Journal of Informatics Education and Research
ISSN: 1526-4726
Vol 6 Issue 1 (2026)

Corporate Fraud and Judicial Review in India: Evaluating the Effectiveness of Legal Remedies for White Collar Crimes

Pranav Raval

Research Scholar

GLS University, Ahmedabad, Gujarat, India

Dr. Foram A. Pandya

Assistant Professor,

Faculty of Law, GLS University, Ahmedabad, Gujarat, India

ABSTRACT

Corporate fraud in India has grown increasingly complex due to technological advancement, financial innovation, and globalization of business operations. This study examines the nature of corporate fraud, the legal framework regulating it, and the crucial role of judicial review in ensuring accountability. It explores how institutions such as SEBI, the MCA, the SFIO, and the ED enforce laws and how courts intervene to uphold due process, clarify statutory interpretation, and strengthen regulatory actions. Through an analysis of landmark judgments—including the Satyam, Sahara, NSEL, and IL&FS cases—the study highlights the judiciary's role in shaping corporate governance norms and protecting investor interests. While India possesses a comprehensive legal framework under the Companies Act, IPC, PMLA, SEBI Act, and IBC, the effectiveness of remedies remains mixed due to procedural delays, technical complexities, and coordination challenges among enforcement agencies. The study identifies key obstacles in prosecuting corporate fraud and emphasizes the need for specialized investigative capacity, stronger institutional collaboration, and judicial efficiency. It concludes that robust judicial review, combined with improved regulatory enforcement and governance reforms, is essential to effectively address white-collar crime and maintain public trust in India's corporate ecosystem.

Keywords: Corporate Fraud, Judicial Review, White Collar Crime, SEBI, SFIO, Companies Act, Corporate Governance, Regulatory Enforcement

1. Introduction

Corporate fraud in India has emerged as one of the most challenging forms of economic and financial crime, reflecting the growing sophistication of business operations and the increasing integration of the Indian economy with global markets. Traditionally, frauds in the corporate sector were limited to simple misappropriation of funds or falsification of records, but over the years, their nature, scale, and methods have become far more complex. Today's corporate frauds often involve intricate financial engineering, manipulation of digital data, cross-border transactions, and the misuse of advanced technologies. The expansion of the corporate sector, coupled with rapid digitalization and globalization, has provided both opportunities for business growth and avenues for fraudulent activities to proliferate.

One of the major reasons for the rising complexity of corporate fraud is the evolving financial landscape. Corporations today handle large volumes of digital financial data and rely heavily on technology-driven systems. This shift has allowed fraudsters to exploit loopholes using sophisticated methods such as algorithmic manipulations, shell companies, multi-layered transactions, insider collusion, and cyber-enabled financial crimes. The growth of fintech platforms, online trading, and digital payments has further expanded the potential for fraud by masking real identities and creating layers of transactions that are difficult to trace. These developments require advanced forensic tools and highly skilled investigators, which are not always available within traditional enforcement agencies.

India has also witnessed several high-profile corporate scandals over the last two decades, such as the Satyam Computer Services accounting fraud, the Kingfisher Airlines loan default controversy, the IL&FS collapse, and various stock market manipulation cases. These incidents highlight how white-collar criminals often operate within legal grey areas, taking advantage of weak internal control systems, poor regulatory oversight, and gaps in corporate governance practices. Many frauds have gone undetected for long periods, only coming to light when the financial damage becomes too large to conceal. Such cases not only undermine investor confidence but also expose the vulnerabilities of regulatory institutions.

Moreover, the interconnectedness of modern corporations—both domestically and internationally—has made fraud investigation more challenging. Cross-border transactions, foreign subsidiaries, and international money flows often complicate evidence collection and jurisdictional control. Fraudsters use offshore tax havens, complex corporate structures, and encrypted communication channels to hide illicit activities. As a result, enforcement agencies must work across jurisdictions and coordinate with foreign regulators, which can be time-consuming and legally difficult. These global dimensions of fraud significantly increase the complexity of detection and prosecution.

In addition to digital and global factors, structural issues within corporate organizations contribute to the rise of complex fraud. Weak internal controls, inadequate compliance frameworks, insufficient auditing practices, and lack of transparency in decision-making create an environment where fraudulent activities can flourish. Although India has strengthened its regulatory mechanisms through the Companies Act, SEBI regulations, and the introduction of the Insolvency and Bankruptcy Code, the speed at which corporate fraud techniques evolve often outpaces the ability of legal and regulatory frameworks to respond effectively.

