RETHINKING OBJECT CLAUSES UNDER THE COMPANIES ACT, 2013: A CASE FOR A HYBRID LEGAL MODEL

Diksha Sharma*

ABSTRACT

The object clause in a company's Memorandum of Association defines the legal scope of its business activities, with any act outside those boundaries considered ultra vires and invalid. While intended to promote transparency and protect investors, India's strict approach to object clauses under Section 4(1)(c) of the Companies Act, 2013 has caused operational rigidity, frequent amendments, and legal uncertainty. This article critiques the current framework by examining key judicial rulings and comparing international models, particularly reforms in the UK, US, and Australia that have shifted toward more flexible or optional object clauses. It argues that India's doctrine, though based on certainty, requires a hybrid model that safeguards third parties while allowing companies to adapt without procedural hurdles. Through analysis of practical drafting strategies, regulatory issues, and reform proposals, the article advocates for reimagining object clauses as flexible governance tools rather than rigid restrictions. It concludes that a modern, choice-based regime would better support both business innovation and legal certainty.

Keywords: Object Clause, Ultra Vires Doctrine, Companies Act 2013, Corporate Law Reform.

INTRODUCTION

In India, every company's Memorandum of Association must include an object clause under Section 4(1)(c) of the Companies Act, 2013. This clause outlines exactly what activities the company is authorised to undertake. Anything outside these stated purposes, no matter how minor, is considered ultra vires, or beyond its powers, and is legally void from inception.

*BBA LLB, FIFTH YEAR, IP UNIVERSITY.

This doctrine isn't just a technical formality. It acts as a protective boundary for investors and creditors, ensuring company funds are used exactly as promised. Yet, the rigidity of such clauses often causes friction. On one hand, restrictive drafting forces companies into frequent amendments for new initiatives; on the other, overly broad or catch-all object clauses can muddy legal clarity and undermine stakeholder trust.

In other jurisdictions, such as the UK, this tension has been resolved: the Companies Act 2006 allows companies to declare unlimited objects, effectively eliminating ultra vires constraints against outsiders. In contrast, India still follows a model rooted in certainty but burdened by procedural inflexibility.

This article contends that India should move toward a hybrid approach, one that maintains legal certainty yet grants flexibility for business evolution. We'll explore the statutory framework and key judgments, review international practices, provide drafting templates for balanced object clauses, and consider potential reforms to strike this balance.

LEGAL FRAMEWORK & HISTORICAL EVOLUTION

Statutory Foundations in India:

1. Under Section 4(1)(c) of the Companies Act, 2013, every company must include an object clause in its Memorandum of Association (MOA).[1] This clause must specify:
2. The company's main objects are the core purpose of its formation.
3. Ancillary objects are necessary to achieve the main objectives, and
4. Other objects, covering any additional purposes the company may pursue.
   Any amendment to this clause requires both a special resolution by shareholders and approval from the Registrar of Companies, ensuring that the company operates within clearly defined legal boundaries.

Doctrine of Ultra Vires: Scope & Safeguards: The doctrine of ultra vires (meaning "beyond the powers") prevents companies from acting outside their MOAs permitted scope. Historically, it serves as a check on unauthorised actions, distinct acts beyond the stated purpose are void from inception, and cannot be ratified by shareholders.

[1] 'Object Clause under the Companies (Amendment) Bill: A Flip-Flop' (IndiaCorpLaw, 15 August 2017) https://indiacorplaw.in/2017/08/15/object-clause-companies-amendment-bill-flip-flop/ accessed 16 July 2025

Ashbury Railway Co. v. Riche (1875):[2] Established that actions beyond the MOA are ultra vires and unenforceable, even if unanimously approved by shareholders.

Attorney General v. Great Eastern Railway Co.(1880):[3] Recognized that actions reasonably incidental to stated objects may still be valid.

Rolled Steel v. British Steel (1986):[4] Distinguished between ultra vires (company lacks capacity) and improper purpose (directors' misconduct); only the former voids the act.

Indian courts have echoed this approach. In Lakshmanaswami Mudaliar v. LIC 963 AIR 1185,[5] the Supreme Court held that a charitable donation not covered by the MOA was ultra vires. In Jahangir Modi v. Shamji Ladha, the Bombay High Court similarly voided director actions outside the company's authorised objects.

Evolving Interpretation & UK Reforms: Recognising the competing interests of legal certainty and operational flexibility, many jurisdictions have modernised their stance:

- The UK's Companies Act 2006 eliminated the strict object clause requirement. New companies can include an "unlimited objects" clause, and ultra vires is no longer a concern for third parties.[6]
- However, internal compliance is still enforced via directors' duties under section 171 (acting within the constitution).

