



INTERNATIONAL LAW
JOURNAL

**WHITE BLACK
LEGAL LAW
JOURNAL**
**ISSN: 2581-
8503**

Peer - Reviewed & Refereed Journal

The Law Journal strives to provide a platform for discussion of International as well as National Developments in the Field of Law.

WWW.WHITEBLACKLEGAL.CO.IN

DISCLAIMER

No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored, transmitted, translated, or distributed in any form or by any means—whether electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording, scanning, or otherwise—without the prior written permission of the Editor-in-Chief of *White Black Legal – The Law Journal*.

All copyrights in the articles published in this journal vest with *White Black Legal – The Law Journal*, unless otherwise expressly stated. Authors are solely responsible for the originality, authenticity, accuracy, and legality of the content submitted and published.

The views, opinions, interpretations, and conclusions expressed in the articles are exclusively those of the respective authors. They do not represent or reflect the views of the Editorial Board, Editors, Reviewers, Advisors, Publisher, or Management of *White Black Legal*.

While reasonable efforts are made to ensure academic quality and accuracy through editorial and peer-review processes, *White Black Legal* makes no representations or warranties, express or implied, regarding the completeness, accuracy, reliability, or suitability of the content published. The journal shall not be liable for any errors, omissions, inaccuracies, or consequences arising from the use, interpretation, or reliance upon the information contained in this publication.

The content published in this journal is intended solely for academic and informational purposes and shall not be construed as legal advice, professional advice, or legal opinion. *White Black Legal* expressly disclaims all liability for any loss, damage, claim, or legal consequence arising directly or indirectly from the use of any material published herein.

ABOUT WHITE BLACK LEGAL

White Black Legal – The Law Journal is an open-access, peer-reviewed, and refereed legal journal established to provide a scholarly platform for the examination and discussion of contemporary legal issues. The journal is dedicated to encouraging rigorous legal research, critical analysis, and informed academic discourse across diverse fields of law.

The journal invites contributions from law students, researchers, academicians, legal practitioners, and policy scholars. By facilitating engagement between emerging scholars and experienced legal professionals, *White Black Legal* seeks to bridge theoretical legal research with practical, institutional, and societal perspectives.

In a rapidly evolving social, economic, and technological environment, the journal endeavours to examine the changing role of law and its impact on governance, justice systems, and society. *White Black Legal* remains committed to academic integrity, ethical research practices, and the dissemination of accessible legal scholarship to a global readership.

AIM & SCOPE

The aim of *White Black Legal – The Law Journal* is to promote excellence in legal research and to provide a credible academic forum for the analysis, discussion, and advancement of contemporary legal issues. The journal encourages original, analytical, and well-researched contributions that add substantive value to legal scholarship.

The journal publishes scholarly works examining doctrinal, theoretical, empirical, and interdisciplinary perspectives of law. Submissions are welcomed from academicians, legal professionals, researchers, scholars, and students who demonstrate intellectual rigour, analytical clarity, and relevance to current legal and policy developments.

The scope of the journal includes, but is not limited to:

- Constitutional and Administrative Law
- Criminal Law and Criminal Justice
- Corporate, Commercial, and Business Laws
- Intellectual Property and Technology Law
- International Law and Human Rights
- Environmental and Sustainable Development Law
- Cyber Law, Artificial Intelligence, and Emerging Technologies
- Family Law, Labour Law, and Social Justice Studies

The journal accepts original research articles, case comments, legislative and policy analyses, book reviews, and interdisciplinary studies addressing legal issues at national and international levels. All submissions are subject to a rigorous double-blind peer-review process to ensure academic quality, originality, and relevance.

Through its publications, *White Black Legal – The Law Journal* seeks to foster critical legal thinking and contribute to the development of law as an instrument of justice, governance, and social progress, while expressly disclaiming responsibility for the application or misuse of published content.

