



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

This is an Open Access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution-Non-Commercial-Share Alike 4.0 International (CC-BY-NC-SA 4.0) License, which permits unrestricted non-commercial use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium provided the original work is properly cited.

CORPORATE GOVERNANCE IN INDIA: CHALLENGES AND THE WAY FORWARD

- *Mudit Vikaram Singh*

ABSTRACT

Corporate governance is the machine through which organizations are directed, controlled, monitored and held accountable to their shareholders and different stakeholders. In India, corporate governance has evolved considerably via an aggregate of regulation, securities regulation, judicial decisions and institutional reforms. The groups Act, 2013 brought a comprehensive statutory framework handling directors' duties, independent directors, board committees, related-celebration transactions, company social duty, monetary reporting and managerial duty. For listed entities, the Securities and trade Board of India (“SEBI”) has supplemented this framework via the Securities and exchange Board of India (list duties and Disclosure requirements) regulations, 2015 (“LODR guidelines”).

No matter this significant regulatory framework, good sized demanding situations stay. Corporate governance failures may additionally rise up from promoter dominance, inadequate independence of boards, useless audit mechanisms, related-birthday celebration transactions, insufficient protection of minority shareholders, accounting irregularities, statistics asymmetry, weak whistle-blower mechanisms and the gap between formal compliance and major governance. Essential company screw ups, inclusive of the Satyam pc services scandal, have demonstrated that compliance with governance systems on paper does no longer always make certain ethical or powerful choice-making.

This paper examines the evolution and legal framework of corporate governance in India, analyses the essential challenges affecting its effectiveness and considers crucial judicial and regulatory traits. It argues that the future of corporate governance calls for a shift from a predominantly compliance-oriented version toward a way of life of duty, transparency,

independence and moral choice-making. Strengthening board effectiveness, enhancing safety for whistle-blowers, improving minority shareholder participation, strengthening gatekeeper accountability, enhancing disclosure requirements and using generation for regulatory monitoring can make contributions to a greater resilient company governance environment.

Keywords: Corporate Governance, Companies Act 2013, SEBI, Independent Directors, Related Party Transactions, Board of Directors, Minority Shareholders, Corporate Accountability, Corporate Compliance.

INTRODUCTION

Corporate governance has come to be a critical issue of contemporary company law. A business enterprise is an artificial person whose ownership, control and management can be separated amongst shareholders, administrators and professional managers. This separation creates the opportunity of conflicts between unique members within the corporate shape. Corporate governance attempts to set up mechanisms through which corporate power is exercised responsibly and corporate resources are managed inside the pastimes of the company and its stakeholders.

The significance of corporate governance is mainly widespread in India because of the prevalence of promoter-managed organizations and focused possession systems. Not like jurisdictions where widely dispersed share possession is extra not unusual, many Indian groups have giant promoter or controlling-shareholder influence. Consequently, corporate governance worries in India involve not best the conventional organization trouble among shareholders and executives but also the possibility of conflicts among controlling shareholders and minority shareholders.

The legal framework governing corporate governance in India has developed considerably. The companies Act, 2013 ("Companies Act") added several provisions meant to reinforce board duty and corporate transparency. phase 149 offers with the composition of forums and impartial directors; segment 166 establishes statutory responsibilities of directors; section 177 offers with audit committees; section 178 addresses nomination and remuneration committees and stakeholder relationships; section 184 concerns disclosure of directors' interests; section 188 regulates associated-birthday celebration transactions; and phase 134 establishes requirements concerning financial statements and the Board's document¹.

