

## Director cannot be penalised when the lapse is on the part of the company – Bombay HC

16 August 2022



## Summary:

The Bombay High Court (HC) has held that a show cause notice imposing a penalty cannot be issued against an ex-director due to a lapse on the part of the company. The HC observed that there has to be a specific act attributed to a director or the person allegedly in control of the management of the company, to the effect that such a person was responsible for the acts committed by or on behalf of the company. In the present case, the entire charge undisputedly is levelled against the company for not fulfilling the export obligations. Further, in the notice issued to the company no details about a lapse on the part of the director were specified. Therefore, such proceedings initiated against the ex-director for lapse on the company's part are contrary to the principle of vicarious liability and are *void-ab-initio*.

## Facts of the case

- The petitioner<sup>1</sup> is the wife of a practising advocate<sup>2</sup>. The late advocate was an independent, non-executive director of the company<sup>3</sup> and was not involved in the day-to-day affairs of the company. He had subsequently resigned and fulfilled all the statutory compliances<sup>4</sup>.
- The company defaulted in fulfilling the export obligations as prescribed at the time of issue of Advance Import licences.
- Further, the authorities held that, since the company did not submit the MODVAT reversal certificate<sup>5</sup>, no export was made against the licence.
- Therefore, adjudication orders were passed holding the company as a defaulter under the Foreign Trade (Development and Regulation) Act, 1992 (FTDR Act).
- The order-imposing penalty was addressed to the company and was also forwarded to the ex-director on the

ground that, even after his resignation his name was still appearing in the Import Export Code (IEC) of the company.

- Therefore, the petitioner filed a writ before the Bombay HC challenging the impugned order.

## Bombay HC observations and ruling<sup>6</sup>:

- **Lapse on the part of the company for non-fulfilment of obligations:** The company was under an obligation to comply with requirements under the FTDR Act or the Foreign Trade Policy. Hence, it is to be primarily accused of lapse. Further, the order was passed for penal actions against ex-directors and the company. However, the order did not specify the role of each director contributing to such lapse. Thus, it is a clear contradiction of the principle of vicarious liability.
- **A clear violation of principles of natural justice:** The SCN was issued to the company, and neither of the notices

<sup>1</sup> Meena Anand Suryadutt Bhatt

<sup>2</sup> Late Shri Anand S. Bhatt

<sup>3</sup> TPI India Ltd

<sup>4</sup> Under the provisions of the Sick Industrial Companies (Special Provisions Act), 1955 (SICA) by

the Board of Industrial and Financial Reconstruction (BIFR), New Delhi.

<sup>5</sup> As per Circular 108/19/95-Central Excise

<sup>6</sup> Writ Petition No. 325 of 2009 dated 8 July 2022

were issued to the director. Further, the director was not given an opportunity of being heard at the time of the impugned order, whereby the aforesaid penalty was imposed on him. Thus, it is a clear violation of the principles of natural justice. Therefore, the proceedings initiated against the ex-director are *void-ab-initio*.

- **The penalty cannot be sustained:** The HC has placed reliance on the decision<sup>7</sup> of Gujarat HC, wherein it was held that if no SCN is issued to the directors against the penalty imposed and no opportunity of hearing is granted, then the consequential orders shall be nullified. Accordingly, the HC has passed the present order in line with the decision of the Gujarat HC.

#### Our comments:

The present ruling is welcome and is likely to set precedence in similar matters.

The Delhi HC<sup>8</sup> had held that the director cannot be vicariously or jointly liable for service tax dues of a company in the absence of a specific provision and given a company's separate legal personality. The HC had further held that the onus of proof shall remain on the department/respondents to show that a director is personally liable for the dues of the company at the stage of issuing SCN.

However, it is pertinent to note that the GST law<sup>9</sup> provides that where any tax, interest or penalty is due from a private company and the same cannot be recovered from the company, then the directors of such company shall be jointly and severally liable for payment of such dues. It further provides that the director shall be liable unless he proves that the non-recovery cannot be attributed to any gross neglect, misfeasance or breach of duty on his part in relation to the affairs of the company.

