The Indian Journal for Research in Law and Management

Open Access Law Journal – Copyright © 2026
Editor-in-Chief – Dr. Muktai Deb Chavan; Publisher – Alden Vas; ISSN: 2583-9896

THE EVOLUTION OF INDEPENDENT DIRECTORS' LIABILITY UNDER THE COMPANIES ACT, 2013

Subasree S

ABSTRACT

In Indian corporate law, independent directors hold a peculiar position: although they are supposed to serve as the board's conscience, they typically lack the day-to-day authority and information access necessary to be regarded as executive directors when anything goes wrong. From the voluntary, listing-agreement-based framework of the early 2000s to the codified protection of Section 149(12) of the Companies Act, 2013, this article tracks the evolution of their liability system and looks at how regulators and courts have interpreted that protection ever since. The paper argues that a significant gap has opened between the statutory liability shield Parliament enacted and the practical exposure independent directors face in regulatory proceedings, drawing on the Satyam scandal, the Sunita Palita ruling, and the divergent enforcement postures of SEBI in cases like the IL&FS crisis. It also considers what a more cohesive framework might look like.

I. INTRODUCTION

An independent director is supposed to be a paradox made useful: someone who is both close enough to the board of a firm to effectively supervise it and far enough away from its management to make an unbiased assessment of it. First through voluntary listing-agreement clauses, then through statutory codification in the Companies Act, 2013, Indian company law has spent the greater part of two decades attempting to turn that paradox into practical regulations. Section 149(12), which restricts an independent director's liability to acts that occurred with their knowledge, were attributable through Board processes, and involved their consent, connivance, or a failure to act diligently, is the single, carefully worded provision at the center of that codification.

The purpose of that clause was to address a particular issue: trained professionals would not be motivated to take independent directorships that carried significant financial and reputational risk over which they had little control if there was no liability shield. However, since 2013, one of the more contentious issues in Indian corporate governance has been the discrepancy between what Section 149(12) promises on paper and how independent directors are actually treated when a firm fails. In order to determine whether the current framework achieves the balance it was intended to achieve, this study follows the evolution of the independent director concept from its soft-law beginnings to its statutory entrenchment in 2013 and the subsequent unequal judicial and regulatory record. The issue in question is important outside of the boardroom because how India responds to it affects who is initially willing to serve as an independent director, which in turn affects the general standard of governance oversight accessible to creditors, employees, and shareholders in the corporate sector.

II. HISTORICAL DEVELOPMENT: FROM STATUTE TO SOFT LAW

There is absolutely no Indian statute that introduced the idea of the independent director. Anglo-American corporate governance reform was a major source of inspiration for its arrival through committee recommendations and stock market listing agreements. A committee led by Kumar Mangalam Birla was established by the Securities and Exchange Board of India in 1999 to improve listed businesses' governance standards. In 2000, the committee's recommendations were added to the listing agreement as Clause 49, which mandated that listed boards have a minimum percentage of independent, non-executive directors and defined independence as the lack of significant financial ties to the company or its promoters.[1] The Clause 49's amended 2004 draft was strengthened in 2002 when the government created the Naresh Chandra Committee to investigate auditor independence and the role of independent directors in greater detail following the collapse of Enron and WorldCom overseas.[2]

Since Clause 49 operated through the listing agreement, its ultimate consequence was delisting, which regulators were unwilling to employ against running businesses. This first wave of reform was, by design, soft law. It imposed governance standards on independent directors without providing them with a corresponding statutory liability framework. This omission was

[1]SEBI, Clause 49 of the Equity Listing Agreement (introduced 2000, revised 2004).
[2]Naresh Chandra Committee, Report on Corporate Governance and Auditor-Company Relationship (Dep't of Co. Affairs 2002).

significant when companies started to fail, but it was less significant when independent directors were viewed as essentially symbolic appointments.

This disparity came to light in January 2009 when the head of Satyam Computer Services admitted to understating liabilities, exaggerating profits for years, and creating fictional cash balances of almost 5,000 crore rupees. Following the fraud, an estimated 350 independent directors resigned from boards across the country, demonstrating how exposed the position had suddenly become. Several of Satyam's independent directors, including reputable academics and businesspeople, had approved transactions and signed off on financial statements without realising the fraud. The Companies Act, 2013, which granted independent directors a defined statutory duty and a defined statutory liability threshold for the first time, was largely sparked by Satyam.

