



Chapter III

Prospectus and allotment of shares

Q	Section	Topic
1	23	Allotment without prospectus
2	26	Reports which shall be included in the prospectus
3	27	Procedure for variation in the objects in the prospectus
4	27	variation in the objects or terms in the prospectus
5	29	Securities to be in Demat Form
6	30	Contents of its memorandum to be specified in every advertisement
7	31	Shelf prospectus
8	34,35	Liability and protection in case of mis-statement in prospectus
9	34,35	Liability and protection in case of mis-statement in prospectus
10	34,35	Liability and protection in case of mis-statement in prospectus
11	34,35	Liability and protection in case of mis-statement in prospectus
12	34,35	Liability and protection in case of mis-statement in prospectus
13	34,35	Liability and protection in case of mis-statement in prospectus
14	39,40	Allotment of securities
15	39,40	Allotment of securities
16	40(6)	Underwriting Commission
17	40(6)	Underwriting Commission
18	40(6)	Underwriting Commission
19	42	Private Placement
20	42	Private Placement
21	-	Irregular allotment

PRACTICAL QUESTION	
Question 1	<p>Examine the validity of these allotments in the light of the provisions of the Companies Act, 2013</p> <p>The Board of Directors of Reckless Investments Ltd. have allotted shares to the investors of the company without issuing a prospectus with the concerned Registrar of Companies. Explain the remedy available to the investors in this regard. (MTP NOV 2018)</p>
Law:	According to Section 23 of the Companies Act, 2013, a public company can issue securities to the public only by issuing a prospectus. Section 26 (1) lays down the matters required to be disclosed and included in a prospectus and requires the registration of the prospectus with the Registrar before its issue.
Conclusion:	In the given case, the company has violated with the above provisions of the Act and hence the allotment made is void. The company will have to refund the entire moneys received and will also be punishable under section 26 of the Act.

	<p>2.The Board of Directors of Ramesh Ltd. proposes to issue the prospectus inviting offers from the public for subscribing the shares of the Company. State the reports which shall be included in the prospectus for the purposes of providing financial information under the provisions of the Companies Act, 2013. (RTP nov 2020) (NOV 2019)</p>
	<p><u>Reports which shall be included in the prospectus</u></p> <p>(i) As per section 26(1) of the Companies Act, 2013, every prospectus issued shall be dated and signed</p> <p>(ii) It shall state such information and set out such reports on financial information as may be specified by the Securities and Exchange Board in consultation with the Central Government.</p> <p>(iii) Every prospectus shall make a declaration about the compliance of the provisions of this Act and a statement to the effect that nothing in the prospectus is contrary to the provisions of:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Companies Act, 2013 b. Securities Contracts (Regulation) Act, 1956 c. Securities and Exchange Board of India Act, 1992 d. Rules and regulations made under above Acts. <p>(iv) Every prospectus shall contain the following disclosures on the cover page [Sec. 26(6)] :</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> (a) A statement that a copy of the prospectus has been filed with the Registrar. (b) A list of all such documents as are required to be attached with the prospectus. <p>(v) General Information , Financial Information and terms and conditions of the issue as prescribed by roC</p>

	(vi) Report by Expert
--	-----------------------

PRACTICAL QUESTION

Question 3	Lotus valley Ltd. issued a prospectus with the object of setting up of a chain of hotels. However, later it decided to set-up a Pharmaceutical Manufacturing unit. Keeping in view of the provisions of the Companies Act, 2013, state whether Lotus valley Ltd. can do so and if it can be done, also state the procedure to be followed for variation in the objects in the prospectus. (RTP May 2016)
Law:	<p><u>Procedure for variation in the objects in the prospectus</u></p> <p>As per section 27 the Companies Act, 2013, A company shall vary the terms of contract or object for which the prospectus was issued only if following conditions are satisfied:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (i) Special resolution is passed in GM; and (ii) the prescribed details of the notice of GM (indicating clearly the justification for such variation) are published in 2 newspapers (one in English language and one in vernacular language) circulating in the city in which the registered office of the company is situated. in Form PAS-1. (iii) The dissenting shareholders (the shareholders who did not agree to the variation at the time of passing SR) shall be given an exit offer by the promoters or controlling shareholders.
Conclusion:	Thus, Lotus valley Ltd. can change the object mentioned in the prospectus from setting up a chain of hotels to setting up of a pharmaceutical manufacturing unit by following the above mentioned procedure of section 27

