VOLUME 7 | ISSUE 2

INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF ADVANCED LEGAL RESEARCH

CORPORATE PERSONALITY AND THE LIFTING OF THE CORPORATE VEIL IN INDIA

- Akshat Mishra[1] & Priyanka Gehlot

ABSTRACT

The concept of corporate personality that confers artificial legal personality to the incorporated entity which is distinct from its members is the very basis of contemporary company law. This doctrine was originally laid out in case of Salomon v. Salomon & Co. Ltd. It confers the advantages of limited liability and perpetual succession, facilitating capital building and entrepreneurial endeavours. However, if this corporate facade is misused in the perpetration of fraud, tax evasion, statutory and public policy circumvention, then the courts step in and 'pierce' / 'lift' the corporate veil to reveal the human personalities behind. This paper seeks to present a comprehensive jurisprudential and statutory inquiry into the concept of corporate personality and lifting of the corporate veil in the Indian legal ecosystem. The paper does a comprehensive analysis of the important legislations and provisions of Companies Act, 2013 and important judicial precedents of India, ranging from State of U.P. v. Renusagar Power Co. to Vodafone International Holdings B.V. v. Union of India. It offers critical analysis into theever-changing judicial approach. Further, it explores the contemporary challenges of complex group companies' structures, economic offences and environmental liabilities. It offers an understanding of how corporate autonomy can be reconciled with the broader socio-economic responsibilities imposed upon corporate entities.

Keywords: *Corporate Personality, Lifting Corporate Veil, Companies Act 2013, Salomon Doctrine, Group Companies, Judicial Dynamism, Fraud & Economic Offences.*

1. INTRODUCTION AND HISTORICAL GENESIS

[1]Student at Jagannath University, Jaipur

© 2026 International Journal of Advanced Legal Research

The conceptual foundation of modern corporate law rests upon the legal fiction of corporate personality, in many respects. The historic recognition of corporate personality reshaped international commerce by allowing entrepreneurs to pool risk capital without exposing their personal assets to total financial ruin. In absence of separate legal personality, large-scale industrialization and modern enterprise structures would be basically impossible, as person investors would be hesitant to commit capital if faced with unlimited personal blame for corporate obligations. The legal persona functions as a protective shield, separating the commercial commitments of the business from the private patrimony of those who invest in or manage the enterprise. This structural independence is encouraging venture innovation, structural scalability, and institutional capital accumulation across the global financial markets. A company, once validly included under law, comes into the existence as an autonomous legal element, a persona ficta and distinct from the people who compose its membership, direct its approach, or capitalize. This foundational tenet grants the incorporated entity distinct rights, obligations, liability boundaries, and perpetual succession.

The jurisprudential bedrock of this legal fiction was finally laid down by the House of Lords in the historic case of *Salomon v. Salomon & Co, in actual application. Ltd.*[2]In this decision, Lord Macnaghten famously gathered that 'the company is at law a different person altogether from the subscribers to the memo. And, though it may be that after incorporation the business is precisely the same as it was before, and the same persons are managers, and the same hands receive the profits, the company isn't in law the agent of the subscribers or trustee for them, on the whole. Nor are the subscribers as members liable, in any shape or form, except to the extent and in the manner provided by the Act.' Aron Salomon, a sole trader manufacturing leather boots, converted his proprietary business into a limited company, and then for the business, 20,000 shares of £1 each were taken by Salomon and debentures worth £10,000 secured by a charge over the company's assets. Six members of his family were issued one share each to meet the statutory need of seven members, under the UK Companies Act, 1862. Reversing the Court of Appeal, the House of Lords held that once the company is legitimately included, it autonomously exists separate from its incorporators, and Salomon's secured debentures prioritized over broad unsecured debts. This decision firmly cemented the rule that ownership and management don't merge the legal personality of the company into its constituent members. When the company later faced financial collapse and entered

[2]Salomon v. A. Salomon & Co. Ltd. [1897] AC 22 (HL).

© 2026 International Journal of Advanced Legal Research

liquidation, the unsecured liquidator argued the company was a mere sham and alias for Salomon, claiming that Salomon should indemnify the company's creditors.

