

**BEFORE THE SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE BOARD OF INDIA, MUMBAI
CORAM: S. RAMAN, WHOLE TIME MEMBER**

ORDER

Under Sections 11, 11(4), 11A and 11B of the Securities and Exchange Board of India Act, 1992, in the matter of M/s Micro Leasing and Funding Limited and its Directors, viz. Shri Upendra Nath Mishra (PAN: AHDPM1535G; DIN: 01733091), Shri Durga Prasad Misra (PAN: AATPM7049N; DIN: 00627749), Shri Bijoy Kumar Routray (PAN: AIBPR3316B; DIN: 02382909), Shri Durga Prasad Shadangi (PAN: AZAPS2983D; DIN: 06585224), Shri Kali Prasad Mishra (PAN: ANZPM6759L; DIN: 00577580) and Smt. Banaja Pattnaik (PAN: AGTPP2815R; DIN: 01690637).

1. Securities and Exchange Board of India ("**SEBI**") received a reference dated September 12, 2013, from the Economic Offence Wing – Odisha Police alleging mobilization of funds by M/s Micro Leasing and Funding Limited ("**MLFL**").
- 2.1 Thereafter, SEBI vide letter dated September 25, 2013, sought the following information from MLFL and the Registrar of Companies, Odisha ("**ROC**"), viz. –
 - i. Copy of the Memorandum and Articles of Association of the company;
 - ii. Copy of Audited Annual Accounts of the company for the last 3 years;
 - iii. Copies of Annual Returns filed by the company for the last 3 years;
 - iv. Copies of Compliance Certificate filed by the company for the last 3 years;
 - v. Name, addresses and occupation of all the Promoters/Directors of the company;
 - vi. Names and details of the Key Managerial Personnel of the company;
 - vii. Other information in respect of every series of shares issued by the company, viz. –
 - a. Copy of Prospectus/Red Herring Prospectus/Statement in lieu of Prospectus/Information Memorandum filed with ROC;
 - b. Confirmation of having made an Application for listing;
 - c. Copy of Form 2 filed with ROC;
 - d. Date of opening and closing of the subscription list;
 - e. Details regarding the number of application forms circulated inviting subscription;
 - f. Details regarding the number of applications received;

- g. Details regarding the number of allottees and list of such allottees, etc.;
- h. Number of shares allotted and value of such allotment against each allottee's name.
- i. Details regarding subscription amount raised;
- j. Date of allotment of shares;
- k. Copies of the minutes of Board/Committee meeting in which the resolution has been passed for allotment;
- l. Date of dispatch of Share Certificates;
- m. Details of the total number of applicants for each of MLFL's scheme besides the list of final allottee;
- n. Copies of application forms, pamphlets, advertisements and other promotional material circulated for issuance of shares;
- o. Terms and conditions of the issue of shares.

2.2.1 Vide letter dated October 3, 2013, MLFL submitted the following information to SEBI, viz. –

- i. Copy of the Memorandum and Articles of Association of the company;
- ii. Copy of Audited Annual Accounts of the company for the Financial Years 2010 – 11, 2011 – 12 and 2012 – 13;
- iii. Name, addresses and occupation of all the promoters/directors of the company;
- iv. Names and details of the Key Managerial Personnel of the company;
- v. Other information in respect of every series of shares issued by the company, viz. –
 - a. Copies of the minutes of Board resolution for allotment of shares;
 - b. List of allottees.

2.2.2 Vide its abovementioned reply, MLFL also submitted that: *"The Company has not filed any prospectus/RHP/Statement in lieu of prospectus, etc. with ROC as the Preference Shares were raised by way of private placement..."*

2.3 ROC replied to the abovementioned SEBI letter dated September 25, 2013, vide its letter dated November 28, 2013.

2.4 SEBI was also in receipt of a copy of the Reserve Bank of India's ("**RBI**") letter dated July 15, 2014, wherein it was stated that MLFL was not registered with that Authority

and was not authorised to raise public deposits. Further, it was stated that MLFL had applied for new Certificate of Registration to function as a Non – Banking Finance Company ("**NBFC**"), which was rejected by RBI in May 2014.