III. THE STATUTORY FRAMEWORK UNDER THE COMPANIES ACT, 2013

The foundation of the contemporary independent director regime is Section 149 of the 2013 Act. Every listed public company must have at least one-third of its board composed of independent directors,[3] and eligibility is defined negatively: A person can only be considered independent if they have no significant financial ties to the company, are unrelated to its promoters or senior management, and have not worked for the company as an employee, owner, or auditor during the designated lookback periods.[4] The Code for Independent Directors, which is found in Schedule IV of the Act, outlines the responsibilities, roles, and duties expected of independent directors in guidance form. These responsibilities include using independent judgement on strategy, performance, and risk management as well as ensuring the integrity of financial information.[5] This is supplemented by broad statutory obligations that apply to all directors under Section 166. These obligations include acting in good faith, using reasonable care and independent judgement, and avoiding conflicts of interest.[6]

The most significant section for this paper, however, is Section 149(12), which starts with a non-obstante clause that supersedes other sections of the Act and states that an independent director or a non-executive director who is not a promoter or key managerial personnel shall be held liable only for acts of commission or omission by the company that occurred with their knowledge, attributable through Board processes, and with their consent or connivance, or

[3]Companies Act, 2013, No. 18 of 2013, § 149(4) (India).
[4]Companies Act, 2013, No. 18 of 2013, § 149(6) (India).
[5]Companies Act, 2013, No. 18 of 2013, sch. IV (India) (Code for Independent Directors).
[6]Companies Act, 2013, No. 18 of 2013, § 166 (India).

where they had not acted diligently.[7] In contrast to executive directors or important managerial staff, who are nonetheless subject to the full scope of statutory culpability for corporate malfeasance, this liability standard is significantly more restrictive. The clause was widely understood and meant to serve as a shield: an independent director should not be brought into proceedings just by virtue of board membership unless there is evidence of real knowledge and either collusion or a lack of diligence.

On top of this legal foundation, the Securities and Exchange Board of India imposed its own regulations. Clause 49 was replaced by the SEBI Listing Obligations and Disclosure Requirements Regulations, 2015, which set independent director composition thresholds and, crucially, mandate prior audit committee approval for related-party transactions regardless of their significance.[8] The "knowledge attributable through Board processes" language of Section 149(12) is directly linked to committee approval because independent directors frequently serve on audit committees. This means that an independent director who approves a related-party transaction on the audit committee cannot later claim ignorance of it in the same way that they might plausibly claim ignorance of an operational decision made entirely at the management level.

This foundation is reinforced by two additional statutory characteristics. First, an independent director's term is limited to two consecutive terms of up to five years each. After that, there is a three-year cooling-off period before they can be reappointed. This restriction was put in place to avoid the long, comfortable board tenures that opponents of the pre-2013 regime believed would eventually weaken their independence. Second, as of 2019, each person appointed as an independent director is required to register with the Indian Institute of Corporate Affairs' Independent Directors Databank and finish a proficiency self-assessment within the allotted time. This administrative requirement is meant to professionalise the position and establish a verifiable record of who is serving in this capacity throughout the corporate sector. Although neither clause directly impacts the Section 149(12) responsibility requirement, they both express the same underlying legislative sense that independence must be actively upheld and institutionally validated rather than merely declared at the time of appointment.

IV. PROCEDURAL PROTECTIONS AND THEIR PRACTICAL LIMITS

[7]Companies Act, 2013, No. 18 of 2013, § 149(12) (India).
[8]SEBI (Listing Obligations and Disclosure Requirements) Regulations, 2015, Regs. 23(2), 25 (India).

The Companies Act and associated procedural law provide independent directors with a number of extra layers of protection beyond the substantive responsibility requirement in Section 149(12). Each of these layers is important for comprehending how the shield functions in a real-world process rather than in theory. The freedom to document dissent is the most straightforward. A contemporaneous record that can be definitive evidence against a subsequent claim of "knowledge" or "connivance" under Section 149(12) is created when an independent director disagrees with a board decision, minutes that disagreement, and, in suitable situations, formally resigns over an unresolved concern. A documented dissent has typically been regarded by Indian courts and tribunals as substantial, if not always conclusive, proof that a director did not approve of or participate in the underlying misconduct.

