

MEPL CLASSES

AUDIT AND AUDITORS

WEBSITE – [www.mepclasses.com](http://www.mepclasses.com)

EMAIL-ID – [d2hclasses@mohitsir.com](mailto:d2hclasses@mohitsir.com)

ADDRESS – 59, JATINDRA MOHAN AVENUE , SOVABAZAR, KOLKATA – 700005

(TIME ALLOTTED – 90 MINUTES)

(MARKS ALLOTTED – 50 MARKS)

ATTEMPT ALL QUESTIONS

EACH QUESTION CARRIES 5 MARKS

**Question 1.**

A company includes the following shareholders also:

(I) Bank of Baroda (A Nationalized Bank) holding 12% of the subscribed capital in the company.

(II) National Insurance Company Limited (carrying on General Insurance Business) holding 10% of the subscribed capital in the company.

(III) Maharashtra State Financial Corporation (A Public Financial Institution) holding 8% of the subscribed capital in the company.

Advise the company, whether the provisions related to 'appointment of auditor in case of Government Company' are applicable to it. Discuss in the light of the provisions of the Companies Act, 2013.

**Answer –**

According to section 139(5) of the Companies Act, 2013, in the case of a Government company or any other company owned or controlled, directly or indirectly, by the Central Government, or by any State Government or Governments, or partly by the Central Government and partly by one or more State Governments, the Comptroller and Auditor-General of India shall, in respect of a financial year, appoint an auditor duly qualified to be appointed as an auditor of companies under this Act, within a period of one hundred and eighty days from the commencement of the financial year, who shall hold office till the conclusion of the annual general meeting.

In the given case as the total shareholding of the three institutions adds up to 30% of the subscribed capital of the company it is not a government company. Hence, the provisions applicable to non-government companies in relation to the appointment of auditors shall apply.

**Question 2.**

EF Limited appointed an individual firm, Naresh & Company, Chartered Accountants, as Auditors of the company at the Annual General Meeting held on 30th September, 2018. Mrs. Kamala, wife of Mr. Naresh, invested in the equity shares face value of Rs. 1 lakh of EF Limited on 15th October, 2018. But Naresh & Company continues to function as statutory auditors of the company. Advice as per the provisions of the Companies Act, 2013.

**Answer –**

**Disqualification of auditor:** According to section 141(3)(d)(i) of the Companies Act, 2013, a person who, or his relative or partner holds any security of the company or its subsidiary or of its holding or associate company a subsidiary of such holding company, which carries voting rights, such person cannot be appointed as auditor of the company. Provided that the relative of such person may hold security or interest in the company of face value not exceeding 1 lakh rupees as prescribed under the Companies (Audit and Auditors) Rules, 2014.

In the case Mr. Naresh, Chartered Accountants, did not hold any such security. But Mrs. Kamala, his wife held equity shares of EF Limited of face value Rs. 1 lakh, which is within the specified limit. Further Section 141(4) provides that if an auditor becomes subject, after his appointment, to any of the disqualifications specified in sub-section 3 of section 141, he shall be deemed to have vacated his office of auditor. Hence, Naresh & Company can continue to function as auditors of the Company even after 15th October 2018 i.e. after the investment made by his wife in the equity shares of EF Limited.

**Question 3.**

State the provisions of the Companies Act, 2013 regarding the signing of the Audit report by the Auditors of the company.

**Answer –**

Section 145 of the Companies Act, 2013 provides for auditors to sign audit reports, etc. According to this section:

(i) The person appointed as an auditor of the company shall sign the auditor's report or sign or certify any other document of the company in accordance with the provisions of sub-section (2) of section 141 (i.e. in case of firm including LLP, only Chartered Accountants are authorised to act and sign).

(ii) The qualifications, observations or comments on financial transactions or matters, which have any adverse effect on the functioning of the company mentioned in the auditor's report shall be read before the company in general meeting and shall be open to inspection by any member of the company.

**Question 4.**

(a) Mr. Suresh, a Chartered Accountant, was appointed by the Board of Directors of AB Limited as the First Auditor. The company in General Meeting removed Mr. Suresh without seeking the approval of the Central Government and appointed Mr. Gupta as Auditor in his place? Examine the validity of the aforesaid decision. (3 marks)

**Answer –**

Removal of first auditor: Section 140(1) stipulates that any auditor appointed under section 139 may be removed from office before the expiry of his term by passing special resolution in general meeting, after obtaining the previous approval of the Central Government in that behalf.