3. The material available on record i.e. correspondences exchanged between SEBI and MLFL alongwith the documents contained therein and information obtained from the ROC, have been perused. On an examination of the same, it is observed that –
 - i. MLFL was incorporated on August 11, 2006, with the ROC, Odisha with CIN No. as U65921OR2006PLC008904. MLFL's Registered Office is at Plot No. 320 B, Sahid Nagar, Bhubaneswar – 751010, Odisha, India.
 - ii. The present Directors in MLFL are Shri Upendra Nath Mishra, Shri Bijoy Kumar Routray and Shri Durga Prasad Shadangi.
 - iii. Shri Kali Prasad Mishra, Shri Durga Prasad Misra and Smt. Banaja Pattnaik, who were earlier Directors in MLFL, have since resigned.
 - iv. From the application form in respect of the issue of *Redeemable Preference Shares* ("***Offer of Redeemable Preference Shares***") by MLFL, it is observed that the terms and conditions included the following:
 - a. "***Who can Buy:*** (a) *Adult Individuals, either single or jointly (not exceeding three), resident in India* (b) *Parents/Guardians on behalf of minors,* (c) *Registered Partnership Firms/Trusts,* (d) *Companies,* (e) *Domestic and Public Sector Undertakings registered in India,* (f) *Registered Societies, Association of Persons, body of Individuals, Clubs, etc.* (g) *Such other individuals, institutions, body corporate, etc. as may be allowed under the provisions of law of the land and as decided by the management of MLFL from time to time.*"

- v. MLFL issued "*Cumulative Redeemable Preference Shares*" ("***Offer of Redeemable Preference Shares***") to a large number of investors during the Financial Years 2010–11, 2011–12 and 2012–13, details of which are provided below -

Type of Security	Year	Date of Allotment	No. of preference shares allotted	No. of persons to whom preference shares were allotted	Total Amount ()
Cumulative Redeemable Preference Shares	2010–11	16.12.2010	1532112	20587	15,32,11,200
	2011–12	31.03.2012	2630	29	2,63,000
	2012–13	16.05.2012	590171	3103	5,90,17,100
		20.06.2012	1186625	4137	11,86,62,500
		03.10.2012	2494914	22406	24,94,91,400
Total			5806452	50262	58,06,45,200

- 4.1 In the context of the abovementioned details of the *Offer of Redeemable Preference Shares*, the issue for determination in the instant matter is whether the mobilization of funds by MLFL through the aforesaid, is in accordance with the provisions of the SEBI Act, 1992 ("**SEBI Act**") read with the Companies Act, 1956 and the Companies Act, 2013.
- 4.2 I note that the jurisdiction of SEBI over various provisions of the Companies Act in the case of public companies, whether listed or unlisted, when they issue and transfer securities, flows from the provisions of Section 55A of the Companies Act. While examining the scope of Section 55A of the Companies Act, 1956, the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India in ***Sahara India Real Estate Corporation Limited & Ors. vs. SEBI (Civil Appeal no. 9813 of 2011) (Judgment dated August 31, 2012)*** (hereinafter referred to as the "***Sahara Case***"), had observed that:

"We, therefore, hold that, so far as the provisions enumerated in the opening portion of Section 55A of the Companies Act, so far as they relate to issue and transfer of securities and non-payment of dividend is concerned, SEBI has the power to administer in the case of listed public companies and in the case of those public companies which intend to get their securities listed on a recognized stock exchange in India."

4.3 In this regard –

- i. Reference is also made to Sections 67(1) and 67(3) of the Companies Act, 1956, which are reproduced as under:

"67. (1) Any reference in this Act or in the articles of a company to offering shares or debentures to the public shall, subject to any provision to the contrary contained in this Act and subject also to the provisions of sub-sections (3) and (4), be construed as including a reference to offering them to any section of the public, whether selected as members or debenture holders of the company concerned or as clients of the person issuing the prospectus or in any other manner.