PRACTICAL QUESTION



Question 4	XYZ Limited issued a prospectus to raise funds for a new manufacturing project. After successfully raising the funds, the company identified an investment opportunity in a different industry six months later, requiring a significant portion of the funds. The proposed investment involved trading in equity shares of other listed companies. The board of directors suggested varying the original objectives for which the funds were raised to allow this new investment and recommended passing a special resolution in the company's general meeting. While the promoters and controlling shareholders supported this change, some shareholders expressed concerns, particularly regarding the deviation from the initially stated purpose of the funds.
-------------------	---

	Based on the provisions of the Companies Act, 2013, advise on the validity of the proposal to redirect the funds toward this new investment. (RTP Jan 25)
Law:	<p>According to section 27(1) of the Companies Act, 2013,</p> <p>(i) the terms of a contract referred to in the prospectus or objects for which the prospectus has been issued can be varied, but only with the authority of the company given by it in general meeting by way of special resolution.</p> <p>(ii) The second proviso to sub-section (1) prescribes that such company is not to use any amount raised by it through the prospectus for buying, trading or otherwise dealing in equity shares of any other listed company.</p>
Conclusion:	<p>In the given question, XYZ Limited, is planning to use the amount initially raised for investing in a different industry, which also involves trading in equity shares of other listed companies.</p> <p>Though XYZ Limited has passed a special resolution for the said proposal but it cannot use any amount raised by it through the prospectus for buying, trading or otherwise dealing in equity shares of any other listed company. Hence, the said proposal for new investment is not valid.</p>

PRACTICAL QUESTION

Question 5	Grab Ltd., an unlisted company, intends to make a public offer of securities. However, they are not sure about the compliance requirements for issuing securities in dematerialised form. You being an expert, guide Grab Ltd, on the relevant provisions of the Companies Act, 2013 and whether Grab Ltd. is eligible to issue its securities? (RTP May 25)
Law:	<p>The given issue is based on section 29 of the Companies Act, 2013 read with the relevant 9A (Issue of securities in dematerialised form by unlisted public companies) of the Companies (Prospectus and Allotment of Securities) Rules, 2014.</p> <p>(i) As per Section 29 every company making a public offer and unlisted company, have to issue their securities only in dematerialised form by complying with the provisions of the Depositories Act, 1996 and regulations made under it.</p> <p>(ii) Any company, other than a company mentioned above, may convert its securities into dematerialised form or issue its securities in physical form in accordance with the provisions of the Depositories Act, 1996 and the regulations made thereunder.</p> <p>(iii) Every unlisted public company making any offer for issue or buyback or bonus shares or rights offer shall ensure that before making such offer, <i>entire</i></p>



	<p><i>holding of securities of its promoters, directors, key managerial personnel has been dematerialised</i> in accordance with provisions of the Depositories Act 1996 and regulations made there under.</p> <p>(iv) Following Unlisted Public Co. are exempted from Demat:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Nidhi Company. Government Company. 100% Subsidiary
Conclusion:	Accordingly, in the given case, Grab Ltd., an unlisted company, falls in the prescribed classes of companies, must ensure that its securities are issued and transferred in dematerialised form in compliance with the Depositories Act, 1996.

	<p>6. Keya Limited decides to issue 1,00,000 securities of the company. The company decides to publish an advertisement of the prospectus. Enumerate to the company about necessary contents of its memorandum to be specified therein. (RTP MAY 2021)</p>
	<p><u>Contents of its memorandum to be specified in every advertisement</u></p> <p>According to Section 30, where an advertisement of any prospectus of a company is published in any manner, it shall be necessary to specify therein the contents of its memorandum as regards the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> the objects, the liability of members and the amount of share capital of the company, the names of the signatories to the memorandum, the number of shares subscribed for by the signatories, and the capital structure of the company.