In India, this belief system was embraced well before independence and later tied into the statutory architecture of Indian company law, in real-world scenarios. In fact, the Salomon doctrine was firmly employed by Early Indian judicial decisions. In *Re Kondoli Tea Co. Ltd.*[3], eight people owned a tea estate and transferred it to a limited company included, under the Indian Companies Act, in the main. They claimed exemption from ad valorem conveyance duty on the ground that the transaction was only a transfer of characteristic to themselves, under a diverse commercial title. This contention was firmly rejected by the Calcutta High Court, holding that the company was in law a wholly separate body from its shareholders. What's more, the transfer of feature to the company made up a sale subject to full stamp duty. This ruling pointed out that incorporation creates a genuine legal break between property owners and the corporate item, creating a distinct legal title holder noticed, under the statutory property laws.

The tenet was later restated in post-independence constitutional and corporate jurisprudence. In *Heavy Engineering Mazdoor Union v. State of Bihar*[4], the Supreme Court of India investigated whether a government company included, under the Companies Act could be treated as a starting carried on by or under the authority of the Central Government, at least empirically. The Supreme Court held that a government company keeps an independent corporate persona distinct from the state, even, broadly speaking, and yet, the entire share capital is typically held by the President of India and thorough managerial control is mainly exercised by the Central Government. Along the same lines, in *Tata Engineering and Locomotive Co. Ltd. v. State of Bihar,*[5], the Supreme Court stressed that even where all or greatly all shares are normally held by statutory bodies or state organs, the corporate personality remains intact and can't be disregarded at the whim of the shareholders. The Supreme Court ruled that shareholders, even if they're corporate bodies or state authorities, can't claim essential rights under Article 19 on behalf of the corporate item, thereby upholding a strict legal dichotomy between the company and its constituent equity holders.

[3]Re Kondoli Tea Co. Ltd. (1886) ILR 13 Cal 43.
[4]Heavy Engineering Mazdoor Union v. State of Bihar (1969) 1 SCC 765.
[5]Tata Engineering and Locomotive Co. Ltd. v. State of Bihar, AIR 1965 SC 40.

© 2026 International Journal of Advanced Legal Research

But still, corporate personality is a privilege created by law for legitimate commercial purposes, to a significant degree. The doctrine of 'lifting' or 'piercing' the corporate veil so is emerging as an essential fair counterweight, which is making sure that corporate form doesn't become a shield for economic wrongdoing, statutory evasion, or fraudulent conduct, at least in principle. Down the road, courts and legislatures have devised structured exceptions to prevent the Salomon doctrine from being converted into an instrument of injustice, creating a complex balance between corporate autonomy and responsibility. Avoid tax liabilities, break statutory commands, escape contractual burdens, or defeat public interest, law and equity demand that the artificial veil be lifted, when this corporate legal form is abused to carry out fraud.

2. THE DOCTRINE OF SEPARATE LEGAL ENTITY AND ITS JURISPRUDENTIAL THEORIES

To understand the theoretical foundations of lifting the corporate veil, one must examine the jurisprudential theories regulating corporate personality. Legal thinkers and jurists have long debated the nature of corporate elements, making several prominent legal doctrines that try to explain why law spots artificial bodies as rights-bearing legal subjects:

a) **The Fiction Theory (Savigny, Salmond):** Advanced by jurists like Friedrich Carl von Savigny and Sir John Salmond, this theory is claiming that a corporation really exists, in many respects. Its personality is a pure legal creation created by sovereign fiction for commercial convenience,[6] at least for now. As, the element exists only in contemplation of law, its capacity is rigorously restricted to the rights granted by state enactment. Under this view, because the corporate mind is an artificial build, any illegal or *ultra vires* acts committed in its name must finally be credited to human actors, directly founding for piercing the veil whenever the fiction is misused for unlawful or inequitable ends.

b) **The Concession Theory:** Closely lined up with fiction theory, the concession doctrine is holding that corporate legal standing is a concession granted solely by sovereign authority.[7] Because, incorporation is a state-granted privilege, the basic authority is kept by the state to look behind the corporate front whenever the privilege is usually abused

[6]Friedrich Carl von Savigny, System of Modern Roman Law (Vol 2, 1840); Sir John Salmond, Jurisprudence (12th edn, Sweet & Maxwell 1966).
[7]Sir Frederick Pollock, Jurisprudence and Legal Essays (Macmillan 1961).