(2) ...

(3) No offer or invitation shall be treated as made to the public by virtue of sub-section (1) or sub-section (2), as the case may be, if the offer or invitation can properly be regarded, in all the circumstances-

(a) as not being calculated to result, directly or indirectly, in the shares or debentures becoming available for subscription or purchase by persons other than those receiving the offer or invitation; or

(b) otherwise as being a domestic concern of the persons making and receiving the offer or invitation

...

Provided *that nothing contained in this sub-section shall apply in a case where the offer or invitation to subscribe for shares or debentures is made to fifty persons or more:*

Provided further *that nothing contained in the first proviso shall apply to non-banking financial companies or public financial institutions specified in section 4A of the Companies Act, 1956 (1 of 1956)."*

- ii. While examining the scope of Section 67 of the Companies Act, 1956, the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India in the *Sabara Case* observed that:

"Section 67(1) deals with the offer of shares and debentures to the public and Section 67(2) deals with invitation to the public to subscribe for shares and debentures and how those expressions are to be understood, when reference is made to the Act or in the articles of a company. The emphasis in Section 67(1) and (2) is on the "section of the public". Section 67(3) states that no offer or invitation shall be treated as made to the public, by virtue of subsections (1) and (2), that is to any section of the public, if the offer or invitation is not being calculated to result, directly or indirectly, in the shares or debentures becoming available for subscription or purchase by persons other than those receiving the offer or invitation or otherwise as being a domestic concern of the persons making and

receiving the offer or invitations. Section 67(3) is, therefore, an exception to Sections 67(1) and (2). If the circumstances mentioned in clauses (1) and (b) of Section 67(3) are satisfied, then the offer/invitation would not be treated as being made to the public.

The first proviso to Section 67(3) was inserted by the Companies (Amendment) Act, 2000 w.e.f. 13.12.2000, which clearly indicates, nothing contained in Sub-section (3) of Section 67 shall apply in a case where the offer or invitation to subscribe for shares or debentures is made to fifty persons or more. ...

Resultantly, if an offer of securities is made to fifty or more persons, it would be deemed to be a public issue, even if it is of domestic concern or proved that the shares or debentures are not available for subscription or purchase by persons other than those received the offer or invitation. ...

I may, therefore, indicate, subject to what has been stated above, in India that any share or debenture issue beyond forty nine persons, would be a public issue attracting all the relevant provisions of the SEBI Act, regulations framed thereunder, the Companies Act, pertaining to the public issue. ..."

- iii. In the instant matter, for ascertaining whether the *Offer of Redeemable Preference Shares* is a public issue or an issue on private placement basis in accordance with Section 67 of the Companies Act, 1956, the number of subscribers is of utmost importance.
 - a. Under the *Offer of Redeemable Preference Shares*, it is observed that during the Financial Years 2010–11, 2011–12 and 2012–13, MLFL allotted 5806452 *redeemable preference shares* to a total of 50262 individuals/investors and mobilized funds amounting to approximately 58.06 Crores. The number of investors to whom allotments were made under the *Offer of Redeemable Preference Shares* alongwith the amount mobilized therein, during the Financial Years 2010–11 and 2012–13 (details provided in Table at paragraph 3(v) of page 4), would *prima facie* indicate that such *Offer* was a public issue of securities and *prima facie* indicate that the number of persons to whom such *Offer* was made, was above the limit of forty–nine persons as prescribed under the *first proviso* to Section 67(3) of the Companies Act, 1956.
 - b. It is observed from the RBI's letter dated July 15, 2014, that MLFL was not registered with that Authority and was not authorised to raise public deposits. Further, it is observed that MLFL had applied for new Certificate of Registration to function as a NBFC, which was rejected by RBI in May 2014. I

also find that MLFL is not stated to be a public financial institution within the meaning of Section 4A of the Companies Act, 1956. In view of the aforesaid, I, therefore, find that MLFL is not covered under the *second proviso* to Section 67(3) of the Companies Act, 1956.

