 DOI: https://10.5281/zenodo.23395018

Directors' Duties and Minority Shareholder Protection under Indian Company Law

Simranpreet Singh[1]

© The Author(s), under exclusive licence to Oxford Law Review 2026.

Abstract

The Companies Act, 2013 seeks to reconcile corporate autonomy and commercial risk-taking with accountability to the company, shareholders, creditors and the public. This article analyses directors' duties and minority shareholder protection in India, focusing on section 166, related-party transactions under section 188, oppression and mismanagement proceedings under sections 241–242, class actions under section 245, and the institutional role of the National Company Law Tribunal (NCLT). It argues that India's framework combines statutory duties, disclosure-based governance, shareholder approvals and remedial jurisdiction, but its effectiveness depends on procedural access, reliable corporate records and the ability to distinguish injury to the company from injury to an individual member. It also considers the role of board independence, audit committees and recent reforms to fast-track mergers. The central proposition is that minority protection should neither obstruct legitimate commercial decisions nor be reduced to formal compliance. Effective governance requires meaningful disclosure, independent scrutiny, reasoned records and remedies proportionate to the legal wrong.

Keywords: Companies Act, 2013; Directors' Duties; Corporate Governance; Related-Party Transactions; Oppression And Mismanagement; NCLT

1. Introduction

Company law separates the company's legal personality from the individuals who own, manage or finance it. That separation enables a company to hold property, contract, borrow, sue and continue despite changes in membership. It also creates a governance problem: directors and controlling shareholders exercise powers that affect investors who do not participate in daily management. The law must permit entrepreneurial discretion while guarding against diversion of assets, conflicts of interest, unfair treatment and misuse of corporate control.

The Companies Act, 2013 is India's central statute for incorporation, governance, reporting and restructuring. It operates alongside rules made under it, the Securities and Exchange Board of India (SEBI) framework for listed entities, the Insolvency and Bankruptcy Code, 2016 (IBC), and sector-specific legislation. The NCLT and National Company Law Appellate Tribunal (NCLAT) have important roles in company-law disputes, while other courts and regulators retain jurisdiction over matters allocated to them by law.

[1] Punjabi University, Patiala, India.

Copyright © Oxford Law Review. (editor@oxfordlr.com)

This article examines directors' duties and minority shareholder protection as connected subjects. Section 166 sets out directors' statutory duties; sections 177 and 188 address audit-committee oversight and related-party transactions in specified contexts; and sections 241–242 provide remedies for oppression and mismanagement. Their effectiveness depends on disclosure, board independence, access to records, standing and the fit between the alleged wrong and the remedy sought. Compliance with a meeting or filing requirement is important, but formal compliance may not answer whether a conflicted decision was fair or whether corporate control was abused.

2. Statutory architecture and corporate personality

The Companies Act, 2013 consolidates and amends the law relating to companies. It covers incorporation, securities, share capital, management, accounts and audit, directors, inspection and investigation, compromises and arrangements, oppression and mismanagement, class actions and winding up. It must be read with subordinate legislation and applicable amendments rather than as a static text (Companies Act 2013, Preamble and chs. II–XX).

Separate legal personality is foundational. In Salomon v A Salomon & Co Ltd, the House of Lords held that a duly incorporated company is distinct from its members ([1897] AC 22). Indian courts have adopted this principle while recognising that the corporate veil may be lifted in legally justified circumstances, such as where the corporate form is used for fraud or to evade legal obligations. The veil is not lifted merely because a result appears unfair; the basis must be grounded in the applicable doctrine and facts.

Corporate personality has direct consequences for remedies. A company's cause of action ordinarily belongs to the company, even where the alleged wrongdoer is a director or controlling shareholder. A reduction in share value caused by injury to the company does not automatically create a separate individual claim for every shareholder. This principle explains the importance of derivative-action concepts and statutory mechanisms that permit members to seek relief when corporate control prevents the company from acting.

The framework also varies by company type. Private companies, public companies, listed entities, government companies, small companies and Section 8 companies may face different requirements or exemptions. SEBI's Listing Obligations and Disclosure Requirements Regulations, 2015 (LODR) impose additional governance and disclosure duties on listed entities. Analysis should begin by identifying the company's status, its constitutional documents and the applicable statutory and regulatory regime.