LIFTING THE CORPORATE VEIL: JUDICIAL TRENDS IN INDIA

AUTHORED BY - VIPIN KUMAR¹ & DR. RAJU KUMAR BHAGAT²

Abstract

A crucial legal alternative to the "separate legal entity" approach defined in *Salomon v. Salomon & Co. Ltd*³, is the theory of Lifting the Corporate Veil. Although Indian law typically acknowledges a firm as a separate entity, this "veil" does not completely protect those who engage in fraud or unlawful activity.

This abstract explores how Indian courts manage the conflict between upholding corporate autonomy and guaranteeing responsibility as it looks at the country's changing legal system. The study emphasizes the shift from a strict commitment to corporate forms towards a content based strategy by examining significant judgments under the Companies Act, 2013 and common law developments.

The analysis highlights the manner in which the Indian judiciary uses the "Economic Reality" test in order to safeguard against misuse of the corporate framework, making sure that a company's legal personality is not utilized in order to evade statutory requirements or public policy, by looking into cases including tax evasion, humiliating incorporation of a company, and the "alter ego" concept.

Keywords: Separate legal entity, Corporate Veil, Companies Act, 2013, alter ego.

Introduction

The concept of corporate personality, a legal invention that transforms a company or corporation into a group of persons into a unique legal person, is the cornerstone of contemporary commercial law. According to this idea, a corporation has an independent legal identity beyond its directors, managers⁴, and stockholders. The law offers the structure required for permanent succession and enormous investment by giving a company the ability to possess

¹ Research Scholar, Department of Law, Netaji Subhas University, jmsshedpur, Jharkhand.

² Assistant Professor, Department of Law, Netaji Subhas University, jmsshedpur, Jharkhand

³ *Salomon v A Salomon & Co Ltd* [1897] AC 22 (HL).

⁴ *Salomon v A Salomon & Co Ltd* [1897] AC 22 (HL).

property, participate into legally binding contracts, and start or defend legal processes.

A key concept in this legal system is the "corporate veil." This veil protects investors' private assets against the corporation's creditors by facilitating limited liability⁵. This distance, though, is not a perfect barrier. When the corporate structure is used as a "cloak" for fraud, avoiding legal duties, or committing offenses, courts have the authority to "pierce" or "lift" this disguise⁶ in order to preserve the honesty of the legal system.

Handling the complexity of modern corporate jurisprudence requires an awareness of dual nature of the corporate individual as simultaneously a separate entity and a possible front. The historical emergence of these concepts and the evolving legal environment that determines when the needs of equity and justice must take precedence above the integrity of the corporate organization are examined in this article.

Development of the Concept of Separate Legal Entity

A significant development in legal background is the corporation's transformation from a state-approved monopoly to an independent right of association. In the past, the "concession theory" held that corporation existence was a privilege bestowed by the state. But as the industrial revolution progressed and general incorporation laws were passed, the philosophy changed to become "realist theory." It made it easier to separate ownership from administration and gave the corporation the legal stability needed for long-term capital investment, establishing it as an independent commercial entity.

Salomon v. Salomon & Co. Ltd⁷.

The House of Lords continues to be the last court affirmation of the distinct legal entity. ruling in *Salomon & Co. v. Salomon. Ltd.* The tribunal's job was to ascertain whether a business that was formally established in accordance with the Companies Act of 1862 might be seen as its principal shareholder's simple agent. The lower courts were unanimously overturned. A company is not merely a "alias" for its creator, according to the House of Lords determined that the business becomes a "different person altogether" after incorporation from its members, protecting personal assets from business bankruptcy even in the in relation to a "one-man company."

⁵ *Salomon v A Salomon & Co Ltd [1897] AC 22 (HL)*

⁶ *Gilford Motor Co Ltd v Horne [1933] Ch 935; Jones v Lipman [1962] 1 WLR 832.*

⁷ *Salomon v A Salomon & Co Ltd [1897] AC 22 (HL).*

Nature & Features of Corporate Identity

Numerous distinctive structural features determine a company's legal identity:

- ❖ **Perpetual Succession:** The company person's "immortality" guaranties that it will remain in existence even if its members pass away, become insolvent, or retire, offering continuity to both creditors and employees.
- ❖ **Proprietary Independence:** The company owns all of its owned property and assets. Although they do not have immediate equitable or legal entitlement to the company's particular assets, the investors do have an ownership stake in the capital of the business.
- ❖ **Litigation Autonomy:** The company must be prosecuted in its personal capacity for its own responsibilities and retains sole authority to sue for violations done to it as a juristic person.