PRACTICAL QUESTION

Question 7	<p>Prakhar Ltd. intends to raise share capital by issuing Equity Shares in different stages over a certain period of time. However, the company does not wish to issue prospectus each and every time of issue of shares. Considering the provisions of the Companies Act, 2013, discuss what formalities Prakhar Ltd. should follow to avoid repeated issuance of prospectus? (RTP NOV 2018)</p> <p>What is a Shelf-Prospectus? State the important provisions relating to the issuance of Shelf-Prospectus under the provisions of Companies Act, 2013. (NOV 2018) (NOV 2016)</p>
Law:	Considering sec 31 of companies act, 2013

	<p>(i) Shelf Prospectus means a prospectus in respect of which the securities are issued for subscription in one or more issues over a certain period without the issue of a further prospectus.</p> <p>(ii) Provisions of shelf prospectus is applicable to companies as prescribed by SEBI</p> <p>(iii) Any class of company to whom shelf prospectus is applicable, may file a shelf prospectus with the Registrar at the stage of the 1st offer of securities specified in the shelf prospectus.</p> <p>(iv) The shelf prospectus shall remain valid for period not exceeding 1 year from the date of opening of the first offer of securities</p> <p>(v) Prior to the issue of a subsequent offer of securities under the shelf prospectus, the company shall be required to file an information memorandum with the Registrar. in Form PAS - 2 and filed with ROC along with fee, within 1 month prior to issue of subsequent offer. contain material facts relating to:</p> <p>(a) new changes created;</p> <p>(b) changes in the financial position of the company as have occurred between the previous offer and the succeeding offer of securities; and</p> <p>(c) such other changes as may be prescribed.</p> <p>(vi) the information memorandum together with the shelf prospectus shall be deemed to be a prospectus.</p>
Conclusion:	In present case, Prakhar Ltd. intends to raise share capital by issuing Equity Shares in different stages over a certain period of time and want to avoid repeated issuance of prospectus we suggest it to file shelf prospectus and follow above procedures as mentioned in sec 31

	8. What is the extent of liability of an expert, in relation to publication of prospectus, for any mis-statement in the report given by him? (MTP MAY 2017)
	<p>For any misstatement in report given by prospectus, an expert can be liable for</p> <p>(a) Criminal liability (sec 35)</p> <p>(b) Civil Liability (sec 34)</p> <p>A) Criminal liability</p> <p>(i) If a prospectus includes any statement by expert; which is misleading; or omission of any matter in the prospectus is misleading and such statement is intentional then, he will be liable u/s 447.</p> <p>(ii) However, this section shall not apply to a person:</p> <p>(a) If he proves that such statement or omission was immaterial; or</p> <p>(b) He had reasonable grounds to believe that the statement was true or the inclusion or omission was necessary</p> <p>B) Civil Liability</p>

	<p>(i) If a prospectus includes any statement by expert; which is misleading; or omission of any matter in the prospectus is misleading and such statement is unintentional then, he will be liable compensate to every person who has sustained any loss or damage</p> <p>(ii) However, this section shall not apply to an expert if</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">(a) he withdrew his consent before the issue of the prospectus</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">(b) that the prospectus was issued without his knowledge or consent</p>
--	---

PRACTICAL QUESTION

Question 9	<p>An allottee of shares in a Company brought action against a Director in respect of false statements in prospectus. The director contended that the statements were prepared by the promoters and he has relied on them. Is the Director liable under the circumstances? Decide referring to the provisions of the Companies Act, 2013. (RTP Nov 2014) (MTP NOV 2019) (6 Marks) (MTP M 21)</p>
Law:	<p>As under Section 34 and 35 of the Companies Act, 2013 A Director shall not be liable if he puts up the following defences:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (i) Such statement or omission in the prospectus was immaterial, or (ii) Director had reasonable grounds to believe, and did up to the time of issue of the prospectus believe, that the statement was true (Section 34, the Companies Act, 2013) (iii) Where a person having consented to become a director of the company, withdrew his consent before the issue of the prospectus, and that it was issued without his authority or consent; or where the prospectus was issued without the knowledge or consent of a person, and that on becoming aware of its issue, he forthwith gave a reasonable public notice that it was issued without his knowledge or consent. (Section 35, the Companies Act, 2013). (iv) He relied on public document or experts opinion
Conclusion:	<p>Yes, the Director shall be held liable. A director can escape liability for mis-statements in a prospectus only on the grounds specified under Section 34 and 35 of the Companies Act, 2013. Relying on statements prepared by promoters is not a ground included there under also a promoter cannot be expert. Accordingly, no defense shall be available to the Director.</p>

