CORPORATE CRIMINAL LIABILITY IN INDIAN LAW

Juhi Gupta*

ABSTRACT

In India, where the corporate sector has grown rapidly and there are a growing number of incidents of corporate wrongdoing, corporate criminal liability has become a major issue of concern. This study provides a thorough examination of corporate criminal liability in India. "Corporate crimes are becoming a more significant concern for the criminal justice system in the twenty-first century". Certain vested interests in charge of Corporate Affairs Abuse the organisation to commit crimes to increase profits. Although a corporate body has legal personality to govern its operations, it lacks a physical body and a mind of its own, which makes it difficult to declare a corporate entity criminal and impose criminal culpability. Corporate crime hurts infrastructure development, health, safety, and the environment. But as businesses grew and corporate scandals increased—think financial frauds, environmental disasters, or bribery—laws and judgments adapted. The dominance of national and international businesses in economic transactions and their responsibility is one of the most serious worldwide challenges due to the process of globalisation and the increase of interconnectedness in economic, social, and environmental activities by corporate organisations. Due to the corporate vehicle's current widespread use in the industrial, economic, and social spheres, corporations must be subject to criminal law, just like natural persons. The debate over corporate criminal culpability serves as an example of how corporate responsibility is being interpreted in a more functional and relative way. Criminal law is one of the areas where the complexities of corporate personality are particularly problematic.

Keywords: Corporate Criminal Liability, Legal Personality, Impact, Responsibility, Globalisation.

*LLB (HONS.), SECOND YEAR, AMITY UNIVERSITY, PATNA.

INTRODUCTION

Corporate criminal liability refers to the legal principle where a company, as a separate entity, can be held responsible for crimes committed in the course of its business activities. Unlike individuals, companies are artificial persons created by law, so they don't have a physical body or a mind of their own. This makes it tricky to apply traditional criminal law concepts like "guilty mind" (mens rea) or punishments like imprisonment to them. However, in modern times, especially with big corporations influencing economies and societies, holding them accountable for wrongdoing is crucial to ensure justice, deter misconduct, and protect the public.

In India, this concept has evolved significantly over the years. Early on, courts were hesitant to prosecute companies for serious crimes because they believed companies couldn't have intent or be jailed. But as businesses grew and corporate scandals increased—think financial frauds, environmental disasters, or bribery—laws and judgments adapted. Today, Indian law recognises that companies can be criminally liable, often by attributing the actions and intentions of their directors or key employees to the company itself. This shift promotes ethical business practices and ensures that corporations can't hide behind their legal status. Further, CCL serves the purpose of creating deterrence with respect to corporations that might indulge in wrongdoings. This would motivate the agents of the corporations not to commit any crime on behalf of the corporation. Also, it motivates the corporation to implement programs related to compliance with the legal and moral rules and motivates them to follow the laws, which results in reduced crime.

The Indian Penal Code (IPC), 1860, is the foundation, with Section 11 defining "person" to include companies or associations. Other laws like the Companies Act, 2013, the Prevention of Corruption Act, 1988, and environmental statutes build on this. Punishments for companies usually involve fines, since they can't be imprisoned, but individuals involved can face jail time. Landmark cases from the Supreme Court have shaped this area, clarifying when and how liability applies.

This article explains corporate criminal liability in simple terms, covering its legal basis, key doctrines, major cases, challenges, and future directions. We'll use real case examples to illustrate points, keeping everything straightforward for non-lawyers.

LEGAL FRAMEWORK IN INDIA

India's approach to corporate criminal liability combines general criminal laws with specific statutes for business conduct. Let's break it down.

The Indian Penal Code (IPC), 1860: The IPC is India's main criminal law. Section 11 says "person" includes "any company or association or body of persons, whether incorporated or not." This broad definition allows companies to be treated like individuals for criminal purposes. For example, offences like cheating (Section 420), forgery (Section 467), or criminal conspiracy (Section 120B) can apply to companies if their actions fit the crime.

However, challenges arise with mens rea— the intent to commit a crime. Since companies don't think, courts "attribute" the mindset of directors or managers to the company. Also, for punishments: If a crime mandates jail time, early views said companies couldn't be prosecuted because they can't be jailed. But later rulings allowed fines instead, even if jail is mentioned.

The Companies Act, 2013: This is the key law for company operations. It imposes criminal liability for fraud (Section 447), which includes false statements or concealing facts, punishable by up to 10 years in jail and fines up to three times the fraud amount. Directors and officers can be personally liable if they were involved in or knew about the wrongdoing.

The Act uses "piercing the corporate veil"—lifting the company's separate identity to hold individuals accountable in cases of fraud or misuse. Recent amendments in 2020 decriminalised minor offences, shifting them to civil penalties to ease business, but serious crimes remain criminal.

