

# Regulatory Hotline

August 05, 2014

## A SKEWED VIEW OF CORPORATE FRAUD

Even the most well-intentioned of legislations can be quite ineffective in providing succour to honest investors, protecting innocent employees and safeguarding interests of the company.

Whether it was a case of corporate fraud in Satyam and Enron, or even the case of product negligence in cases such as General Motors and Ranbaxy, criminal prosecution of the perpetrators does not provide monetary compensation for the erosion in investments and damage to credibility.

The failings of the law include the failure of regulators to distinguish between criminals who are employees and the company itself, recovery of proceeds from fraud, and balancing the rights of the company and shareholders.

A recent report by Economist Intelligence Unit and Kroll, a US risk consultancy, has found that 69 per cent of India's companies were affected by fraud in the last year. The most chilling aspect was that 89 per cent of the respondents surveyed indicated that the perpetrator was an insider.

## THE PROBLEM

We see companies being prosecuted and investigated when some of its employees engineer a scheme to commit a fraud. Since the law itself sometimes fails to recognise the distinction between the perpetrators and the company, aggrieved shareholders have no choice but to prosecute the company.

The new companies law seeks to strengthen shareholders' action against a company and, in future, this would only increase liability of the company and its directors for the unauthorised, illegal and criminal acts of some employees.

This incongruity is not restricted to scenarios under company law — fraudulent employees colluding with employees of PSUs/PSEs who embezzle funds in public contracts can also cause the company to be blacklisted from participating in government contracts.

In such cases, it is imperative for directors and employees of the company to demonstrate that the company's decisions were in good faith and the actions of the fraudsters were unauthorised. Ironically, while the company is forced to compensate its shareholders for the actions of the fraudsters, the prosecution of the company affects the value of investments of the shareholders.

## THE SOLUTION

Given that instances of corporate fraud are on the rise, the board of directors of a company must ensure that actions of employees and directors are adequately documented. For their part, shareholders must also show greater participation in the decision-making process and in enforcing their rights. Shares are not a secured investment — every shareholder accepts certain risks and is therefore bound to exercise care and caution while attending shareholder meetings. With shareholders and employees keeping a watch, it would be easier for a regulator to prosecute the real culprits rather than prosecute the company — itself a victim of fraud.

The protection of shareholders' interests could have been addressed by incorporating in the new act a principle commonly referred to as 'proceeds from crime'. In the context of corporate fraud, proceeds from crime would be monetary benefit that has been appropriated by the perpetrator.

Under India's current law, regulators and enforcement agencies cannot attach proceeds from crime. While imprisonment may offer retributive justice to aggrieved shareholders, it does not compensate for the financial loss. Burdening the company with the financial obligation is an uneconomical apportionment of risk that only emboldens brazen criminals.

Innovative legislative measures of attaching properties acquired by fraudsters would ensure that proceeds from crime are restored to the rightful owners.

This article was published in The Hindu Business Line dated July 15, 2014. The same can be accessed from the [link](#).

M.S. Ananth

## DISCLAIMER

The contents of this hotline should not be construed as legal opinion. View detailed disclaimer.

## Research Papers

### New Age of Franchising

June 20, 2025

### Life Sciences 2025

June 11, 2025

### The Tour d'Horizon of Data Law Implications of Digital Twins

May 29, 2025

## Research Articles

### 2025 Watchlist: Life Sciences Sector India

April 04, 2025

### Re-Evaluating Press Note 3 Of 2020: Should India's Land Borders Still Define Foreign Investment Boundaries?

February 04, 2025

### INDIA 2025: The Emerging Powerhouse for Private Equity and M&A Deals

January 15, 2025

## Audio

### CCI's Deal Value Test

February 22, 2025

### Securities Market Regulator's Continued Quest Against "Unfiltered" Financial Advice

December 18, 2024

### Digital Lending - Part 1 - What's New with NBFC P2Ps

November 19, 2024

## NDA Connect

Connect with us at events, conferences and seminars.

## NDA Hotline

[Click here to view Hotline archives.](#)

## Video

Yopak Desai speaking on the danger of deepfakes | Legally Speaking with Tarun Nangia | NewsX

April 01, 2025

This Hotline provides general information existing at the time of preparation. The Hotline is intended as a news update and Nishith Desai Associates neither assumes nor accepts any responsibility for any loss arising to any person acting or refraining from acting as a result of any material contained in this Hotline. It is recommended that professional advice be taken based on the specific facts and circumstances. This Hotline does not substitute the need to refer to the original pronouncements.

This is not a Spam mail. You have received this mail because you have either requested for it or someone must have suggested your name. Since India has no anti-spamming law, we refer to the US directive, which states that a mail cannot be considered Spam if it contains the sender's contact information, which this mail does. In case this mail doesn't concern you, please unsubscribe from mailing list.

**Vaibhav Parikh, Partner, Nishith Desai Associate on Tech, M&A, and Ease of Doing Business**

March 19, 2025

**SIAC 2025 Rules: Key changes & Implications**

February 18, 2025