc/115852355/
[23] Schall, Prof. Dr., Alexander, The New Law of Piercing the Corporate Veil in the UK (2016). ECFR, 549–574, 2016, Available at SSRN: https://ssrn.com/abstract=3538410

2. Judicial Interpretation:

UK courts are generally considered to have a more conservative approach towards piercing the corporate veil, focusing strongly on the principle of legality. Indian courts, while also conservative, sometimes adopt a more flexible approach to address social and economic injustices.

Differences in Judicial Interpretation

Conservatism versus Flexibility:

UK: UK courts are traditionally more conservative in piercing the corporate veil. The approach is very much based on strict legal principles established through precedent. The landmark case Salomon v. A Salomon & Co Ltd has set a strong precedent for corporate legal personality, and later cases have reiterated that the veil should only be pierced in exceptional circumstances. The judgment in Prest v. Petrodel Resources Ltd reaffirmed this by stating that the veil can only be pierced when a person is under an existing legal obligation or liability or subject to an existing restriction which he deliberately evades or whose enforcement he deliberately frustrates by interposing a company under his control.

India: Indian courts, on the other hand, have been more flexible and broad in their approach to piercing the corporate veil. While they respect the principle of corporate separateness, they are also guided by the broader principles of 'substantial justice'. Indian courts tend to consider the context and the consequences of corporate actions more expansively, as seen in cases like State of U.P. v. Renusagar Power Co. and others where courts have taken into account socio-economic objectives.

Role of Public Interest:

UK: Public interest plays a role in judicial decisions, but UK courts are more likely to emphasize the protection of commercial certainty and the interests of creditors and shareholders[24].

India: Public interest has a more pronounced influence in Indian judicial reasoning regarding

[24] https://www.jstor.org/stable/24872195

the corporate veil. Indian courts are known to consider the impact of corporate behavior on society at large, potentially leading to a broader application of principles when deciding whether to pierce the veil.

Statutory versus Case Law Influence:

UK: The UK relies heavily on case law to guide judicial interpretation. Statutory interventions are less frequent and typically more targeted. The Companies Act 2006 provides the legislative framework but leaves a lot of room for judicial discretion.

India: While also relying on case law, Indian judicial interpretation is more frequently influenced by statutory provisions, with the Companies Act 2013 providing explicit scenarios under which corporate separateness can be disregarded. This leads to a more codified approach compared to the UK.

Scope and Extent of Judicial Intervention:

UK: Judicial intervention is generally more restrained, with a clear preference for resolving issues within the framework of existing legal principles without extending those boundaries unless absolutely necessary.

India: The Indian judiciary often takes a more interventionist approach, especially when it feels that doing so is necessary to achieve justice or prevent misuse of the corporate form. This can sometimes lead to more unpredictable outcomes.

CONCLUSION

India and the UK, the statutory recognition of the corporate veil provides a foundational legal principle that influences a wide range of corporate activities, from daily operations to the strategic structuring of businesses. It offers predictability and security for investors and shareholders, ensuring that their risk is limited and calculable, and underpins the broader economic system that relies on corporate structures to function efficiently and safely.

The similarity in the protection of shareholders in India and the UK reflects their shared legal heritage and commitment to upholding the principles of corporate governance and limited liability. While there are variations in regulatory practices and legal interpretations, the fundamental goal in both countries is to protect shareholders from the undue financial risk associated with corporate operations, thereby promoting investment and economic growth.

both India and the UK share fundamental principles regarding when it is appropriate to pierce the corporate veil, the specific applications and thresholds can differ, reflecting broader legal and cultural differences in how corporate law is interpreted and applied in each jurisdiction.

The UK and India share foundational legal principles regarding the use of corporate structures and the circumstances under which those structures can be disregarded in the interest of justice. In both countries, the corporate veil serves as a protective mechanism for shareholders but is not an absolute shield against accountability, especially in cases involving fraudulent or improper conduct. Both legal frameworks are equipped to address these abuses effectively, ensuring that the corporate form cannot be misused to circumvent legal responsibilities or commit fraud. This alignment in principles underscores the common legal heritage and shared commitment to fair and equitable business practices.

The differences in judicial interpretation between India and the UK primarily reflect their respective legal cultures and priorities. The UK's approach is more conservative and focused on maintaining commercial stability and predictability, while India's approach is more flexible, often tailored towards achieving justice and addressing broader societal impacts. These differences underline the distinct legal philosophies and societal values that influence how corporate law is applied in each country.

REFERENCES:

1. https://www.lawctopus.com/academike/corporate-veil/#:~:text=Corporate%20veil%3A-,A%20legal%20concept%20that%20separates%20the%20personality%20of%20a%20corporation,company's%20debts%20and%20other%20obligations.
2. https://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/2006/46/notes
3. https://www.law.cornell.edu/wex/piercing_the_corporate_veil
4. https://citylawtutors.co.uk/law-journal/lifting-of-the-corporate-veil-and-salomon-v-salomon
5. https://www.careyolsen.com/insights/briefings/piercing-corporate-veil-new-era-post-prest-v-petrodel
6. https://www.legalauthority.in/judgement/tata-engineering-and-locomotive-co-ltd-vs-state-of-bihar-and-others-36788
7. https://www.corpseed.com/knowledge-centre/lifting-of-corporate-veil-under-the-companies-act-2013
8. https://www.accaglobal.com/content/dam/acca/global/PDF-technical/business-law/rr-125-001.pdf
9. https://www.taxmann.com/post/blog/companies-act-
10. https://www.erdem-erdem.av.tr/en/insights/lifting-the-corporate-veil-an-exceptional-concept-of-the-shareholders-limited-liability-principle
11. https://www.vedantu.com/commerce/corporate-veil-theory
12. https://www.law.cornell.edu/wex/piercing_the_corporate_veil
13. https://assets.kpmg.com/content/dam/kpmg/in/pdf/2024/01/corporate-governance-in-india-and-the-uk-a-regulatory-contrast.pdf

14. https://www.investopedia.com/terms/c/corporation.asp

15. https://www.law.cornell.edu/wex/piercing_the_corporate_veil

16. https://www.lexology.com/library/detail.aspx?g=4ff8ebf0-4bca-426e-8273-758140f6d0eb

17. https://www.moorebarlow.com/blog/the-corporate-veil-an-overview-and-update-from-recent-cases/

18. Dr Edwin C. Mujih, "Piercing the Corporate Veil as a Remedy of Last Resort after Prest v Petrodel Resources Ltd: Inching towards Abolition?" https://repository.londonmet.ac.uk/4910/6/Article-on-veil-piercing-in-Prest-case.pdf

19. https://articles.manupatra.com/article-details/Pardey-ke-Peechey-kya-hai-A-Comprehensive-Analysis-of-the-Evolution-of-the-Corporate-Veil-Doctrine-in-India

20. https://www.baylor.edu/content/services/document.php/187922.pdf

21. https://www.livelaw.in/know-the-law/lifting-or-piercing-of-corporate-veil-216786

22. https://indiankanoon.org/doc/115852355/

23. Schall, Prof. Dr., "Alexander, The New Law of Piercing the Corporate Veil in the UK (2016)." ECFR, 549–574, 2016, (Available at SSRN: https://ssrn.com/abstract=3538410).

24. https://www.jstor.org/stable/24872195