



Research Article

## Corporate Governance Failures and Regulatory Inadequacies in India: A Legal and Analytical Study

Saurabh Tiwari

LLM (Business Law), Amity Institute of Advanced Legal Studies, Amity University,  
 Uttar Pradesh, India

Corresponding Author: \* Saurabh Tiwari

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.20096820>

### Abstract

Corporate misconduct in India has often been analysed through the narrow lens of fraud, particularly under Section 447 of the Companies Act, 2013. However, this study argues that fraud is merely a manifestation of deeper systemic governance failures. This research critically evaluates the Indian corporate governance framework, focusing on statutory provisions, regulatory institutions, judicial interpretation, and enforcement mechanisms. By adopting a doctrinal and analytical approach, the paper examines key case laws such as Sahara, Satyam, IL&FS, and PNB fraud, highlighting the role of weak governance, regulatory inefficiency, and institutional delays. The study further compares Indian practices with global standards such as OECD and Sarbanes-Oxley frameworks. It concludes that while India has a strong legislative base, enforcement gaps and governance deficiencies persist. The paper recommends a shift toward a governance-centric regulatory model emphasising accountability, transparency, and technological integration.

### Manuscript Information

- ISSN No: 2583-7397
- Received: 01-04-2026
- Accepted: 25-04-2026
- Published: 09-05-2026
- IJCRM:5(3); 2026: 113-117
- ©2026, All Rights Reserved
- Plagiarism Checked: Yes
- Peer Review Process: Yes

### How to Cite this Article

Tiwari S. Corporate Governance Failures and Regulatory Inadequacies in India: A Legal and Analytical Study. Int J Contemp Res Multidiscip. 2026;5(3):113-117.

### Access this Article Online



[www.multiarticlesjournal.com](http://www.multiarticlesjournal.com)

**KEYWORDS:** Corporate Governance, Companies Act 2013, Fraud, SFIO, SEBI, Corporate Liability

## 1. INTRODUCTION

The liberalisation of the Indian economy in the 1990s marked a transformative phase in corporate growth, attracting foreign investment and expanding industrial activity. However, this rapid expansion also exposed vulnerabilities in corporate regulation and governance structures [1]. Corporate fraud, traditionally viewed as an isolated act of deception, is increasingly recognised as a manifestation of systemic governance failures [2].

Corporate governance refers to the framework of rules, practices, and processes by which companies are directed and controlled [3]. Weak governance structures create an environment where unethical practices flourish, ultimately culminating in corporate fraud.

Despite the enactment of the Companies Act, 2013 which introduced provisions such as Section 447 (fraud), Section 143 (auditor duties), Section 149 (independent directors), and Section 177 (audit committees) corporate scandals continue to emerge [4]. This highlights a gap between law and implementation.

## 2. RESEARCH OBJECTIVES

The objectives of this study include examining the legal framework governing corporate misconduct, analyzing governance failures, evaluating regulatory institutions, and identifying enforcement gaps while recommending reforms [5].

## 3. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

This study adopts a doctrinal and analytical methodology, relying on statutes, judicial precedents, and academic literature<sup>6</sup>. Case study and comparative approaches are also used to evaluate practical implications.

## 4. Corporate Governance vs Fraud

### 4.1 Concept of Corporate Fraud

Section 447 of the Companies Act, 2013 defines fraud broadly to include acts, omissions, concealment, or abuse of position with intent to deceive or gain undue advantage [7].

Fraud requires both intent (*mens rea*) and unlawful gain or loss [8]. However, fraud is often the outcome of governance breakdown rather than an isolated act.

### 4.2 Types of Fraud

Corporate fraud includes financial misrepresentation, managerial misconduct, operational irregularities, and digital fraud [9].

### 4.3 Governance Mechanisms

The Companies Act provides mechanisms such as independent directors, audit committees, and auditors to prevent misconduct [10]. However, their effectiveness depends on implementation.

### 4.4 Governance - Fraud Relationship

Weak governance structures such as ineffective boards and poor internal controls create conditions where fraud becomes inevitable [11].

## 5. Legal Framework under the Companies Act, 2013

### 5.1 Introduction to the Statutory Framework.

The Companies Act, 2013 is an important act of reform in legislation, which is designed to improve corporate governance, transparency and elimination of corporate malpractices in India. It superseded the Companies Act, 1956, and provided a more detailed and rigorous structure to deal with new problems of corporate regulation.

As compared to the previous Act that was scattered when addressing issues of fraud, the 2013 Act offers a unified and clear legal structure especially in terms of provisions that address issues of fraud, mechanisms of governance and responsibility of corporate actors. Nevertheless, in spite of the progressive nature of this framework, much depends on how this framework is implemented and allowed to work.

### 5.2 Section 447: Fraudulent punishment.

Section 447 is a pillar of legal protection of corporate fraud. It goes ahead to define fraud in broad terms and lays down serious punishment such as imprisonment and fines in accordance to the amount of the fraud.

