CORPORATE LAW REFORM IN INDIA: RETHINKING THE DOCTRINES OF CONSTRUCTIVE NOTICE AND INDOOR MANAGEMENT

Harini D, O.P. Jindal Global University, Sonipat, Haryana

ABSTRACT

Law is never static; it is dynamic and constantly evolving, responding to the demands and shifts of society. The same can be inferred from the way company law has developed over time. The laws and rules governing company law have been updated and modernized multiple times over the years in response to changing needs and times. In India, the old Companies Act of 1956 was substituted by the Companies Act of 2013 to meet the needs of a modern economy. In an effort to align Indian company law with international best practices in corporate governance and regulation, this Act introduced a number of changes. Given the significance and importance of these reforms, it is critical that they go beyond codified law and incorporate the various doctrines that are important in the field of corporate law. This paper examines two such significant doctrines: the Doctrine of Constructive Notice and the Doctrine of Indoor Management, with the goal of observing how judicial inclination toward the doctrine of indoor management has considerably reduced the significance of constructive notice over time. The purpose of this paper is to assess whether corporate law reforms in India should focus on abolishing the doctrine of constructive notice entirely while strengthening the doctrine of indoor management, and what the consequences of such reforms would be.

Keywords: Constructive Notice, Indoor Management, Judicial Inclination, Corporate Governance, Reforms

I. Coexistence of Constructive Notice and Indoor Management

In corporate law, the doctrines of constructive notice and indoor management have long coexisted as two essential tenets that balance the interests of businesses and other parties. Each doctrine serves a specific purpose in corporate transactions, with constructive notice protecting the internal sanctity of corporate documents and indoor management protecting third parties who deal with companies in good faith.[1]

The doctrine of constructive notice holds that anyone dealing with a company is presumed to be aware of the company's public documents, such as the Memorandum of Association and Articles of Association. This ensures that third parties verify whether an agent has the authority to bind the company and deters them from entering into transactions without exercising due diligence and knowledge of a company's public documents. On the other hand, third parties that enter into contracts with a company are protected by the doctrine of indoor management, as derived from the *Royal British Bank v. Turquand*[2] case of 1856. This doctrine permits third parties to assume that internal procedures and formalities within the company have been appropriately followed. By relieving third parties of the responsibility to verify each internal company process, this doctrine promotes more seamless business transactions. It acts as a safeguard, presuming that businesses would make sure internal policies were followed when interacting with outside parties.

This interaction strikes a balance so that outside parties are obligated to know about a company's public limitations (constructive notice) but are exempt from having to investigate internal affairs beyond what is made publicly available (inside management).

II. Conflict in Practice

Despite the complementary relationship between the two doctrines, they are not always in a perfect harmony. The Doctrine of Constructive Notice is a negative doctrine, a doctrine which operates in the favour of the company.[3] Conversely, the doctrine of Indoor Management known as the Turquand Rule was formulated as an exception to the Constructive Notice Doctrine and works positively in the favour of a third party dealing with a company. Given that the doctrines operate in two different directions, it is not surprising that they often come into conflict. In such

[1] S. Jahnavi Sunila Vangapandu, *A Critical Analysis of Doctrine of Indoor Management and Constructive Notice*, 3 JLRJS 304, 311-318 (2014).
[2] Royal British Bank v. Turquand, 6 E&B 327 (1856).
[3] Rama Corporation Ltd v Proved Tin General Investments Ltd, 2 QB at 147 (1952).

cases, courts will have to ultimately prioritize one doctrine over the other. For example, the authority of a company's officers or directors may be restricted by its internal documents, which are made available to the public under constructive notice. Should a third party contract the company under the assumption that the officer possesses the requisite authority (as per the indoor management doctrine), the courts will have to determine whether the third party was required to review the public documents (constructive notice) or could rely on the presumption of regularity (indoor management).

III. Judicial Prioritization of Indoor Management Over Constructive Notice

Turquand's Rule, or the theory of indoor management, was initially established in the landmark judgment of *Royal British Bank v. Turquand* (1856). In this case, the court decided that, despite a Company's Articles of Association's requirement for a shareholder resolution, the third party—Royal British Bank—was entitled to assume that the company had obtained internal approvals for borrowing and that it wasn't necessary for the bank to confirm if the internal protocol had been adhered to.

Since the introduction of the Turquand Rule in this case, it has served to be a significant check on the effects of Constructive Notice and the courts in UK frequently prioritized the doctrine of indoor management over the doctrine of constructive notice to protect innocent third parties.

In the case of *Morris v. Kanssen*[4] *(1946)*, the court emphasized the principle that indoor management should protect third parties, stating that third parties could assume that directors were properly appointed, even though the Articles required formal procedures for such appointments. The decision emphasized the importance of indoor management over constructive notice, especially when formal internal processes are involved. In *Freeman & Lockyer*[5]*case*, the court upheld the importance of indoor management by ruling that, despite the Articles of Association's restrictions on a director's authority, a third party could rely on that director's apparent authority. The ruling highlighted that indoor management permitted the third party to believe that the director had the power to act, and constructive notice did not include comprehensive knowledge of a director's internal authority. This tendency of relying primarily on indoor management continued till the year 1972 when the Constructive Notice doctrine was ultimately done away with in UK.