© 2026 International Journal of Advanced Legal Research

against public interest, state revenue, or statutory policy, in the main. The grant of separate legal personality is currently conditional upon compliance with the laws of the realm. Indeed, without statutory registration, collective legal personality canbe claimed by no group of people.

c) **The Realist Theory (Otto von Gierke):** Countering the fiction theory, German jurist Otto von Gierke posited that a corporation is an organic legal reality, a socio-psychological item with a collective willpower separate from its person members,[8] in many respects. Under the realist view, the company isn't a fiction but a real element having an autonomous mind and capability. This theory is often supporting holding the corporation directly liable for torts and corporate crimes, through the 'alter ego' or 'directing mind' belief system, knowing that corporate decision-making represents collective enterprise willpower, at least empirically.

d) **The Bracket Theory (Ihering):** Formulated by Rudolf von Ihering, the bracket theory indicates corporate personality is only a convenient administrative bracket put around a collection of people for legal convenience,[9] to a significant degree. The true subjects of rights and duties are, more precisely, the natural persons inside the bracket, at least empirically. Lifting the veil, under this theory, is simply removing or looking inside the bracket to see the human beings who are the true beneficiaries and controllers behind corporate transactions.

A practical combination of the Fiction and Bracket theories is mostly employed by courts in the Indian legal framework, in actual application. Indeed, in the landmark decision of *Bacha F. Guzdar v. Commissioner of Income Tax*,[10] the Supreme Court of India exactly enforced the difference between a company and its shareholders, in actual application. The Court ruled that a shareholder receiving dividends from an agricultural company doesn't obtain agricultural income directly, because the agricultural income belongs to the autonomous corporate item, not the person shareholder. The Supreme Court clarified that a shareholder's rights arise from their membership in the company and the provisions of its Articles of

[8]Otto von Gierke, Political Theories of the Middle Age (FW Maitland tr, Cambridge University Press 1900).
[9]Rudolf von Ihering, Geist des römischenRechts (Vol 3, 1865).
[10]Bacha F. Guzdar v. Commissioner of Income Tax, AIR 1955 SC 08.

© 2026 International Journal of Advanced Legal Research

Association, including the entitlement to receive dividends. However, such rights do not confer direct ownership over the assets held by the company.

3. STATUTORY PROVISIONS FOR LIFTING THE CORPORATE VEIL UNDER THE COMPANIES ACT, 2013

Even as the judiciary devised fair rules to pierce the veil, the Indian Parliament codified particular statutory circumstances where the corporate veil is clearly lifted to force direct personal blame on directors, officers, or members. The Companies Act, 2013 includes solid statutory processes designed to discourage corporate abuse, fraud, and non-compliance:

3.1 Fraudulent Conduct of Business and Trading (Section 339)

Section 339 of the Companies Act, 2013[11], empowers the National Company Law Tribunal (NCLT), during winding-up proceedings, to impose personal liability upon individuals who were knowingly involved in conducting the company's business with fraudulent intent or for an unlawful purpose. Where such circumstances are established, the Tribunal may direct those individuals to bear responsibility for the whole or any part of the company's debts and liabilities, notwithstanding the protection ordinarily afforded by the corporate structure. This section acts as a powerful statutory piercer of the corporate veil, completely stripping perpetrators of restricted liability protection and making directors personally responsible for company obligations, in real-world scenarios.

3.2 Misstatements in Prospectus and Fraudulent Inducement (Sections 34 & 35)

Where a prospectus issued by a company contains untrue or misleading statements that induce members of the public to subscribe for securities, Section 34 imposes criminal liability under Section 447, while Section 35 imposes joint and several civil liability on directors, promoters, and experts without benefit of the corporate shield.[12] As, well, the law is ensuring that people who misrepresent facts to public investors can’t hide behind the corporate body that issued the prospectus, at least empirically.