¹ Companies Act, No. 18 of 2013, sec 134, 149, 166, 177, 178, 184, 188, 204, India Code (2013), Ministry of Corporate Affairs, Government of India, <https://www.mca.gov.in/Ministry/pdf/CompaniesAct2013.pdf>

For indexed businesses, the corporations Act operates alongside the SEBI regulatory framework. The LODR regulations include tremendous requirements concerning board composition, audit committees, related-birthday celebration transactions, disclosures, shareholder rights and other governance subjects.²

SEBI has regularly boosted these requirements in reaction to traits in Indian capital markets. Its company-governance projects have particularly focused on independent directors, associated-celebration transactions, accounting and auditing practices, board assessment, shareholder participation and disclosure.³

The development of corporate governance regulation has additionally been prompted by way of company scandals and judicial decisions. The Satyam laptop services scandal demonstrated the consequences of economic misrepresentation and disasters of internal oversight. SEBI ultimately took enforcement motion against individuals related to Satyam, along with guidelines regarding market get right of entry to and disgorgement.⁴ The Supreme Court's held in *Tata Consultancy Service Ltd. v. Cyrus Investments Pvt. Ltd.* also illustrates the importance of board authority, shareholder rights and the statutory remedies to be had in disputes concerning corporate control.⁵

OBJECTIVES OF THE RESEARCH

The principal objectives of this research are:

1. To take a look at the idea and significance of corporate governance in India.
2. To examine the statutory framework governing corporate governance under the Companies Act, 2013.
3. To study SEBI's role in regulating company governance in listed entities.

² Securities & Exchange Board of India, *Securities and Exchange Board of India (Listing Obligations and Disclosure Requirements) Regulations 2015*, <https://www.sebi.gov.in/sebiweb/home/HomeAction.do?doListing=yes&sid=1&ssid=3>. The SEBI regulatory database records the LODR Regulations as a continuing regulatory framework and identifies Subsequent Amendments.

³ Securities & Exchange Board of India, *Committee on Corporate Governance*, Terms of Reference, <https://www.sebi.gov.in/sebiweb/about/AboutAction.do?committeesId=43&doMember=yes>.

⁴ Securities & Exchange Board of India, *Order in the Matter of Satyam Computer Services Ltd.*, July 15, 2014, https://www.sebi.gov.in/enforcement/orders/jul-2014/order-in-the-matter-of-satyam-computer-services-ltd-in-respect-of-mr-b-ramalinga-raju-mr-b-rama-raju-mr-vadlamani-srinivas-mr-g-ramakrishna-and-mr-v-s-prabhakara-gupta_27413.html

⁵ *Tata Consultancy Services Ltd. v. Cyrus Investments Pvt. Ltd.*, (2021) 9 S.C.C. 449; Supreme Court of India, Judgment dated Mar. 26, 2021, https://api.sci.gov.in/supremecourt/2020/212/212_2020_31_1503_27229_Judgement_26-Mar-2021.pdf.

4. To pick out the fundamental demanding situations affecting company governance in India.
5. To study important corporate-governance disputes and regulatory tendencies.
6. To analyse the gap between formal legal compliance and great company governance.
7. To signify legal, regulatory and institutional reforms for strengthening corporate governance in India.

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

This research adopts a doctrinal and analytical technique. Primary assets encompass the Companies Act, 2013, rules and regulations framed under the Act, SEBI rules, regulatory orders and judicial decisions. Secondary substances include reviews of governmental and regulatory committees, institutional guides and academic remark. The studies more often than not examines the Indian corporate-governance framework and focuses specifically on developments concerning businesses included beneath the corporations Act and listed entities regulated by way of SEBI.

MEANING OF CORPORATE GOVERNANCE?

Corporate governance is the mechanisms, methods, and family members via which businesses are controlled and directed. It stipulates the systems and principles which perceive the distribution of rights and obligations amongst different participants within the company (along with the board of administrators, managers, shareholders, lenders, auditors, regulators, and different stakeholders) and consists of the guidelines and approaches for making choices in company affairs. Virtually placed it's far the code of behavior in enterprise for the good management of the groups.

CONCEPT AND SIGNIFICANCE OF CORPORATE GOVERNANCE

Corporate governance might also extensively be understood because the framework of policies, standards, institutions and practices thru which a company is directed and managed. It concerns the relationship among the board of directors, management, shareholders and different stakeholders.

The organization for economic Co-operation and development has historically related company governance with relationships among an organization's control, board, shareholders and

stakeholders and with the systems via which company targets are installed and overall performance is monitored.⁶

- **CORPORATE GOVERNANCE SERVES SEVERAL FUNCTIONS.**

First, it promotes duty. Administrators and senior control workout giant authority over company sources. Governance mechanisms make sure that such authority is exercised inside felony and fiduciary barriers.