This reform removed commercial friction and legal redundancy, striking a balance between corporate agility and responsibility.

[2] 'Ashbury Railway Carriage V Riche' (LawTeacher.net, 26 June 2025) https://www.lawteacher.net/cases/ashbury-railway-carrage-and-iron-co-v-riche.php accessed 16 July 2025
[3] 'Capcha' (CaseMine) https://www.casemine.com/judgement/uk/5a938b3d60d03e5f6b82b9e6 accessed 16 July 2025
[4] 'Rolled Steel Products (Holdings) Ltd v British Steel Corp' (Wikipedia, 10 April 2023) https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Rolled_Steel_Products_(Holdings)_Ltd_v_British_Steel_Corp accessed 16 July 2025
[5] (Dr. A. Lakshmanaswami Mudaliarand ... vs life insurance corporation on 11 December, 1962) https://indiankanoon.org/doc/1682214/ accessed 17 July 2025
[6] Gosling S, 'Objects Clause and Memorandum of Association: A Whistle-Stop Tour' (Machins Solicitors LLP, 10 October 2017) https://www.machins.co.uk/news/objects-clause-and-memorandum-of-association-a-whistle-stop-tour/ accessed 17 July 2025

Why It Matters for India?

- India's current model emphasises certainty, helping investors, lenders, and courts understand what a company can or cannot do.
- But it also creates commercial rigidity, since crossing object boundaries means costly procedural changes.
- A middle-ground solution could offer flexibility for business evolution without compromising on legal safeguards.

COMPARATIVE BENCHMARKS: GLOBAL MODELS & WHAT INDIA CAN LEARN

The UK: From Rigid to Responsive: Historically, UK companies operated under detailed object clauses that strictly limited their capacity, any action beyond those stated was considered ultra vires, and contracts could be voided even if shareholders approved them later.

In Attorney General v. Great Eastern Railway Co. (1880), courts recognised that activities closely related to the core purpose, like essential infrastructure work, should still be valid despite not being expressly mentioned. The real turning point came with the Companies Act 2006, which removed the requirement for object clauses for most companies under Section 31 and made ultra vires irrelevant in contracts involving third parties, thanks to Section 39. Directors, however, remain accountable under Section 171 if they act outside any internal limits.

United States & Australia: Broad Authority for Companies: In the US, many states have adopted the Model Business Corporation Act (MBCA), which removes ultra vires for most business companies, allowing them to operate with the same capacity as natural persons.

Australia similarly grants companies wide-ranging powers under its Corporations Act unless they opt to restrict themselves. In both countries, challenges based on ultra vires are mostly internal, limited to specific contexts like non-profit governance or director misconduct.

Lessons for India: These global shifts show a clear pattern. Third-party deals are rarely voided based on capacity, which enhances business reliability. Flexibility doesn't mean chaos; regulatory safeguards and director duties maintain accountability. Companies pivot smoothly, without undergoing MOA amendments every time they try something new. India, by contrast, still operates under a rigid system. Any deviation from stated objectives, no matter how minor, requires a special resolution and regulatory approval. Until then, any contract beyond those objects can be declared void.

A Balanced Model for India: India could adopt a choice-driven approach by allowing companies to opt for an "unlimited objects" clause, alongside the current detailed model. Ensuring third-party contracts remain protected, even if based on broad capacity. Strengthening director accountability under Section 171 for exceeding internal limits. Streamlining the process to amend MOAs when companies choose to define their objectives narrowly. Such a hybrid model would let businesses choose the level of certainty they want. Companies needing specificity can keep their detailed clauses. Others can embrace flexibility without giving up transparency or stakeholder protection.

PRACTICAL CHALLENGES WITH THE CURRENT INDIAN APPROACH

Despite the intent behind object clauses, to provide clarity, protect stakeholders, and ensure lawful operations, the way they function in India often leads to more friction than protection. Companies, especially newer or fast-growing ones, find themselves caught between a rigid framework and the need to respond quickly to market changes.

Administrative and Procedural Burden: Changing a company's object clause isn't simple. It necessitates obtaining a special resolution from shareholders and subsequently submitting Form MGT-14 to the Registrar of Companies (ROC).. If the company is public, it must also publish notices in newspapers and inform stock exchanges.

This may be reasonable for significant changes in business strategy, but in practice, even small adjustments, such as branching into a related activity, can initiate this entire process. This leads to delays, increased costs, and legal uncertainties as the company awaits approval. For startups or MSMEs that rely on quick decision-making, this rigidity can block growth opportunities. Many are advised to preemptively include a long, general list of potential activities, which ironically defeats the purpose of having a precise object clause in the first place.