[4] Morris v. Kanssen, A.C. 459 (1946).
[5] Freeman and Lockyer v. Buckhurst Park Properties Ltd., 2 QB 480 (1964).

Although unlike UK the Constructive Notice Doctrine continues to persist in India, an examination of the Indian case laws on company law indicates a similar judicial inclination in favour of the Turquand Rule over the doctrine of Constructive Notice. In *Manabe & Co. Pvt. Ltd. v Commissioner of Police*[6], the court reasoned that internal irregularities that are not evident from the company's public documents should not be covered by the doctrine of constructive notice, which requires third parties to be aware of those documents. The court in *M. Rajendra v. Sterling Holiday Resorts*[7] stressed that, as long as third parties have acted in good faith and without knowledge of any irregularities, the doctrine of indoor management protects them from a company's internal shortcomings.

In *Dehradun Mussourie Electric Tramway Co. v Jagmandar Das*[8] case the issue arose when the managing agents took out an overdraft without the board's consent, even though the articles forbade the directors from assigning authority to borrow money. A factual matter under consideration in this ruling concerned the validity of the meeting that was called to approve the overdraft. The court considered that the resolution signed was fraudulent because the evidence indicated that the necessary meeting was never held and that the third party may not have been aware of the same because of the agent's deceptive statements. Here the Court applied the Turquand rule and held that the company was bound by the transaction.

These cases demonstrate that courts prefer to use the Turquand rule to safeguard third parties' rights in corporate transactions whenever possible. The basis for such a rule tends to stem from the Law of Agency and Contracts which provides that 'where an agent has acted in good faith as per one construction of his authority, his acts would be binding on the principal'.[9] This reasoning was also applied in the *'Mussourie Tramways'* case, where the agent was found to be working for the benefit of the company. Thus, rather than imposing an unrealistic burden on third parties to investigate the complexities of a company's internal operations, the doctrine allows them to rely on the apparent authority of company officers and the consistency of company procedures. This indicates how the introduction of indoor management has already eroded the value and application of the doctrine of Constructive Notice significantly.

---

[6] Official Liquidator, Manasuba and Co. v Commissioner of Police And Ors., AIR 1967 (Mad.) 359 (Madras HC).
[7] M.Rajendra Naidu v. Sterling Holiday Resorts, 2008 (Mad) 1261.
[8] Dehra Dun Mussorie Electric Tramway Co. v Jagmandar Das and Ors., AIR 1932 (All.) 141 (Allahabad HC).
[9] Pranjal Singh, *Constructive notice and Indoor Management*, RESEARCH GATE (2012), https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Pranjal-Singh-2publication/262378371_Constructive_notice_and_Indoor_Management/links/00b7d5378b728757e9000000/Constructive-notice-and-Indoor-Management.pdf.

IV. Abolition of Doctrine of Constructive Notice

The Doctrine of Constructive Notice has its roots in early corporate law doctrines that placed a strong emphasis on disclosure and openness. Even though it was created as a safeguard for businesses during the development of corporate law, it has since become unfair and obsolete in the modern era, especially in light of the corporate environment in India.

The doctrine imposes an unfair burden on third parties to be aware of all the public documents of a company. This is frequently unfeasible and impractical, particularly for small enterprises or private citizens who might lack the means to carefully review a company's public filings. In a dynamic economy like India's, where transactions occur rapidly and frequently, forcing third parties to examine corporate documents before entering transactions would create friction in business dealings and slow down commerce.

Legal opinions have criticized the doctrine for being overly harsh and inconsistent with natural justice principles. It is argued that the doctrine can result in unjust outcomes in which third parties are held liable for failing to understand the complexities of a company's internal regulations. The doctrine has been applied in several cases, including those involving the Department of Atomic Energy, resulting in disputes and dissatisfaction among parties who believe they have been treated unfairly. Such instances highlight the practical difficulties and injustices that can result from applying the doctrine.[10]

In the modern era with corporate documents being readily available through digital platforms, transparency in corporate governance has increased significantly. Indian companies are required to file important documents with the Ministry of Corporate Affairs (MCA), and these filings are accessible in online portals. This ease in access to information through digital means has reduced the necessity for such a doctrine. A modern commercial environment demands simpler, more efficient mechanisms for protecting both companies as well as third parties.

V. Global Legal Trends

Many jurisdictions around the world have either abolished or significantly weakened the doctrine of constructive notice.

