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.

DISSENT AND LIABILITY: BOARDROOM ACCOUNTABILITY IN INDIA

~ Pratyusa Roy And Pratishtha Chatterjee

ABSTRACT

Effective corporate governance relies on an informed, independent and legal decisions by the company's board of directors. Dissent plays a key role within corporate governance. It will allow directors to raise concerns, question a proposed resolution and note their disagreement with a resolution supported by the majority. However, the issue arises of how protected a director is by noting their dissent in relation to a decision made by the company leading to financial losses, regulatory breaches or another consequence.

In this research, I have explored the connection between dissent and director's liability within Indian Company Law. This included exploring section 166 of the Companies Act, 2013 (director's duties), section 118(4) (noting dissent), section 149(12) (limited protection for certain independent and non-executive directors) and Schedule IV (directors' duties). I also looked at the importance of interests, board procedures, committee oversight and company records.

This research uses a doctrinal approach to look at the interpretation of statutory provisions, case law and secondary resources. I have looked at how directors are held accountable for fiduciary duties, due diligence, corporate misconduct and board responsibility.

The research suggests dissent can be an important protection however it does not automatically protect directors. Whether it will depend on the nature of the dissent, the director's knowledge, the relevant statutory duty, the accuracy of board records and actions taken in response to the wrongdoing. Overall, if there is more detailed record keeping, clear board procedures and consistency with current legal standards, it can help increase corporate accountability whilst protecting directors who have exercised genuine independent judgment.

INTRODUCTION

1. Background to the Research

Corporate governance is an important aspect of modern companies. A company is run by shareholders providing capital, directors providing strategic and supervisory powers and management carrying out the day-to-day operations. The board of directors play a crucial role in the company as they are responsible for overseeing strategy, monitoring management, acting in the best interests of the company and ensuring they are compliant with the relevant law.

Directors have many responsibilities and are expected to act with good faith, reasonable care and diligence, avoid conflicts of interest and act in the best interests of the company. This is especially important for transactions that carry a large financial risk, have an interest with another party, regulatory concerns or possible legal breaches.

Decisions will be made by the board of directors however this will usually be done collectively. While this can improve efficiency, it can also lead to a director having a different view to the proposed resolution. This could be due to a director considering the proposal to be financially imprudent, legally questionable, not enough investigation or not in the best interests of the company and its stakeholders.

This can provide a very important aspect to responsible corporate governance. Directors can voice their concerns, question the majority and highlight any doubts they have. By noting dissent can show the director was not in favour with the decision however this does not necessarily mean they have met all their legal requirements.

The Companies Act, 2013 has recognised the importance of board accountability. Section 166 of CA 2013, outlines directors' duties to act with good faith, reasonable care and diligence, independence and avoid conflicts of interest and unjust enrichment. Section 118(4) CA 2013, requires minutes of directors' and committee meetings to note dissenting and non-concurring directors. Section 149(12) CA 2013, provides limited protection for specific independent and nonexecutive directors.

However, this needs to be considered together. While the law requires directors to note dissent, it does not state they will be protected from liability. It can help provide evidence for the director's conduct, knowledge and diligence.

This research looks at how the law relates to the connection between dissent and liability. It focusses on how Indian company law balances director accountability with protecting responsible and independent directors.

1.1. What is Boardroom Dissent?

Boardroom dissent is when a director disagrees with a proposal, resolution, action or decision made by the board or committee. They could disagree with the legality of the transaction, lack of sufficient information, financial risk, conflict of interest or not in the best interests of the company in the long term.

They can voice their disagreement during discussions, voting against the resolution, providing comments or asking for the dissent to be noted in the minutes. The legal implications depend on the rules and situation.

Dissent should not be confused with silence, abstention or absence. If the director was not present then they will not have had the opportunity to consider the matter. If they abstain, they could have a variety of reasons such as conflict of interest or not feeling they have enough information. If they disagree then they have clearly communicated that they do not agree with the proposal.

However, this does not necessarily mean they will be liable. It depends on what duties they have and the situation. For example, if the director has voted against the transaction, they may still have duties to disclose a conflict, investigate serious allegations or take appropriate action.

1.2. What is Directors' Liability?

Directors' liability can occur if a director breaches any relevant statutory duty, fiduciary duty or legal requirement. This could result in civil, regulatory, criminal or disciplinary liability.

Civil liability can occur if a director breaches causing loss to the company or creating a claim.

Regulatory liability can occur if they breach company law, securities law or other requirements.

Criminal liability will depend on the elements of the offence and the legal requirements.

It is important to note that just because a company commits a regulatory breach this does not necessarily mean each director is personally liable. This depends on what statute is being referred to, the role of the director, their knowledge, conduct and whether there are any conditions.

A director's role on the board does not give them a general defence. If they knowingly participated in illegal activity, disregarded major indicators or failed to exercise reasonable legal diligence they could be liable despite disagreeing with one resolution.

The connection between dissent and liability should be considered in detail.

1.3. Problem Statement

The main problem within this research is the uncertainty relating to the impact of dissenting opinions on directors' liability in India.

Section 118(4) of the CA 2013, explicitly states that minutes of the board meetings must note the names of dissenting and non-concurring directors. This can improve transparency however it does not explicitly state they will be protected.

Directors are expected to act with independence and reasonable diligence. If they have identified a major legal or financial concern they may need to take further action. This could include requesting further information, seeking legal advice through proper channels, ensuring the dissent is correctly noted, bringing it to the relevant committee or taking other lawful actions.

This is an important issue for independent and non-executive directors. They may not be involved in the day to day running of the company however they still should have informed oversight. Section 149(12) provides limited liability for independent and non-executive directors however if the statutory requirements are met then they will still be liable.

Therefore, this research looks at whether the current framework provides a clear and balanced position to differentiate between directors who are genuinely diligent in their dissent and those who have not met their duties.

1.4. Research Objectives

a) Explore the statutory framework surrounding directors' duties and liability in the CA, 2013.
b) Analyse the importance of dissent being noted in section 118(4) CA, 2013.
c) Explore the connection between dissent, independence and duties in section 166 CA, 2013.
d) Investigate the extent and limitations of section 149(12) CA, 2013 in relation to independent and specific non-executive directors.
e) Analyse relevant case law relating to fiduciary duties, oversight and individual liability.
f) Differentiate between the evidence dissent can provide and a complete defence.
g) Identify issues with board minutes, information, conflict of interest and corporate misconduct.
h) Recommend ways to improve board accountability whilst protecting responsible dissent.

1.5. Hypothesis

This study hypothesises that noting dissent can be an important protection within corporate governance however it depends on the director's conduct. It should be seen as relevant evidence of independence.

This study will also hypothesise that clear record keeping, sufficient information, escalating major concerns and consistency with statutory requirements can help protect diligent directors.

1.6. Research Methodology

This study uses a doctrinal approach. It analyses statutory provisions, case law, regulatory materials and academic commentaries.