Provided that before taking any action under subsection (1) of Section 140, the auditor concerned shall be given a reasonable opportunity of being heard.

The first auditors appointed by Board of Directors can be removed in accordance with the provision of Section 140(1) of the Companies Act, 2013. Hence, the removal of the first auditor appointed by the Board without seeking approval of the Central Government is invalid. The company contravened the provision of the Act.

(b) Mr. Honest, an auditor of MM company Ltd. has colluded with the company for a fraud. The Central Government has applied to Tribunal about the said fraud by Mr. Honest. State the provisions of the Companies Act, 2013 regarding the steps that can be taken by Tribunal when it finds that the auditor of a company has acted in a fraudulent manner. (2 marks)

**Answer –**

On satisfaction of Tribunal that the auditor of a company has acted in a fraudulent manner etc.: Without prejudice to any action under the provisions of this Act or any other law for the time being in force, the Tribunal either suo moto or on an application made to it by the Central Government or by any person concerned, if it is satisfied that the auditor of a company has, whether directly or indirectly, acted in a fraudulent manner or abetted or colluded in any fraud by, or in relation to, the company or its directors or officers, it may, by order, direct the company to change its auditors.

**Requirement for change of auditor:** If the application is made by the Central Government and the Tribunal is satisfied that any change of the auditor is required, it shall within fifteen days of receipt of such application, make an order that he shall not function as an auditor and the Central Government may appoint another auditor in his place.

### Question 5.

Irah Limited is incorporated on 3.10.2020. The company is having a paid-up share capital of Rs. 5 crores. Following are key shareholders of the company:

Name of party holding shares	Amount (₹)
Central Govt.	1.50
Punjab Govt.	1.23
Others	2.27

The first auditor of the company has been appointed by the Board of Directors on 31.10.2020. The members of the company have objected to such an appointment by the Board of Directors. According to the members its only the members who can appoint the first auditor. Advise the company on the validity of such appointment as per the provisions of the Companies Act, 2013. Also, advise whether the contention of members of the company is correct.

### Answer –

According to section 2(45) of the Companies Act, 2013, "Government company" means any company in which not less than 51% of the paid-up share capital is held by the Central Government, or by any State Government or Governments, or partly by the Central Government and partly by one or more State Governments, and includes a company which is a subsidiary company of such a Government company.

As per section 139(7), in the case of a Government company or any other company owned or controlled, directly or indirectly, by the Central Government, or by any State Government, or Governments, or partly by the Central Government and partly by one or more State Governments, the first auditor shall be appointed by the Comptroller and Auditor-General of India within 60 days from the date of registration of the company and in case the Comptroller and Auditor - General of India does not appoint such auditor within the said period, the Board of Directors of the company shall appoint such auditor within the next 30 days; and in the case of failure of the Board to appoint such auditor within the next 30 days, it shall inform the members of the company who shall appoint such auditor within the 60 days at an extraordinary general meeting, who shall hold office till the conclusion of the first annual general meeting .

In the given question, Shiv Limited is a government company as 54.6%  $[(1.5+1.23)/ 5= 54.6\%]$  of the share capital is held by Central government and State Government (Punjab Government). Thus, the first auditor of Shiv Limited shall be appointed by the Comptroller and Auditor-General of India within 60 days from the date of registration. Thus, the appointment of first auditor by Board of Directors on 31.10.2020 is not valid. The Board of Directors can appoint the first auditor in case the Comptroller and Auditor-General of India does not appoint such auditor within the said period of period 60 days. The Board of Directors of the company shall appoint such auditor within the next 30 days.

In the case of failure of the Board to appoint such auditor within the next 30 days, it shall inform the members of the company who shall appoint such auditor within 60 days at an extraordinary general meeting, who shall hold office till the conclusion of the first annual general meeting . Thus, the contention of members that its only the members who can appoint the first auditor of the Government company, is not correct.