The procedural conditions that must be met before criminal or quasi-criminal proceedings against a director may even be started provide a second line of defence. Rather than a general recitation of the names of all directors drawn from the company's statutory filings, complaints under provisions like Section 141 of the Negotiable Instruments Act, 1881 or the various offence provisions of the Companies Act itself typically require specific averments identifying how a particular individual was, at the relevant time, in charge of and responsible for the conduct of the company's business. Sunita Palita is noteworthy because it strictly enforced this pleading requirement, refusing to let the complainant's inability to differentiate between executive and independent directors pass judicial examination just because the official director's name appeared on a business filing.

Directors' and officers' liability insurance, which is currently normal practice for the majority of listed Indian firms and particularly advised—though not required—for independent directors under various governance guidelines, is a third, less formal but increasingly significant kind of protection. The underlying legal liability standard is unaffected by such insurance, but the practical experience of dealing with a proceeding is significantly altered because defence costs are usually covered, which can be a major deterrent to serving as an independent director regardless of the outcome.

When combined, these practical and procedural safeguards make it unlikely for Section 149(12) to function on its own. The substantive knowledge-and-connivance standard itself, the pleading requirements that limit how proceedings can be framed against them in the first place, any contemporaneous dissent on the record, and the practical cushion that insurance provides while a matter is litigated are all common intersecting lines of defence for an independent director under scrutiny. The instances covered in the following section demonstrate what happens when these safeguards are put to the test against truly significant company failures and where the multi-layered defence based on Section 149(12) has and has not stood up in real-world situations.

V. JUDICIAL AND REGULATORY INTERPRETATION SINCE 2013

A scattered but enlightening assemblage of judicial and administrative rulings have influenced how Section 149(12) actually functions in practice rather than a single definitive Supreme Court decision on the provision itself.

The criminal law, rather than corporate law, provided the most direct judicial validation of the basic rationale of the liability shield. The Supreme Court examined whether independent, non-executive directors of a corporation might be prosecuted under Section 141 of the Negotiable Instruments Act, 1881 just by virtue of their directorship following the dishonouring of a company cheque in Sunita Palita v. Panchami Stone Quarry.[9] The Court ruled that criminal culpability under Section 141 could not be based just on directorial status; rather, it required specific allegations demonstrating that the person was, at the pertinent time, genuinely in control of and accountable for the conduct of the company's operations. The appellants were entitled to have the proceedings against them annulled because their Form DIR-12 filings attested to their status as independent, non-executive directors with no involvement in day-to-day management. Sunita Palita represents the same fundamental idea that Section 149(12) codifies: that formal board participation alone is insufficient justification for personal accountability, even if it was decided under the Negotiable Instruments Act rather than the Companies Act.

The enforcement record of SEBI has been significantly less in line with that principle. SEBI has imposed liability on independent directors for financial misconduct at the company in a number of adjudication proceedings, such as those involving Lloyd Electric & Engineering Ltd. and Fortis Healthcare Ltd., even in the absence of clear evidence of their direct personal involvement in the wrongdoing. This is a materially stricter view than the "knowledge, consent, or connivance" standard outlined in Section 149(12).[10] As a result, there is an obvious conflict: an independent director who may be shielded from criminal liability under the Sunita Palita

[9]Sunita Palita v. Panchami Stone Quarry, (2022) 10 SCC 152.
[10]The Oxymoron of Independent Directors in India, IP & Legal Filings (2025) (discussing SEBI's orders concerning Lloyd Electric & Engineering Ltd. and Fortis Healthcare Ltd.).

standard and from company-law liability under Section 149(12) may still be subject to negative securities-law repercussions if a regulator applies a lower threshold that is more concerned with results than personal responsibility.

This conflict escalated after Infrastructure Leasing & Financial Services Ltd. collapsed in 2018. The independent directors who served on the audit committees of IL&FS group entities and had authorised loans and financial arrangements that were later discovered to be unsustainable came under scrutiny as IL&FS group companies defaulted on debt obligations that had, until just before default, appeared to be adequately serviced. Regulators treated those directors' case as clearly falling under the "knowledge attributable through Board processes" language of Section 149(12) rather than outside of it because they had specifically reviewed and approved lending decisions in their audit committee capacity. This shows how membership in an audit committee in particular limits the practical scope of the statutory shield.[11] In other words, even though Section 149(12) makes no statutory distinction between the two, independent directors who serve on audit committees are in a considerably more exposed position than independent directors who do not.