PRACTICAL QUESTION

Question 10	Green Ltd. was dealing in export of rubber to specified foreign countries. The company was willing to purchase rubber trees in A.P. State. The prospectus issued by the company contained some important extracts of the expert report and number of trees in A.P. State. The report was found untrue. Mr. Andrew purchased the shares of Green Ltd. on the basis of the expert's report published in the prospectus. However, he did not suffer any loss due to purchase of such shares. Will Mr. Andrew have any remedy against the company? State also the circumstances where an expert is not liable under the Companies Act, 2013. (RTP MAY 2020)
Law:	As per case Derry vs Peek, in case of mis-statement in prospectus remedy is available to such allottee to whom personal loss has been caused.
Conclusion:	<p>In the present case, Mr. Andrew purchased the shares of Green Ltd. on the basis of the expert report published in the prospectus. Mr. Andrew can claim compensation for any loss or damage that he might have sustained from the purchase of shares. However, he did not suffer any loss due to purchase of such shares. Hence, Mr. Andrew will have no remedy against the company.</p> <p>Circumstances when an expert is not liable: An expert will not be liable for any mis- statements in the prospectus under the following situations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (i) Such statement or omission in the prospectus was immaterial, or (ii) Director had reasonable grounds to believe, and did up to the time of issue of the prospectus believe, that the statement was true (Section 34, the Companies Act, 2013) (iii) Where a person having consented to become a director of the company, withdrew his consent before the issue of the prospectus or was issued without his authority or consent;

PRACTICAL QUESTION

Question 11	A company issued a prospectus. All the statements contained therein were literally true. It also stated that the company had paid dividends for a number of years, but did not disclose the fact that the dividends were not paid out of trading profits, but out of capital profits. An allottee of shares wants to avoid the contract on the ground that the prospectus was false in material particulars. Decide. (RTP May 2015) (RTP MAY 2018) (MAY 2013)
Law:	As per case Rex vs Kysant Prospectus must disclose all material facts; no fact must be omitted due to which the nature or quality of privileges disclosed by prospectus is affected; and no facts must be suppressed.

Conclusion:	The non-disclosure of the fact that dividends were paid out of capital profits is a concealment of material fact as a company is normally required to distribute dividend only from trading or revenue profits and under exceptional circumstances can do so out of capital profits. Hence, a material misrepresentation has been made.
--------------------	---

PRACTICAL QUESTION

Question 12	<p>P Ltd. issued and published its prospectus to invite the investors to purchase its shares. The said prospectus contained a false statement.</p> <p>Mr. X purchased some partly paid shares of the company in good faith from the Stock Exchange. Subsequently, the company was wound up and the name of Mr. X was included in the list of contributories. Decide:</p> <p>(i) Whether Mr. X is liable to pay the unpaid amount?</p> <p>(ii) Can Mr. X sue the directors of the company to recover damages? (MAY 2016)</p>
Law:	<p>A person who has applied for shares in the company, and who has been allotted shares has certain remedies against the company and the persons issuing the prospectus.</p> <p>However as per case Peek vs gurney, the right to claim damage from Company or Directors etc. shall lie only if the person has purchased shares on the strength of a statement in prospectus. If a person buys shares from another shareholder or from open market, he cannot bring a claim for damages.</p>
Conclusion:	<p>(i) Yes, X is liable to pay the unpaid amount on the shares as he cannot avoid contract since he purchased shares from stock exchange As X has purchased partly paid shares, so he is liable for the remaining value of the shares. At the time of winding up he is liable to contribute as a contributory.</p> <p>(ii) No, X cannot sue the directors to recover damages for the misstatement in the prospectus. If a person purchases shares in the open market, the prospectus is non operative as far as he is concerned. In the present case, Mr. X purchased shares on the stock exchange even if he did so in good faith he had not relied on the statement in the prospectus. In view of the above, he cannot sue the directors of the company to recover damages.</p>