Primary resources include the Companies Act, 2013, rules relating to board meetings, Schedule IV of the Act, relevant securities law and relevant case law. Secondary resources include textbooks, legal commentaries, research and publications.

This study is an analytical and interpretive research. It does not aim to measure how often dissent occurs or how successful directors are at using dissent in litigation. The findings are based on interpreting legal resources.

1.7. Scope and Limitations

This research primarily focuses on Indian company law and the connection between dissent and directors' liability. It focusses on sections 118, 149 and 166 of the Companies Act, 2013 and other provisions relating to conflicts of interest, board procedures and corporate governance.

This study will also look at case law from previous company law legislation however, the Companies Act, 2013 has its own statutory framework.

This project does not aim to provide an exhaustive list of all offences and regulatory requirements that could apply to directors. Different specialised legislation may have different wording and should be considered separately. Whether a provision applies can depend on whether the company is listed, its structure and the director's actual role.

1.8. Significance of the Research

This research is important as companies often make decisions involving uncertainty, conflicting interests and major legal and financial implications. Responsible dissent can improve the quality of decisions by encouraging further investigation.

This research is relevant to independent directors, non-executive directors, company secretaries, compliance officers, shareholders and company legal advisors. A better understanding of the legal implications of dissent can improve record keeping and reduce uncertainty.

Overall, this research helps contribute to the debate around corporate governance. It emphasises that accountability and protection do not go hand-inhand and a strong legal framework should hold directors accountable for their actions whilst acknowledging their genuine efforts to question, prevent and report wrongdoing.

Chapter II

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Introduction

The connection between dissent and directors' liability is a complex area of law involving company law, fiduciary duty and corporate governance. There are various resources available looking at directors' duties, independent directors, importance of board oversight and identification of corporate misconduct. This study looks at the connection between dissent and directors' liability by focussing on the importance of noting dissent as a director. It analyses how and if it can show independence, diligence or lack of involvement.

This section includes statutory commentary, case law principles, independent director accountability and board record keeping.

2.1. Statutory Framework and Directors' Duties

The Companies Act, 2013 provides the main statutory framework relating to directors' duties. Section 166 requires directors to act with good faith, in the best interests of the company and its stakeholders, reasonable care and diligence, independence, avoid conflicts of interest and unjust enrichment.

Section 118 provides rules for minutes. Subsection (4) requires directors to note dissenting and non-concurring directors. The two provisions are closely linked however section 166 is to regulate the director's conduct whereas section 118 is for record keeping.

This shows that noting dissent should be part of responsible record keeping however it does not guarantee they have met all their duties. It depends on the relevant duty and situation.

Section 149(12) CA, 2013 provides additional insight. It provides limited liability for specific independent and non-executive directors. This highlights the importance of knowledge gained through board processes, consent or connivance and whether they acted with due diligence.

These resources provide the foundation for this research. This project looks at how they work together and whether they are sufficient in distinguishing responsible dissent from trying to avoid accountability by noting dissent.

2.2. Fiduciary Duty and Board Responsibility

Indian company law has consistently recognised the directors have a responsibility and have powers they must use for proper corporate purposes.

In **Dale & Carrington Investment (P) Ltd v P.K. Prathapan** the Supreme Court looked at how directors use their powers in the context of a share allotment. It recognised the importance of fiduciary duty and acting with bona fide in relation to corporate powers. This is relevant to

this research as it shows the legality of the board's actions depends on the purpose and situation.[1]

In **Official Liquidator v P.A. Tendolkar** the Supreme Court looked at the responsibility of directors in situations involving the company's affairs and fraudulent activities. The judgement is often cited It could be argued that a director may have a duty because he is closely involved in management.

However, there must be consideration of the facts.

Overall, from the above sources, it seems that a directors' duty cannot be simplified to one act. Factors, such as the director's role, knowledge and actions may all play a role in the duty owed by a director. In terms of this research, a director may have a duty because they have objected to something.[2]

2.3. Independent Directors and Attributing

Independent directors are to provide objectivity and supervision to a company. As they do not get involved in the day-to-day running of a company, their role is important to ensure there are no conflicts of interest. This is covered in the CA, 2013. Section 149(12) places a limit on the liability of independent directors and certain non-executive directors. The directors can only be liable for acts falling within those listed in subsection (12). Schedule IV covers many points, such as maintaining integrity, providing objectivity and making decisions based upon knowledge. It also emphasises the importance of taking enough care when acting in professional roles and providing independent judgement.

Therefore, it can be seen that there is recognition that there must be a distinction between directors who have a real supervisory role and those who meet the criteria for liability.

Whilst recording an objection can be used to show that an independent director did not agree with the decision, it may not cover all aspects of the directors' duty. For example, whether they had the necessary knowledge, whether the issue was properly investigated and whether reasonable steps were taken.

The literature on independent directors and their accountability will be important to understand the extent of the protection provided.

2.4. Minutes of the Board

[1] SCC ONLINE

[2] SCC ONLINE

Minutes of the board are a key part of corporate governance. Section 118 of the Companies Act, 2013 requires minutes to be taken of the proceedings. This means that they must provide a fair and accurate summary of the proceedings.

It must be noted in the minutes when a director disagreed with a resolution.

he SS-1 ‘Secretarial Standard on Meetings of the Board of Directors’ provides guidance on how to run meetings. It should be used in conjunction with the Companies Act and rules.

Proper minutes can help provide details as to what information was presented to the board, what issues were raised, what was decided and whether any directors objected. This can be an important piece of evidence when looking at how directors have acted.

However, it is important that the minutes are accurate. If the minutes are incomplete or inaccurate, this may not show the true nature of the director’s objection. A general statement that the director disagreed may not provide as much information.

This part of the literature can be used to argue that minutes should be accurate and meaningful. However, it raises the point of how the minutes should relate to the standards of care and diligence.

2.5. Judicial Precedent

There are many cases that provide useful guidance on how to determine whether directors have acted appropriately. The case of N. Narayanan v Adjudicating Officer, SEBI looked at the disclosure and accountability of a company. [3] This shows that there is a legal duty to act as an officer of a company. Therefore, they cannot simply treat following regulations as a formality.

Although this case does not provide a general rule that all directors will be liable for any breach of the company, it does show that the directors’ duties must be looked at under the relevant legal framework.

Tata Consultancy Services Ltd v Cyrus Investments (P) Ltd looked at the governance of a company and the decisions made by the board. [4] The judgement shows that simply disagreeing with the management of a company does not mean that the directors have acted unlawfully. There must be consideration of the statutory grounds.[3]

[3] SCC Online

Overall, this shows that there is a need to look at the circumstances surrounding the board. It is important to understand what legal duty the director had, what facts surrounded the decision and what grounds for liability apply.

2.6. Objection as Protection

Within the statutory framework, it can be seen that the recording of an objection may be an important piece of evidence. However, it does not always provide a defence. Section 118(4) requires the recording of objections. However, it does not state that anyone named in the minutes are protected.

