

## Jai Mahal Hotels Pvt. Ltd. Vs Rajkumar Devraj and Others

**Court:** Supreme Court of India

**Date of Decision:** Sept. 23, 2015

**Acts Referred:** Civil Procedure Code, 1908 (CPC) - Order 39 Rule 1, Order 39 Rule 2

Companies Act, 1956 - Section 10F, 111, 111(7), 155

Succession Act, 1925 - Section 370, 373, 381, 383

**Citation:** (2015) 10 AD (SC) 507 : (2015) 6 ALLMR 410 : (2015) 113 ALR 732 : (2016) 1 AWC 176 : (2015) 128 CLA 375 : (2015) 193 CompCas 214 : (2015) 4 CompLJ 353 : (2015) 7 MLJ 736 : (2016) 130 RD 459 : (2015) 10 SCALE 14 : (2016) 1 SCC 423 : (2016) 1 SCJ 68 :

**Hon'ble Judges:** Anil R. Dave, J; A.K. Goel, J

**Bench:** Division Bench

**Final Decision:** Allowed

### Judgement

A.K. Goel, J

Leave granted. The question raised in these appeals relates to the scope of power Under Section 111 of the Companies

Act, 1956, to direct rectification in the share register of a company. The question has to be examined in the context of correctness of the view

taken in the impugned order passed by the High Court directing rectification at the instance of Respondent No. 1-Rajkumar Devraj and

Respondent No. 2-Rajkumari Lalitya Kumari (the "DR Group"), who are the son and daughter respectively of late Maharaja Jagat Singh

("LMJS").

2. LMJS held shares in M/s. Jai Mahal Hotels Pvt. Ltd., M/s. Ram Bagh Palace Hotels Pvt. Ltd., M/s. Sawai Madhopur Lodge Pvt. Ltd. and

M/s. S.M.S. Investment Corporation Pvt. Ltd. He died on 05th February, 1997 leaving behind a Will dated 23rd June, 1996 in favour of his

mother Gayatri Devi ("GD"). Succession certificate dated 19th February, 2009 was issued by the District Judge, Jaipur jointly in favour of GD and

DR Group. GD executed transfer deed dated 27th April, 2009 in favour of DR Group. She also executed Will dated 10th May, 2009 in favour of

DR Group. She died on 29th September, 2009. Vide letter dated 15th July, 2009, DR Group claimed transmission and transfer of shares in their

favour on the basis of succession certificate dated 19th February, 2009 issued by the District and Sessions Judge, Jaipur (Civil), transfer deed

dated 27th April, 2009 executed by their grand mother Gayitri Devi ("GD") along with revalidation of the letter issued by the Registrar of

Companies.

3. The application having not been accepted by the Company, the DR Group fled appeals before the Company Law Board ("CLB"), New Delhi.

Urvashi Devi, grand daughter of husband of GD from another wife ("UD Group") fled application for impleadment stating that the succession

certificate was a nullity. She accepted validity of Will dated 23rd June, 1996 executed in favour of GD by LMJS but contested the succession

certificate. It was her further case that DR Group had no right of succession in view of Will dated 23rd June, 1996 and they were also not heirs of

GD as LMJS was adopted in another family. Further stand was that since at the instance of GD, proceedings were stayed, succession certificate

could not be granted even at her instance. Stay granted by the High Court was in a petition seeking consolidation of a probate case and succession

certificate. Section 370 of Succession Act was also invoked. It was also submitted that the settlement which was the basis of succession certificate

was not genuine. Her Will dated 10th May, 2009 was also contested. Urvashi Devi, Prithvi Raj and Jai Singh also sought transfer of shares in their

favour claiming as heirs of GD. It was submitted that GD could not enter into any settlement contrary to the Will dated 23rd June, 1996. Further

contention was that she died intestate on 29th September, 2009 and that DG has been disinherited by LMJS in his Will dated 23rd June, 1996.

4. Suit No. 32 of 2010 was also fled by the UD Group before the District Judge, Jaipur, raising the dispute of succession to the estate of GD. In

the said suit, CMA No. 20 of 2010 was fled under Order XXXIX Rules 1 and 2 Code of Civil Procedure, for temporary injunction. The

application was dismissed by detailed order dated 28th July, 2011. In the said application, all the issues raised by the UD Group were examined

prima facie, including validity of succession certificate dated 19th February, 2009. The Court on considering the rival submissions held:

In such condition seeing the said entire facts and circumstances and the documents submitted no prima facie case is made out by the applicants for

stopping the implementation of the order dated 19.02.2009 passed in S.A. No. 134 of 1998 by the learned District Judge, Jaipur till the disposal

of the suit.