3. Directors' duties under section 166

Section 166 is the central statutory statement of directors' duties. A director must act in accordance with the company's articles; act in good faith to promote the company's objects for the benefit of members as a whole and in the best interests of the company, employees, shareholders, community and environment; exercise duties with due and reasonable care, skill and diligence and independent

Copyright © Oxford Law Review. (editor@oxfordlr.com)

judgment; avoid situations involving direct or indirect conflicts of interest; and refrain from obtaining undue gain or advantage for the director or connected persons (Companies Act 2013, § 166).

The provision combines several standards. Good faith and the company's interests concern the purpose for which powers are exercised. Care, skill, diligence and independent judgment concern decision-making. The conflict rule addresses divided loyalty, while the prohibition on undue gain targets personal advantage obtained through office. Analysis should identify the duty engaged and explain the facts, rather than merely reciting section 166.

The statutory reference to members as a whole does not mean that directors must maximise immediate returns in every decision. Corporate decisions may involve long-term investment, employee welfare, environmental obligations, solvency, compliance and reputational risk. The section expressly refers to employees, shareholders, community and environment; its scope should be understood through the statutory wording and the company's lawful purposes.

Independent judgment matters where a director is nominated by a promoter, investor or lender. Nomination does not necessarily turn a director into an agent free to disregard duties owed to the company. A director may consider the nominator's interests, but must exercise independent judgment and cannot treat a board seat as a mandate to advance private interests at the company's expense.

Section 166(5) prohibits assignment of the office of director, and an assignment is void. Section 166(7) provides a monetary penalty for contravention. A breach of duty does not automatically establish fraud, oppression, criminal liability or a securities-law violation; each route has distinct legal requirements.

4. Board structure, independent directors and committees

The Act seeks to improve oversight through board-composition requirements, independent directors and committees. Section 149 sets out board-composition requirements and provides for independent directors in specified classes of companies. Schedule IV contains a code for independent directors, including professional conduct, role, functions, duties and evaluation. The design aims to introduce independent scrutiny into decisions that might otherwise be dominated by promoters or executive management.

Independence is substantive as well as formal. A director may satisfy a statutory definition yet face practical constraints caused by relationships, information asymmetry or dependence on management for access to company affairs. Effective independence requires accurate information, sufficient time, willingness to question assumptions and the ability to record dissent. Board composition alone cannot guarantee these conditions.

Section 177 governs audit committees for companies within its scope. Functions include recommendations on auditor appointment and remuneration, monitoring auditor independence, examining financial statements and audit reports, approving or modifying related-party transactions where applicable, and scrutinising inter-corporate loans and investments. The audit committee is

Copyright © Oxford Law Review. (editor@oxfordlr.com)

therefore a key link between financial reporting, conflicts and board accountability (Companies Act 2013, § 177).

Section 178 addresses nomination and remuneration committees and stakeholder relationship committees in specified companies. Committees do not remove the board's overall responsibility. A committee recommendation is useful only if it is informed, independent and documented. Directors should receive adequate material in advance, record conflicts and abstentions, and ensure significant risks are not obscured in technical reports. Effective committee governance is measured by the quality of oversight, not the mere existence of a committee.

5. Related-party transactions under section 188

Related-party transactions can be commercially legitimate. Group companies may provide services, lease premises, sell goods or share infrastructure. The governance risk arises because interests may diverge: a transaction can shift value away from the company whose directors approve it and toward a promoter, director, relative or associated entity. The Act regulates specified transactions through board approval, prescribed conditions and, in applicable cases, shareholder approval (Companies Act 2013, § 188).

Section 188 covers specified categories, including sale, purchase or supply of goods; sale or purchase of property; leasing; services; appointment of agents; appointment to an office or place of profit; and underwriting securities or derivatives. The section operates with rules prescribing thresholds and procedures. The exception for transactions in the ordinary course of business and on an arm's-length basis is important, but both elements must be considered rather than assumed from routine practice.

Approval should reveal the transaction's economic substance. Relevant information may include the related party's identity and interest, pricing methodology, comparable market terms, commercial rationale, alternatives, duration and likely impact. A board resolution without meaningful disclosure may satisfy the appearance of procedure while failing to provide a sound basis for independent judgment.

Section 188 must be read alongside section 177, applicable rules and, for listed entities, SEBI LODR requirements. Listed-company rules may impose additional requirements for audit-committee and shareholder approval. The analysis must identify whether the company is listed, the transaction's category and value, and the applicable version of the rules. Not every related-party transaction is improper, and the consequences of procedural breach depend on the statutory text, approvals, third-party rights and other applicable law.