Benefits and Drawbacks

Although the doctrine of corporate personality has several benefits, like the effectiveness of the "entity shield" and the broadening of the investment process under limited liability, it cannot be considered without structural flaws. Because the Salomon principle can be used as a weapon to express liabilities upon compulsory debtors, scholars frequently draw attention to the "moral hazard" that results from separating risk from management. Sometimes, the doctrine's rigor allows for "judgment-proofing" using intricate corporate organizations, when the veil is employed to hide the real location of monetary responsibility and decision-making processes.

PIERCING THE CORPORATE VEIL

Although the "corporate veil" doctrine provides investors with fundamental protection, its capacity for misuse calls for a balancing legal mechanism. The judiciary and legislature retain the authority to disregard the strict separation among the entity and its members as established by the Salomon principle in order to prevent the corporate form from being used as a tool of injustice. This procedure, sometimes known as "lifting" or "piercing" the veil, is an egalitarian action meant to achieve an equilibrium between ethical accountability and business assurance.

Definition & its importance

The legal process known as "lifting or piercing the corporate veil" occurs when a court

disregards the corporation's distinct personality and instead focuses on the people or organizations who are behind it. By doing thus, the court views the corporation's rights and obligations as those of its directors or shareholders. When it is discovered that the company is only a "facade" or "sham" intended to protect the controllers from the repercussions of their unlawful or unfair behaviour, this intervention takes place.

Distinction between "Lifting" vs. "Piercing" the Veil

Although the terms are frequently used synonymously in informal conversation, contemporary jurisprudence recognizes a subtle difference between them:

- ❖ **Lifting the Veil:** In broad terms, it refers to "peeking" beyond the corporate framework in order to find the real controllers or to learn more about the internal operations of the organization (e.g., determining the "enemy character" of a company during combat).
- ❖ **Piercing the Veil:** an additional intrusive proceeding in which the court imposes personal culpability on the shareholders for the company's debts by permanently ignoring the corporate shield. Piercing is exclusively limited to situations containing the "evasion principle," in which an individual tries to avoid an existing legal duty by the corporate structure, as per the ruling in *Prest v. Petrodel Resources Ltd*⁸.

Statutory vs. Judicial

There are two different sources of the power to ignore corporate personality:

- ❖ **Statutory Lifting:** Legislatures often include particular clauses inside business and tax statutes that necessitate the removal of the veil in specific circumstances. Notable instances are liability for "fraudulent trading" or "wrongful trading" during insolvency, and clauses regulating the accountability of main businesses for the tax defaults of its affiliates.
- ❖ **Judicial Lifting:** In situations involving fraud, agency, illegal behaviour, or a firm that is only a sham, courts have the inherent equitable authority to uncover the curtain. This is frequently optional and depends on the particulars of the situation.

Rationale Behind the Doctrine of Corporate Veil

Preventing the misuse of the judicial system is the main justification for this philosophy. The integrity of the legal framework would be compromised if the law allowed business entities to

⁸ *Prest v Petrodel Resources Ltd* [2013]

be utilized as a cover for fraud or contract avoidance. The law guaranties the following by retaining the authority to pierce the veil:

- ❖ **Accountability:** People cannot conduct torts or violate trust with freedom by hiding under a document from a company.
- ❖ **Transparency:** In order to ensure that the "separate entity" continues to be an instrument for economic productivity rather than a cover for criminal activity, the actual nature of business transactions is exposed.
- ❖ **Equity:** Whenever the company's assets are purposefully depleted or mismanaged, shareholders and sufferers of corporate malfeasance are given a recourse.