Whether it is relevant will depend on what issue is being looked at. If the director is liable for participating in a resolution, it may be important to know that they

---

objected. However, if the director is being accused of failing to disclose an interest, supervise compliance or take reasonable steps, it may not be relevant. This means that the objection cannot be misused as a defence. A responsible objection should reflect that the director was genuinely concerned.

This research will look at how the objection relates to other factors such as knowledge, participation, care and diligence and what legal duty they have.

2.7. Gap in Research

Many areas have been covered in the statutory framework and judicial precedent. However, they often look at different aspects.

The relationship between recording an objection and the liability of individuals needs to be analysed. This means looking at how to distinguish between the procedural aspect and the substantive aspect.

This study will look at Section 118(4) in conjunction with Section 166 and 149(12). This will be supported by relevant judicial precedent. How should these sections be interpreted when a director claims that they have acted responsibly by recording an objection? What are the implications for the minutes, escalating issues and determining care?

This will provide an insight into how these issues can be looked at within one doctrinal area.

2.8. Conclusion

From analysing the literature and legal materials in this chapter, it can be seen that the directors' liability must be looked at in relation to their statutory duties, fiduciary duties and the

circumstances. The recording of an objection is an important factor of corporate governance. However, it cannot be determined on its own.

The statutory framework, judicial principles and procedural requirements all support that the directors' actions should be looked at in the circumstances. The next chapter provides a detailed look at the relevant sections of the Companies Act, 2013.

CHAPTER III

Legal Framework Governing Directors' Duties and Board Accountability

3. Introduction

To understand the relationship between objection and liability, it is important to look at directors' duties under Indian company law. Directors have powers that may affect the financial position, compliance and sustainability of the company. Therefore, there are duties imposed on directors to ensure that they act responsibly.

The Companies Act, 2013 provides directors with duties. This includes obligations to act in good faith, with care and diligence and to avoid conflicts of interest. There are also procedural requirements to be followed and accountability for independent and non-executive directors.

There is no one section that determines how to deal with all issues related to objection. Section 118(4) requires directors to record an objection. Section 166 sets out the substantive duties of directors. Section 149(12) provides that some directors have limited liability. The legal impact of the objection must be analysed using these sections.

3.1. Section 166 – Directors' Duties

Section 166 of the Companies Act, 2013 is key to understanding directors' actions. It sets out the duties that a director must follow.

3.1.1. Duty to Act in Accordance with Articles

Section 166(1) requires a director to act in accordance with the company articles. This is part of the company constitution and regulates various aspects. Therefore, the director must consider whether the proposed board decision is in line with the company articles and statutory framework. If they believe that there may be an issue, they may raise this and ask for clarification as part of responsible decision making.

The recording of an objection may provide evidence that the director was concerned about the decision. However, if they have become aware that there is an ongoing breach, the legal impact may depend on whether they were required to take further steps.

3.1.2. Acting in Good Faith

Section 166(2) requires directors to act in good faith to promote the objects of the company for the benefit of the members, as a whole. They must also act in the best interest of the company, employees, shareholders, community and the environment.

This means that the directors must act in the legitimate interests outlined in the statute. They should not support a transaction if it only benefits an individual. This is because it does not align with their legal duties.

If the director believes that a proposal will be detrimental to the company, they may have a duty to object. However, this does not guarantee that they acted in good faith. This will depend on the circumstances and why they are objecting.

3.1.3. Duty of Care, Skill and Diligence

Section 166(3) requires directors to act with due care, skill and diligence.

This is an important section as it may determine whether the objection is meaningful. If the director becomes aware of an irregularity, they may need to investigate the information provided, ask for clarification and analyse the legal or financial implications of the decision.

This will depend on the situation. The law should not be interpreted to mean that every director must investigate every decision made by the company in a commercial setting. However, if there are major red flags, apparent breaches or inconsistencies, this may require more careful consideration.

Whilst the objection may show that the director acted independently, it may not always show that they followed all of the duties.

3.1.4. Acting Independently

This is a key point when considering the objection. Directors are expected to make decisions based on their own judgement. They should not just follow the opinions of the chairman, controlling shareholders or management.

This enables them to challenge assumptions, ask for further information and disagree with the majority. This can improve the quality of the discussion at board meetings.

However, this does not mean that they will always disagree. They may have acted independently but agreed with the resolution. On the other hand, if they regularly disagree without investigating the information, they may not be fulfilling their duties under the statute.

The question is whether they have made an informed and responsible decision.

3.1.5. Conflict of Interests and Undue Benefits

Section 166(4) and 166(5) require directors not to place themselves in situations that involve prohibited conflicts of interest. They must also not receive any undue benefits for themselves or certain associated persons.

This does not relate to whether they agreed with a resolution. They may have objected to the transaction but have a duty to disclose their interest, if required by the law. They may also have a separate issue with regards to receiving benefits from another transaction.

Therefore, their objection must be considered in relation to their overall compliance.

3.2. Section 118(4) – Objecting to Resolutions

Section 118 deals with how minutes must be kept and their importance as evidence. Subsection (4) requires that minutes must be kept of board and committee meetings. This includes noting the names of directors who objected to or did not agree with the resolution.

This is important for three reasons:

Transparency – it ensures that the company keeps a record of when there was disagreement.

Evidence – it provides evidence of how the individual director felt.

Accountability – it reduces the risk of the minutes stating that everyone agreed, when in fact they did not.

Section 118(7) states that minutes must be kept in accordance with the statutory requirements. They can therefore be used as evidence. This will depend on the law and circumstances of the matter.

3.2.1. Importance of Objecting

The objection should not be seen as a minor formality. The minutes may become relevant to any allegations of misconduct, breaches of regulation or whether a decision was valid and the circumstances.

The minutes should be kept accurately to show what decision was made and who objected, as required by law. If the director believes that the minutes do not accurately reflect their objection, they should follow the relevant process to request that they are corrected.

If there was a written objection, this may also be relevant evidence. The legal impact will depend on the circumstances and law.

3.2.2. Evidence

It is important to recognise that whilst the objection must be recorded, it does not give the director immunity. Section 118(4) requires that the objection is recorded but does not state that the director will not be liable for any claims relating to the company.

For example, if the director voted against the resolution and it became part of a breach of regulation, it may be relevant. However, other allegations regarding knowledge, care and diligence must be considered.

This creates an important protection through the minutes but does not replace the substantive requirements.

3.3. Section 149(12) – Liability of Independent and Non-Executive Directors Section 149(12) states that an independent director or non-executive director (who is not a promoter or key managerial personnel) can only be held liable for acts or omissions by the company that they had knowledge of (through board processes), consented to or connived at or failed to act with due diligence. This recognises that not all directors have the same level of control over a company. Independent and non-executive directors may have a supervisory role and do not manage the company.

This protection is subject to the director having knowledge, board processes, consenting or conniving and acting with due diligence.

The director cannot rely on them being an independent director or having objected to one resolution. Personal liability should not be assumed just because they are a member of the board. The statutory requirements must be considered.