6. Minority shareholders: oppression and mismanagement

Sections 241–242 provide remedies for qualifying members who allege oppressive or prejudicial conduct. Section 241 permits an application where company affairs have been or are being conducted in a manner prejudicial to public interest, oppressive to a member or members, or prejudicial to the

Copyright © Oxford Law Review. (editor@oxfordlr.com)

company's interests. It also addresses certain material changes in management or control likely to result in prejudicial conduct, subject to statutory conditions (Companies Act 2013, § 241).

Section 244 prescribes eligibility requirements for applications under section 241, including shareholding or membership thresholds, and permits the Tribunal to waive certain requirements in accordance with the statute. Eligibility is not an afterthought: a claimant must establish standing before substantive relief can be granted. The current text and the company's capital or membership structure should be checked carefully.

Section 242 empowers the Tribunal to make orders where statutory conditions are satisfied and it considers that winding up would unfairly prejudice members, although the facts would otherwise justify a just-and-equitable winding-up order. Possible orders include regulating the company's future affairs, purchase of shares, restrictions on transfers or allotments, and termination or modification of certain agreements, subject to the section's terms (Companies Act 2013, § 242).

The jurisdiction is equitable and fact-sensitive. A pattern of exclusion, diversion of business, manipulation of records, unfair share allotment or misuse of majority power may be relevant, but the conclusion depends on the statutory test and evidence. A mere disagreement with a business decision or the existence of majority rule does not automatically constitute oppression. Conduct must be assessed in context, including the company's constitutional arrangements and its effect on members or the company.

Remedies should be proportionate to the wrong. A share-purchase order may provide an exit from a dysfunctional closely held company; regulation of future affairs may address continuing governance defects; other orders may be necessary where control has been abused. The purpose is not to punish a majority merely for exercising control, but to prevent oppressive or prejudicial conduct and restore lawful governance where possible.

7. Leading judicial principles

In Needle Industries (India) Ltd v Needle Industries Newey (India) Holding Ltd, the Supreme Court considered share allotment and alleged oppression, emphasising that an act legally permissible in form may still require scrutiny in the context of the company's affairs, the motives behind the conduct and its effects ((1981) 3 SCC 333). The case remains important for the proposition that a corporate act should not always be isolated from its surrounding circumstances.

Shanti Prasad Jain v Kalinga Tubes Ltd is a leading authority on oppression under the former Companies Act, 1956. The Supreme Court described oppression as conduct that is burdensome, harsh and wrongful, and emphasised the need to assess whether there is a continuous course of conduct rather than treating every isolated irregularity as sufficient (AIR 1965 SC 1535). The case arose under the earlier statutory framework; its reasoning may inform analysis under the 2013 Act, subject to the present statutory language and later decisions.

Life Insurance Corporation of India v Escorts Ltd addresses corporate personality, shareholder rights and the relationship between corporate regulation and public-law considerations ((1986) 1 SCC 264). Its wider significance lies in the Court's treatment of shareholder rights and the limits of treating corporate control as purely private where statutory regulation is engaged.

Copyright © Oxford Law Review. (editor@oxfordlr.com)

These decisions do not replace the statutory text. Their principles must be applied in light of the facts, the provision considered and later jurisprudence. A case under the 1956 Act should not be presented as though it directly interpreted every provision of the 2013 Act.

8. Class actions and the company's cause of action

Indian company law recognises the distinction between a wrong to the company and a wrong to an individual shareholder. Where the company has suffered loss because directors or controllers misappropriated assets, the primary claim generally belongs to the company. A shareholder cannot simply convert that corporate claim into an individual damages claim because the value of the investment has fallen. This follows from separate legal personality and the principle that the company is ordinarily the proper claimant.

Section 245 provides class-action proceedings for qualifying members or depositors who consider that company affairs are being conducted prejudicially to the company, members or depositors. Subject to statutory requirements, the Tribunal may restrain ultra vires or unlawful acts, prevent conduct contrary to the articles or resolutions, declare certain resolutions void where obtained through suppression or misrepresentation, and award damages or compensation against the company, directors, auditors or specified advisers in circumstances covered by the provision (Companies Act 2013, § 245).

Class actions differ from oppression and mismanagement proceedings. The provisions have distinct standing rules, purposes and remedial scope. Section 245 focuses on collective protection for qualifying members or depositors; sections 241–242 provide a broader remedial jurisdiction concerning oppressive or prejudicial conduct. One procedure should not be assumed to substitute automatically for the other.

The effectiveness of collective remedies depends on accessibility and the ability to coordinate evidence and interests. Thresholds can discourage frivolous claims but may also make proceedings difficult for dispersed investors. The Tribunal must apply statutory conditions while preserving the remedial purpose enacted by Parliament.