Indian Statutory Provisions

The Companies Act of 2013⁹ established a number of situations in which the corporate veil is required to be raised by mandate, notwithstanding the fact that the Indian judiciary regularly uses common law principles to ignore corporate personhood. By transferring the responsibility from judicial discretion to legislative duty, these rules act as a statutory deterrence against the abuse of the corporate structure. To further guaranty that the business structure is not used for money laundering or financial evasion, a number of financial statutes complement these requirements.

In contrast to its prior version, the 2013 Act established a stricter regulatory structure that focused on transparency and responsibility throughout a company's inception and final stages.

Punishment for Incorporation via Fraud

The National Company Law Tribunal (NCLT) is the authority to commence an action in cases where a business is incorporated by providing false or incorrect data or by obscuring any essential fact, according to Section 7(7) of the Act. If fraud is proven, the Tribunal may order that members' responsibility be unrestricted, therefore removing the corporate veil from the entity's founding.

Fraudulent Application for Elimination of Name

The individuals in control are held personally accountable when a request is submitted to remove a company's name from the register of companies under Section 248 with the intention of misleading creditors or defrauding anyone. The procedure of "striking off" a company

⁹ The Companies Act of 2013

identity is not permitted to be utilized as a practical departure plan to avoid current liabilities, according to Section 251(1).

In the process of dissolving up a business, the NCLT can decide which any individuals who had been intentionally involved in the business's operation are personal liable for any amount of the company's financial obligations without any limitations if it seems that the business was conducted with the goal of deceiving creditors or to accomplish any other fraudulent reason.

Role of different Financial Statutes

In the public interest, the notion of corporate identity is often disregarded, especially when it comes to the sovereign's authority to regulate foreign exchange and collect taxes.

Income Tax Act, 1961¹⁰

- ❖ According to Section 179¹¹, anyone who served as a director of a private company throughout a specific prior year is jointly and collectively liable for the payment of any taxes owed from that company, provided that what they can demonstrate the fact that the non-recovery cannot be linked to any egregious fault or breach of duty.
- ❖ Authorities are able to determine the "beneficial owner" of assets by looking past the "corporate facade" thanks to the Prevention of Money Laundering Act, 2002¹² (PMLA). Section 70 prohibits the utilization of a company as a cover for the transfer or stacking of illegal funds by declaring all individuals in control of and accountable for the business's operations criminals.

FEMA, 1999¹³

Parallel to the Prevention of Money Laundering Act, 2002, Section 42 of FEMA addresses "Offenses by Companies," guaranteeing that managers and directors are held personally accountable for violations of foreign exchange laws. This prevents the corporate structure from being utilized to get around capital account limits.

LEGAL TRENDS IN INDIA

A more comprehensive, fact-based investigation has replaced rigorous adherence to the

¹⁰ The *Income Tax Act, 1961*

¹¹ Section 179 of *Income Tax Act, 1961*

¹² The *Prevention of Money Laundering Act, 2002*

¹³ *Foreign Exchange Management Act, 1999*

Salomon principle in the Indian judiciary's handling of the corporate veil. The current strategy is known as "functional realism," whereby the veil is raised in order to prevent the corruption of fairness or the failure of statutory aims, in contrast to the courts' earlier perception of the distinct legal entity as an untouchable sanctity.