2. Importance of Judicial Review in Maintaining Accountability and Public Trust

Judicial review plays a vital role in maintaining accountability and public trust in the governance of corporate and economic systems in India. As the ultimate interpreter of the Constitution and guardian of the rule of law, the judiciary ensures that all actions taken by the government, regulatory bodies, and corporate entities are lawful, fair, and transparent. In matters of corporate fraud and white-collar crime, judicial review becomes especially significant because these offences often involve powerful individuals, complex financial transactions, and substantial economic interests. Without judicial scrutiny, there is a risk that regulatory decisions may be arbitrary, investigations may be influenced by external pressures, and corporate wrongdoers may escape accountability.

The importance of judicial review is also evident in its role as a corrective mechanism. Regulatory bodies such as SEBI, the Ministry of Corporate Affairs, the Serious Fraud Investigation Office, and the Enforcement Directorate exercise extensive powers in investigating and penalizing corporate misconduct. Judicial review allows courts to examine whether these authorities have exercised their powers within legal boundaries and in accordance with principles of natural justice. When regulatory orders are challenged, courts ensure that the decision-making process is transparent, evidence-based, and free from bias. This gives affected parties confidence that they are protected from misuse of authority and that justice will be delivered impartially.

Judicial review also plays a crucial role in strengthening public trust in the financial and corporate system. High-profile corporate frauds often create public skepticism about the functioning of regulatory institutions and the integrity of corporate governance. When courts actively intervene to uphold the law, order investigations, protect whistleblowers, or direct corrective actions, it reassures society that wrongdoing will not be tolerated. This judicial intervention reinforces the belief that no individual or corporation is above the law, which is essential for maintaining investor confidence and attracting both domestic and foreign investment.

Furthermore, judicial review contributes to the development of legal principles and precedents that improve the governance framework. Landmark judgments in cases such as the Satyam scam, the Sahara dispute, and the IL&FS crisis have clarified the interpretation of financial laws, strengthened corporate accountability norms, and guided regulators on how to address complex fraud cases. By shaping legal standards, the judiciary enhances the overall regulatory architecture and ensures that the legal system evolves in response to emerging challenges in the corporate sector.

Ultimately, judicial review acts as a balancing force between regulatory power, corporate interests, and public welfare. It helps maintain constitutional values, protects the rights of stakeholders, and ensures that justice prevails even in matters involving complex financial fraud. In doing so, it plays an indispensable role in sustaining public trust and ensuring the integrity of India's corporate governance ecosystem.

3. Understanding Corporate Fraud in India

Corporate fraud in India refers to deliberate and deceptive practices undertaken by individuals or organizations within the corporate sector to gain unlawful financial benefits or to create a false impression of a company's financial health, performance, or operations. It involves a breach of trust, manipulation of systems, and misuse of authority, often carried out by those in managerial or decision-making positions. Corporate fraud is not an isolated criminal activity; it reflects

deeper structural issues within the corporate environment, including weaknesses in governance, lack of transparency, inadequate regulatory oversight, and sometimes collusion among auditors, executives, and external agencies. As India's economy grows and corporations handle increasingly complex financial transactions, the opportunities for sophisticated fraudulent practices have also expanded.

The nature of corporate fraud in India has become multi-dimensional, involving practices such as falsification of accounts, diversion of funds, insider trading, bribery, money laundering, embezzlement, and fraudulent financial reporting. Many frauds are carefully planned and executed over long periods, often using layered transactions and shell companies to conceal evidence. The Satyam Computer Services accounting scandal, the Punjab National Bank–Nirav Modi case, and the IL&FS collapse illustrate how deeply fraud can penetrate corporate structures and cause widespread economic disruption. In several cases, fraudsters exploit regulatory loopholes, weak internal controls, and inadequate risk management practices to manipulate financial systems and mislead investors, lenders, and regulators.

India's corporate fraud problem is also closely linked to deficiencies in corporate governance. Companies that lack strong ethical values, independent oversight, and effective audit mechanisms are more vulnerable to fraud. The absence of robust internal policies and accountability frameworks allows individuals in key positions to misuse their authority for personal gain. Moreover, auditors, who are responsible for ensuring financial accuracy, may sometimes fail to detect fraud due to negligence, lack of professional skepticism, or in rare cases, direct involvement in fraudulent activities. This undermines the reliability of corporate disclosures and affects investor confidence.