9. Corporate restructuring and fast-track mergers

Restructuring can redistribute value and alter control, making procedural safeguards essential. Sections 230–240 of the Companies Act address compromises, arrangements and amalgamations. Section 230 provides a framework for compromises or arrangements with creditors and members; section 232 addresses mergers and amalgamations in specified circumstances; and section 233 creates a fast-track route for eligible classes, subject to statutory and rule-based requirements.

In September 2025, the Ministry of Corporate Affairs widened the classes eligible for fast-track mergers and demergers through amendments to the Companies (Compromises, Arrangements and Amalgamations) Rules, 2016. The expanded scope included certain unlisted companies meeting prescribed conditions, holding and subsidiary companies in specified circumstances, and subsidiaries of the same holding company, subject to exclusions and conditions.

Copyright © Oxford Law Review. (editor@oxfordlr.com)

The reform was intended to reduce the time and cost of eligible restructurings (Ministry of Corporate Affairs 2025).

Fast-track procedures can improve efficiency but do not remove the need to protect creditors, members and other stakeholders. Parties should confirm eligibility, obtain required approvals, prepare accurate financial and valuation information, comply with notice and filing requirements, and assess competition, tax, securities, foreign-investment and insolvency implications. Restructuring also raises minority-protection concerns. A merger can alter voting power, liquidity, asset composition and the value of a minority stake. The availability and form of remedies depend on the statutory route, scheme terms, disclosures, valuation, voting and the Tribunal's jurisdiction. An objection should be assessed against the governing provision rather than assumed to veto a transaction simply because it changes a shareholder's position.

10. Enforcement, compliance and the NCLT

The NCLT exercises jurisdiction over matters assigned to it by the Companies Act and other legislation. Appeals lie to the NCLAT where provided, with further appeal to the Supreme Court on questions of law under the relevant provisions. This specialist structure aims to consolidate company-law adjudication, although practical effectiveness depends on case management, evidence, judicial resources and procedural discipline.

Enforcement is not limited to litigation between shareholders. The Registrar of Companies, Ministry of Corporate Affairs, Serious Fraud Investigation Office in cases assigned to it, auditors, the National Financial Reporting Authority within its remit, SEBI for listed entities and other regulators may have roles depending on the conduct. Regulatory enforcement, financial-reporting oversight, investigation, adjudication and private remedies serve different functions and should not be conflated.

Compliance reforms illustrate the tension between reducing administrative burdens and maintaining accountability. The government has pursued decriminalisation of technical and procedural defaults and expanded certain simplified processes, while retaining stronger consequences for serious misconduct. The policy question is not whether compliance should be light or strict in the abstract, but whether the response is proportionate to risk and preserves meaningful accountability for fraud, abuse of control and harm to investors.

A sound compliance system maps statutory duties to accountable personnel, deadlines, approvals, records and escalation procedures. A compliance calendar is insufficient if the board receives unreliable information or conflicts are not disclosed. Conversely, an isolated clerical error should be distinguished from conduct that conceals a related-party benefit or defeats shareholder rights. Risk-based compliance connects legal obligations to actual operations.

11. A practical analytical framework

A structured analysis of a corporate-governance dispute can proceed through six questions. First, what is the company's legal and regulatory status—private, public, listed, government-controlled or

Copyright © Oxford Law Review. (editor@oxfordlr.com)

otherwise specially regulated? Second, which source governs: the Companies Act, rules, articles, shareholders' agreement, SEBI regulations, IBC or sectoral law? Third, what duty or statutory protection is engaged? Fourth, who suffered the legally relevant injury—the company, a member individually, a class of members or depositors, or the public? Fifth, what standing and procedural thresholds apply? Sixth, which remedy is proportionate and legally available?

This framework helps avoid recurrent errors. A related-party transaction should not be called unlawful without examining section 188, applicable rules, the ordinary-course and arm's-length exception, and listed-company requirements. A claim of oppression should not rest solely on dissatisfaction with majority decisions; it must be linked to the statutory standard and the overall course of conduct. Poor commercial judgment is not automatically proof of bad faith or undue gain. A shareholder's economic loss is not automatically a direct claim if the company suffered the primary injury.

Evidence should be collected early and lawfully. Relevant materials may include the articles, shareholders' agreement, board and committee minutes, notices, explanatory statements, related-party disclosures, audited accounts, valuation reports, statutory filings and correspondence. The record should be analysed for substantive content and procedural integrity: who knew what, when information was provided, whether decision-makers were conflicted and whether dissent was documented.