PRACTICAL QUESTION

Question 13	With a view to issue shares to the general public a prospectus containing some false information was issued by a company. Mr. X received copy of the prospectus from the company, but did not apply for allotment of any shares. The allotment of shares
--------------------	--

	to the general public was completed by the company within the stipulated period. A few months later, Mr. X bought 2000 shares through the stock exchange at a higher price which later on fell sharply. X sold these shares at a heavy loss. Mr. X claims damages from the company for the loss suffered on the ground the prospectus issued by the company contained a false statement. Referring to the provisions of the Companies Act, 2013 examine whether X's claim for damages is justified. (MTP MAY 2018)
Law:	<p>A person who has applied for shares in the company, and who has been allotted shares has certain remedies against the company and the persons issuing the prospectus.</p> <p>However as per case Peek vs gurney, the right to claim damage from Company or Directors etc. shall lie only if the person has purchased shares on the strength of a statement in prospectus. If a person buys shares from another shareholder or from open market, he cannot bring a claim for damages.</p>
Conclusion:	Since, X purchased shares through the stock exchange (open market) which cannot be said to have bought shares on the basis of prospectus. X cannot bring action for deceit against the directors. Hence, X will not succeed. It was also held in the case of Peek Vs. Gurney that the above-mentioned remedy by way of damage will not be available to a person if he has not purchased the shares on the basis of prospectus.

PRACTICAL QUESTION

Question 14	Alfa Ltd. after receiving 80% of the minimum subscription as stated in the prospectus, has allotted 100 equity shares in favour of Mr. X. The company deposited the said amount in the bank but withdrew 50% of the amount, before finalization of the allotment, for the purchase of certain assets. Mr. X refuses to accept the allotment of shares on the ground that the allotment is violative of the provisions of the Companies Act, 2013. Discuss in the light of the provisions of the Companies Act, 2013. (MTP NOV 2017)
Law:	<p>According to Section 39 of companies Act,2013</p> <p>(i)no allotment of any securities of a company offered to the public for subscription shall be made unless the amount stated in the prospectus as the minimum amount has been subscribed and the sums payable on application for the amount so stated have been paid to and received by the company</p> <p>(ii)Further, according to Section 39(3), if the stated minimum amount has not been subscribed and the sum payable on application is not received within a period of thirty days from the date of issue of the prospectus, the amount received under sub-section (1) shall be returned within of 15 days from the closure of the issue.</p>

	(iii) If such money is not repaid within such period, the directors of the company who are officers in default shall jointly and severally be liable to repay that money along with interest at the rate of 15% p.a.
Conclusion:	<p>The company has received 80% of the minimum subscription as stated in the prospectus whereas required minimum subscription as per SEBI act is 90% .Hence, the allotment is in contravention of section 39(1) of the Companies Act, 2013 it is required to refund the money received (i.e. 80% of the minimum subscription) to the applicants. It has no other option available.</p> <p>Therefore, in the present case, X is within his rights refuses to accept the allotment of shares which has been illegally made by the company.</p>

PRACTICAL QUESTION

Question 15	<p>Kite Limited issued 1,00,000 equity shares of ` 100 each at par to the public by issuing a prospectus. The prospectus discloses the minimum subscription amount of ` 15,00,000 required to be received on application of shares and share application money shall be payable at ` 20 per share. The prospectus further reveals that Kite Limited has applied for listing of shares in 3 recognized stock exchanges of which 1 application has been rejected. The issue was fully subscribed and Kite Limited received an amount of ` 20,00,000 on share application. Kite Limited, then proceeded for allotment of shares. Examine the three disclosures in the above case study which are the deciding factors in an allotment of shares and the consequences for violation, if any under the provisions of the Companies Act, 2013.(6 Marks) (MTP Sep. 23)</p>
Law:	<p>As per section 39,40 of companies act , 2013 there are 3 important criteria for allotment of shares in case of public offer</p> <p>(i)Every company shall, before making public offer, make an application to one or more recognised stock exchange and obtain permission for the securities to be dealt with in such stock exchange and The prospectus shall state the name or names of the stock exchange in which the securities shall be dealt with Also none of the stock exchange should reject application</p> <p>(ii) The company shall obtain minimum application money on every security which shall not be less than at least:</p> <p>(a) 5% of the nominal amount of the security; or</p> <p>(b) such other percentage or amount, as may be specified by SEBI by making regulations in this behalf.</p> <p>(iii)no allotment of any securities of a company offered to the public for subscription shall be made unless the amount stated in the prospectus as the minimum amount has been subscribed and the sums payable on application for the amount so stated have been paid to and received by the company</p>