3.3 Failure to Refund Application Money (Section 39)

The company must, more accurately, refund all application moneys received, if the minimum subscription amount stipulated in the prospectus isn’t received within the statutory period

[11]Companies Act, 2013, § 339 (Act No. 18 of 2013, India).
[12]Companies Act, 2013, § 34 & 35 (Act No. 18 of 2013, India).

© 2026 International Journal of Advanced Legal Research

probably, at least in principle. Corporate immunity is directly penetrated by the law to guard investor capital from managerial default, on the whole. Under Section 39(4), failure to repay this money, within the recommended timelines renders the directors of the company personally liable to repay that money with statutory interest.[13]

3.4 Fraudulent Application for Removal of Name (Section 251)

Where an application is currently made for removing the name of a company from the register of companies, under Section 248 with the intention of dodging responsibilities or defrauding creditors, Section 251 is offering that the directors who employed shall be personally liable for all obligations racked up by the company, in addition to facing criminal prosecution under Section 447,[14] at least empirically.

3.5 Beneficial Ownership Reporting and Disclosure (Sections 89 & 90)

Sections 89 and 90 of the Companies Act, 2013 introduce strict statutory commands needing people holding 'Significant Beneficial Ownership' (SBO) to declare their interest,[15] broadly speaking. How about this, the statutory piercing forces corporate structures to expose ultimate natural beneficiaries holding 10% or more of shares or exercising noticeable affect, thereby curbing money laundering, tax evasion, shell enterprise creation, and illicit cross-border holding patterns, at least for now.

4. JUDICIAL GROUNDS FOR PIERCING THE CORPORATE VEIL IN INDIA

Beyond statutory commands, Indian courts have exercised built-in fair power to disregard the corporate item in broad administrative, commercial, tax, and socio-economic situations. Under several well-established legal doctrines, the judicial grounds for piercing the corporate veil in India can be classified:

4.1 Fraud, Improper Conduct, and Sham Companies

Corporate personality will, in practice, consistently be disregarded by courts when an entity is formed as a mere sham, cloak, or puppet to commit fraud, perpetrate dishonest acts, or evade existing contractual obligations, all things considered. In fact, in the classic English authority

[13]Companies Act, 2013, § 39(4) (Act No. 18 of 2013, India).
[14]Companies Act, 2013, § 251 & 447 (Act No. 18 of 2013, India).
[15]Companies Act, 2013, § 89 & 90 (Act No. 18 of 2013, India).

© 2026 International Journal of Advanced Legal Research

Gilford Motor Co. Ltd. v. Horne,[16]an employee bound by a restrictive non-compete obligation incorporated a private entity to approach and obtain business from clients of his previous employer. The Court of Appeal granted injunctive relief against both the individual and the newly established company, observing that the latter had been constituted merely as a mechanism to conceal Mr. E.B. Horne's actual business activities. Indian courts firmly follow this doctrine, refusing to permit incorporation to defeat valid contractual covenants.

4.2 Evasion of Taxes and Revenue Protection

The Supreme Court of India has repeatedly confirmed the corporate form can't be employed as a device for tax avoidance or revenue evasion, in actual application. Indeed, in *Sir Dinshaw Maneckjee Petit*,[17] the assessee was a wealthy person who earned huge dividend and interest income, to a significant degree. What he created was four private investment companies, transferred his investments to them, and received back the income in the form of pretended loans. And thus, the Bombay High Court pierced the corporate veil, holding that the four companies were mere small bodies created solely to decrease tax liability. As, well, that the income belonged directly to Sir Dinshaw.

Along the same lines, in *Commissioner of Income Tax v. Sri Meenakshi Mills Ltd.*,[18]recognised that the corporate veil may be disregarded where the corporate structure is being used as an instrument to conceal the true nature of transactions and circumvent tax liabilities. In such circumstances, courts may examine the underlying commercial reality rather than confining themselves to the separate legal identity of the entities involved. The Court established the statutory difference between a company and its shareholders can't be used to defeat tax statutes, in real-world scenarios.