Regulatory agencies in India—including the Ministry of Corporate Affairs, the Securities and Exchange Board of India, the Serious Fraud Investigation Office, and the Enforcement Directorate—play a critical role in monitoring and investigating corporate misconduct. However, the rising complexity of fraud and the involvement of cross-border transactions pose significant challenges to enforcement. Corporate fraud today often involves digital manipulation, international money transfers, and advanced financial instruments, requiring specialized expertise and coordination among multiple agencies. Although India has strengthened its regulatory framework through the Companies Act, 2013, SEBI reforms, and the introduction of the Insolvency and Bankruptcy Code, evolving methods of fraud continue to test the efficiency of detection and prosecution mechanisms.

Overall, understanding corporate fraud in India requires examining both the internal weaknesses of corporate entities and the broader regulatory and economic environment. Effective prevention and control of such fraud demand robust governance mechanisms, greater transparency, strong enforcement actions, and a culture of ethical behaviour within organizations. As corporate fraud becomes more sophisticated, India's legal and regulatory systems must continue to adapt to ensure accountability, protect investors, and maintain the integrity of the corporate sector.

4. Legal Framework Governing Corporate Fraud

The legal framework governing corporate fraud in India is extensive and multi-layered, reflecting the need to regulate complex financial activities, ensure transparency, and hold corporate wrongdoers accountable. Over the years, India has strengthened its legislative and regulatory mechanisms to address various forms of corporate misconduct, ranging from financial misreporting to insider trading and money laundering. This framework consists of general criminal laws, specialized corporate laws, sector-specific regulations, and dedicated enforcement agencies that work together to detect, investigate, and prosecute fraudulent activities.

At the core of the legal structure is the **Companies Act, 2013**, which forms the foundation for corporate regulation in India. The Act contains detailed provisions related to fraud, including Section 447, which defines corporate fraud and prescribes stringent penalties such as imprisonment and heavy fines. It also mandates corporate governance norms, internal financial controls, and auditing standards to reduce the likelihood of fraudulent practices. The Act empowers the Ministry of Corporate Affairs (MCA) and the Serious Fraud Investigation Office (SFIO) to conduct in-depth investigations into complex fraud cases, especially those involving large-scale financial irregularities or multi-layered corporate structures.

Another crucial component is the **Indian Penal Code (IPC)**, which provides the general criminal law framework for prosecuting offences such as cheating, criminal breach of trust, forgery, falsification of accounts, and conspiracy. These IPC provisions are often invoked alongside corporate laws to address fraudulent acts committed by directors, officers, or

employees. Since corporate fraud frequently involves intent, deception, and dishonest practices, the IPC plays a key role in ensuring criminal liability for individuals responsible for misconduct.

Financial market-related frauds fall under the purview of **SEBI Act, 1992** and related regulations. The Securities and Exchange Board of India (SEBI) regulates listed companies, securities markets, and intermediaries. It has the authority to investigate insider trading, market manipulation, fraudulent trading practices, and misrepresentations in financial disclosures. SEBI's powers include issuing penalties, directing disgorgement of unlawful gains, barring individuals from accessing the securities market, and initiating criminal proceedings when necessary. SEBI's regulatory oversight is essential for maintaining investor confidence and ensuring market integrity.

For offences involving illicit financial transactions, money laundering, and diversion of funds, the **Prevention of Money Laundering Act (PMLA), 2002** plays a significant role. The Enforcement Directorate (ED), which enforces the PMLA, can attach properties acquired through fraudulent means, conduct searches and seizures, and prosecute offenders involved in laundering proceeds of crime. Since many corporate fraud schemes involve converting illegal gains into seemingly legitimate assets, PMLA has become an important tool for tackling financial crime.

Banking-related frauds fall under the supervision of the **Reserve Bank of India (RBI)**, which issues guidelines, monitors financial institutions, and ensures compliance with prudential norms. In cases of major loan frauds, the CBI and ED often step in to conduct criminal investigations. Additionally, the **Insolvency and Bankruptcy Code (IBC), 2016** contains provisions to detect and prosecute fraudulent trading, wrongful transactions, and preferential dealings during insolvency proceedings. The IBC framework allows insolvency professionals and tribunals to identify fraudulent conduct and impose penalties on erring parties.

