
AN ANALYSIS OF THE ROLE AND ACCOUNTABILITY OF INDEPENDENT DIRECTORS UNDER THE COMPANY LAW, 2013

V R Kalyani, BA LLB (H), VELS University of Science, Technology and Advanced
Studies, India

ABSTRACT

Independent directors are statutorily mandated cornerstones of corporate governance in India, tasked with providing objective oversight, safeguarding minority shareholder interests, and enhancing institutional credibility. Despite a robust legal framework codified in the Companies Act, 2013, and SEBI's Listing Obligations and Disclosure Requirements (LODR) Regulations, a critical gap exists between their intended role and their actual effectiveness. This report examines this paradox, detailing the legal and fiduciary duties of independent directors while critically analyzing the systemic challenges—such as promoter dominance, information asymmetry, and ambiguous liability standards—that render them, at times, ineffective. Through an in-depth analysis of high-profile corporate scandals like Satyam, IL&FS, and Yes Bank, the report demonstrates how these challenges have manifested as catastrophic governance failures. It concludes by proposing a path forward, evaluating recent regulatory reforms and advocating for a shift from a purely rules-based compliance culture to one rooted in integrity and proactive accountability.

Keywords: Role, Accountability of Independent Directors, Company Law

Introduction

The modern corporation, a complex nexus of contractual relationships, necessitates a sophisticated governance structure to balance the interests of disparate stakeholders. Independent directors (IDs) have emerged globally as a key mechanism to achieve this balance, serving as a check on executive overreach and protecting the interests of non-controlling shareholders. Their significance has been underscored by various global corporate scandals, prompting nations to reevaluate and strengthen their governance frameworks. In India, a series of corporate scandals in the early 2000s, including the Satyam scandal, catalyzed a major overhaul of corporate law, culminating in the Companies Act, 2013, which formalized and significantly elevated the role of IDs. This report provides a comprehensive, expert analysis of this role, examining the legal mandate, the practical challenges, the lessons from historical failures, and the path toward a more accountable governance regime.

I. The Statutory and Fiduciary Role of Independent Directors

The legal framework governing the appointment, qualifications, and responsibilities of independent directors in India is extensive and multi-layered, drawing authority from both the Companies Act, 2013, and the more stringent SEBI (Listing Obligations and Disclosure Requirements) Regulations, 2015.

1.1. Legal and Regulatory Foundation

The foundation for independent directorship in India is laid out in the Companies Act, 2013. Section 149 of the Act mandates the appointment of independent directors for public companies that meet certain financial thresholds: those with a paid-up share capital of Rs. 10 crore or more, a turnover of Rs. 100 crore or more, or outstanding loans, debentures, and deposits exceeding Rs. 50 crore. The appointment process for these directors is subject to shareholder approval and is intended to be independent of company management, with selection often facilitated through a data bank maintained by institutions like the Indian Institute of Corporate Affairs (IICA).

For companies listed on a stock exchange, the Securities and Exchange Board of India (SEBI) imposes additional, more rigorous regulations through its LODR Regulations, 2015. These rules prescribe a specific board composition, requiring that at least one-third of the board

members be independent directors. This proportion increases to at least half if the listed entity does not have a regular non-executive chairperson. The SEBI regulations, therefore, function as a more prescriptive and robust layer of governance, aiming to ensure higher standards of independence and oversight in publicly traded companies.

1.2. The Definition and Criteria for Independence

The core principle of an independent director is that they must be free from any relationship that could compromise their objective judgment. Both the Companies Act and SEBI regulations provide a clear and detailed definition of independence. An independent director is defined as a non-executive director—one who is not a managing director, a whole-time director, or a nominee director—who possesses the necessary integrity and expertise. They must not have or have had any significant financial or pecuniary relationship with the company, its holding, subsidiary, or associate companies, or their promoters and directors, other than their remuneration as a director.

A particularly crucial provision under SEBI's Regulation 16(1)(b)(viii) is the restriction on "cross-holding of directorships". This rule prohibits a director from being an independent director in a listed company if a non-independent director from that company serves as an independent director in another company where the first person is a non-independent director. This intricate provision is a direct and specific attempt by regulators to prevent mutual or reciprocal appointment arrangements that could create conflicts of interest and compromise the director's objectivity. It serves as a strong signal of the regulatory intent to move beyond a simplistic definition of independence to one that addresses the subtle and informal networks that can undermine corporate governance.