Evasion of Welfare Legislation and Employee Rights

In *Workman Employed in Associated Rubber Industry Ltd. v. Associated Rubber Industry Ltd.*,[19] the Supreme Court tackled corporate structures designed to lower statutory obligations toward the employees, in many respects. a company established a wholly-owned subsidiary and transferred its investment shares to that entity. This arrangement had the effect of

[16]Gilford Motor Co. Ltd. v. Horne [1933] Ch 935 (CA).
[17]Re Sir Dinshaw Maneckjee Petit, AIR 1927 Bom 371.
[18]Commissioner of Income Tax v. Sri Meenakshi Mills Ltd., AIR 1967 SC 819.
[19]Workman Employed in Associated Rubber Industry Ltd. v. Associated Rubber Industry Ltd., (1985) 4 SCC 114.

© 2026 International Journal of Advanced Legal Research

diverting dividend income, artificially reducing the profits reflected by the parent company and consequently lowering the amount of statutory bonus payable to its workmen under the Payment of Bonus Act, 1965. The Apex Court lifted the veil, merged the accounts of the parent and subsidiary, and held that social welfare legislation can't be weakened, through the manipulative corporate restructuring.

4.4 Assessment of Enemy Character

Corporate identity will (to some degree) maybe be disregarded by courts to inspect the control and nationality of the people directing the corporate mind during the times of war or national emergency, all things considered, and drawing from the historic decision in *Daimler Co. Ltd. v. Continental Tyre and Rubber Co. (Great Britain) Ltd.*,[20] Indian courts know that where corporate management is mainly controlled by enemy aliens, the company postulates enemy character regardless of its domestic place of incorporation.

4.5 Public Interest and National Policy

In *State of Rajasthan v. Gotan Lime Stone Khanij Udyog (P) Ltd.*,[21]likely, the Supreme Court held that where corporate arrangement is controlled to transfer useful state-granted mining leases to third parties without paying statutory fees, the court will lift the corporate veil to prevent public asset plunder and uphold regulatory integrity, at least for now. Indian jurisprudence strongly is claiming that corporate autonomy must produce to huge public interest, to a significant degree.

5 GROUP ENTERPRISE THEORY AND THE MODERN JUDICIAL APPROACH

One of the most complicated arenas of contemporary corporate law entails multi-tiered group enterprises, holding-subsidiary networks, and multinational corporate structures, at least for now, and yet, viewing group companies as an individual economic unit are often needed by modern commercial reality, at least in principle. Traditional belief system treats each subsidiary as a separate legal item.

5.1 The Renusagar Doctrine - Economic Reality Test

[20]Daimler Co. Ltd. v. Continental Tyre and Rubber Co. (Great Britain) Ltd. [1916] 2 AC 307 (HL).
[21]State of Rajasthan v. Gotan Lime Stone Khanij Udyog (P) Ltd., (2016) 4 SCC 469.

© 2026 International Journal of Advanced Legal Research

The landmark decision of the Supreme Court in *State of U.P. v. Renusagar Power Co.,*[22] marked a major evolution in Indian corporate law, broadly speaking, and Hindalco established a wholly-owned subsidiary, Renusagar Power Co., to electrify only for Hindalco's aluminum manufacturing plant, on the whole. When the state government sought to charge higher electricity duty treating Renusagar as an autonomous seller, the Supreme Court employed the 'individual economic element' belief system. The Court held that Renusagar and Hindalco were key components of a individual business, lifting the veil to grant statutory duty exemption.

5.2 The Vodafone Judgment, such as Restating the Salomon Baseline

In *Vodafone International Holdings B.V. v. Union of India, (2012) 6 SCC 1,*[23] the Supreme Court detailed the veil-piercing framework, within the cross-border holding arrangements. The tax authorities tried to tax an offshore transaction entailing the acquisition of a Cayman Islands holding company sharing in an Indian telecom operator, in real-world scenarios. Sure enough, the Supreme Court held that corporate structures established for legitimate business operations and investment holding can't be routinely disregarded, at least empirically.

The Supreme Court established the 'look at' tenet, including courts must look at the transaction as a whole rather than 'looking through' corporate structures, unless the architecture is shown to be a fake tax-avoidance device, sham, or colorable method, in actual application. Certainty was restored to foreign investments by the Vodafone decision while explaining that veil piercing needs concrete indication of fraud or trick, all things considered.