5. Judicial Review in Cases of Corporate Fraud

Judicial review in cases of corporate fraud plays a central role in ensuring that regulatory actions, investigative processes, and administrative decisions adhere to the principles of legality, fairness, and constitutional propriety. In India, where corporate fraud often involves influential individuals, complex financial structures, and multi-agency investigations, judicial oversight becomes essential for balancing state authority with individual rights and maintaining public confidence in the justice system. Courts act as an impartial authority that examines whether agencies such as the Ministry of Corporate Affairs, SEBI, the Serious Fraud Investigation Office, the Enforcement Directorate, and the CBI exercise their powers within the boundaries laid down by law.

One of the primary functions of judicial review in such cases is to scrutinize the legality of investigative and regulatory actions. Courts ensure that agencies do not exceed their statutory authority or act arbitrarily while conducting searches, seizures, arrests, or issuing administrative orders. This oversight protects individuals from misuse of power and compels authorities to follow due process. When corporate entities or executives challenge regulatory decisions—such as sanctions, freezing of assets, or debarment orders—courts examine whether those decisions are supported by sufficient evidence, comply with statutory provisions, and uphold the principles of natural justice. Such scrutiny not only safeguards the rights of the accused but also reinforces the credibility of enforcement agencies.

Judicial review also contributes to improving the quality of corporate investigations. In several landmark cases, courts have directed agencies to conduct deeper or more coordinated investigations when existing efforts were found inadequate. Courts have ordered forensic audits, constituted special investigation teams, and monitored high-profile cases to ensure thorough examination of financial misconduct. This judicial intervention becomes particularly important in large-scale frauds where multiple agencies are involved, and the complexity of transactions demands specialized expertise. By guiding and supervising these investigations, courts help uncover the full extent of wrongdoing and strengthen accountability.

Another significant aspect of judicial review is its ability to interpret laws related to corporate fraud and provide clarity on ambiguous legal provisions. Through their judgments, courts develop legal principles governing issues such as liability of directors, standards of disclosure, insider trading norms, and responsibilities of auditors. These interpretations help streamline regulatory practices and contribute to the evolution of corporate jurisprudence in India. Judicial precedents in cases such as the Satyam scam, the Sahara dispute, and various SEBI matters have shaped the contours of corporate governance, financial reporting, and market regulation.

Judicial review also plays a vital role in protecting investor interests and maintaining trust in the financial system. When courts intervene to address regulatory lapses, mandate corrective actions, or impose penalties on fraudulent actors, they send a strong message that financial wrongdoing will not be tolerated. This reassurance is crucial in a developing economy where investor confidence is key to economic growth. Moreover, courts provide avenues for aggrieved investors, shareholders, and stakeholders to seek redress when they are victims of corporate fraud, thereby strengthening public trust in the justice delivery system.

Ultimately, judicial review ensures that the battle against corporate fraud is fought within the framework of the rule of law. It holds both individuals and institutions accountable, prevents arbitrary exercise of power, and reinforces democratic values in the corporate regulatory environment. As corporate fraud becomes increasingly sophisticated, judicial oversight remains indispensable for safeguarding transparency, strengthening corporate governance, and ensuring fairness in the administration of justice.

6. Landmark Judicial Decisions on Corporate Fraud

Landmark judicial decisions in India have significantly influenced the legal and regulatory landscape governing corporate fraud, setting precedents that continue to shape corporate governance, enforcement practices, and the interpretation of financial laws. One of the most prominent cases is the Satyam Computer Services scandal of 2009, often referred to as "India's Enron." In this case, the Hyderabad court and later higher judicial forums played a key role in ensuring accountability for one of the largest accounting frauds in Indian history. The judiciary supported swift investigations by the CBI and upheld stringent punishment for the company's founder and key executives. This case also triggered major reforms in the Companies Act, 2013, leading to stronger corporate governance norms, enhanced auditor responsibilities, and greater oversight mechanisms.

Another landmark decision is the Sahara India Real Estate Corporation Ltd. v. SEBI case, which highlighted the judiciary's firm stance against illegal fund-raising practices. The Supreme Court upheld SEBI's authority to regulate collective investment schemes and directed Sahara to refund thousands of crores to investors. The Court's strong directives reinforced the importance of transparency, investor protection, and accountability in financial markets. This judgment also strengthened SEBI's regulatory powers and clarified its jurisdiction over hybrid financial products often used to evade scrutiny.