- Legal Significance
- Gives a broad definition of a fraud.
- Acts, omissions, concealment and abuse of position.
- Relevant to the directors, officers, and other external collaborators.
- Judicial Relevance

The courts have construed the Section 447 very broadly to cover sophisticated business misdeeds that involve more than two players and transactions that are interlaced.

### Critical Analysis

Although Section 447 offers very punitive action, it is weak in some aspects:

- Large burden of proof (particularly intent)
- Slow prosecutions and investigations.
- Change emphasis to punishment instead of prevention.

Therefore, the deterrent isn't useful since the provision is practical but not effective in practice.

### 5.3 Part 143: Duty and responsibilities of auditors.

In section 143, auditors have the obligation of scrutinizing financial records and reporting any fraud to the Central Government.

Auditor role in law.

- Be watchdogs in their own right.
- Be accurate and transparent in reporting finances.
- Identify and report abnormalities.
- Practical Challenges
- There is usually a lack of independence of auditors.
- Collusions with the management.
- Absence of professional scepticism.

### Critical Insight

The concept of auditors to act as the first line of defence is often nullified because of governance failure.

#### 5.4 Section 149: Independent Directors.

Section 149 implements the notion of independent directors as a way of improving the accountability of the board <sup>[14]</sup>.

##### Purpose

- Provide unbiased oversight
- Protect minority shareholders
- Ensure governance standards
- Limitations
- Independence usually is formal, not functional.
- Insufficient skills or availability of information.
- Control of the promoters distorts autonomy.
- Critical Observation

Independent directors are often nominated as a mere figurehead of the board instead of acting as agents of governance.

#### 5.5 Section 177: Audit Committee

The Audit Committee is very important in financial control and internal control. Functions

- Review financial statements
- Keep track of internal audit systems.
- Oversee risk management

##### Challenges

- Weak practice functioning.
- Inadequacy of technical skills.
- Reliance on information given by the management.

##### Analysis

Audit committees are strong structurally but are weak in terms of operations thereby restraining their independent preventive powers.

#### 5.6 Serious Fraud Investigation Office (SFIO)

The SFIO is a dedicated institution that is authorized to examine the complicated frauds that are committed by corporations.

- Powers
- Conduct detailed investigations
- Examine company records
- Liaise with other agencies.
- Issues
- Delayed investigations
- Resource constraints
- Duplicates power with other entities.
- Critical View
- SFIO enhances the institutional strength but lacks efficiencies in execution.

#### 5.7 Role of SEBI and MCA

- SEBI (Securities and Exchange Board of India)
- Regulates listed companies
- Enforces disclosure requirements
- Protects investor interests
- MCA (Ministry of Corporate Affairs)
- Oversees corporate compliance

- Administers company law

##### Key Problems

- Inadequate agency coordination.
- Jurisdictional overlaps
- Fragmented enforcement

#### 5.8 Judicial Interpretation and Corporate Liability.

The role of courts in the interpretation of corporate failure of liability and governance has been crucial <sup>[15]</sup>.

##### Key Doctrines

- Raising the business veil.
- Corporate criminal liability
- Attribution theory

##### Case Law

Iridium India Telecom Ltd. versus Motorola Inc. - established corporate criminal liability. Sahara India vs. SEBI - strengthening of regulatory power.

DDA v. Skipper Construction - veil of incorporation was pierced in order to stop abuse. Analysis

Courts have enhanced accountability, yet dependence on courts means a lack of enforcement of regulations.

#### 5.9 Legality Loopholes in the Legal Framework.

Although there are robust statutory provisions, some enforcement issues still exist:

- Slows down in investigations and adjudication.
- Weak inter-agency coordination
- Procedural complexities
- Failure to integrate technologies.

Such loopholes greatly lessen the deterrent impact of law.

#### 5.10 Legal Analysis concluding.

The company's act 2013 has a solid cell of law to combat corporate malpractices. Even this is not effective due to poor enforcement, institutional inefficiencies and governance failures. The law is well designed but has a weak implementation <sup>[16]</sup>.

#### 6. Case Studies

##### 6.1 Satyam Scam

The Satyam scandal revealed massive accounting fraud due to governance failure and auditor negligence <sup>[17]</sup>.

##### 6.2 IL&FS Crisis

The IL&FS collapse highlighted systemic risk, poor disclosure, and regulatory oversight failure <sup>[18]</sup>.

##### 6.3 Punjab National Bank Fraud

The PNB fraud exposed weaknesses in internal controls and technological monitoring systems <sup>[19]</sup>.

##### 6.4 Comparative Insight

These cases demonstrate common issues such as weak oversight, audit failure, and delayed enforcement <sup>[20]</sup>.