3.3.1. Knowledge

As this refers to knowledge gained through board processes, it is important to consider what information the board have.

This can include board papers, committee reports, audit findings, disclosing interest, minutes and communications around the proposed transaction. This can help determine whether the director was aware of the issue and how they responded.

However, this must be considered in accordance with the relevant law and facts.

3.3.2. Consent/Connivance and Diligence

If the director consented or connived, they may have knowingly approved or participated in actions. Diligence refers to whether the director took appropriate care.

The objection may provide evidence that they did not agree with the resolution. However, it may not determine whether they took due care with regards to other known issues.

Section 149(12) must be considered in accordance with the wording.

3.4. Schedule IV

Schedule IV to the Companies Act, 2013 sets out a code for independent directors. This emphasises the importance of integrity, objectivity and acting bona fide. It also requires directors to take sufficient care when acting in professional roles and make decisions based on their knowledge. Directors must also act independently.

This helps to show that independent directors have a role to challenge decisions made by management.

It also recognises the importance of expressing independent views. Therefore, an objection may be a legitimate way of showing that they have fulfilled their duties as an independent director. However, this should be considered in conjunction with the rest of the Act. Just because they have objected does not mean that they have fulfilled all their duties.

Overall, their actions must be considered.

3.6 Section 184 – Disclosure of Interest by Directors

Section 184 governs how directors must disclose their interests. This aims to increase transparency and ensure that directors are not allowing their personal or other interests to influence decisions.

This shows that an objection cannot be used as a general defence. Just because the director voted against a resolution does not mean that they complied with their duty to disclose.

If there was an interest they must comply with the relevant statutory requirements. This will depend on the facts and relevant provisions.

3.5. Section 177 and 188 – Oversight and Related Party Transactions Section 177 governs the audit committee for companies that fall under its requirements. The committee has a duty to provide certain oversight functions in relation to the auditors,

Financial Statements and Related Parties.

Section 188 is concerned with certain related party transactions, providing there are certain conditions and exemptions. This is relevant to ensure that any issues with decisions made by the company are properly considered. If a director does identify a significant concern, this would depend on what issue they have identified. It may be necessary for them to record their views, but this will not automatically exempt them from any separate statutory duty.

3.6. Section 35: Liability for Misstatements in Prospectus.

Section 35 deals with civil liability for misstatements in prospectuses. This is important in relation to directors' duties because if the director is found liable under this particular piece of legislation, they will be required to comply with the requirements.

While it may be relevant to know a director disagreed with something, this does not automatically exempt them from complying with the requirements or any defence they have under the legislation.

This shows how a director's dissent will depend on what they are being held liable for. There will be differences in what applies under various pieces of legislation, including company law, securities regulation etc.

3.7. Board Meeting Requirements.

Under the Companies Act, 2013, there are various requirements for directors' meetings including Section 173 and 174. Section 118 requires that companies comply with the relevant secretarial standards relating to general and board meetings. These standards have been set out by the Institute of Company Secretaries of India and approved by the Central Government.

SS-1 deals with procedures for board meetings. It includes the requirement to record dissenting opinions.

This will be relevant to directors' accountability. By accurately recording the decisions, it will allow the company to understand what decision was made, what directors were present and if there were any disagreements. It may also help with understanding if the director asked for more information or had certain concerns.

However, this will only deal with procedural requirements.

3.8. Conclusion.

There are clear differences between recording dissent and holding directors liable. Section 118(4) requires dissent to be recorded. Section 166 sets out directors' duties and Section 149(12) provides that certain independent and nonexecutive directors have limited liability. Other requirements relating to conflicts of interest, audit and related parties show that directors may have certain duties to comply with.

Therefore, it is important to consider the director's actions as a whole, what duty they have and what evidence there is.

CHAPTER IV

Dissenting Opinions and Legal Significance

4. Introduction.

Dissent is an important tool for directors to use to challenge proposed decisions made at board meetings and still allow the board to exercise their powers. It also enables directors to express different opinions and can help improve corporate decision making.

From a legal perspective, there are a few considerations to be made regarding dissent. It may be a procedural requirement, evidence, independent opinion or evidence that the director was involved in the decision. However, this should not be confused with a full defence.

4.1. Independent Opinion.

There may be many reasons why a director disagrees with a proposal. This could be due to not having enough information available, financial assumptions not being reliable, there may be a conflict of interest or the proposal may be illegal. This can be a positive thing for good governance as it will encourage the board to reconsider the proposal. It can also identify any issues that may have been missed.

Independent opinion does not mean that the director will automatically disagree with the rest of the board. They should make sure that they are making a responsible decision regarding the proposal.

If they record their dissent, this could suggest they had an independent opinion.

Whether this is strong evidence will depend on the circumstances.

4.2. Evidence.

If there is any issue with the director being liable due to being involved in a decision, recording dissent could be relevant.

For example, if there is evidence in the minutes that the director disagreed with a transaction, this can help show they did not agree with the resolution. If there are certain legal/financial concerns they raised, this can add some context. However, this evidence must be carefully considered. Just because they disagree with one resolution does not mean they had no knowledge of anything wrong or that they complied with all their duties.

4.3. Differences Between Dissent, Abstention and Silence.

There are a few differences between these.

Dissent means that the director disagreed with the proposal or resolution. Abstention means that the director did not vote. This will depend on why they abstained and what the rules are.

Silence may show that the director did not object, but this does not automatically mean they agreed with it or that they did something wrong.

These should not be confused with each other. If the director abstained due to a conflict of interest, they may be in a different position compared to someone who has not looked into the relevant information. Silence may mean they did not know there was a concern, or they have not raised an issue that should have been identified.

Therefore, it is important to look at the facts.

4.4. Diligence.

An important question to ask is whether there is anything more the director needs to do. This will depend on what the concern is and what duties apply. If it is a general risk in business, the director may want to ask for more information or have further discussions. If it is credible evidence that the proposal is illegal or there is a significant financial irregularity, they may want to take further steps.

This could be asking that the issue is discussed with the relevant committee, seeking clarification from legal/compliance within the company, asking that they are accurately recorded in the minutes or ensuring they are reported appropriately.

These are just examples of what can be done to improve governance. The duties that apply to the director will depend on the relevant law and circumstances. Overall, the key point to remember is that dissent should align with the director's overall duty of care and diligence.

4.5. Independent Directors.

Independent directors are expected to provide an impartial view and make independent decisions. They play an important role in situations where there may be conflicts of interest or regulatory risk due to decisions made by management.

Section 149(12) provides that independent directors and certain non-executive directors have limited liability. This means that their knowledge, consent/connivance and diligence will be relevant. If a director records dissent, this could be significant evidence. However, this does not mean they do not have any knowledge of the relevant events or have not complied with any separate duties.

If a director records dissent but ignores any credible evidence of ongoing wrongdoing, this may cause different legal concerns compared to someone who has raised the concern, taken appropriate action and had no further involvement.