It promotes transparency. Traders require correct and well-timed statistics to make informed decisions. Financial statements, associated-birthday celebration disclosures, board reports and stock-alternate disclosures consequently form vital elements of company governance.

Governance protects shareholder pastimes, especially minority shareholders who can also lack sensible manage over corporate decisions.

Governance supports investor confidence. An obvious and predictable governance framework can lessen facts asymmetry and make contributions to confidence in capital markets.

Subsequently, company governance has increasingly acquired a broader stakeholder dimension. Personnel, lenders, consumers, communities and the environment might also all be suffering from company conduct.

The Companies Act reflects this broader technique. Section 166 requires administrators to behave according with the articles of the Organisation, in accurate faith, and inside the pursuits of the agency, its participants, personnel, shareholders, and network and for the protection of the surroundings.⁷

Thus, corporate governance cannot be decreased to compliance with procedural requirements. It also includes ethical selection-making and responsible exercise of corporate electricity.

EVOLUTION OF CORPORATE GOVERNANCE IN INDIA

The cutting-edge company-governance framework in India evolved step by step. One essential milestone become the creation of Clause 49 of the list settlement, which hooked up governance requirements for indexed companies. The guidelines of the Kumar Mangalam Birla Committee played a huge position in this improvement.

⁶ OECD, *G20/OECD Principles of Corporate Governance 2023*, OECD publishing (2023), <https://www.oecd.org/corporate/principles-corporate-governance/>.

⁷ Companies Act, 2013, sec 166, supra note 1.

The Naresh Chandra Committee and ultimately the Narayana Murthy Committee also examined company governance, auditing and accountability.

The Companies Act, 2013 represented a prime statutory improvement. It added unbiased directors as a statutory idea, bolstered board committees and created extra responsibility for administrators and key managerial personnel.⁸

Following the enactment of the companies Act, SEBI amended the existing governance necessities for indexed businesses and eventually introduced the LODR guidelines in 2015. SEBI's reforms included requirements referring to independent directors, whistle-blower mechanisms, audit committees, associated-party transactions, nomination and remuneration committees and board assessment.⁹

The Kotak Committee on corporate Governance, constituted through SEBI in 2017, further tested the governance framework for listed companies. Its phrases of reference especially addressed independent-director effectiveness, associated-party transactions, accounting and auditing practices, board assessment, shareholder participation and disclosure.¹⁰

These developments demonstrate that Indian corporate governance has evolved from a largely voluntary and listing-based framework into a complex combination of statutory and regulatory requirements.

LEGAL FRAMEWORK OF CORPORATE GOVERNANCE IN INDIA

There are many acts with provisions relating to corporate governance in India. These provisions are set in accordance with the international standards. They are:

1. **THE COMPANIES ACT, 2013** – it has provisions regarding the constituency of the board, popular conferences, audit committees, board tactics etc.
2. **SEBI (SECURITIES EXCHANGE BOARD OF INDIA)** – there are many guidelines concerning the company governance which can be mandatory for the agencies to comply with and violation of any suggestions attracts penalties.

⁸ Ministry of Corporate Affairs, Government of India, *Annual Report 2014–15*, describing the Companies Act's provisions concerning independent directors, board committees, CSR, directors' duties and managerial accountability, https://www.mca.gov.in/Ministry/pdf/annualreport_2014_2015.pdf.

⁹ Securities & Exchange Board of India, *SEBI Board Meeting: Review of Corporate Governance Norms in India for Listed Companies*, Apr. 17, 2014, https://www.sebi.gov.in/sebi_data/docfiles/27383_t.html

¹⁰ Securities & Exchange Board of India, *Committee on Corporate Governance*, supra note 3. The Committee's terms specifically addressed independent directors, related-party transactions, accounting and auditing, board evaluation, shareholder participation and disclosure.

3. **ICAI (INSTITUTE OF CHARTERED ACCOUNTANTS OF INDIA)** – there are numerous accounting standards associated with company governance consisting of disclosure of financial statements set by way of ICAI.
4. **ICSI (INSTITUTE OF COMPANY SECRETARIES OF INDIA)** – there are various secretarial standards on assembly of the board of directors, preferred meetings and so on. Set by ICSI which must be followed by means of the agencies.
5. **STANDARD LISTING SETTLEMENT OF INVENTORY** – this is regarded because the most vital framework for company governance which is applicable to the indexed agencies.