5. The CLB dismissed the appeals fled by the DR Group vide order dated 16th March, 2011. The Board framed following questions for

consideration:

(i) Whether order dated 19.02.2009 in Succession Case No. 134/98 is a nullity?

(ii) Whether a Will exists?

(iii) Whether the alleged Will dated 23.06.1996 is required to be proved or disprove?

(iv) Whether the probate proceedings in Case No. 32/2006 could be dismissed/disposed of on the basis of a settlement between the private

parties?

(v) Whether probate proceedings exist as on date?

(vi) Whether construction of the Will is required?

(vii) Whether bar of Section 370 of the Indian Succession Act operates in the facts and circumstances of this case?

(viii) Whether Sections 373, 381, 383 and other provisions of the Indian Succession Act are applicable in the facts and circumstances of this case?

(ix) Whether Late Maharaj Jagat Singh was adopted?

(x) Who really are the legal representatives for the shares held in the sole name of the deceased?

6. To decide the above questions, following issues were framed:

(i) Whether these petitions involve disputed and complicated questions of law and facts regarding entitlement to the estate of late Maharaj Jagat

Singh?

(ii) If these petitions involve complicated questions of law and facts, whether these are maintainable before the CLB? To be precise, whether the

CLB has jurisdiction in this matter or it is ousted on account of the competent court i.e. Civil Court having jurisdiction in this matter.

(iii) In case, the CLB exercising its discretion proceeds to decide the entitlement to shareholding attracting the provisions of Sub-section (7) of

Section 111, is the CLB competent to decide whether the alleged Will is proved or disproved? And as well as other questions enumerated in para

51 above.

(iv) Further, can be CLB ignore that in view of the stay order of the High Court the order dated 19.02.2009 in Case No. 134/98 on which issuing

of Succession Certificate is based and Succession Certificate is the basis for the Petitioners in C.P. Nos. 13 to 16 to claim transmission of shares,

is a nullity, is it ab initio void in law, is it without jurisdiction, is it a merely nullity, it is not necessary for anybody who objects to that order, to apply

to set it aside, he can only rely on its invalidity when it is set up against him, although he has not taken steps to set it aside, such order cannot give

rise to any right whatever not even to a right to appeal, it can give rise to no rights and impose no obligations, the same can be ignored as nullity,

that is, non-existent in the eye of law and it is not necessary to set it aside?

(v) Whether the order dated 19.02.2009 is unenforceable due to the bar of Section 370 of the Indian Succession Act, 1925 for granting

Succession Certificate in the presence of the Will?

(vi) Can in view of Section 381 of the Succession Act, the Succession Certificate granted jointly in the name of the Rajmata and two grand

children be operative after the demise of the Rajmata?

(vii) Can the probate proceedings in case No. 327/06 be dismissed on the basis of a settlement between private parties?

(viii) Can probate proceedings decide entitlement?

(ix) Whether the CLB shall proceed to decide whether in the face of the alleged Will disinheriting Devraj & Lalitya, Late Rajmata can directly or

indirectly still make them entitle to the estate of Late Maharaj Jagat Singh?

(x) Whether in the presence of the alleged Will disinheriting Devraj & Lalitya, the estate of Late Maharaj Jagat Singh devolve upon Rajkumari

Urvashi, Maharaj Prithviraj Singh, Maharaj Jai Singh and Maharaja Bhawani Singh whose case is based on adoption of Late Maharaj Jagat

Singh?

(xi) Whether the CLB can decide these questions in a summary jurisdiction is the main issue to be considered in this matter?

7. It was held that the Board could not decide the complexity of facts and law which had arisen and such questions could be decided before the

Civil Court and not before the CLB. In this view of the matter, the matter was not gone into on merits. The concluding part of the order is as

follows:

67. Having carefully considered the facts of the present case and the nature of the allegations made by the parties as mentioned above and applying

the ratio of the decisions mentioned above, I am of the view that such disputed and complicated questions of law and facts cannot be decided by

the CLB in the summary jurisdiction Under Section 111 of the Act. Such questions which are involved in the present case can be decided before

the Civil Court on the basis of the oral and documentary evidence adduced by the parties in support of their respective cases. The CLB is not the

forum to adjudicate on these complicated questions of law and facts. The issue "whether the application is not maintainable on account of its

involving complicated questions of title" it is not necessary to decide the other issues raised in the case....