**Question 6.**

Mr. Yash is a partner and in charge of PQR firm. The firm is appointed as an auditor firm of A. K. Company limited (listed company). Mr. Yash retires from PQR firm and after some time join Gupta & Gupta firm as a partner, on 20/05/21. In the general meeting of the company held on 15/06/21, the company appointed Gupta & Gupta firm as next auditor of the company. Do you think the company has adhered to the provision of appointing Gupta & Gupta as auditor for the company, under the Company Act 2013. Explain?

**Answer –**

According to Section 139(2) of the Companies Act, 2013, no listed company or a company belonging to such class or classes of companies as may be prescribed, shall appoint or re - appoint—

- (a) an individual as auditor for more than one term of five consecutive years; and
- (b) an audit firm as auditor for more than two terms of five consecutive years. Provided that –
  - (i) an individual auditor who has completed his term under clause (a) shall not be eligible for re - appointment as auditor in the same company for five years from the completion of his term;
  - (ii) an audit firm which has completed its term under clause (b), shall not be eligible for re - appointment as auditor in the same company for five years from the completion of such term.

Provided further that as on the date of appointment no audit firm having a common partner or partners to the other audit firm, whose tenure has expired in a company immediately preceding the financial year, shall be appointed as auditor of the same company for a period of five years.

Under Rule 6(3)(ii)(b) of The Companies (Audit and Auditors) Rules, 2014. if a partner, who is in charge of an audit firm and also certifies the financial statements of the company, retires from the said firm and joins another firm of chartered accountants, such other firm shall also be ineligible to be appointed for a period of five years.

Here Mr. Yash has retired from PQR Firm and joined Gupta & Gupta Firm. Mr. Yash was a partner in PQR firm, where he certifies the financial statement of the company, and retires from the said firm and joins Gupta & Gupta firm. Hence Gupta & Gupta Firm will also be ineligible, to be appointed as auditor firm for a period of 5 years.

### Question 7.

The Board of Directors of Prism Ltd. requested its Statutory Auditor to accept the assignment of designing and implementation of suitable financial information system to strengthen the internal control mechanism of the Company. How will you approach to this proposal, as Statutory Auditor of Prism Ltd., taking into account the consequences, if any, of accepting this proposal?

### Answer –

According to section 144 of the Companies Act, 2013, an auditor appointed under this Act shall provide to the company only such other services as are approved by the Board of Directors or the audit committee, as the case may be. But such services shall not include designing and implementation of any financial information system. In the said instance, the Board of directors of Prism Ltd. requested its Statutory Auditor to accept the assignment of designing and implementation of suitable financial information system to strengthen the internal control mechanism of the company. As per the above provision, said service is strictly prohibited.

In the light of the above provisions, it is advised that the Statutory Auditor not to take up the above stated assignment.

In case the Statutory Auditor accepts the assignment, he will attract the penal provisions as specified in Section 147 of the Companies Act, 2013.

**Question 8.**

HD Software Private Limited is engaged in the business of providing software services. The company appointed its statutory auditors. The engagement letter was signed with a clause that fee to be mutually decided. However, the remuneration was not finalized. Directors of the company seeks your advice for, provisions related to remuneration of directors<sup>1</sup> as per the provisions of the Companies Act, 2013.

**Answer –**

Section 142 of the Companies Act, 2013, provides for remuneration of auditors. According to this section the remuneration of the auditors of a company shall be fixed by the company in general meeting or in such manner as the company in general meeting may determine.

The remuneration shall, in addition to the fee payable to an auditor, include the expenses, if any, incurred by the auditor in connection with the audit of the company and any facility extended to him but does not include any remuneration paid to him for any other service rendered by him at the request of the company.

As per the facts of the Question and stated provision, remuneration of the appointed statutory auditors of a company shall be fixed by the HD Software Private Limited in general meeting or in such manner as the company in general meeting may determine

**Question 9.**

Three chartered accountants, Mr. Robert, Mr. Ram and Mrs. Rohini, formed a Limited Liability Partnership under the Limited Liability Partnership Act, 2008 in the name of 'R & Associates LLP', practicing chartered accountants. SR Ltd. intends to appoint 'R & Associates LLP' as auditors of the company.

Examine the validity of the proposal of SR Ltd. to appoint 'R & Associates LLP', a body corporate, as an auditor of the company as per the provisions of the Companies Act, 2013.