OTHER SPECIALISED LAWS

Prevention of Corruption Act, 1988 (amended 2018): Holds companies liable for bribery. If an employee bribes for a business advantage, the company can be fined, and directors prosecuted unless they prove diligence.

Negotiable Instruments Act, 1881: Under Section 138, companies can be liable for bounced cheques, with directors also accountable.

Environmental Laws: Acts like the Environment Protection Act, 1986, impose liability for pollution. Companies face fines and shutdowns for violations.56be94

Prevention of Money Laundering Act, 2002: Companies involved in money laundering can have assets seized.

Securities and Exchange Board of India (SEBI) Act, 1992: For market frauds like insider trading.

These laws show India's fragmented but comprehensive approach. Liability isn't automatic; it depends on evidence linking the crime to company actions.8d11b7 Enforcement involves agencies like the Central Bureau of Investigation (CBI), Enforcement Directorate (ED), and courts.

In practice, proving corporate crimes is tough due to complex structures. Prosecutors must show the company's "controlling mind" (top executives) knew or intended the act. Fines are common, but personal liability for directors acts as a stronger deterrent.

This framework has grown from British common law influences but has been adapted to Indian needs, especially post-liberalisation, when corporate crimes rose.

OBJECTIVES

To Trace the Evolution of Corporate Criminal Liability: This objective explores India’s historical approach to corporate liability, identifying key legislative milestones, including the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita and Companies Act, to outline how corporate criminal liability has developed over time.

To Analyse Judicial Interpretations and Landmark Cases: The study evaluates significant judgments by Indian courts, such as Standard Chartered Bank v. Directorate of Enforcement and Iridium India Telecom Ltd. v. Motorola Inc., to understand how judicial perspectives on corporate misconduct have evolved.

To Examine the Role of Regulatory Bodies: This objective assesses the enforcement role of regulatory bodies, including SEBI, the RBI, and the Ministry of Corporate Affairs, in ensuring corporate accountability and curbing corporate crime.

To Assess Legislative Reforms Impacting Corporate Accountability: Recent reforms, such as the Companies (Amendment) Act and the Insolvency and Bankruptcy Code, are examined for their effectiveness in strengthening corporate criminal liability.

To Identify Emerging Trends and Global Influences: The study considers the impact of international standards, like the UK Bribery Act and the U.S. Foreign Corrupt Practices Act, and the increasing emphasis on corporate environmental and social accountability.

DEFINITION OF CORPORATE CRIMINAL LIABILITY

"Corporate crime refers to crimes perpetrated by a corporation or an individual associated with one". A corporate crime is an act committed by a company's employees and does not require authorisation or approval from its executives. It is sufficient if the officials used their ordinary powers on behalf of the corporation. Thus, to a large extent, the corporation's criminality is linked to the actions of its officials. Such unlawful behaviours reflect the character of the individuals who run the company. Corporate criminal liability is becoming increasingly prevalent. The phrase corporate crime refers to business operations that involve some characteristics of criminal law. Corporate crime is sometimes used to describe types of regularity offences. Corporate crime also encompasses fraud and other unlawful behaviours that violate general laws.

CORPORATE CRIMINAL LIABILITY IN INDIA

The nullum poena sine lege states that no individual shall be punished except in accordance with a statute that establishes a penalty for criminal action. The origin of nulla poena sine lege may be traced in Magna Carta's 39th clause, which later produced the notion of "Due Process". Et actus non facit reum nisi mens sit rea, which indicates that both the purpose and the act must be present to create a crime. This principle, which has been recognised by courts for centuries, recognises that crime has two elements: physical and mental. Actus non facit reum nisi mens sit rea is a natural and common law concept that serves as the foundation of criminal law. There is no crime without a guilty mind. To hold a person criminally liable for an act, it must be proven that he committed the act with a guilty mind. Thus, every crime has two components: a physical element and a mental one, known as "actus reus" and "mens rea". The word 'actus' refers to a 'deed', a tangible effect of human behaviour. The term 'reus' denotes 'forbidden by law'. The term 'actus reus' can be defined as such an outcome of human activity as the law attempts to avert. Mens rea is a technical word that typically refers to some blameworthy mental condition, whether caused by purpose, knowledge, or otherwise, the lack of which on any given occasion negates the charge of crime. Mens rea originally defined the purposeful performing of a 100 unlawful act, but its meaning has evolved significantly with the emergence of many

notions and principles, such as insanity, necessity, coercion, mistake, accident, carelessness, and so on. Thus, the core meaning of (mens rea) is the deliberate or reckless performance of a morally wrong act. Although the broad rule outlined above applies to all criminal proceedings, the criminal law one exception to the above-mentioned principle is the doctrine of strict responsibility, which allows one to be held accountable even if they are not guilty. The legislature may, however, construct an offence of strict or absolute responsibility if mens rea is not required. Strict liability involves legal culpability even in the absence of mens rea. Strict liability has grown so rapidly in recent years and in so many different forms that it is hard to generalise about it. Quite separate from the several serious crimes that have been committed inside this domain.