8. DR Group moved the High Court of Delhi Under Section 10F of the Companies Act. UD Group also fled appeals before the High Court. The

High Court allowed the appeals of DR Group and dismissed the appeal fled by the UD Group. The operative part of the order passed by the High

Court is as follows:

38. Having considered carefully, the facts of the present case and the nature of the allegations made by the Respondents, it is clear that the alleged

disputes raised by the Respondent group in so far as the rectification issue is concerned are all illusory. Admittedly these shares were in the name

of Jagat Singh who had bequeathed them to his mother Maharani Gayatri Devi and she in terms of a settlement arrived at between her

grandchildren followed by her Will had bequeathed the said share holding thereafter in favour of her grandchildren i.e. the Petitioner group. The

Respondents who were the cousins of Jagat Singh are not even claiming as legal heirs of Jagat Singh but only in their capacity of his legal

representatives; these allegations do not in any manner affect the title of the shareholding of Jagat Singh. There is no involvement of any fraud or

forgery. Petition Under Section 111 of the Companies Act was well maintainable.

39. The CLB returning a finding opposite has committed an illegality which is liable to be set aside. It is accordingly set aside. The order dated

16.3.2011 is set aside; the member register of the companies be rectified in the name of the Petitioner group and the Petitioners i.e. Dev Raj and

Lalitya Kumari be substituted in lieu of Jagat Singh.

40. As noted Supra, the appeals filed by the Respondent group are infructuous; they have supported the order of the CLB, their prayer in the

appeal that the shares register be rectified in their favour as necessarily to be dismissed as even as per their own statement, they do not have any

document to support their submission that they are entitled to the rectification of the member register qua these shares of Jagat Singh in their favour.

9. Thus, the High Court held that the succession certificate dated 19th February, 2009 issued by the competent court had to be taken as

conclusive evidence Under Section 381 of the Indian Succession Act. The plea that the succession certificate dated 19th February, 2009 was in

violation of stay order dated 20th August, 2008 was rejected. It was observed that stay order was passed at the instance of GD herself whose

statement itself was the basis of the order dated 19th February, 2009. Writ Petition No. 7524 of 2008 wherein order dated 20th August, 2008

was passed itself was got disposed of as infructuous on 18th January, 2011 in view of order dated 19th February, 2009. UD Group was in no

manner connected with those proceedings. As regards Suit filed by UD Group challenging order dated 19th February, 2009, interim application for

stay of order dated 19th February, 2009 was dismissed on 28th July, 2011. The Court had refused to grant any interim injunction in favour of UD

Group and other Plaintiffs. As regards disinheritance of DR Group in Will dated 23rd June, 1996, it was observed that the reason for disinheriting

as mentioned therein was not against the DR Group but only against the estranged wife of the testator. The GD who was the legatee herself

bequeathed her rights in favour of the DR Group by duly signing the transfer deeds and communicating the same to the Board of Directors. She

also executed Will dated 10th May, 2009. Mere fact that the same had been challenged was no bar to the claim of the DR Group.

10. We have heard S/Shri H.P. Rawal, Sanjiv Sen, learned senior Counsel for the Companies, Shri Vikas Singh, learned senior Counsel for the

UD Group and Shri C.A. Sundaram, learned senior Counsel for the DR Group and perused the records.

11. Contention raised on behalf of the Appellants mainly is that jurisdiction Under Section 111 of the Companies Act is summary in nature and

complicated questions of title cannot be adjudicated upon in the said jurisdiction. Reliance has also been placed on M/S. Ammonia Supplies

Corporation (P) Ltd. Vs. M/S. Modern Plastic Containers Pvt. Ltd. and Others, AIR 1998 SC 3153 : (1998) 94 CompCas 310 : (1998) 4

CompLJ 211 : (1999) 1 CTC 273 : (1998) 6 JT 116 : (1998) 5 SCALE 147 : (1998) 7 SCC 105 : (1998) 1 SCR 413 Supp : (1998) AIRSCW