**Answer –**

As per the provisions of Section 141 (3) of the Companies Act, 2013 read with Rule 10 of Companies (Audit and Auditors) Rule 2014, a body corporate other than a limited liability partnership registered under the Limited Liability Partnership Act, 2008 shall not be qualified for appointment as auditor of a company.

In the given case, proposal of SR Ltd. to appoint 'R & Associates LLP' as auditors of the company is valid as the restriction marked for appointment as auditor for a body corporate is not applicable to Limited Liability Partnership.

### Question 10.

L Ltd. having 2,000 members with paid-up capital of ₹ 1 crore, decided to hold its Annual General Meeting (AGM) on 21st August, 2022. On 2nd July, 2022, 50 members holding paid-up capital of ₹ 6 lakh in aggregate, has given notice of their intention for a resolution to be passed at the Annual General Meeting for appointing Dawar & Co., as its Statutory auditor from Financial Year 2022-23 onwards, instead of its existing Statutory auditor, SNS & Co. which was originally appointed for 5 years term and had completed only 3 years term.

When such notice was received by existing auditors, they sent a representation in writing to the company along with a request for its notification to the members of the company.

In the context of aforesaid facts, answer the following question(s) according to provisions of the Companies Act, 2013:

- (i) Whether the said notice was given by adequate number of members and within the prescribed time limit to L Ltd.?
- (ii) Whether the company was bound to send such representation to its members made by SNS & Co?

### Answer –

(i) Special Notice: As per section 140(4) of the Companies Act, 2013, resolution for appointment of an auditor other than retiring auditor at an Annual General Meeting requires special notice.

As per section 115 of the Companies Act, 2013, read with rule 23 of Companies (Management and Administration) Rules, 2014:

Where, by any provision contained in this Act or in the Articles of Association of a company, special notice is required for passing any resolution, then the notice of the intention to move such resolution shall be given to the company by such number of members holding not less than 1% of the total voting power, or holding shares on which such aggregate sum not exceeding five lakh rupees, as may be prescribed, has been paid-up.

Rule 23 provides, a special notice required to be given to the company shall be signed, either individually or collectively by such number of members holding not less than one percent of total

voting power or holding shares on which an aggregate sum of not less than 5,00,000 rupees has been paid up on the date of the notice.

The afore-mentioned notice shall be sent by members to the company not earlier than 3 months but at least 14 days before the date of meeting at which the resolution is to be moved, exclusive of the day on which the notice is given and the day of the meeting.

Here, L Ltd. is having 2,000 members with paid-up capital of ₹1 crore, and it received a notice from its 50 members holding paid-up capital of ₹ 6 lakh, in aggregate, on 2nd July, 2022 for a resolution to be passed at the AGM to be held on 21st August, 2022.

As the members who gave the notice hold more than ₹ 5 lakh in the paid-up capital of the company, they were eligible to give such notice.

Further, the notice should have been given not earlier than 3 months but at least 14 days before the date of meeting - 21st August, 2022, and the notice was given on 2nd July, 2022 i.e., within the prescribed time limit.

Thus, it can be said that the said notice was made by adequate number of members within the prescribed time limit to L Ltd.

[Note: In the given question 50 members are holding paid-up share capital of ₹ 6 lakh. In fact they are holding more than 1% of total voting power as the paid-up share capital of the company is ₹ 1 crore.]

This can also be considered as fulfillment of the condition. Further, a presumption may be taken that these members are holding equity shares carrying voting rights in absence of any specific information given in the question regarding class of shares.]

ii) Representation to members: Where notice is given of such a resolution and the retiring auditor makes with respect thereto representation in writing to the company (not exceeding a reasonable length) and requests its notification to members of the company, the company shall, —

(1) in any notice of the resolution given to members of the company, state the fact of the representation having been made; and

(2) send a copy of the representation to every member of the company to whom notice of the meeting is sent, whether before or after the receipt of the representation by the company.

Yes, as per section 140(4) of the Companies Act, 2013, the company was bound to send the representation made by SNS & Co., to its members.

However, if a copy of the representation is not sent as aforesaid because it was received too late or because of the company's default, a copy thereof shall be filed with the Registrar and the auditor may (without prejudice to his right to be heard orally) require that representation shall be read out at the meeting.