1.3. Duties, Responsibilities, and Code of Conduct

Independent directors are not merely figureheads; they are expected to be proactive and engaged in the company's affairs. Their duties and professional conduct are detailed in the Companies Act, including the "Code for Independent Directors" (Schedule IV). This code mandates that they uphold the highest ethical standards, act objectively and constructively, and exercise their responsibilities in a bona fide manner for the benefit of the company.

A comprehensive review of their mandated duties reveals a broad mandate of oversight and

protection. Independent directors are required to bring an independent judgment to board deliberations on issues of strategy, performance, risk management, and key appointments. They are also tasked with bringing an objective view to the evaluation of the performance of the board and management. Furthermore, they must scrutinize the integrity of financial information, ensure robust financial controls are in place, and safeguard the interests of all stakeholders, especially minority shareholders. To fulfill these duties, they are empowered to seek professional advice from outside experts at the company's expense and must strive to attend all board and committee meetings. The code also places a professional obligation on them to immediately inform the board if circumstances arise that may cause them to lose their independence.

1.4. The Mandate in Practice: Board Committees

The influence of independent directors is most pronounced in their roles within key board committees, which are integral to a company's governance structure. Both the Companies Act and SEBI regulations prescribe specific independent director representation on these committees to ensure unbiased decision-making.

The **Nomination and Remuneration Committee (NRC)**, responsible for director appointments and remuneration policies, must consist of at least 50% independent directors. This percentage is increased to two-thirds for companies with outstanding SR equity shares. Similarly, the **Audit Committee (AC)**, a lynchpin of financial oversight, is required to have a minimum of two-thirds of its members as independent directors, with the chairperson also being an independent director. The AC's scope has evolved significantly, encompassing not only the vetting of financial statements and internal/external audits but also broader risk management responsibilities. A crucial addition to the regulations is the requirement that all related party transactions (RPTs) must be approved by the independent directors on the Audit Committee, a measure explicitly designed to prevent self-dealing and protect minority shareholder interests.

The central role of independent directors in these committees underscores a fundamental principle of modern corporate governance: their ability to influence critical decisions and provide a check on managerial and promoter power is directly tied to their presence and authority within these specialized sub-committees.

II. Systemic Challenges to Independence

Despite a comprehensive legal framework, the effectiveness of independent directors in India is often limited by deep-seated systemic challenges that go beyond mere compliance with statutory rules.

2.1. The Paradox of Promoter Dominance

India's corporate landscape is fundamentally distinct from the Anglo-Saxon model that inspired its governance reforms. Whereas Western models were developed to address the "agency problem" between management and dispersed shareholders, India's reality is a "Type II agency problem," where power is concentrated in the hands of promoter groups or families. These controlling shareholders can exert significant influence over the board, even when they do not hold an executive position. This creates a fundamental paradox: the very individuals meant to be independent watchdogs are appointed by and expected to oversee powerful entities who, in many cases, view shareholder approval as a mere formality.

This dynamic can reduce independent directors to symbolic roles rather than genuine supervisors. The pressure to align with the interests of the dominant promoter can be intense, as non-compliance risks being marginalized on the board or not being reappointed. This structural reality creates a persistent tension between the legal mandate for independence and the practical boardroom dynamics that prioritize allegiance over objectivity.

2.2. The Problem of Information Asymmetry

An independent director's ability to act as an effective fiduciary safeguard is critically dependent on their access to accurate, timely, and unbiased information. However, they are often at a significant disadvantage. They must rely on reports provided by management, internal audit, or external auditors who are themselves appointed by the board. This dependence creates a dangerous asymmetry of information, limiting their capacity to "critically assess financial statements" or "identify anomalies early". The legal provision allowing IDs to seek independent professional advice at the company's expense is a partial solution, but without an independent budget, the process may be cumbersome and subject to board approval, delaying or discouraging necessary inquiries. The core issue is that independent directors, by the nature of their non-executive role, lack the day-to-day operational knowledge to question management

effectively. This reliance on information filtered through internal channels makes them particularly vulnerable to sophisticated, well-concealed fraud, as seen in many high-profile scandals.

2.3. Ambiguous and Vexatious Liability Standards

Section 149(12) of the Companies Act, 2013, was designed to protect independent directors from vicarious liability, limiting their culpability to acts of omission or commission that occurred with their "knowledge, attributable through Board processes, and with his consent or connivance or where he had not acted diligently". While the intent was to shield them from undue risk, the law's application has been inconsistent.