- c. The terms and conditions of the *Offer of Redeemable Preference Shares* clearly provide who can invest, viz. – *Adult Individuals, Parents/Guardians on behalf of minors, Registered Partnership Firms/Trusts, Companies, Domestic and Public Sector Undertakings registered in India, Registered Societies, Association of Persons, body of Individuals, Clubs, etc.* Such a generalized category of investor(s) cannot be said to satisfy the condition of specificity as required under Section 67(3) of the Companies Act, 1956.
- d. In view of the above, the *Offer of Redeemable Preference Shares* by MLFL, would *prima facie* qualify as a public issue under the first proviso to Section 67(3) of the Companies Act, 1956. In this regard, it is pertinent to note that by virtue of Section 55A of the Companies Act, Section 67 of that Act, so far as it relates to issue and transfer of securities, shall also be administered by SEBI.

4.4 I note that –

- i. From the abovementioned, it will follow that since the *Offer of Redeemable Preference Shares* is a public issue of securities, such securities shall also have to be listed on a recognized stock exchange, as mandated under Section 73 of the Companies Act, 1956. In this regard, reference is made to Sections 73 of the Companies Act, 1956, of which sub-Sections (1), (2) and (3) are relevant for the instant case, which is reproduced as under:

"73. (1) Every company intending to offer shares or debentures to the public for subscription by the issue of a prospectus shall, before such issue, make an application to one or more recognised stock exchanges for permission for the shares or debentures intending to be so offered to be dealt with in the stock exchange or each such stock exchange.

(1A) ...

(2) Where the permission has not been applied under subsection (1) or such permission having been applied for, has not been granted as aforesaid, the company shall forthwith repay without interest all

moneys received from applicants in pursuance of the prospectus, and, if any such money is not repaid within eight days after the company becomes liable to repay it, the company and every director of the company who is an officer in default shall, on and from the expiry of the eighth day, be jointly and severally liable to repay that money with interest at such rate, not less than four per cent and not more than fifteen per cent, as may be prescribed, having regard to the length of the period of delay in making the repayment of such money.

(3) All moneys received as aforesaid shall be kept in a separate bank account maintained with a Scheduled Bank 1 [until the permission has been granted, or where an appeal has been preferred against the refusal to grant such. permission, until the disposal of the appeal, and the money standing in such separate account shall, where the permission has not been applied for as aforesaid or has not been granted, be repaid within the time and in the manner specified in sub- section (2)]; and if default is made in complying with this sub- section, the company, and every officer of the company who is in default, shall be punishable with fine which may extend to five thousand rupees."

- ii. In the *Sahara Case*, the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India also examined Section 73 of the Companies Act, 1956, wherein it observed that –

"Section 73(1) of the Act casts an obligation on every company intending to offer shares or debentures to the public to apply on a stock exchange for listing of its securities. Such companies have no option or choice but to list their securities on a recognized stock exchange, once they invite subscription from over forty nine investors from the public. If an unlisted company expresses its intention, by conduct or otherwise, to offer its securities to the public by the issue of a prospectus, the legal obligation to make an application on a recognized stock exchange for listing starts. Sub-section (1A) of Section 73 gives indication of what are the particulars to be stated in such a prospectus. The consequences of not applying for the permission under sub-section (1) of Section 73 or not granting of permission is clearly stipulated in sub-section (3) of Section 73. Obligation to refund the amount collected from the public with interest is also mandatory as per Section 73(2) of the Act. Listing is, therefore, a legal responsibility of the company which offers securities to the public, provided offers are made to more than 50 persons."