- An important initial debate on the "single economic entity" notion was sparked by the landmark case *State of UP v. Renusagar Power Co.*¹⁴ The Court concluded that the veil could potentially be lifted to reveal the real essence of the agreement in which an affiliate is so closely connected to the company that it operates as a basic department.
- The Supreme Court reaffirmed that the corporate veil ought not to be lifted carelessly in *LIC of India v. Escorts Ltd*¹⁵. It was decided that the court should uphold the "corporate shell" in all other situations, even when the veil may be lifted in cases of fraud or when a statute demands it.
- In landmark case *Delhi Development Authority V. Skipper Construction Co*¹⁶, the Court held that if it was determined that the company was only a "cloak" for the private affairs of the people in charge, the corporate veil could potentially be lifted. The court notably stated that the idea of a corporate body cannot be used to get around the law's execution.
- Despite being a common law case law precedent, *Gilford Motor Co. Ltd. v. Horne*¹⁷ has had a significant impact in India. Because the business was a "mere sham" established specially to get around a restrictive covenant, the court lifted the veil.
- In ***Balwant Rai Saluja v. Air India Ltd***¹⁸, the Supreme Court held that the "piercing" criteria, holding that it ought to only be enforced in cases where the corporate structure is a "sham" or "façade" intended to evade liability. The "single economic unit" argument was abandoned in favour of a stricter "control and intent" test.
- In a landmark judicial tax decision in ***Vodafone International Holdings v. Union of India***¹⁹, the Court made a distinction between "legitimate tax planning" and "sham transactions." It decided the notion that the agreement's legal document must be preserved until there is clear proof of fraud or some intermediary arrangements.

¹⁴ *State of UP v. Renusagar Power Co. (1988) 4 SCC 59 (India).*

¹⁵ *LIC of India v. Escorts Ltd. (1986) 1 SCC 264 (India).*

¹⁶ *Delhi Dev. Auth. v. Skipper Constr. Co., (1996) 4 SCC 622 (India)*

¹⁷ *Gilford Motor Co. Ltd. v. Horne [1933] Ch 935 (CA) (Eng.).*

¹⁸ *Balwant Rai Saluja v. Air India Ltd., (2014) 9 SCC 407 (India)*

¹⁹ *Vodafone Int'l Holdings B.V. v. Union of India, (2012) 6 SCC 613 (India).*

REASONS TO LIFT THE CORPORATE VEIL

Although it is a basic principle of business, the sacredness of the corporate entity is not an unqualified right. The legal system has determined which categories require the "mask of personality" to be removed in order to identify the people in charge of the organization. These justifications, which are mostly equitable, guaranty that the corporation structure acts as a conduit for lawful activity instead of a cover for wrongdoing.

- ❖ ***Fraud:*** The existence of fraud is one of the most widely accepted justification for penetrating the veil. The law will not permit the corporate form to shield those who create or utilize a corporation for unlawful or inappropriate purposes. The courts consider if the business was a "cloak" or "mere sham" meant to mislead creditors or other parties.
- ❖ ***Agency or "Alter Ego" Theory:*** The "alter ego" doctrine states that when a business is solely a tool of its stockholders and lacks an autonomous will, the veil is broken. The law considers the corporation's actions as the proprietors' if owners' responsibilities neglect to maintain the necessary corporate procedures, including separate accounts with banks, distinct board meetings, or autonomous decision-making.
- ❖ ***Tax Evasion:*** Corporate deception is frequently subordinated to the sovereign's claim to revenue. Tax agencies and courts "look through" the corporate framework in order to tax the true recipients of the income when a company is established purely for tax evasion or to get around financial legislation.

Comparison analysis with legal Trends in India

In order to combat chronic corporate fraud, Indian courts have gradually included equitable concepts akin to the US model, although they have traditionally followed the UK's leadership.

1. ***Strictness:*** Indian courts frequently lift the veil for "public interest" and "economic reality" grounds, which are currently generally ignored under English law, making India less stringent than the post-Prest era UK strategy.
2. ***Flexibility:*** Similar to the US, Indian courts give "substance above form" priority when addressing "one-man" businesses or money laundering, especially in situations like Captain Construction.
3. ***Codification:*** India has vigorously legislated "lifting" provisions in the Companies Act, 2013, and the Insolvency and Bankruptcy Code, 2016, in contrast to the US and the UK, when the doctrine is nearly wholly judge made.

Growth and Control of Shell Companies

The Ministry of Corporate Affairs (MCA) has launched enormous "de-registration" campaigns, eliminating a large number of illegitimate companies. The judiciary now sees the absence of "substance" in these organizations as the main argument for piercing the veil in order to locate the eventual beneficial owners. The term "shell company" has emerged as a key point of argumentation throughout modern corporate law, although it is not explicitly defined under the Companies Act, 2013.

