INDIALAW

CIVIL

Supreme Court Rules Non-Executive Directors Not Liable for Company's Dishonoured Cheques

AUTHOR Rahul Sundaram

PUBLISHED 5 March 2025

Introduction

The Supreme Court of India has delivered a landmark judgment in the case of K.S. Mehta vs. M/s Morgan Securities and Credits Pvt. Ltd., clarifying the extent of liability for non-executive directors under the Negotiable Instruments Act, 1881 (NI Act). This ruling has significant implications for corporate governance in India, particularly for directors who serve in non-executive capacities and do not directly participate in a company's financial decision-making processes. The judgment highlights the importance of specific allegations when prosecuting directors for financial offences and reinforces the principle that mere designation as a director does not automatically attract liability.

Table of contents

- Introduction
- Case Background
- Key Legal Issues
- Court's Analysis
- Conclusion

Case Background

The appellants, K.S. Mehta and Basant Kumar Goswami, was non-executive directors of Blue Coast Hotels & Resorts Ltd. at different times. Their roles were confined to governance oversight in compliance with SEBI regulations, with no executive authority or financial decision-making power. The dispute arose from an Inter-Corporate Deposit (ICD) agreement executed between the company and the respondent in 2002, which culminated in the issuance of two post-dated cheques that were later dishonoured due to insufficient funds. Despite neither appellant being present at the board meeting approving the transaction nor being signatories to the agreement, criminal proceedings were initiated against them under Section 138 read with Section 141 of the NI Act.

Key Legal Issues

The central issue before the Court was whether non-executive directors could be held vicariously liable under Section 141 of the NI Act for financial transactions they did not authorize or participate in. The appellants argued that their non-executive status, confirmed by Corporate Governance Reports and Registrar of Companies records, negated any basis for liability. They contended that the proceedings against them were legally untenable in the absence of specific allegations linking them to the cheque issuance or dishonour. The respondent, however, argued that the appellants' status as directors at the relevant time presumed their involvement in the company's affairs and that their liability should be determined during trial rather than at the quashing stage.

Court's Analysis

The Supreme Court examined the facts and legal precedents to determine the appellants' liability. It reaffirmed that vicarious liability under Section 141 requires specific allegations demonstrating direct involvement in the company's business at the time of the offence. The Court cited several key precedents:

1. National Small Industries Corpn. Ltd. v. Harmeet Singh Paintal: This case established that complaints under Section 141 must contain unambiguous allegations about the director's role in the company's affairs, rather than making bald assertions about their responsibility.

2. S.M.S. Pharmaceuticals Ltd. v. Neeta Bhalla: This judgment emphasized that mere designation as a director is insufficient to establish liability; the complaint must specify the director's active participation in the relevant transactions.

3. Pooja Ravinder Devidasani v. State of Maharashtra: This case clarified that non-executive directors, who typically play a governance role without involvement in daily operations, cannot be held liable under Section 141 unless they were actively in charge of the company's business at the relevant time.

The Court found that the appellants' roles were purely non-executive, with no evidence suggesting their involvement in the financial transactions in question. The complaints against them lacked the specific averments required to establish a direct nexus between the appellants and the dishonoured cheques. Additionally, the Court noted that attendance at board meetings does not automatically translate to control over financial operations.

Conclusion

The Supreme Court's judgment in K.S. Mehta vs. M/s Morgan Securities and Credits Pvt. Ltd. represents a significant clarification of the liability standards for non-executive directors under the NI Act. By quashing the criminal proceedings against the appellants, the Court has reinforced the principle that vicarious liability requires active participation in the company's financial affairs and cannot be presumed solely based on directorship status. This ruling provides important protections for non-executive directors who serve in governance roles without direct involvement in operational or financial decision-making. It is also a reminder to prosecutors and complainants that specific allegations are essential when seeking to hold directors accountable for financial offences. The judgment strikes a balance between holding companies accountable for their financial obligations and protecting directors who serve in oversight capacities without direct financial authority.

For further details write to contact@indialaw.in