The problem arises from the varying judicial interpretations of key terms like "due diligence," "knowledge," and "connivance". This ambiguity creates legal uncertainty, making it difficult for IDs to understand their precise level of legal exposure. This inconsistent application of the law has a demonstrable chilling effect, discouraging qualified and risk-averse professionals from accepting independent director roles. The concern is that this legal vagueness can deter the very talent needed to strengthen corporate boards, leaving a vacuum that is filled by less-qualified individuals who may be more susceptible to influence and less likely to challenge the status quo.

2.4. A Competence and Tenure Deficit

Despite legal requirements for IDs to possess appropriate skills and experience, a competence deficit can arise, particularly in complex sectors. For instance, the case of an audit committee (AC) member who was a retired air marshal and another a physiotherapist highlights a clear gap in the financial expertise necessary to fulfill the responsibilities of the AC. The legal framework may be sufficient for a director's post, but it may not be adequate for a position on a critical committee like the AC, which requires deep financial literacy to vet complex transactions and scrutinize financial statements.

Furthermore, the average tenure of independent directors in India is relatively short compared to executive directors. This creates a constant cycle of replacement and retraining, as new IDs must familiarize themselves with the company's business model and industry. This short tenure, coupled with the threat of non-reeappointment, can limit a director's effectiveness and their

willingness to be a "bothersome" dissenting voice in the boardroom. The lack of institutional memory and the time required for a new ID to gain a comprehensive understanding of the company's risks and strategies can significantly impede their oversight capabilities.

III. The Case for Accountability: Lessons from Corporate Scandals

The theoretical challenges to independent directorship are best understood through the lens of real-world corporate scandals, where the failure of governance mechanisms had catastrophic consequences for stakeholders and the broader economy.

3.1. The Satyam Scandal

The Satyam scandal, which emerged in 2009, was a classic case of sophisticated accounting fraud masterminded by the company's founder, B. Ramalinga Raju. For years, the company's accounts were falsified to show fictitious profits and assets, with money siphoned out through "salary payments" to non-existent employees. Despite a prominent board with a number of well-known independent directors, the elaborate fraud went undetected for several years.

The key takeaway from the Satyam case is not that the IDs were necessarily active participants in the criminal conspiracy, but that they failed in their fundamental duty of oversight. A US court decision regarding the Satyam IDs found them more likely to be "victims of a sophisticated fraud themselves rather than its perpetrators," which suggests they were duped by an intricate internal scheme. This distinction highlights a critical question: what level of due diligence is expected of an independent director in the face of a deliberate, well-concealed conspiracy to deceive the board? The scandal underscored the limitations of relying on an ID's subjective judgment and the need for more objective, rules-based safeguards.

3.2. The IL&FS and DHFL Crises

The IL&FS and DHFL crises involved systemic financial mismanagement and large-scale fraud, where funds were embezzled through a "complex web" of fictitious loans and shell companies. The investigations by the Serious Fraud Investigation Office (SFIO) and other agencies revealed a more troubling situation than in Satyam. The SFIO's chargesheets alleged "connivance" between the top management, auditors, and independent directors. The government even took the unprecedented step of ordering the recovery of commissions from former IDs, signifying a more direct regulatory action.

These cases represent a shift in the regulatory and judicial response to governance failures. The allegations of IDs forming a "coterie" with the management and auditors, as seen in the DHFL case, suggest a fundamental breakdown of the

"independence" principle itself, moving from passive negligence to active complicity. The government's action to recover funds from former IDs underscores that relying on a claim of "not being involved in daily operations" is no longer a valid defense when the failures are systemic and indicative of a lack of diligence in core fiduciary duties.

3.3. The Yes Bank Crisis

The downfall of Yes Bank was a result of aggressive lending to high-risk borrowers and a breakdown of internal controls under its founder and former CEO. The bank's books masked mounting non-performing assets (NPAs) through aggressive accounting practices, a situation that the board and its committees failed to address. An independent director's resignation, citing "governance failures," publicly signaled the board's inability to challenge the bank's leadership and risk-taking behavior.

The Yes Bank crisis demonstrates the failure of independent directors to perform their core duty of bringing an objective perspective and challenging management, particularly on issues of strategy and risk management. The fact that the regulator (RBI) had to step in and supersede the board indicates that the internal governance mechanisms, which included IDs, had become ceremonial and ineffective.