4.6. Collective Decisions.

It is important that corporate boards can make collective decisions. If every time there was a disagreement, the board could not make any decisions which could cause issues with managing the company.

Dissent will mean there is a record of disagreement. However, this does not mean the majority cannot decide on an issue in line with the law and company constitution.

However, just because the majority have approved something does not mean it is legal. The director's duty will not depend on whether they had enough votes for the resolution. The decision must still be analysed to see if it was legal and what the individual directors have done. This helps to ensure there is good governance.

4.7. Strategic/Superficial Dissent.

There may be a concern that dissent is used as a superficial defence.

The director may try to record a general concern but still be involved in the transaction. They may ignore any red flags or fail to comply with any separate duties. In this situation, the fact they recorded dissent should not be taken into account.

The legal significance of dissent should depend on whether they genuinely objected, it was properly recorded and their actions after. It should be considered along with the overall evidence.

This will discourage directors from using the minutes as a defence and encourage genuine dissent.

4.8. Resignation.

A director may wish to resign if they have genuine governance concerns that cannot be resolved. However, this does not automatically mean they do not have any legal duties to comply with. The outcome will depend on what duties apply, the facts and any regulations. If they became involved in any illegal activity, this will not automatically mean they are no longer liable.

Resignation should not automatically mean they did something wrong. Great care should be taken to understand why they resigned.

4.9. Conclusion.

Dissent is an important tool to use within corporate governance to ensure independent opinions are made and there is a record of disagreement. It can also provide relevant evidence.

However, whether it has any legal significance depends on what duty applies and what the director has done overall. It should not be seen as an automatic defence and should not be assumed that the director will be liable due to them being on the board or the corporate decision was not successful.

CHAPTER V

JUDICIAL INTERPRETATION OF DIRECTORS' LIABILITY

5.1 Introduction

Judicial decisions help explain how courts approach the responsibilities attached to corporate office. They clarify the circumstances in which directors may be answerable for misuse of corporate powers, failure to exercise care, misleading disclosures or participation in improper conduct. The cases considered in this chapter do not decide the precise question whether a director is protected merely by recording dissent. Their value lies instead in the principles they establish about fiduciary responsibility, oversight and the need to examine each director's conduct on the facts.

It is therefore important not to overstate these authorities. A judgment dealing with directors' duties cannot be presented as if it created a special statutory defence for a dissenting director. The more accurate approach is to use the cases to identify the standards against which a director's conduct may be assessed, and then consider how a properly recorded objection may form part of the evidence.

5.2 Official Liquidator v. P.A. Tendolkar

In Official Liquidator v. P.A. Tendolkar, the Supreme Court considered misfeasance proceedings arising from the affairs of a bank in liquidation. The Court recognised that a director's responsibility may have to be assessed in the light of the person's position, length and closeness of association with the company's management, and the circumstances surrounding the company's affairs. It observed that a director who is so closely associated with management may be treated as having knowledge of serious irregularities that would have been apparent on even a superficial examination, although a specific personal act of dishonesty is not proved. The principle is not that every director is automatically liable; it is that a director cannot deliberately ignore matters that the circumstances make obvious.[4]

This reasoning is relevant to boardroom dissent because an objection recorded in the minutes is only one part of the factual picture. If a director raises a concern but has long been closely involved in the relevant affairs, or continues to disregard obvious warning signs, the objection may not by itself answer the question of diligence. Conversely, the decision does not justify imposing liability merely because a person holds office as a director. The court must still examine the legal basis of the claim and the director's actual connection with the conduct in question.

5.3 Dale & Carrington Investment (P) Ltd. v. P.K. Prathapan

[4] Official Liquidator, Supreme Bank Ltd. v. P.A. Tendolkar (Dead) by LRs, (1973) 1 SCC 602 (Supreme Court of India, 19 January 1973).

Dale & Carrington Investment (P) Ltd. v. P.K. Prathapan concerned the allotment of additional shares and a dispute over control of a private company. The Supreme Court explained that directors act in a fiduciary capacity and must exercise their powers for the benefit of the company. In particular, the power to issue shares must be used for a proper purpose. A power that is formally available to the board may still be misused if it is exercised for an improper or collateral objective, such as securing control for particular directors rather than serving the company's interests.[5]

The case demonstrates why the legality of a board decision cannot be determined only by asking whether the board had authority to pass it or whether the required majority supported it. Its purpose and surrounding circumstances also matter. In a dissent-related dispute, a director's recorded objection may help establish that the director questioned the purpose or fairness of a proposed transaction.

However, the objection does not replace the court's examination of the transaction itself, the director's role and the applicable fiduciary duty.

The decision is also a reminder that directors' duties are not exhausted by procedural compliance. A director must exercise judgment honestly and for the purpose for which the power was conferred. Dissent may be evidence of independent scrutiny, but the quality of that scrutiny and the director's conduct as a whole remain relevant.

5.4 N. Narayanan v. Adjudicating Officer, SEBI

In N. Narayanan v. Adjudicating Officer, SEBI, the Supreme Court dealt with serious irregularities in the financial statements and public disclosures of a listed company. The case arose in the context of securities-market regulation and involved the company's promoter and whole-time director. The Court stressed the importance of accurate financial reporting, disclosure and investor protection. It also observed that directors of listed companies carry significant responsibilities in relation to the company's accounts and financial statements, and that directors are expected to exercise care, skill and diligence rather than approve information mechanically. [6]

[5] Dale & Carrington Investment (P) Ltd. v. P.K. Prathapan, (2005) 1 SCC 212 (Supreme Court of India, judgment dated 13 September 2004).

[6] N. Narayanan v. Adjudicating Officer, SEBI, (2013) 12 SCC 152 (Supreme Court of India, 26 April 2013).

The judgment is particularly useful when discussing board oversight and warning signs. The Court referred to circumstances in which directors had overlooked red flags in the company's financial information. The decision should nevertheless be cited with precision: it does not mean that every director is personally liable whenever a listed company makes a false disclosure. Liability must be connected to the relevant statutory or regulatory provision and to the person's role, knowledge and conduct.

For the present study, the case supports the proposition that a director cannot treat a board position as a merely ceremonial appointment. A dissenting director who identifies questionable financial information should ensure that the concern is raised through appropriate board or committee processes and that the record accurately reflects the objection. Whether any further step is legally required will depend on the particular duty and circumstances; the case does not establish a universal checklist for dissent.

5.5 Tata Consultancy Services Ltd. v. Cyrus Investments (P) Ltd.

Tata Consultancy Services Ltd. v. Cyrus Investments (P) Ltd. arose from proceedings alleging oppression and mismanagement under Sections 241 and 242 of the Companies Act, 2013. The Supreme Court examined the statutory grounds for relief and the limits of tribunal intervention in the internal affairs of a company. Among other things, the judgment considered allegations based on contested business decisions and emphasised that a disagreement with management or an unfavourable commercial outcome does not, without more, establish oppression or mismanagement. The statutory requirements must be proved on the facts. [7]

The decision is relevant to dissent because it helps distinguish a genuine legal wrong from a disagreement over corporate strategy. Directors may reasonably differ about acquisitions, investments, restructuring or other commercial decisions. Such disagreement does not automatically make the majority's decision unlawful. At the same time, majority approval cannot validate conduct that breaches the Act, the company's constitutional documents or another applicable law.

