

BEFORE THE  
NATIONAL COMPANY LAW TRIBUNAL  
KOLKATA BENCH, KOLKATA

CP No. 124/2015

CORAM

Shri Vijai Pratap Singh  
Hon'ble Member(J)

Shri S. Vijayaraghavan  
Hon'ble Member(T)

In the matter of Section 621A of the Companies Act, 1956  
(Presently Section 441 of the Companies Act, 2013)

And

In the matter of Section 217(2AA) of the Companies Act, 1956

And

In the Matter of  
1M/s. Corporate Ispat Alloys Limited, a Company Incorporated under the  
Companies Act, 1956 and having its Registered Office at Insignia Tower,  
EN-1, 3<sup>rd</sup> Floor, Sector-V, Salt Lake City, Kolkata – 700091.

And

- 1.Mr. Vidya Sagar Banarsi Das Garg, Whole-time Director
- 2.Mr. Avishek Manoj Jayaswal, Director
3. Mr. Prakash Jayaswal, Director
4. Mr. Abhijeet Jayaswal, Ex-Director
5. Mr. Malay Kar, Ex-Director,
6. Mr. Manmohan Singh Kapur, Ex-Director
7. Mr.Rajendra Mohanlal Ganatra, Ex-Director
8. Manoj Jayaswal, Director ..... Applicants

Present for the parties :

Ms. Neha Somani, Pr.C.S. : for the Petitioners

## ORDER

Heard Ms. Neha Somani, Pr.C.S. appearing for the applicants and perused the case records. The brief facts, as emerged from the applications, are that:

- a) Applications were filed by three Directors, one Whole-time Director and Four Ex-Directors of M/s Corporate Ispat Alloys Ltd. before the Company Law Board, Kolkata Bench, under section 621A of the Companies Act, 1956 (Act.1956) for compounding of offence for violation of section 217(2AA) of the Act 1956, which is punishable under section 217(5) of the said Act. The said applications stand transferred to this National Company Law Tribunal, Kolkata Bench, for disposal upon dissolution of the Company Law Board.
- b) The Asstt. Registrar of Companies, West Bengal, (AROCWB) issued a notice on 16.07.2013 to the applicants, indicating that upon scrutiny of the Balance Sheet as at 31.03.2011 and other related documents, it was found that Directors have not given any explanation for non-compliance with the following Accounting Standard in its Directors' Responsibility Statement :-
  - i) In the Deferred Tax Assets, unabsorbed depreciation of Rs.2617 lakhs is included. But the nature of evidence supporting recognition of such deferred tax assets was not disclosed. This resulted in violation of Accounting Standard-22.
  - ii) It is stated in the accounting policies that softwares are amortized over a period of three years and in the profit and loss account it is reported that the amortization of software made was Rs.59.11 lakhs for the year. But in the Balance Sheet no disclosure was made about the amortization method used. This resulted in violation of Accounting Standard-26.
  - iii) In the Balance Sheet, no disclosure was made about the contingent liabilities resulting in violation of Accounting Standard-29.

This is contrary to provision of section 217(2AA) with Accounting Standard 22, 26 and 29 of the Act 1956.

2. In regard to the aforesaid violation, the Pr.CS appearing for the Applicants has stated that :

- i) The deferred tax liability was majorly in respect of excess depreciation claimed in the Income Tax Laws and hence deferred tax assets, created on unabsorbed depreciation (i.e. relating to the excess depreciation claimed than the profit available) which is created under the same governing law, was adjusted with the deferred tax liabilities. Since the Company had net deferred tax liability as at 31<sup>st</sup> March, 2011, no evidence was given for recognizing of deferred tax asset on unabsorbed depreciation.
- ii) The company has disclosed that the "software are amortized over a period of three years", which itself means that the depreciation are charged on straight line method. However, the Company has specifically stated the method of depreciation for software in the financial year ended 31.03.2012. Therefore, the offence has been set right in from 2011-12.
- iii) While filing the Annual Audited Accounts in the XBRL format for the financial year ended 31.03.2012, the Company has disclosed contingent liabilities under the head "Disclosure of additional balance sheet notes explanatory".

Since there were no material departures from the applicable accounts standard in the financial statements of the Company for FY 2011-12 no explanation was required to be given in terms of the provisions of Section 217(2AA) of the Companies Act, 1956, hence non-compliance stands corrected. The Balance Sheet and the Statement of Profit & Loss (in XBRL format) of the Company for the financial year ended 31<sup>st</sup> March, 2012 was filed vide SRN Q04323689 on 13<sup>th</sup> December, 2012.

3. The Registrar of Companies, West Bengal (ROCWB), in its 1<sup>st</sup> report dated 11.12.2013 has recommended for compounding of offence with the observation that the offence committed as aforesaid, is once for all and the same has not been made good. He has further

stated that the directors/officers of the Company are liable for aforesaid violations. In his 2<sup>nd</sup> report dated 16.02.2017, ROCWB has stated that :

i) Non-Disclosure of evidence supporting recognition of such deferred tax assets:

It is observed that in the subsequent Balance Sheet as at 31.03.2012, the deferred tax assets were majorly in respect of excess depreciation claimed in the Income Tax Laws and hence deferred tax assets, created on unabsorbed depreciation which is created under the same governing law was adjusted with the deferred tax liabilities and hence, the offence has been made good in the subsequent Balance Sheet as at 31.03.2012.

ii) Non-Disclosure of Method used for Amortization of Software in the Balance Sheet

It is observed that the Company has specifically stated the method of depreciation for software in the financial year ended 31.03.2012 and hence, the offence has been made good in the subsequent Balance Sheet as at 31.03.2012.

iii) Non-Disclosure about contingent liabilities in the Balance Sheet of the Company:

It is observed that in the subsequent Balance Sheet as at 31.03.2012, the Company has disclosed contingent liabilities under the head "Disclosure of additional balance sheet notes explanatory" and hence, the offence has been made good in the subsequent Balance Sheet as at 31.03.2012.

4. The provisions of section 621A of the Companies Act, 1956 is analogous to Section 441 of the Companies Act, 2013 which confers power to the Tribunal, for compounding of offences. Section 441 of the Companies Act, 2013 came into force w.e.f. 01.06.2016. The breach of the provisions of section 217(2AA) of the Act 1956 has been detected by ROCWB in course of scrutiny of the Balance Sheet as at 31.03.2011 and other documents which is punishable under section 217(5) of the said Act.

5. Perused the applications. Having considered the submissions of Pr.C.S. appearing for the applicants and the reports of ROCWB, we are inclined to permit the applicants to compound the offences as aforesaid. Accordingly, we do hereby compound the aforesaid offences under section 217(2AA) of the Act 1956 in respect of the Balance Sheet as at 31.03.2011, subject to depositing the compounding fees by each of the applicants as indicated herein below:

Sl.No.	Applicant	Compounding fee imposed on each instance
1.	One Whole Time Director	Rs 10,000/- X 3 instances = Rs. 30,000/-
2.	Three Directors	Rs. 10,000/- X 3 X 3 instances = Rs. 90,000/-
3	Four Erstwhile Directors	Rs 8,000/- X 4 X 3 instances = Rs. 96,000/-
		Total : Rs.2,16,000/-

The officers in default shall pay the compounding fees from their personal source. The compounding fees are to be deposited within 15 days hereof.

Sd/-  
( S. Vijayaraghavan)  
Member (T)

Sd/-  
(Vijai Pratap Singh)  
Member (J)

Signed this 29<sup>th</sup> day of May, 2017.