MAJOR CHALLENGES TO CORPORATE GOVERNANCE IN INDIA

PROMOTER DOMINANCE

One of the most essential challenges in Indian corporate governance is promoter dominance. In corporations where promoters preserve big balloting strength, the formal independence of administrators might not usually translate into practical independence. The controlling shareholder might also have enormous influence over board appointments, remuneration and strategic choices.

The venture will become especially severe where the interests of promoters diverge from the ones of minority shareholders.

Corporate governance mechanisms therefore want to cope with the problem of concentrated possession without unnecessarily interfering with legitimate shareholder manipulate.

FORMAL COMPLIANCE VERSUS SUBSTANTIVE COMPLIANCE

A great governance trouble is the opportunity of treating statutory necessities as procedural checklists. For example, a corporation might also officially employ unbiased administrators, represent an Audit Committee and adopt a whistle-blower coverage while these mechanisms continue to be ineffective in practice.

Corporate governance is consequently no longer simply about whether or not the desired committee exists. It is set whether the committee absolutely demanding situations control while essential.

This difference among compliance on paper and governance in substance is one of the maximum essential troubles dealing with Indian organizations.

EFFECTIVENESS OF INDEPENDENT DIRECTORS

Independent administrators are expected to provide goal oversight. Nevertheless, questions might also stand up concerning their potential to project dominant promoters and management.

Their effectiveness depends on:

- a) Independence from controlling shareholders;
- b) Get right of entry to complete information;

- c) Sufficient time and know-how;
- d) Willingness to question control;
- e) Safety from retaliation; and
- f) Significant performance evaluation.

The criminal framework ought to consequently recognition no longer simply on eligibility criteria however also on developing situations in which impartial directors can workout actual judgment.

RELATED-PARTY TRANSACTIONS

Related-celebration transactions are some other predominant governance undertaking.

Such transactions aren't inherently incorrect. Companies automatically transact with entities linked to promoters, directors and group businesses. The governance subject arises whilst a transaction is established or approved in a manner that risks the employer or minority shareholders.

Section 188 of the Companies Act presents statutory controls, whilst SEBI has imposed additional requirements for indexed entities.

SEBI's company-governance reform schedule has repeatedly identified associated-party transactions as a place requiring stronger safeguards and disclosure.¹¹

Effective regulation must consequently make sure:

- a) Complete disclosure;
- b) Impartial overview;
- c) Proper valuation;
- d) Audit committee scrutiny;
- e) Shareholder participation in which required; and
- f) Powerful outcomes for non-compliance.

ACCOUNTING AND AUDITING FAILURES

Financial reporting is central to company governance. If financial statements are materially inaccurate, traders may also make choices primarily based on false information.

¹¹ Securities & Exchange Board of India, *Consultation Paper on Strengthening Corporate Governance at Listed Entities by Empowering Shareholders*, Feb. 21, 2023, https://www.sebi.gov.in/sebi_data/attachdocs/feb-2023/1676983706624.pdf.

The Satyam scandal offers a main illustration of this hassle. SEBI's enforcement court cases documented troubles concerning false economic records and CEO certification.¹² SEBI ultimately imposed restrictions and disgorgement measures in opposition to individuals associated with the matter.¹³

The Satyam enjoy demonstrates that governance failure may additionally involve multiple layers: management, inner controls, auditors, board oversight and external tracking.

Consequently, corporate governance cannot depend exclusively upon the board. It calls for an atmosphere of accountable gatekeepers.

WEAK WHISTLE-BLOWER CULTURE

Whistle-blower mechanisms are supposed to permit employees and other humans to document misconduct.

However, a whistle-blower machine is ineffective if employees fear retaliation, profession effects or lack of confidentiality.

Companies ought to consequently make sure:

- a) Private reporting channels;
- b) Protection towards retaliation;
- c) Independent research;
- d) Direct get right of entry to to the Audit Committee in appropriate instances;
- e) Documented research approaches; and
- f) Suitable remedial measures.