Accordingly, a dissenting opinion should not be treated as proof that the resolution was unlawful, just as majority approval should not be treated as conclusive proof of legality. The

[7] Tata Consultancy Services Ltd. v. Cyrus Investments (P) Ltd., (2021) 9 SCC 449 (Supreme Court of India, 26 March 2021).

correct inquiry is whether the decision and the conduct of the relevant directors satisfy the applicable statutory standard.

5.6 Needle Industries (India) Ltd. v. Needle Industries Newey (India) Holding Ltd. In Needle Industries (India) Ltd. v. Needle Industries Newey (India) Holding Ltd., the Supreme Court considered a dispute involving the issue and allotment of shares, corporate control and allegations of oppression under the Companies Act, 1956. The judgment examined the purpose and circumstances of the share issue and the question whether the directors' powers had been exercised in a manner that was oppressive or improper. It illustrates that corporate action must be assessed in its factual and legal setting rather than by looking only at the formal steps taken.[8] For the present research, the decision provides useful context for evaluating contested board decisions. It does not deal with a statutory right of dissent under Section 118(4) of the 2013 Act, nor does it create an immunity for directors who oppose a resolution. Its contribution is narrower: the substance, purpose and fairness of corporate action matter, and a court must examine the real circumstances rather than rely solely on the existence of a formal resolution.

5.7 Life Insurance Corporation of India v. Escorts Ltd.

Life Insurance Corporation of India v. Escorts Ltd. is a broader authority on company law, shareholder rights and the relationship between corporate action and the statutory framework. The Supreme Court considered the rights of shareholders and the legal setting in which corporate powers are exercised. Its connection with the present topic is indirect. It does not determine the liability of a dissenting director, and it should not be cited as authority for such a proposition. It may be referred to only for the wider proposition that corporate powers and shareholder rights must be understood within the governing statute and the company's constitutional arrangements.[9]

5.8 Comparative Assessment

The decisions discussed above address different legal questions, but together they provide a useful framework for analysing directors' liability. Tendolkar highlights the importance of a director's knowledge, association with management and response to obvious irregularities. Dale & Carrington focuses on fiduciary duties and the proper purpose for which corporate

[8] Needle Industries (India) Ltd. v. Needle Industries Newey (India) Holding Ltd., (1981) 3 SCC 333 (Supreme Court of India, 7 May 1981).

[9] Life Insurance Corporation of India v. Escorts Ltd., (1986) 1 SCC 264 (Supreme Court of India). This authority is cited only for the general statutory context of corporate and shareholder rights, not as a decision on dissenting-director immunity.

powers are exercised. N. Narayanan demonstrates the seriousness of directors' responsibilities in relation to financial reporting and market disclosures. TCS clarifies that not every disagreement or commercial failure amounts to oppression or mismanagement. Needle Industries similarly requires attention to the purpose and circumstances of corporate action.

None of these decisions establishes that recording dissent automatically protects a director. Equally, none supports the proposition that all directors are liable merely because the company has committed a wrong. The legal assessment must identify the particular duty or statutory provision relied upon and then consider the director's knowledge, participation, conduct and available evidence. A contemporaneous record of dissent may be relevant to that assessment, but it is not conclusive.

The central judicial lesson is therefore one of individualised and fact-sensitive responsibility. The courts examine what the director knew, what the director did or failed to do, the nature of the corporate decision and the legal standard governing the claim. Dissent should be considered within that inquiry, not substituted for it.

CHAPTER VI
CRITICAL ANALYSIS OF DISSENT AND BOARDROOM ACCOUNTABILITY

6.1 Introduction

The legal treatment of boardroom dissent raises a practical question: how can the law protect a director who genuinely challenges a questionable proposal without allowing dissent to become a convenient escape from responsibility? Corporate boards must be able to reach decisions, sometimes under commercial pressure and with incomplete information. At the same time, directors are entrusted with powers that must be exercised in good faith and with due care. The challenge is to preserve both effective decision-making and meaningful accountability.

6.2 Procedural Recording and Substantive Responsibility

Section 118(4) of the Companies Act, 2013 requires the minutes of a board or committee meeting to identify the directors who dissent from, or do not concur with, each resolution. This requirement gives formal recognition to disagreement and helps prevent the corporate record from presenting a decision as unanimous when it was not. Section 118(7) further provides that minutes maintained in accordance with the section are evidence of the proceedings recorded in

them. [10] These provisions deal with the recording and evidentiary value of proceedings; they do not displace the substantive duties imposed by Section 166. A director may have ensured that an objection was entered in the minutes but still have failed to disclose an interest, exercise reasonable diligence or respond appropriately to a separate matter within the director's responsibility. Conversely, the fact that a company later suffers a loss does not, by itself, establish that a director breached a duty. The distinction between procedure and substance is therefore essential.

The statutory scheme should be understood as complementary: Section 118 helps establish what occurred at the meeting, while Section 166 helps determine whether the director's conduct met the required standard. A court or regulator may consider both, but neither provision should be treated as a substitute for the other.

6.3 The Risk of Over-Deterrence

Directors are often required to make commercial judgments involving uncertainty, competing interests and risk. If every unsuccessful decision is treated as evidence of personal wrongdoing, capable individuals may become reluctant to accept board positions or may avoid taking decisions that are necessary for the company's development. Such an approach would weaken rather than improve corporate governance.

The law must distinguish a bona fide business decision, taken after reasonable consideration, from fraud, conflict of interest, misuse of power or a breach of statutory duty. The fact that a decision later proves unprofitable is not enough, on its own, to establish liability. This does not mean that directors enjoy an unrestricted business-judgment immunity under Indian company law. Rather, the applicable statutory duties and the facts of the decision must be examined before liability is imposed.

In this context, dissent can contribute to better deliberation. It allows a director to challenge assumptions, ask for missing information and place concerns before the board. The purpose is not to encourage opposition for its own sake, but to ensure that the board's decision is informed and legally compliant.

---

[10] The Companies Act, 2013, No. 18 of 2013, § 118(2), (4), (7) and (10) (India). Section 118(4)(b) requires the names of directors dissenting from, or not concurring with, each resolution to be recorded; Section 118(7) provides that compliant minutes are evidence of the proceedings recorded.

6.4 The Risk of Under-Accountability

The opposite danger is equally serious. If a recorded objection is treated as sufficient protection in every case, directors may use a brief or formulaic statement of dissent as a defensive device while taking no meaningful interest in the underlying issue. A director might object to one resolution but remain silent about continuing misconduct, fail to disclose a relevant interest or ignore financial irregularities that should reasonably attract attention.

