# INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL FOR LEGAL RESEARCH AND ANALYSIS

Open Access, Refereed Journal Multi Disciplinary
Peer Reviewed



www.ijlra.com

ISSN: 2582-6433

# DISCLAIMER

No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored, transmitted, or distributed in any form or by any means, whether electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording, or otherwise, without prior written permission of the Managing Editor of the *International Journal for Legal Research & Analysis (IJLRA)*.

The views, opinions, interpretations, and conclusions expressed in the articles published in this journal are solely those of the respective authors. They do not necessarily reflect the views of the Editorial Board, Editors, Reviewers, Advisors, or the Publisher of IJLRA.

Although every reasonable effort has been made to ensure the accuracy, authenticity, and proper citation of the content published in this journal, neither the Editorial Board nor IJLRA shall be held liable or responsible, in any manner whatsoever, for any loss, damage, or consequence arising from the use, reliance upon, or interpretation of the information contained in this publication.

The content published herein is intended solely for academic and informational purposes and shall not be construed as legal advice or professional opinion.

**Copyright © International Journal for Legal Research & Analysis. All rights reserved.**

ISSN: 2582-6433

# ABOUT US

The *International Journal for Legal Research & Analysis (IJLRA)* (ISSN: 2582-6433) is a peer-reviewed, academic, online journal published on a monthly basis. The journal aims to provide a comprehensive and interactive platform for the publication of original and high-quality legal research.

IJLRA publishes Short Articles, Long Articles, Research Papers, Case Comments, Book Reviews, Essays, and interdisciplinary studies in the field of law and allied disciplines. The journal seeks to promote critical analysis and informed discourse on contemporary legal, social, and policy issues.

The primary objective of IJLRA is to enhance academic engagement and scholarly dialogue among law students, researchers, academicians, legal professionals, and members of the Bar and Bench. The journal endeavours to establish itself as a credible and widely cited academic publication through the publication of original, well-researched, and analytically sound contributions.

IJLRA welcomes submissions from all branches of law, provided the work is original, unpublished, and submitted in accordance with the prescribed submission guidelines. All manuscripts are subject to a rigorous peer-review process to ensure academic quality, originality, and relevance.

Through its publications, the *International Journal for Legal Research & Analysis* aspires to contribute meaningfully to legal scholarship and the development of law as an instrument of justice and social progress.

ISSN: 2582-6433

# *PUBLICATION ETHICS, COPYRIGHT & AUTHOR RESPONSIBILITY STATEMENT*

The *International Journal for Legal Research and Analysis (IJLRA)* is committed to upholding the highest standards of publication ethics and academic integrity. All manuscripts submitted to the journal must be original, unpublished, and free from plagiarism, data fabrication, falsification, or any form of unethical research or publication practice. Authors are solely responsible for the accuracy, originality, legality, and ethical compliance of their work and must ensure that all sources are properly cited and that necessary permissions for any third-party copyrighted material have been duly obtained prior to submission. Copyright in all published articles vests with IJLRA, unless otherwise expressly stated, and authors grant the journal the irrevocable right to publish, reproduce, distribute, and archive their work in print and electronic formats. The views and opinions expressed in the articles are those of the authors alone and do not reflect the views of the Editors, Editorial Board, Reviewers, or Publisher. IJLRA shall not be liable for any loss, damage, claim, or legal consequence arising from the use, reliance upon, or interpretation of the content published. By submitting a manuscript, the author(s) agree to fully indemnify and hold harmless the journal, its Editor-in-Chief, Editors, Editorial Board, Reviewers, Advisors, Publisher, and Management against any claims, liabilities, or legal proceedings arising out of plagiarism, copyright infringement, defamation, breach of confidentiality, or violation of third-party rights. The journal reserves the absolute right to reject, withdraw, retract, or remove any manuscript or published article in case of ethical or legal violations, without incurring any liability.

ISSN: 2582-6433

# CORPORATE GOVERNANCE FAILURES IN INDIA: A STUDY OF THE SATYAM SCANDAL

AUTHORED BY - ANSHIKA JHUNJHUNWALA & VANSIKA CHAUDARY
BA. LLB 7th Semester Amity University, Kolkata

## ABSTRACT

Corporate governance plays an important role in ensuring transparency, accountability, ethical behaviour and effective management within a company. The Satyam Computer Services scandal, which came to light in January 2009, exposed serious weaknesses in financial reporting, auditing, board supervision and regulatory monitoring in India. B. Ramalinga Raju, the founder and chairman of Satyam Computer Services, admitted that the company's financial statements had been manipulated over several years. The scandal affected shareholders, employees, investors and other stakeholders and raised important questions about the responsibilities of directors, auditors and regulatory authorities. This research paper examines the concept and importance of corporate governance, the development of the Satyam scam, the role and failure of the board of directors, auditors' responsibilities and accountability, shareholders' interests and disclosure failures, and the legal and regulatory response. It also considers corporate governance reforms introduced after the scandal and recommends measures to improve transparency, independent auditing and corporate accountability. The study highlights that effective corporate governance requires more than formal compliance with legal provisions. It also depends upon ethical leadership, independent supervision, reliable financial reporting and accountability at every level of corporate management.

**Keywords:** Corporate Governance; Satyam Scam; Board of Directors; Auditors' Accountability; Shareholders' Interests; SEBI; Financial Fraud; Corporate Governance Reforms.

## 1. INTRODUCTION

Corporate governance is an essential part of modern business management because it establishes the principles and procedures through which companies are directed, controlled and held accountable. It helps maintain a balance between the interests of shareholders, directors,

ISSN: 2582-6433

management, employees, investors and other stakeholders.