The function of regulators: MCA and SEBI

In order to maintain market transparency, regulatory agencies are now able to "look through" company layers:

- **SEBI:** The SEBI (Prohibition of Fraudulent and Unfair Trade Practices) In order to punish "connected persons" involved in insider trading or manipulation of the market, the regulator regularly circumvents company frameworks.
- **MCA:** The MCA now requires those with supreme authority over a corporation to reveal their identities under the Substantial Beneficial Ownership (SBO) Rules, so keeping the corporate veil "transparent" for regulatory monitoring.

Digital Economy and Globalization's Effects

Multinational Enterprises, also called MNEs, that use intricate, cross-border subsidiary networks have become more prevalent as a result of globalization. This is made more difficult by the digital economy, which permits businesses to function in areas lacking an actual "permanent establishment." In order to avoid baseline erosion and profit shifting (BEPS), current legal developments concentrate on "Economic Presence" and "Global Minimum Tax" structures, whereby consider MNE organizations as a unified financial unit while ignoring the distinct legal personalities of their separate subsidiaries.

Recent Development

A "Balanced Realism" strategy has just been approved by the Indian Supreme Court. The Court has shown a readiness to combine the financial resources of various group firms in cases pertaining to the Insolvency and Bankruptcy Code (IBC) provided they have "commonality of control" and "interdependence of finances." The Court is still cautious, though, as evidenced by recent decisions that protected the fundamental idea of limited liability for lawful business

failures by refusing to pierce the veil in commercial disputes regardless of whether an obvious "fraudulent intent" to avoid a particular statutory obligation was proven.

Challenges & Limitations

The practice of ignoring corporate identity is still one of the most highly contentious and fought aspects of company law, notwithstanding the doctrine's development. The fundamental conflict among the expectation for fair justice and the necessity for commercial stability is the main obstacle. The systemic obstacles that impede the "piercing" doctrine from being applied consistently are described in the subsequent sections.

CONCLUSION

Through the concept of limited liability, the idea of corporate personhood continues to be the most powerful tool of contemporary capitalism, encouraging investment as well as creativity. But as this study has shown, the "corporate veil" is not an unbreakable barrier. Indian jurisprudence has advanced considerably from the fundamental reasoning of *Salomon v. Salomon* to the contemporary "economic reality" approach in *Vodafone* and *Balwant Rai Saluja*.

The present condition of affairs reflects a "Functional Realism" in which the law respects corporate entities in their regular business operations while being watchful for their use as a "facade" for tax evasion or fraud. Future developments in the digital economy including group insolvency procedures will put this theory to the test. The development of corporate law in India depends on striking a healthy balance between safeguarding the truthfulness of the corporate person and making sure that the "veil" never serves as a haven for the fraudulent.

REFERENCES:

PRIMARY SOURCES: STATUTES

- Companies Act, 2013,
- Companies Act, 1956,
- Insolvency and Bankruptcy Code, 2016,
- Income Tax Act, 1961, No. 43, Acts of Parliament, 1961 (India).
- Prevention of Money Laundering Act, 2002,
- Foreign Exchange Management Act, 1999,
- Companies Act 2006 (United Kingdom).

PRIMARY SOURCES: CASE LAWS

- Salomon v. A. Salomon & Co. Ltd. [1897] AC 22 (HL).
- Prest v. Petrodel Resources Ltd. [2013] UKSC 34, [2013] 2 AC 415.
- State of UP v. Renusagar Power Co. (1988) 4 SCC 59 (India).
- LIC of India v. Escorts Ltd. (1986) 1 SCC 264 (India).
- Delhi Development Authority v. Skipper Construction Co. (1996) 4 SCC 622 (India).
- Vodafone International Holdings B.V. v. Union of India (2012) 6 SCC 613 (India).
- Balwant Rai Saluja v. Air India Ltd. (2014) 9 SCC 407 (India).
- Gilford Motor Co. Ltd. v. Horne [1933] Ch. 935 (CA).