The life of a whistle-blower policy have to no longer be taken into consideration sufficient except personnel accept as true with the mechanism.

MINORITY SHAREHOLDER PROTECTION

Minority shareholders may lack sufficient voting power to influence corporate decisions.

The Companies Act provides remedies against oppression and mismanagement under Sections 241–244.¹⁴ These provisions enable eligible members to approach the National Company Law Tribunal in appropriate circumstances.

¹² Securities & Exchange Board of India, *Order in the Matter of Satyam Computer Services Ltd.*, supra note 4. SEBI's order records issues concerning false and manipulated financial information and CEO certification under the listing framework.

¹³ Securities & Exchange Board of India, *Order in the Matter of Satyam Computer Services Ltd.*, Sept. 10, 2015, https://www.sebi.gov.in/cms/sebi_data/attachdocs/1441894262377.pdf.

¹⁴ Companies Act, 2013, sec 241–244, supra note 1

The Supreme Court's decision involving the Tata group illustrates the complex relationship between majority control, minority shareholder rights and corporate management. The Court considered the statutory framework concerning oppression and mismanagement and the powers available under the Companies Act.¹⁵

Minority shareholder protection should nevertheless extend beyond litigation. Greater participation in general meetings, improved disclosures and effective electronic voting can enhance shareholder oversight.

BOARD EVALUATION AND ACCOUNTABILITY

A board may additionally comply with meeting requirements without always functioning efficaciously.

Board evaluation have to therefore observe:

- a) Attendance;
- b) Preparedness;
- c) Contribution;
- d) Independence;
- e) Know-how;
- f) Venture to control;
- g) Committee effectiveness; and
- h) Responsiveness to stakeholder concerns.

Evaluation ought to now not end up an in simple terms formal annual exercising.

INFORMATION ASYMMETRY

Management typically possesses extensively extra statistics than shareholders.

This records asymmetry can create opportunities for manipulation, selective disclosure or behind schedule disclosure.

Strong disclosure responsibilities are consequently critical. The LODR Regulations are searching for to address this issue through continuing disclosure and governance requirements applicable to indexed entities.¹⁶

The mission is to make sure that disclosures are not simply voluminous but additionally understandable, timely and decision-useful.

¹⁵ *Tata Consultancy Services Ltd. v. Cyrus Investments Pvt. Ltd.*, (2021) 9 S.C.C. 449. The Supreme Court considered the statutory framework governing oppression and mismanagement and disputes concerning corporate control.

¹⁶ SEBI (Listing Obligations and Disclosure Requirements) Regulations, 2015, *supra* note 2

REGULATORY FRAGMENTATION

Indian organizations can be difficult to a couple of felony and regulatory regimes, inclusive of:

- a) Companies Act, 2013;
- b) SEBI regulations;
- c) Securities Contracts (Regulation) Act, 1956;
- d) SEBI Act, 1992;
- e) Insolvency and Bankruptcy Code, 2016;
- f) Area-unique rules;
- g) Accounting requirements;
- h) Tax rules; and
- i) Rules and guidelines issued by unique regulators.

Multiple regulators can beef up oversight however can also create overlapping compliance necessities. Effective coordination the various Ministry of Corporate Affairs, SEBI, stock exchanges, the National Financial Reporting Authority and other regulators is consequently crucial.

CORPORATE GOVERNANCE FAILURES: LESSONS FROM SATYAM COMPUTER SERVICES SCANDAL

The case concerned manipulation of economic facts and raised questions regarding the effectiveness of inner and outside governance mechanisms. SEBI's complaints recorded that fake and manipulated economic information had been used in connection with company movements and that CEO certification below the then-relevant list requirements became fake.¹⁷

The Satyam enjoy demonstrates numerous crucial classes.

1. Impartial administrators have to have actual access to facts.
2. Auditors should exercising professional scepticism and independence.
3. Board committees need to actively take a look at unusual economic developments.
4. Whistle-blower mechanisms should be credible.
5. Regulatory enforcement need to be sufficiently powerful to discourage misconduct.