Risk of Ultra Vires Transactions: India hasn't entirely moved away from the ultra vires doctrine, especially in shareholder litigation or creditor disputes. This means that if a company signs a contract that doesn't relate to its stated objects, that contract can be declared void even if both parties acted in good faith. The real-world implication is this: businesses may hesitate to explore adjacent industries, form new partnerships, or bid for unusual projects if those ventures don't fall neatly under their MOA. It also creates risk for third parties—vendors, investors, collaborators, who may not realise that a contract is technically unenforceable.

Legal Drafting Becomes a Loophole Game: To sidestep these problems, many Indian companies use extensive object clauses. Some insert boilerplate lines like:

- To conduct any business that the Company may find profitable or advantageous in any way.
- On paper, this solves the ultra vires issue. In reality, it defeats the whole point of requiring an object clause. A document meant to ensure transparency and legal certainty turns into a checkbox exercise.
- Worse, it shifts the burden of risk and clarity to shareholders and regulators, who are left guessing what the company might do.

Investor Friction and Compliance Risk: Venture capital and private equity investors often demand object clause amendments as part of pre-funding conditions. If the company's current MOA doesn't cover the new business plan, they may refuse to release funds until it's amended. This can stall fundraising, delay launch timelines, and introduce compliance risk if amendments are mishandled. It's also a drain on legal bandwidth, especially for smaller companies that don't have in-house counsel or corporate secretaries to navigate the process smoothly.

Judicial Attitudes: Still Conservative: Indian courts still treat the object clause as a boundary, not just a formality. In *Lakshmanaswami Mudaliar v. LIC*, the Supreme Court clarified that activities beyond the defined purposes, including charitable contributions, were ultra vires and invalid. This conservative reading reinforces the legal risks of using vague or improperly updated clauses. Until courts and the law itself embrace a more functional, modern view of corporate objects, Indian companies will continue to operate in a cautious legal climate.

DRAFTING BETTER OBJECT CLAUSES IN INDIA

If Indian law is slow to reform, the least companies can do is draft smarter object clauses. The goal isn't just to avoid legal risks, but to build clarity, earn investor confidence, and reduce friction in business decisions. While boilerplate clauses have become common, they often invite ambiguity or even judicial scrutiny. A thoughtful approach to drafting makes all the difference.

What Makes an Object Clause "Good"?

A well-drafted object clause should show the current and future business models clearly. Include incidental and ancillary activities that logically support the main object; Use language that is broad enough to allow reasonable expansion, but not so vague that it loses legal meaning; Avoid phrases that may be seen as overreach or evasion, like "any business whatsoever." Instead of blindly copying lengthy clauses from templates, companies should tailor their objectives to what they truly intend to do and to what they may reasonably expect to explore shortly.

A Balanced Drafting Approach: Here's a practical way to structure object clauses without falling into either extreme**.**

Main objects: Clearly state the company's principal activity. "To carry on the business of online retail and e-commerce services, including but not limited to sales, marketing, warehousing, and delivery of consumer goods*."*[7]

Incidental or Ancillary Objects: List supportive functions necessary to achieve the main objective. To acquire, lease, or manage warehouses and logistics infrastructure required for business operations. To have interaction in marketing, analytics, and generation offerings without delay related to the number one e-trade operations."

General Clauses with Limits: If a catch-all clause is needed, it should be narrowed by logic, not left open-ended. To undertake such other activities as may be incidental or conducive to the attainment of the above objects, provided they align with applicable laws and regulatory frameworks.[8] This avoids the overly broad "any lawful business" line but still grants the company flexibility to operate smartly within reason.

Clauses to Avoid: Here are some examples of language that, while common, should be used carefully or avoided altogether, to conduct any business that the company deems appropriate.

[7] taxguru_in and Bhat S, 'Moa Main Objects Clauses for Different Types of Companies' (TaxGuru, 1 May 2020) https://taxguru.in/company-law/moa-main-objects-clauses-types-companies.html#google_vignette accessed 17 July 2025

[8] (Dpconline) https://www.dpconline.org/about/governance/articles-of-association-2/file accessed 17 July 2025

This is overly broad and invites examination. To deal in any articles or things of every description. Legally meaningless and risky if challenged. To carry out any additional activities that are related to or assist in achieving the aforementioned objectives. This is permissible only when used following specific clauses, and not as an independent clause.

Why Investors and Regulators Care?

Well-drafted object clauses are not just a legal formality. They reduce friction during fundraising, since investors often require alignment between the MOA and the business pitch; Provide clarity in due diligence and valuations; Prevent compliance issues in areas like FDI, where regulators examine the stated business activity; and reduce the risk of disputes with co-founders, directors, or shareholders, especially in strategic pivots or exits.