Case	Nature of Fraud/Failure	Role/Failure of Independent Directors	Regulatory/Judicial Aftermath
Satyam	Sophisticated accounting fraud, falsified profits, non-existent assets and cash.	Failed to detect a well-concealed fraud; deemed by a US court to be more "victims" than perpetrators.	Founder convicted and sentenced; Indian arm of auditor fined and barred; government superseded the board and appointed new directors.
IL&FS & DHFL	Systemic financial mismanagement, embezzlement via fictitious loans, and a	Alleged "connivance" with management and auditors; failure to check aggressive	SFIO chargesheets against IDs; government ordered recovery of managerial

Case	Nature of Fraud/Failure	Role/Failure of Independent Directors	Regulatory/Judicial Aftermath
	complex web of shell companies.	lending and financial misrepresentation.	remuneration and commissions from former directors.
Yes Bank	Weak internal controls, aggressive lending to high-risk borrowers, and masking of non-performing assets (NPAs).	Failure to check management's aggressive strategies and challenge accounting practices; one ID resigned citing "governance failures."	RBI intervened, curtailed the CEO's tenure, and ultimately superseded the board.

IV. Proposals for Enhanced Accountability: Reforming Law and Practice

The lessons from India's corporate scandals have not gone unnoticed by regulators. The response has been a series of landmark reforms and a growing call for a shift in corporate culture to empower independent directors.

4.1. Landmark Regulatory Reforms

A major push for reform came from the **Kotak Committee**, established by SEBI in 2017 to address corporate governance concerns. The committee's recommendations sought to enhance board independence and curb promoter dominance. Key proposals included the mandatory separation of the roles of Chairperson and Managing Director/CEO, a significant move to prevent a single individual from wielding both operational and board-level authority. The committee also proposed stricter eligibility criteria to exclude individuals from the promoter group from being appointed as IDs and to reduce the maximum number of directorships a person can hold to seven. It also recommended making Directors and Officers (D&O) insurance mandatory for the top 500 listed companies.

Subsequent to these recommendations, **SEBI's 2021 amendments** further strengthened the framework, giving shareholders a more direct say in the appointment and removal of IDs through a resolution. The regulations also introduced a "cooling-off period" for IDs transitioning to executive roles, preventing a potential misuse of the position. The composition of the Nomination and Remuneration Committee was made more robust by mandating that two-thirds of its members be independent directors.

4.2. Strengthening Boardroom Dynamics

Beyond legal amendments, a fundamental shift in boardroom dynamics is necessary. The SEBI chief's call for independent directors to be treated as "stewards of accountability" rather than "friendly critics" is a pivotal conceptual change. This paradigm shift requires moving beyond a "check-the-box" compliance mentality to one that fosters a culture of integrity

and proactive governance. To facilitate this, boards must demand more than mere PDF reports from management. Independent directors should have access to "real-time dashboards" that provide actionable insights and track potential risks, such as high employee turnover or a surge in whistleblower complaints, before they become public issues. This empowers IDs with the information they need to challenge assumptions and fulfill their fiduciary duties proactively. Furthermore, providing independent directors with a dedicated budget and the authority to seek legal or financial counsel without prior board approval would directly address the problem of information asymmetry, giving them the tools to conduct independent due diligence.

4.3. The Role of Directors and Officers (D&O) Insurance

Directors and Officers (D&O) insurance is a critical risk-management tool that protects directors from personal financial loss due to lawsuits and regulatory actions. The Kotak Committee's recommendation to make D&O insurance mandatory for top companies is a powerful lever for accountability. This measure is a double-edged sword for corporate governance. Firstly, it can attract and retain high-quality talent, as it mitigates the personal financial risk that might otherwise deter qualified professionals from accepting an ID role, especially given the ambiguous liability standards. Secondly, and more importantly, it introduces a market-based mechanism for accountability. Insurance providers, to manage their own risk, will require companies to demonstrate robust governance practices. They may, for instance, demand evidence of a functional audit committee, independent oversight, and clear internal controls before underwriting a policy. By linking insurance coverage to diligence, D&O insurance can act as an external enforcer of good governance.