3062 : (1998) 7 Supreme 191 , Standard Chartered Bank Vs. Andhra Bank Financial Services Ltd. and Others, AIR 2006 SC 3626 : (2006) 5

SCALE 384 : (2006) 6 SCC 94 : (2006) 68 SCL 109 : (2006) 3 SCR 1 Supp : (2006) AIRSCW 3460 : (2006) 4 Supreme 238 , Luxmi Tea

Company Limited Vs. Pradip Kumar Sarkar, (1990) 67 CompCas 518 : (1989) 3 CompLJ 285 : (1989) 4 JT 350 : (1989) 2 SCALE 1035 :

(1989) 2 SCC 656 Supp : (1989) 2 SCR 82 Supp and Bajaj Auto Ltd. Vs. N.K. Firodia and Another etc., AIR 1971 SC 321 : (1971) 41

CompCas 1 : (1970) 2 SCC 550 : (1971) 2 SCR 40 . Further submission is that succession certificate was void on account of interim order

passed by the High Court dated 20th August, 2008. Reliance has been placed on Mulraj Vs. Murti Raghonathji Maharaj, AIR 1967 SC 1386 :

(1967) 3 SCR 84 , Manohar Lal (D) by Lrs. Vs. Ugrasen (D) by Lrs. and Others, (2010) 6 JT 41 : (2010) 6 SCALE 151 : (2010) 11 SCC 557

: (2010) AIRSCW 6282 : (2010) AIRSCW 6821 : (2011) AIRSCW 2158 , Ajudh Raj and others Vs. Moti, AIR 1991 SC 1600 : (1991) 2 JT

591 : (1991) 1 SCALE 896 : (1991) 3 SCC 136 : (1991) 2 SCR 690 : (1991) 2 UJ 443 and Chiranjilal Shrilal Goenka (Deceased) through Lrs.

Vs. Jasjit Singh and Others, (1993) 2 JT 341 : (1993) 2 SCALE 146 : (1993) 2 SCC 507 : (1993) 2 SCR 454 .

12. It was also submitted that DR Group could not inherit the rights of LMJS in view of the language of the Will dated 23rd June, 1996 and also

on the ground that the Will executed by GD was under challenge. In absence of the said Will, DR Group could not acquire any rights as UD

Group was entitled to inherit the estate of GD.

13. Per contra, Shri Sundaram supported the view taken by the High Court. His submission is that there is no real dispute. The succession

certificate in favour of DR Group has to be acted upon especially when in the suit filed by the UD Group, interim order has been declined and it has

been found that there was no prima facie case in challenge to the said certificate. Pendency of suit without there being any interim order in favour of

the UD Group in respect of succession to the estate of the GD was of no consequence. The scope of power Under Section 111(7) of the

Companies Act included jurisdiction to decide a question of title. Apart from succession certificate and the Will, GD had executed transfer deed

and communicated the same to the Board of Directors. In the face of her statement in proceedings for succession certificate followed by transfer

deed, no dispute whatsoever, remained as to the rights of DR Group to have the shares transferred in their favour. The Board of Directors was

dominated by the UD Group who abused its position to deprive DR Group of their rights. The CLB failed to appreciate the scope of its

jurisdiction as well as the scope of controversy between the parties. The High Court rightly allowed their appeal. Apart from relying upon the

judgment in *Ammonia* (supra), reliance was also placed on judgment of Calcutta High Court by Ruma Pal, J. (as she then was) in *Nupur Mitra v.*

*Basubani Pvt. Ltd.* 1999 (2) Calcutta Law Times 264.

14. We have given due consideration to the rival submissions. The main question for consideration is whether there is any real dispute between the

parties about the entitlement of DR Group to have the shares transferred in their favour and whether the exercise of jurisdiction by the High Court

is beyond the scope of Section 111 of the Companies Act.

15. We are of the opinion that there is no real dispute between the parties as held by the High Court. DR Group has furnished the succession

certificate as well as the transfer deed executed by GD in their favour. The same had to be acted upon. Moreover, the civil court in interim

application moved by the UD Group held that the UD Group had no prima facie case. The said order was required to be acted upon subject to

any further order that may be passed in any pending proceedings between the parties. There is no conflicting order of any court or authority. There

is thus, no complicated question of title. Moreover, there is no bar to adjudication for purposes of transfer of shares unless the court finds

otherwise. The stay order obtained by GD herself could not debar her from making a statement to settle the matter. The judgments relied upon by

the Appellants have no application to such a fact situation.