Conclusion:	In above case since Kite Limited has applied for listing of shares in 3 recognized stock exchanges of which 1 application has been rejected, he cannot proceed to issue shares and if allotted, issue will be void
--------------------	--

PRACTICAL QUESTION

Question 16	Kapoor Builders Limited decides to pay 2.5 percent of the value of debentures as underwriting commission to the underwriters but the Articles of the company authorize only 2.0 percent underwriting commission on debentures. The company further decides to pay the underwriting commission in the form of flats. Examine the validity of the above arrangements under the provisions of the Companies Act, 2013. (RTP MAY 2018) (MTP NOV 2017)
Law:	As per Section 40 (6) of the Companies Act 2013, The rate of commission paid or agreed to be paid shall not exceed, in case of shares, five percent (5%) of the price at which the shares are issued or a rate authorised by the articles, whichever is less, and in case of debentures, shall not exceed two and a half per cent (2.5 %) of the price at which the debentures are issued, or as specified in the company's articles, whichever is less;
Conclusion:	<p>(i) In view of the above, the decision of Kapoor Builders Ltd. to pay underwriting commission exceeding 2% as prescribed in the Articles is invalid.</p> <p>(ii) The company may pay the underwriting commission in the form of flats as both the Companies Act and the Rules do not impose any restriction on the mode of payment though the source has been restricted to either the proceeds of the issue or profits of the company.</p>

PRACTICAL QUESTION

Question 17	Modem Jewellery Ltd. decides to pay 5% of the issue price gap of shares as underwriting commission to the underwriters, but the Articles of the company authorize only 4% underwriting commission on shares. Examine the validity of the above decision under the provision of the Companies Act, 2013. (MAY 2019)
Law:	Section 40(6) of the Companies Act, 2013 provides that a company may pay commission to any person in connection with the subscription to its securities subject to such conditions as may be prescribed. Rule 13 of the Companies (Prospectus and Allotment of Securities) Rules, 2014 provides the conditions. As per Rule 13(c) of the Companies (Prospectus and Allotment of Securities) Rules, 2014, the rate of commission paid or agreed to be paid shall not exceed, in case of shares, five per cent of the price at which the shares are issued or a rate authorised by the articles, whichever is less.

Conclusion:	In the instant case, Modern Jewellery Ltd. decides to pay 5% of the issue price gap of shares as underwriting commission to the underwriters, but the Articles of the company authorize only 4% underwriting commission on shares. Hence the company can only pay a maximum of 4% underwriting commission on shares.
--------------------	--


PRACTICAL QUESTION


Question 18	“The Articles of Association of X Ltd. contained a provision that upto 4% of issue price of the shares may be paid as underwriting commission to the underwriters. The Board of Directors of X Ltd. decided to pay 5% underwriting commission. (MTP MAY 2019)
Law:	Section 40 (6) of the Companies Act 2013, provides that a company may pay commission to any person in connection with the subscription or procurement of subscription to its securities, whether absolute or conditional, subject to the number of conditions which are prescribed under Companies (Prospectus and Allotment of Securities) Rules, 2014. Under the Companies (Prospectus and Allotment of Securities) Rules, 2014 the rate of commission paid or agreed to be paid shall not exceed, in case of shares, five percent (5%) of the price at which the shares are issued or a rate authorised by the articles, whichever is less.
Conclusion:	In the given problem, the articles of X Ltd. have prescribed 4% underwriting commission but the directors decided to pay 5% underwriting commission. Therefore, the decision of the Board of Directors to pay 5% commission to the underwriters is invalid.



PRACTICAL QUESTION

Question 19	<p>Prakash Limited wants to raise funds for its upcoming project. Accordingly, it has issued private placement offer letters for issuing equity shares to 55 persons, of which four are qualified institutional buyers and remaining are individuals. Before the completion of allotment of equity shares under this offer letter, company issued another private placement offer letter to another 155 persons in their individual names for issue of its debentures.</p> <p>Being a public company is it possible for Prakash Limited to issue securities under a private placement offer? By doing so, whether the company is in compliance with provisions relating to private placement or should these offers be treated as public offers? What if the offer for debentures is given</p>
--------------------	--

