

WEEKLY CORPORATE UPDATES

Saturday 29th October, 2022

(Curated & compiled by)

Team Indiacorp Law

Headed by: Adv. (CS) Alok Kumar Kuchhal, M. Com, LL.B., FCS, Insolvency Professional

Disclaimer:

Whilst we endeavour to ensure that the information in the newsletter is correct, we do not warrant or represent its completeness or accuracy.

The information contained in this newsletter is provided by M/s Indiacorp Law, Solicitors and Advocates as a service/promotion to its users, subscribers, customers and possible others. It does not contain (legal) advice. Although we try to provide quality information, we do not guarantee of results obtained from the use of this information, and without warranty of any kind, express or implied, including, but not limited to warranties of performance for a particular purpose.

In no way M/s Indiacorp Law, Solicitors and Advocates is liable to user or any other party for any damages, costs of any character including but not limited to direct or indirect, consequential, incidental or other costs or damages, via the use of the information contained in the newsletters

<u>Concerns:</u> M/s Indiacorp Law, Advocates & Solicitors, Noida & Jangpura Extension (New Delhi)



SEBI UPDATES

SEBI issues clarifications on Block Mechanism in demat account of clients undertaking sale transactions

Circular No.: SEBI/HO/MIRSD/DOP/P/CIR/2022/143 Dated: 27 October, 2022

SEBI, in exercise of powers conferred under Section 11(1) of the Securities and Exchange Board of India Act, 1992, and Section 19 of the Depositories Act, 1996 to protect the interests of investors in securities and in view of the representations received from Depositories and Custodians, clarified that the block mechanism shall not be applicable to clients having arrangements with custodians registered with SEBI for clearing and settlement of trades. It directed the Stock Exchanges and Depositories to:

- bring the provisions of this circular to the notice of their members / participants and also disseminate the same on their websites;
- make necessary amendments to the relevant Bye-laws, Rules and Regulations for the implementation of the above decision;
- communicate to SEBI, the status of the implementation of the provisions of this circular.

Related Link: https://www.sebi.gov.in/legal/circulars/oct-2022/block-mechanism-in-demat-account-of-clientsundertaking-sale-transactions-clarification 64384.html

SEBI reduces denomination for debt securities and non-convertible redeemable preference shares

Circular No.: SEBI/HO/DDHS/P/CIR/2022/00144 Dated: 28 October, 2022

SEBI, with an aim to enhance liquidity in the corporate bond market, notified amendments to chapter V (Denomination of issuance and trading of Non-convertible Securities) of the Operational Circular wherein it reduced the face value of debt security and non-convertible redeemable preference share issued on private placement basis to Rs 1 lakh from the current Rs 10 lakh.

The new guidelines will be applicable to all issues of debt securities and non-convertible redeemable preference shares on private placement basis through new ISINs, on or after January 1, 2023. However, with respect to shelf placement memorandum which is valid as on January 1, 2023, the issuer thereof will have the option while raising funds through tranche placement memorandum, to keep the face value at Rs 10 lakh or Rs 1 lakh.

Related Link: https://www.sebi.gov.in/legal/circulars/oct-2022/reduction-in-denomination-for-debt-securities-andnon-convertible-redeemable-preference-shares 64429.html

M/s Indiacorp Law, Advocates & Solicitors, Noida & Jangpura Extension (New Delhi)

Concerns:



RBI UPDATES

RBI announces rate of interest on Government of India Floating Rate Bond, 2034

Press Release: 2022-2023/1103 Dated: 28 October, 2022

The Reserve Bank of India (RBI) announces that the rate of interest on Government of India Floating Rate Bond, 2034 (GOI FRB 2034) applicable for the half year October 30, 2022 to April 29, 2023 shall be 7.69 percent per annum. This 231 basis point higher rate of interest shall be applicable for the half-year period from October 30, 2022 to April 29, 2023.

It further stated that FRB, 2034 will carry a coupon, which will have a base rate equivalent to the average of the Weighted Average Yield (WAY) of last 3 auctions of 182 Day T-Bills, plus a fixed spread (0.98%).