The National Spot Exchange Limited (NSEL) scam provided another critical moment for judicial intervention. With thousands of investors affected by massive trading irregularities, courts had to examine the role of the exchange, brokers, and regulatory agencies. The Bombay High Court's rulings in the case emphasized the duty of exchanges to maintain market integrity and supported the attachment of properties of key accused individuals under state and central laws. The judiciary's involvement ensured that investor claims were given priority and established the seriousness with which fraudulent commodity market practices should be addressed.

In the IL&FS crisis, where a major infrastructure finance company collapsed under mounting debt, the National Company Law Appellate Tribunal (NCLAT) and the Supreme Court played pivotal roles. Judicial decisions supported the government's intervention to replace the company's board and oversee its resolution. The courts acknowledged the systemic risk posed by the crisis and ensured that regulatory action was carried out in a transparent and responsible manner. These decisions also highlighted the need for stronger oversight of large financial conglomerates to prevent systemic corporate failures.

Other significant cases, such as the Nirav Modi–Punjab National Bank fraud, have seen courts uphold strict action under the Prevention of Money Laundering Act (PMLA), including extradition proceedings, asset seizures, and investigation supervision. Courts have consistently emphasized the need for swift and coordinated action in cases involving large-scale financial fraud, setting benchmarks for future enforcement.

Together, these landmark judicial decisions have strengthened India's approach to handling corporate fraud. They have clarified regulatory jurisdictions, enhanced investor protection, ensured stringent penalties for wrongdoing, and emphasized the importance of ethical corporate conduct. Through these rulings, the judiciary has played an essential role in shaping a more accountable and transparent corporate environment in India.

7. Effectiveness of Legal Remedies for White Collar Crimes

The effectiveness of legal remedies for white-collar crimes in India remains a topic of ongoing debate. On one hand, the legal framework has significantly improved over the years with strict provisions under the Companies Act, SEBI Act, PMLA, IPC, and Insolvency and Bankruptcy Code. These laws provide mechanisms for penalties, imprisonment, asset attachment, disgorgement of unlawful gains, and disqualification of directors. Regulatory agencies now possess substantial investigative and enforcement powers, which have contributed to detecting fraud earlier than before. The establishment of specialized bodies like SFIO and NCLT has further strengthened institutional capacity to address corporate wrongdoing.

However, the actual implementation of these remedies faces several challenges. White-collar crimes often involve complex financial structures and sophisticated methods that require specialized expertise to investigate. Many agencies struggle with limited manpower, outdated technology, and coordination issues. As a result, investigations may take years, delaying prosecution and reducing the deterrent effect of legal penalties. In many high-profile cases, delays in court proceedings undermine public confidence in the justice system and allow offenders ample time to manipulate evidence or assets.

Another major issue is the low conviction rate in white-collar crime cases. While regulators may impose administrative penalties quickly, criminal convictions through courts remain rare due to lengthy trials, technical complexities, and difficulties in establishing fraudulent intent beyond reasonable doubt. This weakens the overall effectiveness of legal remedies and signals to potential offenders that the risk of punishment is relatively low. Additionally, corporate influence, political connections, and the involvement of multiple stakeholders often complicate the enforcement process.

Despite these challenges, legal remedies are gradually becoming more effective as reforms continue to strengthen investigation procedures, expand regulatory oversight, and promote transparency. Courts have also become more proactive in supporting enforcement actions and ensuring that corporate offenders are held accountable. However, to achieve truly effective control over white-collar crimes, India must continue modernizing investigative tools, improving inter-agency coordination, speeding up judicial processes, and cultivating strong corporate governance practices across all sectors.

8. Challenges in Prosecuting Corporate Fraud

Prosecuting corporate fraud in India is a difficult and time-consuming process because of the complex nature of financial crimes. One of the biggest challenges is the technical sophistication involved in modern frauds. Many corporate fraud schemes include layered transactions, shell companies, offshore accounts, digital manipulation, and misleading financial statements. Investigators often require advanced expertise in forensic accounting, cyber analysis, and international finance—skills that are not always readily available in traditional enforcement agencies.