4.4. A Proactive Approach to Governance

To ensure independent directors are genuinely effective, their development and support must be institutionalized. This involves:

- **Mandatory Familiarization and Continuous Learning:** Companies are already required to conduct familiarization programs for IDs. These programs must be more robust and ongoing, not limited to a one-time induction, to ensure directors are up-to-date on new and emerging risks like cybersecurity, technology, and ESG.
- **Whistleblower Protection:** A functional vigil mechanism is crucial, as it provides independent directors with a channel to receive information about unethical behavior, fraud, or code of conduct violations that management may be concealing. Robust whistleblower protections can provide IDs with the critical information they need to intervene before a crisis erupts.

Recommendation Source	Key Recommendation	Rationale	Implementation Status
Kotak Committee Report	Separation of Chairperson and MD/CEO roles.	To reduce promoter dominance and create a clear division of authority and oversight.	Implemented for top listed entities.
Kotak Committee & SEBI	Reduced directorship limits to seven.	To ensure directors can dedicate sufficient time and attention to their professional obligations.	Implemented as a regulation.
Kotak Committee Report	Mandatory D&O Insurance for top 500 companies.	To attract and retain high-quality talent and incentivize robust governance practices.	Proposal made, status pending.
SEBI Amendments	Shareholder approval for IDs via special resolution.	To provide more power to shareholders in the appointment and removal of independent directors.	Implemented as a regulation.
SEBI Amendments	2/3rd ID composition for Nomination & Remuneration and Audit Committees.	To strengthen the independence and objectivity of key board committees.	Implemented as a regulation.

V. A Global Comparative Analysis

Placing India's governance model in an international context reveals its unique challenges and the rationale behind its rules-based approach.

5.1. *India vs. The West*

A comparison of Indian corporate governance with that of the US and UK highlights a key difference in their foundational structure. While all three jurisdictions mandate the appointment of independent directors, the numbers differ significantly. The US, with its dispersed ownership system, requires a majority (over 50%) of the board to be independent. In contrast, India's Companies Act requires only a minimum of one-third. While this number is higher for certain listed companies under SEBI's regulations, it still reflects a different philosophical approach.

The reason for this divergence lies in the ownership patterns. The US and UK models were designed to address the "agency problem" of a dispersed ownership structure, where passive shareholders need protection from an all-powerful management. India's concentrated ownership model, however, faces a different type of agency problem: protecting minority shareholders from a powerful, controlling promoter group. This structural difference explains why India's regulations have become increasingly prescriptive and rules-based, focusing on preventing specific issues like RPTs and cross-directorships, which are common in promoter-driven environments.

5.2. *A "Principles-Based" Approach vs. a "Rules-Based" Approach*

The UK's governance framework is famously "principles-based," providing broad guidelines and relying on companies to "comply or explain". This approach assumes a certain level of maturity and a corporate culture that values integrity over mere compliance. In contrast, the US and India have adopted a more "rules-based" approach, which provides explicit and detailed regulations with clear penalties for non-compliance.

India's choice to adopt a rules-based model is a necessary response to its unique ownership structure and a history of corporate malfeasance. While this approach can sometimes lead to a "check-the-box" mentality, the alternative—a more ambiguous, principles-based framework—would likely be ineffective without a fundamental cultural shift and a more robust enforcement regime. The challenge for Indian regulators is to find a way to make the rules-based system

more effective without stifling a company's ability to innovate and respond to new governance challenges, such as those related to technology and ESG reporting.

Country	Ownership Structure	Mandate	Key Regulatory Acts
India	Concentrated/Family-Controlled	At least 1/3 of the board for public companies; at least 1/2 for certain listed companies with promoter/executive chairman.	Companies Act, 2013; SEBI (LODR) Regulations, 2015.
USA	Dispersed	A majority (over 50%) of board members must be independent for listed companies.	Sarbanes-Oxley Act of 2002; NYSE and Nasdaq listing standards.
UK	Dispersed	At least half the board (recommended by the UK Corporate Governance Code).	UK Corporate Governance Code (principles-based).

Conclusion: Beyond Compliance, Towards a Culture of Integrity

The legal framework for independent directors in India has evolved significantly in response to a history of corporate governance failures, transforming a symbolic position into a statutorily mandated fiduciary role. However, the evidence from recent corporate scandals demonstrates a persistent gap between the law's intent and its practical application. The fundamental cause of this gap lies in the inherent friction between a Western-style, rules-based governance model and India's reality of concentrated, promoter-led businesses. The "Type II agency problem" of protecting minority shareholders from a controlling promoter group is not fully addressed by laws designed for a dispersed ownership environment.