The Role of Legal Professionals: Founders often treat the object clause as a task to be completed quickly during incorporation. But as seen in practice, what looks like a single paragraph in a registration form can have serious long-term consequences. Corporate lawyers and company secretaries have a clear role here: to move beyond generic templates and help clients draft object clauses that are defensible, flexible, and future-proof.

PROPOSED REFORM PATHWAY: RETHINKING OBJECT CLAUSES IN INDIAN COMPANY LAW

India doesn't need to abandon object clauses altogether, but the current system needs an upgrade. As companies evolve rapidly, the law must give them space to do so without forcing bureaucratic delays or exposing them to needless legal risk. Other jurisdictions have shown that it's possible to maintain corporate discipline without overregulating purpose. India can get there too, through careful, targeted reforms.

Introduce an Optional "Unlimited Objects" Model: One of the most effective steps would be to make the object clause optional for certain categories of companies, such as private limited companies or startups, while preserving it for sectors where legal clarity is more crucial (like NBFCs, companies in regulated industries, or public listed entities).

A new provision could allow companies to register with a simple clause like: The company shall have the capacity and powers of a natural person to carry on any lawful business. This language is already the norm in several US states and in the UK since 2006. It simplifies incorporation, removes artificial barriers to innovation, and reduces the need for constant amendments.

Limit the Doctrine of Ultra Vires to Internal Governance: Ultra vires should not be used as a weapon by third parties to void contracts. If both parties have acted in good faith, and the transaction is otherwise lawful, it should be upheld even if it strays from the company's stated objects. Instead, violations of the object clause should be treated as internal governance failures. Directors could still be held accountable under Section 166 (duties of directors) and Section 171-style norms (borrowed from UK law), without undermining commercial certainty **for outsiders.**

Simplify the Amendment Process: Right now, even a minor adjustment to the object clause can require:

- Shareholder special resolution
- Board meeting, explanatory statements
- Newspaper publications (in case of listed companies)
- ROC filing through Form MGT-14
- In some cases, Central Government or regulatory approvals

This is excessive for startups or companies simply expanding to a closely related sector. The process could be restructured as follows: for changes within the same business vertical (e.g., adding product lines), allow automatic updates upon board approval. For unrelated diversifications, retain shareholder resolution + ROC filing, but scrap publication and third-party approvals. This would speed up business agility without removing safeguards.

Encourage Better Drafting Through Model Templates: Rather than imposing new restrictions, the MCA and professional bodies like ICSI or ICAI could publish model clauses, well-drafted object clauses tailored to common sectors: tech, manufacturing, services, etc. This would help new founders and drafters understand what’s legally sound and practically useful, reducing reliance on vague or copy-pasted boilerplate language.

Align Startup Ecosystem Norms: If India wants to support ease of doing business, especially through initiatives like Startup India, then companies under the DPIIT-recognised startup framework should be allowed to operate with simplified or unlimited object clauses, with only internal accountability requirements. This would eliminate legal delays during early-stage pivots or funding rounds, when flexibility is most critical.

A Balanced Reform Agenda: These reforms wouldn't erase the purpose of object clauses. They would, preserve legal discipline for companies that need it**,** reduce administrative load on small or agile businesses**,** remove friction for third parties in commercial transactions**,** make corporate compliance smarter, not heavier**.** In other words, reform doesn't mean deregulation; it means proportional, modern, and sector-sensitive governance.

CONCLUSION: TIME TO REIMAGINE, NOT DISCARD

Object clauses were never meant to be obstacles. At their best, they provide clarity, structure, and protection for companies, investors, and the public. But in the way Indian company law currently treats them, they have become outdated tools, rigid, unnecessarily procedural, and misaligned with how modern businesses work. This article has shown that the ultra vires doctrine, while well-intentioned, creates more confusion than discipline when applied strictly. The burden of compliance with object clause amendments often stalls growth, adds cost, and leads to overly broad, meaningless drafting. Worse, it places unnecessary risk on third parties and startups trying to operate in good faith.

Global models, especially the UK's shift post-Companies Act 2006, demonstrate that it's possible to maintain director accountability and shareholder protection without forcing companies into narrow legal boxes. India does not need to copy these systems blindly. But a middle ground is long overdue, a model that preserves transparency where it matters, while giving companies the room to adapt, grow, and explore. In the meantime, companies can do their part. Smarter drafting of object clauses, balanced, specific, and realistically broad, can reduce the need for constant amendments and future-proof the MOA. Legal professionals, too, must treat object clauses as serious governance tools, not checklist formalities. But ultimately, systemic change has to come from the top. It's time for lawmakers and regulators to see object clauses not just as legacy features, but as levers of corporate freedom and control. The future of Indian business deserves a legal infrastructure that's clear, efficient, and built for change, not stuck in the past.