Finally, company governance calls for ethical leadership. No regulatory framework can absolutely save you misconduct if the humans controlling the agency are determined to circumvent it.

¹⁷ Securities & Exchange Board of India, *Order in the Matter of Satyam Computer Services Ltd.*, supra notes 4, 23.

JUDICIAL APPROACH TO CORPORATE GOVERNANCE

Indian courts have increasingly more dealt with questions related to shareholder rights, directors' responsibilities, company manipulate and oppression and mismanagement.

In *Tata Consultancy Services Ltd. V. Cyrus Investments Pvt. Ltd.*, the Supreme Court considered lawsuits under Sections 241 and 242 of the Companies Act concerning allegations of oppression and mismanagement and disputes involving corporate manipulate.¹⁸

The judgment illustrates that company governance includes balancing multiple hobbies, together with majority shareholder rights, minority safety and the statutory concept of company interest.

The judicial framework consequently complements statutory governance mechanisms.

At the same time, courts commonly interfere within the obstacles mounted by company regulation. Corporate governance must mostly be secured via effective boards, shareholder mechanisms, expert gatekeepers and regulatory supervision in place of through judicial intervention after company failure has already happened.

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR STRENGTHENING CORPORATE GOVERNANCE

A. STRENGTHENING SUBSTANTIVE INDEPENDENCE

The concept of unbiased administrators ought to cognize on considerable independence in preference to merely technical eligibility.

- 1) Independent directors must have:
- 2) Unrestricted get right of entry to relevant statistics;
- 3) Get admission to impartial professional recommendation where essential;
- 4) Adequate remuneration;
- 5) Sufficient time for board duties; and
- 6) Protection in opposition to fallacious strain.

B. IMPROVING BOARD DIVERSITY AND EXPERTISE

Board composition must replicate the complexity of cutting-edge agencies.

Boards have to include people possessing appropriate information in:

- 1) Finance;
- 2) Regulation;
- 3) Era;
- 4) Cybersecurity;
- 5) Risk control;
- 6) Sustainability; and

¹⁸ *Tata Consultancy Services Ltd. v. Cyrus Investments Pvt. Ltd.*, (2021) 9 S.C.C. 449, supra note 5.

- 7) Enterprise-particular regulation.
- 8) Diversity have to not be regarded only as a numerical goal however also as a way of bringing special perspectives into choice-making.

C. STRENGTHENING AUDIT COMMITTEES

Audit Committees ought to acquire ok sources and need to no longer simply review financial statements after training.

They need to pay particular attention to:

- 1) Unusual transactions;
- 2) Associated-celebration transactions;
- 3) Internal controls;
- 4) Auditor independence;
- 5) Cybersecurity dangers;
- 6) Financial irregularities; and
- 7) Whistle-blower lawsuits.

D. IMPROVING RELATED-PARTY TRANSACTION OVERSIGHT

Related-celebration transactions should be subjected to sturdy scrutiny.

Companies must ensure that cloth transactions are followed by sufficient statistics regarding:

- 1) Commercial intent;
- 2) Valuation;
- 3) Phrases;
- 4) Conflicts of interest;
- 5) Alternatives considered; and
- 6) Potential impact on minority shareholders.

E. STRENGTHENING WHISTLE-BLOWER PROTECTION

Whistle-blowers must obtain significant safety towards retaliation.

Companies have to set up personal channels and make sure that critical court cases can attain the Audit Committee or some other unbiased authority.

F. BETTER GATEKEEPER ACCOUNTABILITY

Auditors, unbiased directors, Organisation secretaries, compliance officials and other expert gatekeepers play a critical position in preventing corporate misconduct.

Where gatekeepers fail to perform their criminal responsibilities, suitable regulatory outcomes ought to comply with. At the equal time, enforcement need to distinguish between actual expert negligence, deliberate misconduct and inadvertent technical breaches.

G. ENHANCING MINORITY SHAREHOLDER PARTICIPATION

Technology may be used to enhance shareholder participation through:

- 1) Digital vote casting;
- 2) Virtual well-known meetings;
- 3) Simplified disclosures;
- 4) Shareholder data portals; and
- 5) More accessibility of explanatory statements.