5.3 Environmental and Tortious Liabilities

Indian courts have fearlessly pierced the corporate veil to enforce absolute blame in cases including severe environmental getting worse and industrial disasters. Following the Bhopal Gas Leak Incident (*Union Carbide Corp. v. Union of India*[24]) and the oleum gas leak case (*M.C. Mehta v. Union of India*[25]), the judiciary established parent multinational items can't shield themselves from environmental disasters caused by domestic smallers.

6. COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS AND CONTEMPORARY CHALLENGES

[22]State of U.P. v. Renusagar Power Co., (1988) 4 SCC 59.
[23]Vodafone International Holdings B.V. v. Union of India, (2012) 6 SCC 1.
[24]Union Carbide Corporation v. Union of India, (1991) 4 SCC 584.
[25]M.C. Mehta v. Union of India (Oleum Gas Leak Case), AIR 1987 SC 1086.

© 2026 International Journal of Advanced Legal Research

The Indian framework for lifting the corporate veil dynamically interacts when checked with Anglo-American legal systems. Recent Supreme Court decisions such as *Prest v. Petrodel Resources Ltd* in the United Kingdom, in real-world scenarios[26] have narrowed judicial judgment, distinguishing between 'concealment' (where the veil is hiding facts) and 'evasion' (where the corporate form is normally employed to avoid an existing legal obligation). UK courts now treat veil piercing as an absolute fix of last resort.

Or better yet than that, a broader, socio-economic strategy is being sustained by Indian jurisprudence, at least for now. In fact, indian courts don't hesitate to lift the veil where public interest, labor rights, statutory evasion, or revenue protection are generally impacted. Even as this flexible method is ensuring justice in person cases, it occasionally introduces uncertainty into the commercial transactions.

Contemporary obstacles in India further complicate this world:

i. **Insolvency and Bankruptcy Code (IBC), 2016:** Under the IBC, complex cross-border group insolvencies are often faced by resolution professionals and tribunals. Section 66 of IBC imposes tough personal responsibility on directors for dishonest or wrongful trading[27], needing tribunals to pierce corporate veils to recover assets.

ii. **FinTech and Shell Companies:** The increase of digital shell companies and complex algorithmic holding patterns provides operational roadblocks for law enforcement agencies, strengthening the vital for solid SBO reporting under Section 90.

7. CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The doctrine of corporate personality and the fair solve of lifting the corporate veil represent two fundamental sides of modern corporate jurisprudence. Indeed, the autonomous legal persona established in Salomon is remaining a vital statutory guarantee driving capital investments, risk enterprise, and economic growth, broadly speaking. But still, this legal persona isn't an absolute cloak behind which illegality, tax evasion, fraud, or social injustice can (in actual operation) hide.

A mature balance between protecting corporate sanctity and preventing corporate abuse is shown by the evolution of Indian law, at least empirically. Statutory enactments in the

[26] Prest v. Petrodel Resources Ltd. [2013] UKSC 34, [2013] 2 AC 415.

[27] Insolvency and Bankruptcy Code, 2016, § 66 (Act No. 31 of 2016, India).

© 2026 International Journal of Advanced Legal Research

Companies Act, 2013, combined with judicial dynamism from Renusagar to Vodafone and Gotan Lime Stone, are showing that Indian courts judge corporate entities based on economic reality and ethical compliance, in the main.

To encourage commercial predictability while preserving legal integrity, the paper recommends:

a) **Legislative Guidelines for Group Insolvency:** Formulating clear statutory frameworks under the IBC for group insolvency proceedings, setting codifying measures for substantive consolidation of parent-subsidiary assets, at least in practice.
b) **Judicial Restraint and Standardized Tests -** Employing structured tests matched up with international standards to distinguish legitimate tax planning and structuring from fake shams. This is making sure investor confidence, all things considered.
c) **Enhanced Digital Transparency**, including Strengthening real-time AI-driven monitoring of Ultimate Beneficial Ownership (UBO) registries, under Section 90 to prevent misuse of corporate entities before fraud arises.

© 2026 International Journal of Advanced Legal Research