Thus, the GST laws shifting the onus on the director in such cases is contrary to the settled legal principles and needs a relook.

---

<sup>7</sup> Om Vir Singh

<sup>8</sup> in the case of Sanjiv kumar mittal

<sup>9</sup> Section 89 of the CGST Act, 2017

# Contact us

To know more, please visit [www.grantthornton.in](http://www.grantthornton.in) or contact any of our offices as mentioned below:

---

## NEW DELHI

National Office,  
Outer Circle,  
L 41, Connaught Circus,  
New Delhi - 110001  
T +91 11 4278 7070

## NEW DELHI

6th Floor, Wordmark 2,  
Atrocity,  
New Delhi - 110037  
T +91 11 4952 7400

## AHMEDABAD

Unit No - 603 B, 6th Floor,  
Brigade International  
Financial Center,  
GIFT City Gandhinagar,  
Ahmedabad - 382355  
T +91 79 6900 2600

## BENGALURU

5th Floor, 65/2, Block A,  
Bagman Trudi,  
Bagman Tech Park,  
CV Raman Nagar,  
Bengaluru - 560093  
T +91 804 243 0700

---

## CHANDIGARH

B-406A, 4th Floor,  
L&T Elate Office Building,  
Industrial Area Phase I,  
Chandigarh - 160002  
T +91 172 433 8000

## CHENNAI

9th floor, A wing, Prestige  
Polygon, 471 Anna Salami,  
Mylapore Division, Teynampet,  
Chennai - 600035  
T +91 44 4294 0000

## DEHRADUN

Suite No 2211, 2nd Floor,  
Building 2000, Michigan Avenue,  
Doon Express Business Park,  
Subhash Nagar,  
Dehradun - 248002  
T +91 135 264 6500

## GURGAON

21st Floor, DLF Square,  
Jacaranda Marg,  
DLF Phase II,  
Gurgaon - 122002  
T +91 124 462 8000

---

## HYDERABAD

Unit No - 1, 10th Floor,  
My Home Twits, APIIC,  
Hyderabad Knowledge City,  
Hyderabad - 500081  
T +91 40 6630 8200

## KOCHI

6th Floor, Model Centre Point,  
Warri am Road Junction,  
MG Road  
Kochi - 682016  
T +91 484 406 4541

## KOLKATA

10C Hungerford Street,  
5th Floor,  
Kolkata - 700017  
T +91 33 4050 8000

## MUMBAI

11th Floor, Tower II,  
One International Center,  
SB Marg Prabhadevi (W),  
Mumbai - 400013  
T +91 22 6626 2600

---

## MUMBAI

Caledonia, 1st Floor,  
C Wing,  
(Opposite J&J Office),  
Sahar Road, Andheri East,  
Mumbai - 400069

## NOIDA

Plot No 19A, 2nd Floor,  
Sector - 16A,  
Noida - 201301  
T +91 120 485 5900

## PUNE

3rd Floor, Unit No 310-312,  
West Wing, Nyati Unitree,  
Nagar Road, Yeravda  
Pune - 411006  
T +91 20 6744 8800

---

For more information or for any queries, write to us at [GTBharat@in.gt.com](mailto:GTBharat@in.gt.com)



Follow us @GrantThorntonIN

© 2022 Grant Thornton Bharat LLP. All rights reserved.

“Grant Thornton Bharat” means Grant Thornton Advisory Private Limited, the sole member firm of Grant Thornton International Limited (UK) in India, and those legal entities which are its related parties as defined by the Companies Act, 2013, including Grant Thornton Bharat LLP.

Grant Thornton Bharat LLP, formerly Grant Thornton India LLP, is registered with limited liability with identity number AAA-7677 and has its registered office at L-41 Connaught Circus, New Delhi, 110001. References to Grant Thornton are to Grant Thornton International Ltd. (Grant Thornton International) or its member firms. Grant Thornton International and the member firms are not a worldwide partnership. Services are delivered independently by the member firms.