This can lessen the facts and participation gap among controlling shareholders and minority buyers.

CURRENT SCENARIO OF CORPORATE GOVERNANCE IN INDIA

India's company governance framework has developed right into a multi-layered regulatory device combining the Companies Act, 2013, SEBI guidelines, accounting and auditing requirements, and disclosure duties. The gift framework locations tremendous emphasis on board duty, unbiased directors, audit committees, shareholder participation, associated-party transactions, transparency, and protection of investors.

A. STATUTORY FRAMEWORK BENEATH THE COMPANIES ACT, 2013

The Companies Act, 2013 is one of the most important foundations of company governance in India. Section 149 affords for the constitution of the Board of Directors and requires indexed public organizations to have as a minimum one-third in their directors as unbiased directors. It also includes requirements referring to ladies directors and resident directors¹⁹.

Section 177 requires listed organizations and prescribed classes of agencies to constitute an Audit Committee. The committee plays an essential function in supervising monetary reporting, internal controls and auditing functions.²⁰

The Act additionally regulates related-birthday party transactions, disclosure of administrators' interests, managerial responsibilities, auditors, and company social responsibility. These provisions are seeking to lessen conflicts of interest and enhance duty among control, directors and shareholders.

B. ROLE OF SEBI IN INDEXED-COMPANY GOVERNANCE

For indexed entities, company governance is supplemented substantially by way of the SEBI (Listing Obligations and Disclosure Requirements) Regulations, 2015 (LODR Regulations). SEBI's regulatory technique specializes in transparency, timely disclosures, board composition, committees, related-party transactions and safety of shareholders and traders.

¹⁹ Companies Act, 2013, No. 18 of 2013, sec 149 (India), Ministry of Corporate Affairs, Companies Act, 2013.

²⁰ Companies Act, 2013, No. 18 of 2013, sec 177 (India), Ministry of Corporate Affairs, Companies Act, 2013.

SEBI continues to review corporate-governance requirements. For instance, SEBI's recent regulatory paintings has covered consultations regarding governance of marketplace infrastructure institutions and continuing discussions regarding corporate-governance requirements.²¹

The continuing regulatory hobby demonstrates that corporate governance in India isn't a static framework however an evolving place of securities and corporation regulation.

C. INDEPENDENT DIRECTORS AND BOARD DUTY

Independent directors are meant to offer a detail of independent oversight over management and promoters. Under Section 149 of the Companies Act, 2013, indexed public organizations need to typically have at least one-third of their board comprising impartial administrators.²²

However, the effectiveness of unbiased administrators relies upon no longer simply upon numerical compliance however additionally upon their actual independence, get right of entry to facts, willingness to impeach control and participation in board committees. SEBI's corporate-governance work has especially diagnosed independence and energetic participation of impartial administrators as vital governance worries.²³

D. AUDIT COMMITTEES AND ECONOMIC ACCOUNTABILITY

Audit committees have turn out to be an essential component of India's corporate-governance structure. Section 177 of the Companies Act requires an Audit Committee for indexed groups and prescribed lessons of organizations.²⁴

E. RELATED-BIRTHDAY CELEBRATION TRANSACTIONS

Related-party transactions continue to be a vital corporate-governance issue, particularly in groups where promoters or controlling shareholders workout full-size affect.

The Companies Act and SEBI's LODR framework impose disclosure and approval requirements intended to save you transactions that improperly favour related parties on the rate of the organization or minority shareholders. SEBI's corporate-governance time table has specially diagnosed safeguards and disclosures relating to associated-birthday party transactions as a vital area.²⁵

²¹ Securities & Exchange Board of India, *SEBI Reports & Statistics*, SEBI Publications

²² Companies Act, 2013, No. 18 of 2013, § 149(4) (India), Ministry of Corporate Affairs, Companies Act, 2013.

²³ Securities & Exchange Board of India, *Committee on Corporate Governance*, SEBI Committee on Corporate Governance.