True accountability for independent directors will not be achieved merely by adding more rules or increasing penalties. The path forward requires a fundamental cultural transformation where integrity and ethical conduct are valued over mere compliance. Independent directors must be empowered with independent access to information, protected by robust whistleblower mechanisms, and selected based on a genuine need for their expertise and independent judgment. The call from the SEBI chief to view independent directors as "stewards of

accountability" is a pivotal conceptual step, but it must be supported by practical measures that empower them with the tools and authority to act decisively. Only when the spirit of independence is valued as much as its legal form can these professionals truly transition from being ceremonial "paper tigers" to the genuine fiduciary watchdogs India's dynamic economy needs.

REFERENCES

1. Independent Directors: US UK India & UAE Compared - Isam Kabir, <https://isamkabir.com/how-different-countries-define-and-use-independent-directors-us-uk-india-uae-compared/>
2. Role of Independent Directors | LawTeacher.net, <https://www.lawteacher.net/free-law-essays/business-law/role-of-the-independent-directors.php>
3. Corporate Governance: Are Independent Directors in India Truly Independent? - Deccan Herald, <https://www.deccanherald.com/opinion/independent-or-just-in-name-3546463>
4. PROVISIONS RELATING TO INDEPENDENT DIRECTOR UNDER ..., <https://www.taxtmi.com/article/detailed?id=12240>
5. Independent Directors in India and USA | PDF | Board Of Directors | Corporate Governance, <https://www.scribd.com/document/407773414/Independent-Directors-in-India-and-USA-2-1>
6. Section 150. Manner of selection of independent directors and maintenance of databank of independent directors | Companies Act Integrated Ready Reckoner|Companies Act 2013|CAIRR, <https://ca2013.com/150-manner-of-selection-of-independent-directors-and-maintenance-of-databank-of-independent-directors/>
7. Schedule IV [See section 149(8)] CODE FOR INDEPENDENT DIRECTORS - Companies Act Integrated Ready Reckoner, <https://ca2013.com/wp-content/uploads/2015/07/Schedule4.pdf>
8. PROVISIONS RELATING TO INDEPENDENT DIRECTOR UNDER SEBI (LODR) REGULATIONS, 2015 | TaxTMI, <https://www.taxtmi.com/article/detailed?id=9706>
9. Understanding-Regulation-of-SEBI-LODR-A-Googly-for-Independent-Directors, <https://www.legalmantra.net/blog-detail/Understanding-Regulation-of-SEBI-LODR-A-Googly-for-Independent-Directors>
10. Independent Directors- Applicability, Roles And Duties - ClearTax, <https://cleartax.in/s/independent-directors-applicability-roles-and-duties>
11. SEBI revamps norms for Independent Directors appointment & removal - Enterslice, <https://enterslice.com/learning/sebi-revamps-norms-for-independent-directors-appointment-removal/>
12. Efficiency through Expertise: Reforming Independent Directors for Better Corporate Governance - NLUJ LAW REVIEW, <https://nlujlawreview.in/banking-and-finance-law/elementor-841/>