This trend is not specific to any one episode. Proxy advisory firms and institutional investors have become significantly more inclined in the years following IL&FS to vote against the reappointment of independent directors at companies where governance flaws later surfaced, even in cases where those directors had not yet been found legally liable. Reputational repercussions often precede and occasionally replace any formal adjudication of statutory liability. Boardroom disputes at listed financial and healthcare companies have frequently revolved around whether independent directors exercised adequate oversight of related-party dealings, promoter pledges, or fund diversions. This implies that the actual cost of being an independent director in India today goes far beyond the Section 149(12) liability standard itself: institutional and market accountability mechanisms have established their own, frequently lower, thresholds for consequence, functioning concurrently with and occasionally ahead of the formal legal process.

It's crucial to be precise about what these market-driven and regulatory effects do and do not replace. None of them formally supersede Section 149(12); the Companies Act's liability standard is unaffected by an adverse SEBI order, a proxy advisory recommendation against

[11]Independent Director Under Companies Act 2013: Legal Framework, Compliance & Case Law Guide, iPleaders (2026) (discussing IL&FS audit committee proceedings).

reappointment, or a wave of institutional votes withholding support; and an independent director who is genuinely innocent of knowledge or collusion is entitled to the statutory defence that Section 149(12) offers in any company-law proceeding brought against them. These systems function completely independently, employing their own standards, at their own institutional pace, and frequently coming to conclusions—or at the very least, consequences—long before a company-law proceeding utilising Section 149(12) would even be initiated, much less decided. This means that even if the statutory responsibility shield is real, it only covers one of the many different types of exposure that the position already bears in practice for an individual independent director considering whether to serve on a particular board.

VI. CRITICAL ANALYSIS: THE GAP BETWEEN SHIELD AND PRACTICE

When regarded as a whole, these changes indicate that Section 149(12) has developed along two distinct, non-aligned paths. The plain language of the provision and its affirmation in Sunita Palita and other cases are on one track: independent directors are not liable simply for holding office, and courts have demonstrated a genuine willingness to enforce that limit, at least when the underlying cause of action necessitates proof of individual culpability. On the other hand, an increasingly assertive regulatory stance, especially from SEBI, treats committee and board approval as adequate proof of the "knowledge" and "Board process attribution" components of the statutory test, erasing much of the distinction between formal board membership and personal liability that Section 149(12) was intended to maintain.

This discrepancy does not always indicate that the regulator or the courts have interpreted the legislation incorrectly. The seeds of this conflict are found in Section 149(12) itself: an independent director who sits on an audit committee, receives comprehensive transaction papers, and votes to approve a related-party loan has, on any ordinary reading, brought themselves within the provision's own liability triggers rather than outside of them. Additionally, "acted diligently" is by definition a facts-and-circumstances standard. The issue is not so much that the regulation is being misused as it is that many independent directors—and perhaps the market as a whole—have interpreted Section 149(12) as providing more protection than its actual wording does, especially for those with committee responsibilities.

The imbalance between company-law and securities-law liabilities is another issue. Liability under the Companies Act is governed by Section 149(12); it makes no mention of SEBI's independent adjudicatory powers under the SEBI Act and LODR Regulations, which are focused on market integrity and investor protection rather than individual culpability in the sense of criminal law and operate on their own statutory tests and enforcement priorities. Because the two liability regimes are responding to separate legal concerns using different evidential levels, independent directors can therefore be completely accurate that Section 149(12) protects them from company-law culpability while yet being subject to SEBI orders. Although this is not a legal contradiction, it does indicate that independent directors' statutory "liability shield" is actually far more limited than the term implies.

In this instance, a quick comparison with comparable jurisdictions is helpful. The general duties outlined in the Companies Act 2006, such as the duty to exercise reasonable care, skill, and independent judgement, apply uniformly to both executive and non-executive directors. The practical difference in exposure arises from what a court will treat as reasonable diligence given a non-executive director's more limited day-to-day role, rather than from a separate statutory threshold. This is because English company law does not establish a separate, lighter liability standard for non-executive or independent directors. Directors, whether independent or not, are similarly protected by American company law through the business judgement rule, which mostly relies on a presumption of good faith and reasonable process rather than a role-specific liability carve-out. Therefore, by comparison, Section 149(12)'s explicit, role-based liability standard is somewhat unusual: India decided to incorporate independence-based protection directly into positive statutory text instead of relying on judicial doctrines of reasonable care calibrated to a director's actual role. Although this decision has the benefit of being clear, it also means that the clause encourages the exact kind of close textual interpretation of what constitutes "knowledge," "Board processes," and "diligence" that has resulted in the current unequal record between regulators and judges.