²⁴ Companies Act, 2013, No. 18 of 2013, sec 177(1) (India), Ministry of Corporate Affairs, Companies Act, 2013

²⁵ Companies Act, 2013, No. 18 of 2013, sec 188 (India); Securities & Exchange Board of India, *Securities and Exchange Board of India (Listing Obligations and Disclosure Requirements) Regulations, 2015*, reg. 23, SEBI, LODR Regulations; Securities & Exchange Board of India, *Master Circular for Compliance with the Provisions of the SEBI (Listing Obligations and Disclosure Requirements) Regulations, 2015*, at 18–19 (2023), SEBI Master Circular.

F. TRANSPARENCY AND DISCLOSURE

Modern corporate governance increasingly more depends upon timely and correct disclosure of cloth information. Listed groups are subject to tremendous disclosure necessities below the securities-law framework.

SEBI continues to submit regulatory reviews and statistics, along with its 2025–26 Annual Report and month-to-month announcements, reflecting its continuing regulatory and supervisory function in India's securities marketplace.²⁶

Transparency is crucial as it permits shareholders, creditors, regulators and other stakeholders to make selections primarily based upon dependable information.

G. PROTECTION OF MINORITY SHAREHOLDERS

Another crucial aspect of India's company-governance framework is the protection of minority shareholders. This is particularly applicable in agencies with concentrated ownership structures, where promoters might also exercise considerable influence over corporate decisions.

Board independence, shareholder balloting rights, disclosure necessities, law of related-birthday celebration transactions and treatments below corporation regulation collectively provide mechanisms through which minority hobbies can acquire protection.

H. CORPORATE GOVERNANCE AND STAKEHOLDER PURSUITS

The contemporary information of company governance extends beyond the connection among shareholders and management. Companies are more and more predicted to recall employees, creditors, customers, communities and environmental considerations.

The Companies Act's Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) framework is a crucial instance of this broader technique. Section 135 calls for qualifying groups to constitute a CSR framework and observe detailed CSR responsibilities.

²⁶ Securities and Exchange Board of India (Listing Obligations and Disclosure Requirements) Regulations, 2015, sec. 4(1)(c)–(d), 30 (India); Securities & Exchange Board of India, *Annual Report 2025–26*, SEBI Annual Report 2025–26

CONCLUSION

Corporate governance in India has undergone great development. The Companies Act, 2013 created a complete statutory structure incorporating independent administrators, board committees, directors' duties, related-party transaction controls, monetary reporting requirements, secretarial audits and CSR duties. SEBI's LODR Regulations have similarly strengthened governance requirements for listed entities. These trends constitute sizeable progress from the sooner framework.

Nevertheless, corporate governance failures demonstrate that regulation alone cannot assure accountable corporate behavior. Promoter dominance, insufficient board independence, related-party transactions, accounting failures, ineffective whistle-blower systems, data asymmetry and inadequate minority shareholder participation remain vital challenges.

The experience of Satyam illustrates that even a complicated governance framework can fail in which company tradition, inner controls and gatekeeper oversight are ineffective. Judicial tendencies regarding shareholder rights and corporate manipulation in addition show the significance of balancing majority authority with minority protection.

The destiny of company governance in India consequently requires a transition from rule-based compliance to principle-primarily based accountability. Independent directors ought to be truly independent; Audit Committees need to exercise significant scrutiny; auditors and other gatekeepers ought to discharge their obligations efficiently; shareholders should obtain comprehensible and well-timed records; and regulators need to coordinate enforcement.

Technology can improve these mechanisms thru computerized compliance tracking, records analytics and stepped forward shareholder participation. At the identical time, new dangers involving cybersecurity, facts safety and technological decision-making need to turn out to be part of board-stage chance governance.

Ultimately, powerful corporate governance depends upon the interplay of regulation, establishments, expert duty and company ethics. An agency that merely satisfies the minimum criminal requirements may stay at risk of governance screw ups. An employer that embeds transparency, responsibility, and independence and ethical responsibility into its selection-making is better located to hold stakeholder self-belief and lengthy-time period institutional sustainability.

The manner forward for India is consequently not necessarily the introduction of extra rules alone. It is the creation of a company environment wherein existing guidelines are understood, implemented and enforced in their real spirit. Corporate governance need to turn out to be a necessary part of company selection-making rather than a compliance workout carried out after decisions have already been made.