## 7. Comparative Analysis

### 7.1 OECD Principles

The OECD framework emphasizes transparency, accountability, and shareholder protection <sup>[21]</sup>.

### 7.2 Sarbanes-Oxley Act

The Sarbanes-Oxley Act introduced strict audit regulations and accountability mechanisms <sup>[22]</sup>.

### 7.3 Key Insight

India's challenge lies in enforcement inefficiency rather than lack of legislation <sup>[23]</sup>.

## 8. Critical Analysis

India suffers from a compliance gap where legal provisions are followed in form but not in substance <sup>[24]</sup>. Structural weaknesses such as regulatory fragmentation, judicial delays, and weak governance institutions persist <sup>[25]</sup>.

Corporate culture also plays a significant role, as profit-driven environments often compromise ethical standards <sup>[26]</sup>.

## 9. RECOMMENDATIONS

Reforms should focus on strengthening board independence, enhancing auditor accountability, improving regulatory coordination, promoting whistleblower protection, and integrating technology in governance <sup>[27]</sup>.

## 10. CONCLUSION

Corporate misconduct in India cannot be adequately addressed through a narrow focus on fraud alone. While statutory provisions such as Section 447 of the Companies Act, 2013 provide a strong legal mechanism for punishing fraud, they fail to address the root causes of such misconduct. As this study has demonstrated, corporate fraud is often the result of deeper governance failures, ineffective internal controls, weak regulatory oversight, and delayed enforcement.

The analysis of major corporate scandals such as Satyam, IL&FS, and the Punjab National Bank fraud reveals a consistent pattern of governance breakdowns. These cases highlight that corporate misconduct is not merely a legal issue but a systemic problem involving multiple stakeholders, including boards of directors, auditors, regulators, and policymakers.

Furthermore, comparative analysis with international frameworks such as the OECD Principles and the Sarbanes-Oxley Act indicates that India's primary challenge lies not in legislative inadequacy but in implementation inefficiency. Strong laws without effective enforcement mechanisms fail to achieve their intended objectives. This study therefore argues for a paradigm shift from a fraud-centric approach to a governance-centric approach. Such a shift would emphasize preventive measures, strengthen institutional accountability,

and promote ethical corporate behaviour. It would also require improved coordination among regulatory bodies, faster judicial processes, and integration of technology in monitoring and enforcement.

In conclusion, the future of corporate regulation in India lies in bridging the gap between law and practice. Strengthening governance structures, enhancing enforcement mechanisms, and fostering a culture of accountability are essential for ensuring corporate integrity and protecting stakeholder interests. Only through such comprehensive reforms can India build a resilient and transparent corporate ecosystem capable of sustaining long-term economic growth<sup>28</sup>.

## REFERENCES

1. Ministry of Corporate Affairs. Report on corporate governance in India. Government of India; 2013.
2. Varottil U. Corporate governance in India: Evolution and challenges.
3. Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development. Principles of corporate governance. OECD; 2015.
4. Government of India. Companies Act, 2013.
5. Research objectives derived from study framework.
6. Jain SN. Legal research methodology.
7. Government of India. Companies Act, 2013, §447.
8. Ibid.
9. Ravichandran KS. Corporate fraud and governance.
10. Government of India. Companies Act, 2013, §§143, 149, 177.
11. Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development. OECD principles. 2015.
12. Government of India. Companies Act, 2013, §447.
13. Government of India. Companies Act, 2013, §143.
14. Government of India. Companies Act, 2013, §149.
15. Government of India. Companies Act, 2013, §177.
16. Securities and Exchange Board of India. Annual report; Ministry of Corporate Affairs reports.
17. Satyam scam case reports. 2009.
18. Infrastructure Leasing and Financial Services crisis report. 2018.
19. Punjab National Bank fraud investigation reports. 2018.
20. Comparative case analysis.
21. Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development. OECD principles. 2015.
22. United States Congress. Sarbanes-Oxley Act, 2002.
23. Comparative legal analysis.
24. Varottil U. Corporate governance in India: Evolution and challenges.
25. Ministry of Corporate Affairs reports. Government of India.
26. Corporate ethics studies.

27. Policy recommendations based on analysis.
28. Government of India. Companies Act, 2013.

**Creative Commons (CC) License**

This article is an open-access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution–Non-Commercial–No Derivatives 4.0 International (CC BY-NC-ND 4.0) license. This license permits sharing and redistribution of the article in any medium or format for non-commercial purposes only, provided that appropriate credit is given to the original author(s) and source. No modifications, adaptations, or derivative works are permitted under this license.

**About the Corresponding Author**

**Saurabh Tiwari** is a budding legal scholar currently pursuing LL.M. in Business Law from the Amity Institute of Advanced Legal Studies, Amity University, Uttar Pradesh, India. His academic interests include corporate law, business regulations, and contemporary legal issues. He is actively engaged in academic research and legal studies in the field of business law.