13. From Promoter Power to Boardroom Responsibility: Dissecting SEBI's RPT Overhaul, <https://www.tcclr.com/post/from-promoter-power-to-boardroom-responsibility-dissecting-sebi-s-rpt-overhaul>
14. A Critical Analysis of the Relationship between Corporate Ownership and Governance - Scholarship Repository, <https://repository.nls.ac.in/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1061&context=nlsblr>
15. Kotak Committee Report: India's Recognition of Its Unique Corporate Governance Problem, <https://www.irccl.in/post/kotak-committee-report-india-s-recognition-of-its-unique-corporate-governance-problem>
16. Independent directors and controlling shareholders around the world, https://www.ecgi.global/sites/default/files/working_papers/documents/ssrn-id2443786.pdf
17. Independent Directors in India: Guardians of Governance or Paper ..., <https://www.irccl.in/post/independent-directors-in-india-guardians-of-governance-or-paper-tigers>
18. Liability of Non-Executive and Independent Directors - PRIME Database, <https://www.primedatabase.com/article/2020/Article-R.S.Loona.pdf>
19. LODR - Regulation 25 - Companies Act Integrated Ready Reckoner, <https://ca2013.com/lodr-regulation-25/>
20. The role of independent directors must be bolstered by legislation in order to safeguard the company's best interests - Esade, <https://www.esade.edu/en/news/the-role-independent-directors-must-be-bolstered-by-legislation-in-order-to-safeguard-the>
21. Satyam scandal - Wikipedia, https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Satyam_scandal
22. US Decision Giving Relief to Satyam Directors - Implications for Independent Directors in India - Bombay Chartered Accountant Journal, <https://bcajonline.org/journal/us-decision-giving-relief-to-satyam-directors-implications-for-independent-directors-in-india/>
23. The IL&FS Accounting and Financial Fraud Case Study, <https://journals.iium.edu.my/ijcsm/index.php/jcsm/article/download/208/90/1001>
24. Group3_CGSR_Final Rport | PDF | Corporate Governance - Scribd, <https://www.scribd.com/document/852137515/Group3-CGSR-Final-Report>
25. IL&FS case: Independent directors, rating agencies, auditors under Sebi lens, <https://www.businesstoday.in/latest/economy-politics/story/ilfs-case-independent-directors-rating-agencies-auditors-under-sebi-lens-205684-2019-06-16>
26. Rare move by govt: IL&FS, two subsidiaries ordered to recoup Rs 150 crore from ex-directors after accounts farce - The Economic Times,

<https://m.economictimes.com/news/company/corporate-trends/rare-move-by-govt-ilfs-two-sidiaries-ordered-to-recoup-rs-150-crore-from-ex-directors-after-account-mess-up/articleshow/110554549>

28. Kotak Panel - Recommendations - Shankar IAS Parliament, <https://www.shankariasparliament.com/current-affairs/kotak-panel-recommendations>

29. RECOMMENDATIONS OF KOTAK COMMITTEE ON CORPORATE ..., <https://www.taxtmi.com/article/detailed?id=7980>

30. Acceptance of Kotak Committee recommendations by SEBI: Additional “To Do” for listed entities - Lakshmikumaran & Sridharan, <https://www.lakshmisri.com/insights/articles/acceptance-of-kotak-committee-recommendations-by-sebi-additional-to-do-for-listed-entities/>

31. Sebi chief calls for redefining role of independent directors as stewards of accountability, <https://cfo.economictimes.indiatimes.com/news/governance-risk-compliance/sebi-chief-calls-for-redefining-role-of-independent-directors-as-stewards-of-accountability/123199768>

32. Director Essentials: Directors & Officers Liability Insurance, <https://www.nacdonline.org/all-governance/governance-resources/governance-research/director-faqs-and-essentials/director-essentials-directors--officers-liability-insurance/>

33. Directors and Officers (D&O) Liability Insurance, <https://www.travelers.com/business-insurance/professional-liability-insurance/directors-officers>

34. FAMILIARISATION PROGRAMME FOR DIRECTORS PREAMBLE: In accordance with Regulation 25(7) of the SEBI (Listing Obligations and Disclosures) Regulations, 2015, https://www.sebi.gov.in/sebi_data/attachdocs/21f7ccfa2fc3401091938f541a6f8f2a.pdf?download=false&channelToken=21f7ccfa2fc3401091938f541a6f8f2a

35. Terms and Conditions of appointment of Independent Directors - MAS Financial Services <https://mas.co.in/pdf/terms-and-conditions-of-appointment-of-independent-directors24032023053743.pdf>

36. Corporate Governance in India and the UK: A regulatory contrast, <https://assets.kpmg.com/content/dam/kpmgsites/in/pdf/2024/01/corporate-governance-in-india-and-the-uk-a-regulatory-contrast.pdf>

37. MCA and Corporate Governance Reforms – What Indian Directors Must Know - Info Security Solution Kolkata, <https://insec.in/mca-guidelines-key-governance-knowledge-for-directors/>

38. Corporate Governance in India: Objectives, History, Regulatory Framework, Examples, <https://cleartax.in/s/corporate-governance-in-indiahttps://www.yesbank.in/content/published/api/v1.1/assets/CONT7289BB65EAED4882AD0>

67579FEF17143/native/independentdirectors_pdf1.pdf?download=false&channelToken=21f7ccf
a2fc3401091938f541a6f8f2a Framework, Examples, [https://cleartax.in/s/corporate-governance-
in-india](https://cleartax.in/s/corporate-governance-in-india)