16. In Ammonia (supra), the scope of jurisdiction of the Company Court to deal with an issue of rectification in the Register of Members

maintained by the Company was considered. The Public Passenger Service Limited Vs. M.A. Khader and Others, AIR 1966 SC 489 : (1966) 36

CompCas 1 : (1966) 1 SCR 683 , it was held that jurisdiction Under Section 155 was summary in nature. If for reasons of complexity or

otherwise, the matter could be more conveniently decided in a suit, the Court may relegate the parties to such remedy. Subject to the said

limitation, jurisdiction to deal with such matter is exclusively with the Company Court. It was observed:

31....It cannot be doubted that in spite of exclusiveness to decide all matters pertaining to the rectification it has to act within the said four corners

and adjudication of such matters cannot be doubted to be summary in nature. So, whenever a question is raised the court has to adjudicate on the

facts and circumstances of each case. If it truly is rectification, all matters raised in that connection should be decided by the court Under Section

155 and if it finds adjudication of any matter not falling under it, it may direct a party to get his right adjudicated by a civil court. Unless jurisdiction

is expressly or implicitly barred under a statute, for violation or redress of any such right the civil court would have jurisdiction....

17. Thus, there is a thin line in appreciating the scope of jurisdiction of the Company Court/Company Law Board. The jurisdiction is exclusive if

the matter truly relates to rectification but if the issue is alien to rectification, such matter may not be within the exclusive jurisdiction of the

Company Court/Company Law Board.

18. In Standard Chartered Bank (supra), scope of Section 111(7) was considered. It was observed that jurisdiction being summary in nature, a

seriously disputed question of title could be left to be decided by the civil court. It was observed:

29.....The nature of proceedings Under Section 111 are slightly different from a title suit, although, Sub-section (7) of Section 111 gives to the

Tribunal the jurisdiction to decide any question relating to the title of any person who is a party to the application, to have his name entered in or

omitted from the register and also the general jurisdiction to decide any question which it is necessary or expedient to decide in connection with

such an application. It has been held in Ammonia Supplies Corpn. (P) Ltd. v. Modern Plastic Containers (P) Ltd. that the jurisdiction exercised by

the Company Court Under Section 155 of the Companies Act, 1956 (corresponding to Section 111 of the present Act, before its amendment by

Act 31 of 1988) was somewhat summary in nature and that if a seriously disputed question of title arose, the Company Court should relegate the



parties to a suit, which was the more appropriate remedy for investigation and adjudication of such seriously disputed question of title.

19. In Luxmi Tea Company Limited and Bajaj Auto Ltd. (supra), it was observed that a company did not have any discretion in rectifying its

register except to require the procedure being followed.

20. In the present case, as already observed, there is no real dispute between the parties. The DR Group followed the due procedure. It had the

succession certificate in its favour apart from the transfer deed from GD, who admittedly inherited rights from LMJS. Will in favour of GD is

beyond any dispute. Thus, the DR Group derived rights from the GD by documents executed by her in her lifetime and conveyed to the Company.

Even if the Will of GD is not taken into account, for purposes of issue of rectification, the documents executed by GD clearly entitled the DR

Group to have the rectification made.

21. The decisions in Mulraj, Manohar Lal, Ajudh Raj and Chiranjilal Shrilal Goenka (supra) are of no relevance to a situation where the

beneficiary of the interim order itself opts to proceed with the matter in respect of which stay is granted by higher Court. In the present case, GD

having settled the matter and having herself sought rectification, the interim order granted at her instance could be no bar against the DR Group.

The decisions sought are thus, of no relevance to such a situation.

22. We sum up our conclusions as follows:

(i) LMJS executed will in favour of his mother-GD which is not in dispute;

(ii) GD and DR jointly obtained succession certificate;

(iii) GD signed the transfer deeds and communicated the same to the Board of Directors; and

(iv) The civil court vide order dated 28th July, 1991 declined to grant temporary injunction finding no prima facie case against the succession

certificate.

23. In above circumstances, even in summary jurisdiction, the CLB had no justification to reject the claim of the DR Group. The High Court rightly

reversed the said order.

24. In view of the above, we find no merit in these appeals. The same are dismissed with costs quantified at Rs. 5 lakhs in each of the appeals.