Such an approach would undermine the purpose of directors' duties. The law should therefore examine the substance of the objection, the information available to the director, the director's role and the steps taken after the concern was raised. The question is not simply whether the minutes contain the word 'dissent', but whether the director's conduct, considered as a whole, is consistent with the duties imposed by law.

6.5 Independent and Non-Executive Directors

Independent and non-executive directors occupy a particular position. They are not ordinarily responsible for the company's day-to-day management in the same way as executive directors, but they are expected to contribute independent scrutiny and oversight. The law must avoid two extremes: treating them as automatically responsible for every act of the company, or assuming that their non-executive status removes all responsibility.

Section 149(12) provides a qualified limitation on the liability of an independent director and a non-executive director who is neither a promoter nor key managerial personnel. The provision links liability to acts or omissions of the company that occurred with the director's knowledge attributable through board processes and with the director's consent or connivance, or where the director had not acted diligently. The statutory language must be applied as written, with attention to each element and the evidence in the particular proceeding.[11] A recorded dissent may be relevant to whether the director consented to a particular resolution. It may also help establish that a concern was brought to the board's attention. However, it does not automatically answer whether the director had knowledge through board processes, whether there was consent or connivance, or whether the director acted diligently. The provision is a qualified

[11] The Companies Act, 2013, No. 18 of 2013, § 149(12) (India). The subsection applies to an independent director and a non-executive director who is neither a promoter nor key managerial personnel, and sets out the statutory conditions for liability.

statutory protection, not a general immunity attached to the title of independent director.

6.6 The Importance of Accurate Board Records

The value of dissent depends significantly on the reliability of the corporate record. Minutes should identify the directors present and, for each resolution, the directors who dissented or did not concur. They should also provide a fair and correct summary of the proceedings, subject to the statutory framework governing the contents of minutes.[11]

A record that merely states 'director dissented' may satisfy the minimum identification requirement in some circumstances, but a meaningful account of the discussion may be important where the objection concerns a material legal, financial or governance risk. The record should accurately reflect the concern raised and the action, if any, requested by the director. It should not be exaggerated, reconstructed or edited to create an artificial appearance of diligence. Nor should a genuine objection be omitted.

Where a director believes that the minutes do not fairly record the objection, the director should use the company's established procedures to seek correction or to place the concern on the appropriate record. Supporting board papers, committee materials and relevant communications should also be retained in accordance with applicable legal and record-management requirements.

6.7 Dissent and the Business-Judgment Idea

The business-judgment idea is relevant because courts should be cautious about treating ordinary commercial risk as legal misconduct. Directors are not guarantors of business success. However, it would be inaccurate to suggest that Indian law provides an unrestricted, separately codified immunity for every decision described as a business judgment. Section 166 expressly requires due and reasonable care, skill and diligence, together with independent judgment. The question is therefore whether the director acted in accordance with the statutory standard, not simply whether the decision was commercially unsuccessful.[12]

Dissent may be evidence that a director identified a risk or questioned the information before the board. It is not conclusive proof that the director exercised adequate care. The quality of the decision-making process, the seriousness of the warning signs and the director's response all remain relevant.

6.8 Dissent and Different Forms of Liability

[12] The Companies Act, 2013, No. 18 of 2013, § 166(1)–(7) (India).

A company's conduct may give rise to civil, regulatory or criminal consequences under different statutes. The requirements for personal liability are not identical across these regimes. Some provisions may focus on consent, connivance, knowledge, neglect, being in charge of the business or another specifically

defined condition. A director's recorded dissent must therefore be considered in the context of the exact provision under which liability is alleged.

For example, a dissenting vote may be relevant where the allegation is that the director approved a particular board resolution. It may be less decisive where the allegation concerns a failure to make a disclosure, a continuing omission, the approval of misleading financial statements or a separate statutory obligation. It would be legally unsafe to assume that Section 118(4) creates a universal defence under company law, securities law or criminal legislation.

6.9 Overall Assessment

The Companies Act, 2013 already contains several parts of the framework needed to evaluate dissent and accountability: Section 118 addresses the recording of board proceedings; Section 166 sets out directors' duties; Section 149(12) provides qualified protection to specified directors; and Schedule IV sets out principles relevant to independent directors. Other provisions, including Sections 177, 184 and 188, address audit oversight, disclosure of interests and related-party transactions. Their application depends on the company and the facts.[13]

The principal challenge is therefore not to turn dissent into a separate immunity, but to apply the existing provisions coherently. A fair assessment should recognise genuine objections and avoid imposing liability solely because of board membership or an unsuccessful business outcome. At the same time, it should not allow a recorded objection to excuse a breach of a distinct legal duty.

CHAPTER VII

FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

7.1 Major Findings

[13] The Companies Act, 2013, No. 18 of 2013, §§ 177, 184 and 188, sch. IV (India). The applicability of particular committee, disclosure and related-party requirements depends on the company and the transaction.

7.1.1 Dissent Has Express Statutory Recognition

Section 118(4) expressly requires board and committee minutes to identify directors who dissent from, or do not concur with, a resolution. The requirement makes dissent part of the formal corporate record and supports transparency in collective decision-making. It is not merely a matter of personal preference or informal boardroom practice.[11]

7.1.2 Recording Dissent Does Not Create Automatic Immunity

Section 118(4) does not state that a director is immune from all liability once dissent is recorded. Its immediate function is to ensure that the minutes accurately identify disagreement. The legal effect of that record depends on the particular allegation, the applicable statutory provision and the director's conduct.

7.1.3 Substantive Duties Continue to Apply

Section 166 imposes duties of good faith, care, skill, diligence and independent judgment, and restricts conflicts of interest and undue gain. A director's objection to one resolution does not, by itself, establish compliance with every other duty.[13]

7.1.4 Section 149(12) Is a Qualified Protection

The protection under Section 149(12) is limited to the categories of directors specified in the provision and is subject to its statutory conditions. It should neither be interpreted as blanket immunity nor ignored when assessing the liability of an eligible independent or non-executive director.[12]

7.1.5 Judicial Decisions Require a Fact-Sensitive Assessment

The authorities examined in Chapter V focus on fiduciary responsibility, proper purpose, financial disclosure, oversight and the limits of intervention in corporate affairs. They support an individualised assessment of conduct; they do not directly decide that recording dissent is a complete defence.

7.1.6 Accurate Records Are Essential but Not Conclusive

Board minutes and supporting documents may provide important evidence of what was placed before the board, what concerns were raised and how the board responded. Their value depends on accuracy and context. The record is an important evidentiary tool, not a substitute for examining the director's actual conduct.

7.2 Recommendations

7.2.1 Improve the Quality of Board Minutes

Companies should ensure that minutes comply with Section 118 and the applicable Secretarial Standard. Where a director raises a material concern, the minutes should accurately record the dissent and fairly summarise the relevant discussion. The purpose is to preserve the actual proceedings, not to create a document designed only to defend the company or an individual director.