Another major challenge is the delay in investigations and court proceedings. Corporate fraud cases typically involve large volumes of financial records, emails, transaction data, and digital evidence. Collecting, analyzing, and presenting this data takes considerable time. Additionally, legal loopholes and frequent appeals by accused parties slow down the judicial process. These delays reduce the likelihood of securing timely convictions and weaken the deterrent effect of the law.

Coordination among multiple agencies also poses difficulties. Corporate fraud may fall under the jurisdiction of several bodies such as SEBI, RBI, MCA, SFIO, ED, and CBI. Lack of seamless communication and overlapping powers often lead to inefficiencies and delays. Moreover, powerful corporate figures may influence witnesses, tamper with evidence, or use political and financial connections to obstruct investigations. This makes it challenging to build a strong and clear case for prosecution.

Finally, internal corporate governance weaknesses contribute to the problem. Poor internal controls, ineffective audit systems, and lack of whistleblower protection make it easier for fraud to go undetected for long periods. When fraud is discovered, companies sometimes hesitate to cooperate fully with investigators due to reputational concerns. These factors collectively make prosecuting corporate fraud difficult and highlight the need for stronger enforcement capabilities, quicker judicial processes, and better regulatory coordination.

9. Conclusion

Corporate fraud in India has evolved into a multifaceted challenge that threatens economic stability, investor confidence, and the integrity of the corporate governance framework. As businesses grow in scale and complexity, fraudulent practices have also become more sophisticated, often involving advanced technology, intricate financial transactions, and cross-

border networks. To address these challenges, India has developed a robust legal and regulatory framework through statutes such as the Companies Act, IPC, SEBI Act, PMLA, and the Insolvency and Bankruptcy Code. These laws, together with regulatory bodies like SEBI, MCA, SFIO, ED, and RBI, form a comprehensive system aimed at preventing, detecting, and punishing corporate misconduct.

Judicial review plays a crucial role in strengthening this framework by ensuring that regulatory actions are lawful, transparent, and fair. Courts act as guardians of constitutional principles, reviewing administrative decisions, interpreting financial laws, and intervening in cases of regulatory failures. Landmark judicial decisions have shaped the contours of corporate accountability, improved enforcement mechanisms, and established important legal precedents that guide future fraud investigations. Through their interventions in cases such as Satyam, Sahara, and IL&FS, Indian courts have demonstrated their commitment to safeguarding public interest and restoring trust in the corporate system.

Despite these efforts, challenges persist in prosecuting corporate fraud. Delays in investigations, lack of coordination among agencies, technical complexities, influence of corporate power, and limitations in forensic capabilities continue to hinder swift justice. As a result, even though legal remedies exist, their effectiveness is often constrained by operational inefficiencies, procedural delays, and resource gaps. Strengthening the enforcement ecosystem, improving inter-agency cooperation, and enhancing the capacity of investigative bodies are essential for ensuring timely and effective prosecution.

To effectively combat corporate fraud, India must continue to evolve its legal and regulatory systems while promoting strong ethical governance within organizations. Enhancing transparency, implementing stringent compliance mechanisms, and fostering a culture of accountability will be crucial in mitigating fraud risks. Judicial review will remain a vital pillar of this ecosystem, ensuring that justice is delivered and that no corporate entity operates above the law. Ultimately, a coordinated, transparent, and vigilant approach is necessary to protect stakeholders, uphold market integrity, and build long-term public trust in India's corporate sector.

References

1. IL&FS Transportation Networks Ltd. v. Union of India, 2020 SCC OnLine NCLAT 15.
2. Indian Penal Code, 1860 (India).
3. National Spot Exchange Ltd. v. Union of India, 2016 SCC OnLine Bom 10309.
4. Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD), "Corporate Governance and Anti-Corruption Measures" (2021).
5. Reserve Bank of India, Financial Stability Report (2023).
6. Sahara India Real Estate Corp. Ltd. v. SEBI, (2012) 10 SCC 603.
7. Satyam Computer Services Ltd. v. Union of India, (2011) 2 SCC 114.
8. SEBI, Annual Report (2023).
9. Serious Fraud Investigation Office, Ministry of Corporate Affairs, Annual Report (2022).
10. The Companies Act, 2013 (India).
11. The Insolvency and Bankruptcy Code, 2016 (India).
12. The Prevention of Money Laundering Act, 2002 (India).
13. The Securities and Exchange Board of India Act, 1992 (India).