This inconsistent record has a quantifiable deterrent effect on willingness to serve. Rising resignation rates among independent directors at companies under regulatory scrutiny, financial strain, or promoter disputes have been often highlighted in corporate governance surveys and board-recruitment discussion in India. These resignations frequently occur well before any formal findings of specific wrongdoing. A portion of this is a healthy reaction from the market: an independent director who feels that a company's governance is failing and decides to leave rather than give the board more credibility is, in a way, precisely the kind of independent judgement that Section 149(12) was intended to safeguard and promote. However, a pattern of preemptive resignation motivated more by liability anxiety than by a thoughtful assessment of the company's behaviour runs the risk of producing the opposite of what the statute intended: boards that lose their most watchful overseers at the exact moment when oversight is most important, replaced by directors who are either less cognisant of the risk or more tolerant of it. A large portion of what determines an independent director's actual exposure depends on documentation and record-keeping practices that are currently neither standardised nor consistently required, making it challenging to distinguish between these two motivations from the outside. This is part of the larger evidentiary problem this paper has traced throughout.

VII. A MORE COHERENT FRAMEWORK

Without compromising the accountability that IL&FS and related incidents demonstrated was actually required, three modifications may close the gap between the legislative shield and its actual use.

First, More harmonisation between SEBI's enforcement practices and Section 149(12)'s liability standard would be beneficial. Since SEBI's regulatory goals are different from those of the Companies Act, it is not necessary to apply the same test; however, more openness regarding when and why it deviates from the Section 149(12) standard would enable independent directors to more precisely assess their risk.

Second, An independent director who never sees a related-party transaction paper is simply not in the same position as one who reviews and approves it; a clearer distinction between regular board membership and audit or risk committee membership would better reflect the true difference in information access between the two roles, both in how companies structure director responsibilities and in how liability is assessed.

Third, A statutory standard that currently reads clearly on paper would be transformed into something independent directors can actually rely on when determining the level of diligence required for a particular board decision with the support of stronger director and officer liability insurance markets and more precise guidance from the Ministry of Corporate Affairs on what "acting diligently" requires in practice.

A fourth, A standardised minimum diligence procedure for board and committee decisions over a specified materiality threshold, covering issues like documented dissent, required escalation of unresolved concerns, and minimum information-review record, is another structural adjustment worth taking into consideration. The substantive criterion of Section 149(12) would not be compromised by such a protocol; an independent director who neglects to raise a documented concern in spite of warning signs would still be equally vulnerable as they would be under the existing legislation. The current reliance on reconstructing what a director knew or should have known after the fact tends to disadvantage even truly diligent directors when the company's affairs are later reconstructed under regulatory or judicial scrutiny. Instead, it would provide independent directors with a clearer, more contemporaneous record of having exercised the diligence that the statute already requires of them.

VIII. CONCLUSION

Since the idea first surfaced in a stock exchange listing agreement in 2000, the responsibility of independent directors under Indian company law has undergone significant modification. After Satyam revealed its limitations, what had started out as a voluntary governance goal became a codified statutory standard in Section 149(12) of the Companies Act, 2013, intended to shield truly independent, arm's-length directors from liability for management decisions they neither made nor could reasonably have detected. The clause has effectively prevented independent directors from being dragged into proceedings solely on the basis of their formal office in cases like Sunita Palita, and the procedural safeguards that have been established around it—from pleading requirements to the increasing practice of recording dissent—give that statutory promise real teeth in the appropriate situations.However, the IL&FS crisis and SEBI's enforcement record in cases such as LEEL and Fortis Healthcare demonstrate that the shield functions far more narrowly than its plain language might imply, especially for directors who serve on audit or risk committees and are thus closer to the information that matters, especially once formal legal liability is taken into account along with market and institutional consequences. The main question Section 149(12) was designed to address—how much oversight should accompany how much exposure—is likely to continue to require more precise answers than the statute alone currently offers as Indian companies become more complex and board committees assume more substantive responsibility. Correcting that response is more than just a technical writing task; it will determine whether India's boardrooms continue to attract the calibre of independent judgment the role was created to supply.