7.2.2 Establish Clear Channels for Raising Concerns

Companies should maintain clear procedures through which directors can raise concerns about legality, conflicts of interest, financial irregularities and regulatory compliance. Depending on the issue, the concern may need to be considered by the full board, the audit committee or appropriate compliance personnel. These procedures should make it possible to track whether a concern was considered and what response followed.

7.2.3 Ensure Timely and Sufficient Board Information

Directors can exercise independent judgment only when they receive adequate information in time to consider it. Board papers should identify material risks, significant assumptions, relevant interests and compliance implications. If information is insufficient, directors should be able to request clarification or defer consideration where appropriate.

7.2.4 Provide Regular Training on Directors' Duties

Companies should provide periodic training on the Companies Act, 2013, directors' duties, conflicts of interest, board procedures and relevant sectorspecific regulation. Training should make clear that recording dissent and fulfilling substantive legal duties are related but separate responsibilities. Independent and non-executive directors should also be made familiar with the scope and limits of Section 149(12).

7.2.5 Apply Section 149(12) Consistently

Courts, tribunals and regulators should apply Section 149(12) according to its text and the evidence in each case. Board membership alone should not be treated as sufficient proof of personal liability where the statutory conditions are not met. Equally, a director should not receive automatic protection merely by relying on the designation of independent or non-executive director.

7.2.6 Preserve Relevant Supporting Material

Companies should preserve board papers, committee reports, audit materials and relevant communications in accordance with applicable law and internal retention policies. Where a

material objection is raised, preserving the supporting material can help establish the information available at the time and the steps taken in response.

7.2.7 Clarify the Evidentiary Role of Dissent

The Ministry of Corporate Affairs, professional bodies and corporate governance institutions may consider issuing practical guidance explaining how recorded dissent can be evaluated alongside knowledge, participation and diligence. Such guidance should not create a new immunity by implication. Its purpose should be to encourage accurate records and responsible board conduct.

7.2.8 Protect Good-Faith Independent Judgment

Companies should foster a board culture in which directors can question proposals without being treated as disloyal merely because they disagree with the majority. Good-faith dissent should be considered on its merits. Pressure to withdraw a genuine objection or to approve a proposal without adequate information is inconsistent with meaningful board oversight.

7.2.9 Discourage Formulaic or Strategic Dissent

A generic objection entered without meaningful consideration of the matter should not be encouraged as a routine liability-avoidance technique. Board processes should promote reasoned discussion and accurate documentation. Where a director raises a serious concern, the record should, where appropriate, identify the issue clearly enough to distinguish genuine scrutiny from a merely formal objection.

7.2.10 Review Governance Practices Periodically

The Ministry of Corporate Affairs, SEBI in relation to entities within its jurisdiction, and relevant professional bodies should periodically review how board-accountability requirements operate in practice. Any proposed reform should be evidence-based and should preserve the balance between protecting genuine diligence and maintaining accountability for misconduct.

CHAPTER VIII

CONCLUSION

Corporate governance depends on more than the formal distribution of powers within a company. It also depends on the manner in which those powers are exercised and the willingness of directors to question decisions that may expose the company or its stakeholders to legal, financial or reputational harm. Boardroom dissent is an important part of this process because it allows a director to express disagreement, challenge assumptions and ensure that an alternative view is preserved in the corporate record.

The Companies Act, 2013 recognises the importance of that record through Section 118(4), which requires the minutes of board and committee meetings to identify directors who dissent from or do not concur with a resolution. Section 118(7) gives evidentiary value to minutes maintained in accordance with the Act. These provisions promote transparency, but they do not create a general statutory immunity for a director whose objection has been recorded.[11]

The substantive position is governed by the duties imposed under Section 166, including the obligations to act in good faith, exercise due and reasonable care, skill and diligence, use independent judgment and avoid conflicts of interest and undue gain. Section 149(12) separately provides qualified protection to independent directors and specified non-executive directors, subject to the conditions set out in the provision. These provisions must be read together, while recognising that each addresses a different aspect of corporate accountability.[12] 13

The judicial authorities examined in this research reinforce the need to assess directors' conduct in context. Tendolkar demonstrates that a director may not ignore serious irregularities that should be apparent in the circumstances. Dale & Carrington emphasises fiduciary duties and the proper purpose of corporate powers. N. Narayanan highlights the importance of accurate financial reporting and meaningful oversight. TCS and Needle Industries show why corporate disputes must be assessed under the relevant statutory standards and by reference to the substance of the conduct, rather than simply the existence of disagreement or majority approval.

The central conclusion is that recorded dissent is an important but nonconclusive factor in determining directors' liability. Its weight will depend on what the director objected to, what information was available, whether the objection was accurately recorded, what the director knew and whether the director's conduct otherwise met the applicable legal standard. A director who raises a genuine concern and acts consistently with the duties imposed by law should be distinguished from one who relies on a formal objection while disregarding a separate responsibility.

A stronger culture of board accountability therefore requires accurate minutes, timely access to information, effective channels for escalating concerns, appropriate training and a consistent application of statutory standards. These measures do not require directors to oppose every majority decision. They require directors to exercise independent judgment and to take their responsibilities seriously.

Ultimately, the objective should be neither to punish directors for every unsuccessful commercial decision nor to allow dissent to become a shield against legal responsibility. The law should protect genuine independent judgment while holding each director accountable for their own conduct. That balance is essential to informed decision-making, investor confidence and responsible corporate management in India.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

I. Primary Sources

A. Legislation and Regulatory Materials

The Companies Act, 2013, No. 18 of 2013 (India).

The Companies (Meetings of Board and its Powers) Rules, 2014, as amended.

The Companies (Management and Administration) Rules, 2014, as amended. Institute of Company Secretaries of India, Secretarial Standard on Meetings of the Board of Directors (SS-1), as applicable.

Securities and Exchange Board of India (Listing Obligations and Disclosure Requirements) Regulations, 2015, as amended, where applicable.

B. Judicial Decisions

Dale & Carrington Investment (P) Ltd. v. P.K. Prathapan, (2005) 1 SCC 212.

Life Insurance Corporation of India v. Escorts Ltd., (1986) 1 SCC 264.

Needle Industries (India) Ltd. v. Needle Industries Newey (India) Holding Ltd., (1981) 3 SCC 333.

N. Narayanan v. Adjudicating Officer, SEBI, (2013) 12 SCC 152.

Official Liquidator, Supreme Bank Ltd. v. P.A. Tendolkar, (1973) 1 SCC 602.

Tata Consultancy Services Ltd. v. Cyrus Investments (P) Ltd., (2021) 9 SCC 449.

II. Official Online Sources Consulted

India Code, The Companies Act, 2013, official consolidated text, https://www.indiacode.nic.in/.

Supreme Court of India, Tata Consultancy Services Ltd. v. Cyrus Investments (P) Ltd., Civil Appeal Nos. 440–441 of 2020 and connected matters, judgment dated 26 March 2021, https://api.sci.gov.in/.

Indian Kanoon, text of the Supreme Court judgments cited above, used for crosschecking case names, dates, citations and the propositions discussed.