Strict responsibility is a result of current legislative policy, not traditional morality. In other words, the issue is one of malum prohibitum rather than malum in se. Malum in **se** signifies that it is commonly acknowledged that they are ethical errors. Malum prohibita are often termed quasi-criminal offences, offences that are seen as not criminal in any actual sense, but conduct that, in the public good, is forbidden by punishment. It has long been contended that strict liability violations are examples of minor infractions and hence not immoral. They are essentially conventional wrongs that are banned by positive law. This promoted the legal view that mens rea is not a significant feature of responsibility.

DOCTRINES IN CORPORATE CRIMINAL LIABILITY

Doctrines are legal principles courts use to apply laws. Here are the main ones in India.

Doctrine of Attribution or Identification: This says a company's intent comes from its "alter ego"—directors, managers, or key personnel who control decisions. If they commit a crime for the company, it's attributed to the company. For example, if a CEO approves a fraudulent scheme, the company is liable as if it "thought" it. This evolved from English law but was adopted in India through cases. It's key for mens rea offences.

Doctrine of Vicarious Liability: Under this, companies are responsible for employees' actions done in the course of employment, even without direct involvement.3a8e7f But in criminal law, it's limited—statutes must specify it, like in the Companies Act. Directors aren't automatically liable; they need a specific role.

Piercing the Corporate Veil: Normally, companies have a separate identity from owners **(Salomon v. Salomon principle)**. But courts "pierce" this veil in fraud or injustice, holding shareholders or directors personally liable. Used in tax evasion or sham companies.

Absolute or Strict Liability: For some offences, like environmental harm, no mens rea is needed. Companies are liable if the act happened, regardless of intent. This is harsh but protects public interest.

These doctrines balance corporate autonomy with accountability. Courts apply them case-by-case, ensuring fairness.

LANDMARK CASES

Landmark cases have defined corporate criminal liability.

A.K. Khosla v. T.S. Venkatesan (1992, Calcutta High Court):

Facts: Two companies and their directors were accused of fraud in selling shares by misrepresenting facts and falsifying documents. Charges under IPC Sections 420 (cheating), 467 (forgery), etc.

Issue: Can companies be prosecuted for crimes requiring mens rea and mandatory imprisonment?

Ruling: The court said no. Companies, as juristic persons, lack mens rea—the guilty intent. Also, since punishments include jail, which companies can't serve, prosecution isn't possible. It quashed proceedings against the companies but allowed them against individuals if evidence showed their role. From the judgment: "Mens rea is an essential ingredient for all these offences... A body corporate cannot be prosecuted for these offences."

Impact: This reflected early reluctance, protecting companies from serious charges. It influenced later debates until overruled.

Assistant Commissioner v. Velliappa Textiles Ltd. (2003, Supreme Court):

Facts: A company was convicted for tax evasion under the Income Tax Act, sentenced to a fine and imprisonment.

Issue: Can a company be sentenced to imprisonment?

Ruling: No. The court held that since companies can't be physically jailed, they can't be prosecuted for offences with mandatory imprisonment. Fine alone isn't enough if the law requires both. The conviction was set aside for the company.

Key quote: "A company being a juristic person cannot be imprisoned."

Impact: This limited corporate liability for grave crimes, sparking criticism for letting companies off easy. It was later overruled.

Standard Chartered Bank v. Directorate of Enforcement (2005, Supreme Court):

Facts: The bank violated foreign exchange laws (FERA). It was fined, but argued it couldn't be prosecuted since the punishment included jail.

Issue: Can companies be liable despite mandatory imprisonment clauses?

Ruling: Yes. A five-judge bench overruled Velliappa by a 3:2 majority. Companies can be prosecuted and fined, even if jail is mentioned—the court can impose a fine only. Mens rea can be attributed. "The company is liable to be prosecuted and punished even if the punishment is mandatory imprisonment."

Impact: A game-changer! It established corporate criminal liability firmly, aligning India with global trends. Companies lost immunity for intent-based crimes.

M.C. Mehta v. Union of India (1986, Supreme Court) – Oleum Gas Leak Case:

Facts: Oleum gas leaked from Shriram Foods & Fertilisers in Delhi, harming people. It was a public interest petition under Article 32.

Issue: What's the liability of companies in hazardous industries for accidents?

Ruling: The court introduced "absolute liability." For dangerous activities, companies are strictly liable for harm, with no exceptions like in strict liability (Rylands v. Fletcher). Compensation must match the company's size for deterrence. "An enterprise engaged in a hazardous industry owes an absolute duty to ensure safety." Though more tort than criminal, it influenced criminal environmental liability.