In England, the Doctrine of Constructive Notice was abolished on grounds of serving no useful

[10] Bhumesh Verma & Abhisar Vidyarthi, Question Marks on Efficacy of the Principle of Constructive Notice, SCC Online (December 7, 2024), https://www.scconline.com/blog/post/2019/06/05/question-marks-on-efficacy-of-the-principle-of-constructive-notice/.

purpose in company law save for causing unfair prejudice to third parties contracting with companies. It was mentioned that the Doctrine was created when there were not many businesses, and that it was now impractical to expect everyone who does business with a company to read both the memos and articles published by the company. The Constructive Notice doctrine thus came to an end in the case of *TCB Ltd. v. Gray*[11] *(1987)* and Sir Nicholas Brown-Wilkinson V.C. held that the European Communities Act of 1972 shielded third parties engaging in lawful commerce from needless harm resulting from the application of the doctrines of constructive notice and ultra vires.[12]

In South Africa the change in Section 36 of the Old Act as prompted by the Van Wyk de Vries Commission, tasked with looking into the objects and powers of a company, curtailed the application of the Doctrine of Constructive Notice with respect to a company's Memorandum. By making actual knowledge irrelevant on the part of a third party, the revised section abolished the operation of the Doctrine in relation to the MOA of a company. Sections 19(4) and 19(5) of the New Act dealt with the Doctrine in more detail. According to Section 19(4), just because a company document has been filed or is available for inspection does not mean that someone has knowledge of it or has been notified of it.[13] For 'RF' companies, however, section 19(5) establishes a statutory doctrine of constructive notice, whereby third parties are presumed to have notice of certain provisions if their attention is drawn to them in the Notice of Incorporation or Notice of Amendment.

In order to facilitate ease of doing business, India as a rising economic force in the world, needs to harmonize its corporate laws with international standards. Abolition of doctrine of constructive notice would be a sign of India's commitment to establishing a business-friendly legal framework, boosting investor confidence, and encouraging more fair business practices.

VI. Strengthening the Doctrine of Indoor Management and its Implications

Strengthening the doctrine of indoor management in India would help strengthen the protection provided to third parties, ensuring that they can rely on the apparent authority of company representatives without having to investigate the company's internal compliance. The speed of

[11] TCB Ltd. v. Gray, 1 ER 587 (1986).
[12] Tania Mila Seely, *The Protection Afforded to Third Parties When Contracting with Companies: An Analysis of the Turquand Rule and Doctrine of Constructive Notice,* UNIVERSITY OF PRETORIA (2018), https://repository.up.ac.za/bitstream/handle/2263/69995/Seely_Protection_2018.pdf?sequence=1.
[13] Charlotte Hinga, *Observations on the Impact of 2008 Companies Act on the Doctrine of Constructive Notice and the Turquand Rule*, 130 SALJ 464 (2013).

business transactions could be increased, and transaction costs could be decreased by eliminating the need for thorough due diligence on a company's internal operations. This could encourage a more dynamic business environment and draw in more foreign investment. A culture of business integrity and dependability could be fostered as a result, increasing trust in corporate transactions on a social level. Additionally, in order to guarantee adherence to their own articles and memorandum of association, companies are likely to implement stricter internal controls and governance procedures ensuring a more accountable and transparent management.

There is, nevertheless, an opposing risk. Financial mismanagement and fraud may result if businesses take advantage of this doctrine to get around internal checks and balances. As a result, even though the doctrine offers third parties a safety net, it also demands strong internal governance procedures to stop abuse.[14] Furthermore, if improperly regulated, it may result in situations where decisions made without the required internal authorization have a negative impact on stakeholders, including employees. Therefore, while improving indoor management in India could boost investor confidence and business efficiency, it needs to be supported by robust internal governance frameworks to reduce misuse risks and guarantee the protection of all stakeholders' interests.

VII. Conclusion

Though it had a valuable purpose in the past, the doctrine of constructive notice is now out of date and impractical in contemporary corporate law, particularly in India where the business landscape is changing quickly. Although historically the doctrines of constructive notice and indoor management coexisted to strike a balance between corporate responsibility and the protection of third parties, the doctrine of indoor management has gained more and more support from the courts in conflicting cases. The shift reflects a judicial tendency to prioritize business efficiency and good faith transactions over strict adherence to internal company documents, which are frequently not easily accessible or fully comprehensible to third parties.

The doctrine of constructive notice has consequently been diminished of its practical significance, and indoor management has emerged as the preeminent doctrine in contemporary

[14] Sahil Varshney & Rajat Shandilya, Analysis of Doctrine of Indoor Management, Manupatra Articles (December 7, 2024), https://articles.manupatra.com/article-details/Analysis-of-Doctrine-of-Indoor-Management.

corporate law transactions.[15] A stronger emphasis on the doctrine of indoor management in conjunction with the elimination of the constructive notice doctrine would signal a move toward more effective, open, and equitable business practices. A reform of this kind would improve third-party protections while also encouraging more seamless corporate transactions, bringing India more in line with international practices and improving the ease of doing business there.

However, regulatory changes that improve corporate transparency and internal governance frameworks must go hand in hand with this change. In order to balance corporate accountability and protect third parties in good faith, indoor management should be strengthened. The Companies Act 2013 needs to be amended legislatively to ensure that India develops a legal framework that is both business-friendly and provides safeguards against corporate abuse.

[15] Law Teacher, https://www.lawteacher.net/free-law-essays/company-law/doctrine-of-constructive-notice.php (last visited Dec 8, 2024)