- iii. In the facts of the instant case, since the *Offer of Redeemable Preference Shares* was made to fifty persons or more by MLFL, the same will attract the requirement of compulsory listing before a recognized stock exchange in terms of Section 73(1) of the Companies Act, 1956. It therefore *prima facie* appears that MLFL has violated the provisions of Section 73(1) of the Companies Act, 1956, since it has failed to ensure

listing with a recognised stock exchange of the securities issued under the *Offer of Redeemable Preference Shares*.

- iv. As per Section 73(2) of the Companies Act, 1956, the obligation to refund the amount with interest that was collected from investors under the *Offer of Redeemable Preference Shares* is mandatory on MLFL. In this regard, there is no evidence on record to indicate whether or not MIRL has paid interest to the investors within 8 days under the *Offer of Redeemable Preference Shares*, as per the aforesaid Section. In view of the same, I find that MLFL has *prima facie* not complied with the provisions of Section 73(2) of the Companies Act, 1956.
- v. Section 73(3) of Companies Act, 1956, says that all moneys received shall be kept in a separate bank account maintained with a Scheduled Bank and if default is made in complying with this sub-Section, the company, and every officer of the company who is in default, shall be punishable with fine which may extend to five thousand rupees. In the instant case, there is no evidence on record to indicate whether or not funds received from the investors under the *Offer of Redeemable Preference Shares* has been kept in separate bank account by MLFL. In view of the same, I find that MLFL has *prima facie* not complied with the provisions of Section 73(3) of Companies Act, 1956.

- 4.5 Under Section 2(36) read with Section 60 of the Companies Act, 1956, a company needs to register its prospectus with the ROC, before making a public offer or issuing the prospectus. As per the aforesaid Section 2(36), "*prospectus*" means any document described or issued as a prospectus and includes any notice, circular, advertisement or other document inviting deposits from the public or inviting offers from the public for the subscription or purchase of any shares in, or debentures of, a body corporate. As mentioned above, since the *Offer of Redeemable Preference Shares* was made to fifty persons or more, it has to be construed as a public offer. Having made a public offer, MLFL was required to register a prospectus with the ROC under Section 60 of the Companies Act, 1956. I note that in its reply dated October 3, 2013, MLFL submitted that: "*The Company has not filed any prospectus/RHP/Statement in lieu of prospectus, etc. with ROC as the Preference Shares were raised by way of private placement...*" In view of the aforesaid, I find that MLFL has not complied with the provisions of Section 60 of Companies Act, 1956.

- 4.6 Under Section 56(1) of the Companies Act, 1956, every prospectus issued by or on behalf of a company, shall state the matters specified in Part I and set out the reports specified in Part II of Schedule II of that Act. Further, as per Section 56(3) of the Companies Act, 1956, no one shall issue any form of application for shares in or debentures of a company, unless the form is accompanied by abridged prospectus, contain disclosures as specified. Based on the material available on record, I find that MLFL has not complied with the provisions of Section 56(1) and 56(3) of the Companies Act, 1956 and therefore, has *prima facie* violated the aforesaid provisions.
- 4.7 As per Section 465(1) of the Companies Act, 2013, the Companies Act, 1956, "*shall stand repealed*". However, Section 465(2)(i) of the Companies Act, 2013, provides that:
- "(2)Notwithstanding the repeal under sub-section (1) of the repealed enactments,—*
(a) anything done or any action taken or purported to have been done or taken, including any rule, notification, inspection, order or notice made or issued or any appointment or declaration made or any operation undertaken or any direction given or any proceeding taken or any penalty, punishment, forfeiture or fine imposed under the repealed enactments shall, insofar as it is not inconsistent with the provisions of this Act, be deemed to have been done or taken under the corresponding provisions of this Act;"
- 4.8 Upon a consideration of the aforementioned paragraphs, I am of the view that MLFL is *prima facie* engaged in fund mobilising activity from the public, through the *Offer of Redeemable Preference Shares* and as a result of the aforesaid activity has violated the aforementioned provisions of the Companies Act, 1956 (Section 56, Section 60 read with Section 2(36), Section 73) read with Section 465 of the Companies Act, 2013.
5. SEBI has a statutory duty to protect the interests of investors in securities and promote the development of, and to regulate, the securities market. Section 11 of the SEBI Act has empowered it to take such measures as it deems fit for fulfilling its legislative mandate. Further, as per the provisions of Section 55A of the Companies Act, 1956 read with Section 465 of the Companies Act, 2013, administrative authority on the subjects relating to public issue of securities is exclusively with SEBI. For this purpose, SEBI can exercise its jurisdiction under Sections 11(1), 11A, 11B and 11(4) of the SEBI Act read with Section 55A of the Companies Act, 1956 and Section 465 of the Companies Act, 2013 (as mentioned in paragraphs 4.1–4.8 above). Steps therefore, have to be taken in the