	after allotment of equity shares but within the same financial year? (6 Marks) (MTP M 21)(May 25 MTP)
Law:	<p>According to section 42 of the Companies Act, 2013 any private or public company may make private placement through issue of a private placement offer letter.</p> <p>(i) However, the offer shall be made to the persons not exceeding two hundred in a financial year. For counting number of persons, Qualified Institutional Buyers (QIBs) and employees of the company being offered securities under a scheme of employees' stock option will not be considered.</p> <p>(ii) It is to be noted that if a company makes an offer or invitation to more than the prescribed number of persons, it shall be deemed to be an offer to the public and accordingly, it shall be governed by the provisions relating to prospectus.</p> <p>(iii) Also, a company is not permitted to make fresh offer under this section if the allotment with respect to any offer made earlier has not been completed or otherwise, that offer has been withdrawn or abandoned by the company. This provision is applicable even if the issue is of different kind of security.</p> <p>Any offer or invitation not in compliance with the provisions of this section shall be treated as a public offer and all provisions will apply accordingly.</p>
Conclusion:	<p>(i) In the given case Prakash Limited, though a public company but the private placement provisions allow even a public company to raise funds through this route. The company has given offer to 55 persons out of which 4 are qualified institutional buyers and hence, the offer is given effectively to only 51 persons which is well within the limit of 200 persons. From this point of view, the company complies the private placement provisions.</p> <p>(ii) However, as per the question, the company has given another private placement offer of debentures before completing the allotment in respect of first offer and therefore, the second offer does not comply with the provisions of section 42. Hence, the offers given by the company will be treated as public offer.</p> <p>(iii) In case the company gives offer for debentures in the same financial year after allotment of equity shares is complete then both the offers can well be treated as private placement offers.</p>

	<p>20. Ram Limited is planning to make a private placement of securities. The Managing Director arranged to obtain a brief note from some source explaining the salient features of the issue of private placement that the Board of Directors shall keep in mind while approving the proposal on this subject. The brief note includes, inter alia, the information / suggestions on the following points:</p> <p>(i) A private placement shall be made only to a select group of identified persons not exceeding 200 in a financial year.</p>
---	--

	<p>(ii) The aforesaid ceiling of identified persons shall not apply to the offer made to the qualified institutional buyers but is applicable to the employees of the Company who will be covered under the Company's Employees Stock Option Scheme.</p> <p>(iii) The offer on private placement basis shall be made only once in a financial year for any number of identified persons not exceeding 200.</p> <p>(iv) The Company solicits your remarks on the points referred above as to whether they are valid or not? Reasoned remarks should be given in accordance with the provisions of the Companies Act, 2013.(5 Marks) (MTP Sep. 23)</p>
	<p>(i) The statement is valid as private placement shall be made only to a select group of identified persons not exceeding 200 in a financial year but such limit is per kind of security and for a financial year.</p> <p>(ii) The statement is invalid as The aforesaid ceiling of identified persons shall not only apply to the offer made to the qualified institutional buyers but also to the Company's Employees Stock Option Scheme.</p> <p>(iii) The statement is valid as private placement shall be made only to a select group of identified persons not exceeding 200 in a financial year but such limit is per kind of security and for a financial year.</p>

	<p>21. Explain various instances which make the allotment of securities as irregular allotment under the Companies Act, 2013. (MAY 2019)</p>
	<p>The Companies Act, 2013 does not specifically provide for the term “Irregular Allotment” of securities. Hence, we have to examine the requirements of a proper issue of securities and consider the consequences of non- fulfillment of those requirements.</p> <p>In broad terms an allotment of shares is deemed to be irregular when it has been made by a company in violation of Sections 23, 26, 39 or 40. Irregular allotment therefore arises in the following instances:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1 Where a company does not issue a prospectus in a public issue as required by section 23; or 2 Where the prospectus issued by the company does not include any of the matters required to be included therein under section 26 (1), or the information given is misleading, faulty and incorrect; or 3 Where the prospectus has not been filed with the Registrar for registration under section 26 (4); or 4 The minimum subscription as specified in the prospectus has not been received in terms of section 39; or 5 The minimum amount receivable on application is less than 5% of the nominal value of the securities offered or lower than the amount prescribed by SEBI in this behalf; or 6 In case of a public issue, approval for listing has not been obtained from one or more of the recognized stock exchanges under section 40 of the Companies Act, 2013.

CA WALLAH