

**NATIONAL COMPANY LAW TRIBUNAL**  
**NEW DELHI BENCH**  
**NEW DELHI**

C.P.No.  
CA.No . 16/24/2017  
**PRESENT: SMT.INA MALHOTRA**  
Hon'ble Member (J)

**ATTENDANCE-CUM-ORDER SHEET OF THE HEARING OF NEW DELHI BENCH OF  
THE NATIONAL COMPANY LAW TRIBUNAL ON 22.03.2017**

**NAME OF THE COMPANY:** Sh. Mohinder Singh Narula

**SECTION OF THE COMPANIES ACT:** 441

<b><u>S.NO.</u></b>	<b><u>NAME</u></b>	<b><u>DESIGNATION</u></b>	<b><u>REPRESENTATION</u></b>	<b><u>SIGNATURE</u></b>
---------------------	--------------------	---------------------------	------------------------------	-------------------------

**Present:** Mr. B.S. Goyal, Practicing Company Secretary

**ORDER**

The petitioner Mr. Mohinder Singh Narula, was a Director in more than 10 Public Ltd. Companies. This being in gross violation of Section 165 of the Companies Act 2013 which limits any individual being a Director to only 10 public companies, a Show Cause Notice was issued to him by the office of the RoC on 24.02.2016. It was only then that the applicant took steps to resign from the directorship of the companies so as to adhere to the provision of Section 165. Nonetheless, prosecution has been initiated. The period of default is stated to be from 01.04.2015 to 14.03.2016 i.e for 339 days.

Contd/-.....

↓

2. With a view not to face a protracted criminal prosecution and penal consequences, the applicant who admits this default on account of ignorance, has filed the present petition under section 441 of the Act.

3. The offence is punishable u/s 165(6) of the Companies Act, 2013 which provides for an imposition of a fine which shall not be less than Rs.5,000/- but which may extend to Rs.25,000/- for every day after the first during which the contravention continues. Accordingly the office of the RoC has recommended the imposition of a fine of **Rs.84,75,000/-**(Max.) and **Rs.16,95,000/-**(Min.) on the petitioner.

4. The calculation recommended by the RoC is by way of imposition of penalty on prosecution holding the defaulter guilty. Under such circumstances, the sentencing provided under the act cannot be below the minimum. However, the principle of imposing minimum fine on compounding matters is not mandatory, as compounding of an offence can be accepted by a Court even by admonishing or issuance of a warning. The petitioner submits that the said omission was inadvertent and not on account of any malafide intentions. Though ignorance of law is no excuse, one cannot shy away from the fact that the technicalities of law are complicated and adherence to several statutory provisions very complex. The said restriction of a limit to being a Director of Public Ltd Companies to ten has been incorporated in the new law. It would be prudent to accept that no one would deliberately violate this provision so as to attract such a draconian fine, which in the present circumstances may extend upto Rs. Eighty four lakhs seventy five thousand.

5. Since the applicant has prayed for compounding, the fees imposed for the inadvertent default should be of a just and equitable parameter.

6. Under the circumstances, notwithstanding what would be the minimum quantum of fine imposed by the prosecuting court at the time of sentencing, I deem it just, fit and proper to direct compounding of the default on payment of a fee of Rs.6,00,000/- for perpetuation of the offence for about 339 days.

✓

<b>Name of the Applicant</b>	<b>Penalty</b>
Mr. Mohinder Singh Narula	Rs.6,00,000/-

7. Fine imposed on the applicant shall be paid out of his personal account.
8. Subject to the remittance of the aforesaid fine within two weeks, the offence shall stand compounded. Copy of the order be sent to the office of the RoC. Compliance Report be placed on record.
9. Petition stands disposed off in terms of the above and consigned to Record Room.

201-

**(Ina Malhotra)**  
**Member Judicial**