instant matter to ensure only legitimate fund raising activities are carried on by MLFL and no investors are defrauded. In light of the facts in the instant matter, I find that there is no other alternative but to take recourse through an interim action against MLFL and its Directors, for preventing that company from further carrying on with its fund mobilising activity under the *Offer of Redeemable Preference Shares*.

6. In view of the foregoing, I, in exercise of the powers conferred upon me under Sections 11, 11(4), 11A and 11B of the SEBI Act, hereby issue the following directions –
- i. MLFL shall not mobilize funds from investors through the *Offer of Redeemable Preference Shares* or through the issuance of equity shares or any other securities, to the public and/or invite subscription, in any manner whatsoever, either directly or indirectly till further directions;
 - ii. MLFL and its present Directors, viz. Shri Upendra Nath Mishra (PAN: AHDPM1535G; DIN: 01733091), Shri Bijoy Kumar Routray (PAN: AIBPR3316B; DIN: 02382909) and Shri Durga Prasad Shadangi (PAN: AZAPS2983D; DIN: 06585224) alongwith its past Directors, viz. Shri Durga Prasad Misra (PAN: AATPM7049N; DIN: 00627749), Shri Kali Prasad Mishra (PAN: ANZPM6759L; DIN: 00577580) and Smt. Banaja Pattnaik (PAN: AGTPP2815R; DIN: 01690637), are prohibited from issuing prospectus or any offer document or issue advertisement for soliciting money from the public for the issue of securities, in any manner whatsoever, either directly or indirectly, till further orders;
 - iii. MLFL and its abovementioned Directors, are restrained from accessing the securities market and further prohibited from buying, selling or otherwise dealing in the securities market, either directly or indirectly, till further directions;
 - iv. MLFL shall provide a full inventory of all its assets and properties;
 - v. The abovementioned Directors of MLFL shall provide a full inventory of all their assets and properties;
 - vi. MLFL and its abovementioned present Directors shall not dispose of any of the properties or alienate or encumber any of the assets owned/acquired by that company through the *Offer of Redeemable Preference Shares*, without prior permission from SEBI;
 - vii. MLFL and its abovementioned present Directors shall not divert any funds raised from public at large through the *Offer of Redeemable Preference Shares*, which are kept in bank account(s) and/or in the custody of MLFL.

7. The above directions shall take effect immediately and shall be in force until further orders.
8. The *prima facie* observations contained in this Order are made on the basis of the material available on record i.e. correspondences exchanged between SEBI and MLFL alongwith the documents contained therein and information obtained from the ROC. In this context, MLFL and its abovementioned past and present Directors may, within 21 days from the date of receipt of this Order, file their reply, if any, to this Order and may also indicate whether they desire to avail themselves an opportunity of personal hearing on a date and time to be fixed on a specific request made in that regard.
9. This Order is without prejudice to the right of SEBI to take any other action that may be initiated against MLFL and its abovementioned Directors in accordance with law.

Place: Mumbai
Date: November 21, 2014

S. RAMAN
WHOLE TIME MEMBER
SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE BOARD OF INDIA