Related Link: <u>https://rbi.org.in/Scripts/BS_PressReleaseDisplay.aspx?prid=54601</u>

IBC & NCLT UPDATES

In the absence of any order from the Adjudicating Authority appointing a liquidator, the continuation of a Resolution Professional for a period beyond what was expressly approved by the COC is not in contravention of any provisions of IBC- NCLT Chandigarh bench Dated: 14th October, 2022

In the matter of **Mr. Sameer Rastogi erstwhile RP Tara Chand Rice Mills Pvt. Ltd. vs. Mr. Rakesh Ahuja Liquidator of M/s. Tara Chand Rice Mills Pvt. Ltd** [IA No.953/2020 In CP (IB) No.121/Chd/Hry/2017], the original CIRP of the Corporate Debtor i.e. Tara Chand Rice Mills Pvt. Ltd concluded on 11.09.2018 which was extended upto 10.12.2018 and accordingly, the CoC had approved the professional fees during the CIRP or any extension. However, for period from 11.12.2018 till 12.02.2019, the Resolution Professional (RP) had managed the affairs of corporate debtor without any approval of the CoC. Now the issue of the claim of fees of the RP was brough up wherein two issues were placed before the Hon'ble NCLT Chandigarh bench for adjudication, firstly that whether payment to the Resolution Professional for the period beyond what was expressly approved by the COC is maintainable; and secondly as to who will decide the fees, if any, due to the erstwhile Resolution Professional.

> <u>Concerns:</u> M/s Indiacorp Law, Advocates & Solicitors, Noida & Jangpura Extension (New Delhi)



Solicitors and Advocates

In the present case while adjudicating upon the said issues, the Hon'ble Chandigarh bench held that in the absence of any order from this Adjudicating Authority appointing a liquidator, the continuation of the RP is not in contravention of any provisions of IBC. Further, contention of the Respondent that no fees is payable for the extended period as the same was not ratified by the CoC was considered as untenable.

Related Link: https://ibbi.gov.in//uploads/order/2937014e95d5cd9bf379764eed54655b.pdf

Failure or breach of a P<mark>rofit Sha</mark>ring Agreement cannot be a ground to trigger CIRP – NCLAT N<mark>ew Delhi</mark> bench

Dated: 20th October, 2022

Aggrieved by an order dated 15.03.2022 passed by the Hon'ble NCLT Mumbai bench-IV wherein a section 9 application was admitted and CIRP was initiated against the Corporate Debtor i.e. ABMAY Health Ventures LLP, an appeal was filed before the Hon'ble NCLAT New Delhi bench in the matter of **Prashanth Shekara Shetty Vs. Alcuris Healthcare Pvt. Ltd**. [Company Appeal (AT) (Ins.) No. 359 of 2022]

In the present matter, an agreement was entered between Alcuris Healthcare Pvt. Ltd. and "ABMAY Health Ventures LLP", (the Corporate Debtor) creating a joint venture named "SRV Heart Centre-unit of MHPCL". wherein the clauses of the agreement were described as "general profit sharing partners" The clauses of the agreement clearly disclosed an intent that both parties shall exercise joint control over the SRV Heart Centre and will be accountable to each other for their respective acts with reference to the functioning of the Cathlab.

The Hon'ble Appellate Tribunal observed that when shared control of interest or enterprise and shared liability for profit and losses is so clearly manifested, it cannot be denied that both parties are implicit partners and co-adventurers in the Cathlab venture rather than one being a consumer and the other a service provider. From the material on record, facts and circumstances there arises no clear or unambiguous jural relationship between the two parties as one of Corporate Debtor and Operational Creditor. Rather both the Corporate Debtor and Respondent No. 1 are like the principal as well as the agent of the other party. This spirit is not only captured in the body of the agreement but also demonstrated in the actions and conduct of both parties in their role as "general profit sharing partners".

For the said reasons, the Hon'ble Appellate Tribunal refused to agree with the contention of the Respondent No. 1 i.e the Operational Creditor that the outstanding amount so claimed constitutes an operational debt under the IBC. Furthermore, since the claim was not considered to be in the nature of Operational debt, the Hon'ble Appellate did not deem it necessary to examine whether there was any default in respect of a debt which had become due and payable and whether it was laced with pre-existing dispute.

Related link:

https://efiling.nclat.gov.in/nclat/order_view.php?path=L05DTEFUX0RvY3VtZW50cy9DSVNfRG9jdW1lbnRzL

<u>Concerns:</u>

M/s Indiacorp Law, Advocates & Solicitors, Noida & Jangpura Extension (New Delhi)



Solicitors and Advocates

<u>2Nhc2Vkb2Mvb3JkZXJzL0RFTEhJLzIwMjltMTAtMjAvY291cnRzLzEvZGFpbHkvMTY2Njl2NzkwNzExMzczOTE0</u> <u>MzY2MzUxM2IwM2QwZDZiLnBkZg==</u>

Thanking You, Team Indiacorp 0120 - 421 4372, 9810894275, 8826016751 indiacorp@live.com, csaloknoida@gmail.com, info@indiacorplaw.com www.indiacorplaw.com

Disclaimer:

This publication contains information in summary form and is therefore intended for general guidance only. It is not intended to be a substitute for detailed research or the exercise of professional judgment. Neither India Corp Law nor any other member of the India Corp Law organization can accept any responsibility for loss occasioned to any person acting or refraining from action as a result of any material in this publication. On any specific matter, reference should be made to the appropriate advisor.