Impact: Revolutionised environmental law. Companies now face heavy penalties for pollution, extending to criminal charges under green laws.

Iridium India Telecom Ltd. v. Motorola Inc. (2011, Supreme Court):

Facts: Motorola was accused of cheating investors by misrepresenting a satellite phone project's viability, leading to losses.

Issue: Can companies be liable for cheating (IPC Section 420), which requires mens rea?

Ruling: Yes. The court confirmed companies can have mens rea through attribution. "Companies can no longer claim immunity from criminal prosecution on the ground that they are incapable of possessing the necessary mens rea." Non-disclosure of risks can be deceptive. It allowed prosecution to proceed.

Impact: Solidified attribution doctrine. Made companies liable for fraud, boosting investor protection.

Sunil Bharti Mittal v. CBI (2015, Supreme Court):

Facts: In the 2G spectrum scam, telecom company directors were summoned without specific allegations.

Issue: When are directors personally liable for company crimes?

Ruling: Not automatically. Vicarious liability needs a specific statutory provision or evidence of the director's active role. "The liability of its directors is not automatic." Attribution works for company liability, but for individuals, it proves involvement.

Impact: Protected innocent directors from blanket charges, balancing accountability.

Sanjay Dutt v. State of Haryana (2024, Supreme Court):

Facts: Actor Sanjay Dutt, as a company director, faced charges under wildlife laws for illegal possession.

Issue: Extent of directors' vicarious liability.

Ruling: Clarified that company liability doesn't automatically extend to directors without evidence of their knowledge or consent. Emphasised preventive measures like compliance programs to mitigate risks.

Impact: Recent ruling (post-2020) reinforces fairness, influencing how cases are filed against top management.

Other notable mentions: In recent scams like Punjab National Bank fraud (2018, ongoing) and IL&FS crisis (2018), courts applied these principles, holding companies and executives accountable under money laundering and fraud laws. These cases show evolving enforcement.

CHALLENGES IN ENFORCING CORPORATE CRIMINAL LIABILITY

Enforcing corporate criminal liability in India poses significant challenges due to several factors. One major issue is proving the intent of corporations, as criminal liability traditionally requires a demonstration of mens rea (guilty mind). Unlike individuals, corporations do not possess a mind; thus, attributing intent to a corporate entity complicates prosecution efforts. The Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita (BNS) allows for liability under certain conditions, but ambiguity often leads to inconsistent applications. Moreover, penalties imposed on corporations may be insufficient, deterring meaningful compliance. For instance, fines levied may be mere fractions of a corporation's profits, undermining their deterrent effect. Enforcement challenges are exacerbated by complex corporate structures, including subsidiaries and holding companies that can obscure accountability. Corporations often exploit legal loopholes, making it difficult for law enforcement agencies to trace liability effectively. The absence of specific provisions addressing the unique nature of corporate crimes in India further complicates enforcement. For example, the Companies Act lacks clear mechanisms for imposing criminal liability, often leading to reliance on general statutes. Additionally, the limited capacity and resources of regulatory agencies hinder thorough investigations and prosecutions. These factors collectively illustrate the difficulties in holding corporations accountable, highlighting the need for comprehensive reforms in the legal framework to enhance the effectiveness of corporate criminal liability enforcement in India.

CONCLUSION

The evolving landscape of corporate criminal liability in India reflects significant changes in legal frameworks, particularly through statutes like the IPC,1860, the Companies Act, and the Environmental Protection Act. These laws have progressively established a structure for prosecuting corporate crimes, marking a shift towards greater accountability. However, challenges remain, particularly in proving intent and the complexities of corporate structures that often obscure accountability. The limitations in penalties further complicate enforcement,

highlighting the need for a more robust legal framework. Emerging trends, such as corporate manslaughter, suggest a growing recognition of corporate responsibility in India, aligning with international standards that emphasise corporate accountability. To enhance the effectiveness of corporate criminal liability, it is crucial to address existing loopholes, streamline enforcement mechanisms, and promote clarity in legal definitions. Additionally, fostering a culture of compliance and ethical conduct within corporations will be essential. Continued judicial interpretation and proactive legislative reforms can ensure that corporate entities are not only held accountable but also deterred from engaging in criminal activities, ultimately strengthening the integrity of India's corporate governance landscape.

REFERENCES

1. M.C. Mehta v. Union of India, Writ Petition (civil) 4677 of 1985)
2. Sahana D, Arya R. Corporate Criminal Liability in India, 120 International Journal of Pure and Applied Mathematics,2018:87:93-98.
3. Kumar S Pradeep. Corporate Criminal Liability in India, X Athens Journal of Law,2021:1:14-17.
4. A.K. Khosla v. T.S. Venkatesan (1992, Calcutta High Court)