Remedy design matters. Tribunal proceedings may be expensive and time-consuming, while internal resolution or a negotiated exit may preserve enterprise value. Settlement should not compromise statutory duties or third-party rights, but a tailored solution can sometimes address control, valuation, access to records and future governance more effectively than a broad demand for dissolution.

12. Conclusion

The Companies Act, 2013 establishes a multi-layered framework for directors' accountability and minority shareholder protection. Section 166 articulates duties of good faith, care, independent judgment and loyalty; sections 177 and 188 seek to manage conflicts and related-party transactions; sections 241–242 empower the NCLT to address oppression and mismanagement; and section 245 provides a collective remedy for qualifying members and depositors. These provisions operate within a wider ecosystem of disclosure, audit, listed-company regulation, restructuring law and regulatory enforcement.

The strength of the framework lies in its combination of preventive governance and remedial jurisdiction. Its limits arise where procedures become formalities, investors cannot access meaningful information, or the legal route is mismatched to the injury. Strong governance is not achieved merely by recording a resolution or filing a form. It requires informed approval, independent scrutiny, transparent disclosure, contemporaneous records and a remedy capable of addressing the actual wrong.

The proper balance is neither absolute managerial freedom nor a minority veto over ordinary commercial decisions. It is accountable discretion: directors must be able to take lawful

Copyright © Oxford Law Review. (editor@oxfordlr.com)

business risks, but cannot use office or control to secure improper private advantage or prejudice the company and its members in ways prohibited by law. The practical success of Indian company law depends on how consistently that balance is implemented by boards, investors, regulators and tribunals.

References

Companies Act, 2013 (India), No. 18 of 2013.

Companies (Compromises, Arrangements and Amalgamations) Rules, 2016 (India), as amended.

Companies (Meetings of Board and its Powers) Rules, 2014 (India), as amended.

Companies (Appointment and Qualification of Directors) Rules, 2014 (India), as amended.

Companies (Audit and Auditors) Rules, 2014 (India), as amended.

Companies (Management and Administration) Rules, 2014 (India), as amended.

Companies Act, 2013, §§ 149, 166, 177, 178, 188, 230–245 and Schedule IV.

India Code. (n.d.). The Companies Act, 2013. https://www.indiacode.nic.in/indiacode/handle/123456789/2114?view_type=browse

Insolvency and Bankruptcy Code, 2016 (India), No. 31 of 2016.

Life Insurance Corporation of India v Escorts Ltd, (1986) 1 SCC 264.

Ministry of Corporate Affairs. (2025, 11 September). MCA widens the scope of fast track mergers under the Companies Act, 2013. Press Information Bureau, Government of India. https://www.pib.gov.in/PressReleseDetailm.aspx?PRID=2165660&lang=2&reg=48

National Company Law Appellate Tribunal. (n.d.). Acts and rules. https://nclat.nic.in/act-rules

National Company Law Tribunal. (n.d.). Official website. https://nclt.gov.in/

Needle Industries (India) Ltd v Needle Industries Newey (India) Holding Ltd, (1981) 3 SCC 333.

Salomon v A Salomon & Co Ltd, [1897] AC 22 (HL).

Securities and Exchange Board of India. (2015). SEBI (Listing Obligations and Disclosure Requirements) Regulations, 2015, as amended.

Shanti Prasad Jain v Kalinga Tubes Ltd, AIR 1965 SC 1535.

Institute of Company Secretaries of India. (n.d.). Companies Act, 2013: Section 188, related-party transactions. https://e-book.icsi.edu/Actpagedisplay.aspx?PAGENAME=17582

OXFORD LAW REVIEW
Copyright © Oxford Law Review. (editor@oxfordlr.com)

Institute of Company Secretaries of India. (n.d.). Companies Act, 2013: Section 241, application to Tribunal for relief in cases of oppression. https://e-book.icsi.edu/Actpagedisplay.aspx?PAGENAME=17651

Ministry of Corporate Affairs. (n.d.). Companies Act, 2013 and rules. https://www.mca.gov.in/

Companies Act, 2013, Schedule IV: Code for Independent Directors.

Publisher's Note

Oxford Law Review remains neutral with regard to jurisdictional claims in published maps and institutional affiliations. Oxford Law Review or its licensors retain the rights to this article pursuant to the applicable publishing agreement with the author(s) or other rightsholder(s). Any self-archiving, reproduction, distribution, or reuse of the accepted manuscript or published version is subject to the terms of the applicable publishing agreement and applicable law.