The Satyam Computer Services scandal is one of India's most significant corporate accounting frauds. The revelation of the fraud in January 2009 raised serious questions about the reliability of corporate financial statements, the effectiveness of auditing procedures and the role of regulatory authorities in preventing corporate misconduct. The company's founder and chairman, B. Ramalinga Raju, admitted that the company's financial records had been manipulated over a period of several years.[1]

The scandal demonstrated that the mere existence of a board of directors, an audit committee and statutory auditors is not sufficient unless these mechanisms function effectively. The incident also led to greater attention to auditor independence, financial disclosures, related-party transactions and the responsibilities of corporate management.

This research paper examines the Satyam scandal as a case study of corporate governance failure in India. It analyses the background of the fraud, the responsibilities of the board and auditors, the consequences for shareholders, the legal and regulatory response and the reforms introduced to strengthen corporate governance.

## 2. UNDERSTANDING CORPORATE GOVERNANCE

### 2.1 Meaning of Corporate Governance

Corporate Governance is the system of processes, principles and policies used to direct, control and manage a company. It sets up the relation between the board of directors and management, shareholders and other stakeholders and outlines the nature of the corporate decisions made. In its practical sense, corporate governance ensures that a company is run efficiently, ethically and transparently. This includes financial management, business strategy, risk management, internal controls and ethics and stakeholder relationships. A company's credibility and perpetual growth is maintained by good corporate governance. However, under the other extreme of weak governance, financial irregularities may occur, corporate resources may be misused, or investor confidence may be lost and the company's reputation may suffer.

### 2.2 Importance of Corporate Governance

Corporate governance is important for the following reasons:

- Transparency: It assures that the business is giving accurate and up-to-date information about the financial situation and business activities.

[1] B. Ramalinga Raju, Letter to the Board of Directors of Satyam Computer Services Ltd. (Jan. 7, 2009), reproduced in *Full Text of the Letter from Satyam Computers Chairman B. Ramalinga Raju*, Domain-b (Jan. 7, 2009), https://www.domain-b.com/companies/companies_s/Satyam_Computers/20090107_letter_raju.html.

ISSN: 2582-6433

- Accountability: It causes directors and management to be answerable for their decisions and action.
- Financial Reporting: When financial reporting is reliable, investors can be assured of doing business with a company responsibly.
- Protection of shareholders: It helps to safeguard shareholders against abuse of the company's resources and against false statements and actions that would be to the advantage of those controlling the company.
- Ethical business practices: Promotes honesty, integrity and responsible decision making in the business.
- Long-term stability: Good governance enables companies to mitigate risks, enhance internal controls and ensure long-term stability.

**2.3 How does the Corporate Governance work?**

The board of directors is the focus of corporate governance. The board of directors is responsible for overseeing the management of the company, approving important business decisions and making sure the business operates in the company's and shareholders' interests. The board's overall duties are the determination of the company's strategic direction, appointment of key personnel, performance monitoring, and review of major risks. It should also make sure the information and statements in the company's financial news are accurate. Other significant mechanisms are audit committee, internal auditors, statutory auditors, independent directors and regulatory authorities. These mechanisms are mutually interdependent and play a part in ensuring management decisions are appropriately overseen and the legal and ethical requirements are adhered to. Cooperation between the board, shareholders, management, employees and other stakeholders are essential to good corporate governance. They all have a different role to play and all are responsible for the correct operation of the company.

**2.4 Rules Governing Corporate Governance**

The rules governing corporate governance are outlined below:

Many different sources of law and regulations govern corporate governance practices. The key legislations in India are the Companies Act, 2013, the Securities and Exchange Board of India Act, 1992 and the SEBI (Listing Obligations and Disclosure Requirements) Regulations, 2015. Companies Act, 2013 provides for provisions relating to directors' duties, independent directors, audit committees, statutory auditors, financial statements and related-party transactions. The SEBI regulations lay down the requirements of disclosure and governance

ISSN: 2582-6433

for listed companies. Professional standards and internal corporate policies and codes of conduct also affect corporate governance. The rules are designed to give companies a way to be responsible and to make sure that the directors and management of companies are responsible for their decisions. It is crucial to differentiate the law that was in force at the time of the Satyam scandal and the reforms made since then. The Companies Act, 1956 was the applicable company law when the fraud came to light in January 2009. This paper discusses the subsequent legal developments, namely, the Companies Act, 2013 and the SEBI LODR Regulations, 2015.

### 2.5 Main Challenges of Corporate Governance

The following are some of the key issues in corporate governance:

- Inadequate independence: Directors could be influenced by promoters or senior management and be unable to exercise independent judgement.
- Weak internal control: Lack of accounting and monitoring controls may enable financial irregularities to persist.
- Lack of adequate information disclosure: Shareholders do not have access to accurate and timely financial information to make informed decisions.
- Conflicts of interest: Transactions with promoters or related companies can be more of an interest of the promoter or related companies than the company.
- Inadequate auditing: When auditors are not able to gather adequate and independent evidence, they might miss material misstatements.
- Regulatory challenges: To investigate, coordinate, and enforce complex corporate fraud, they need to be addressed.

The Satyam scandal is a pertinent example of how these weaknesses can converge and lead to a significant corporate governance breach

## 3. THE SATYAM SCANDAL

### 3.1 Background of the Satyam Scam

Satyam scam is a massive accounting scam perpetrated by Satyam Computer Services Limited, an Indian IT Company, and its founder B. Ramalinga Raju. The fraud was uncovered in January 2009 when Raju acknowledged the manipulation of the company's financial statements for several years. Manipulation of reported cash and bank balances, revenues, profits, interest income and debtors. The bogus financial statements gave the impression of Satyam being more profitable and financially sound than it actually was. In different reports the fraud amount is

ISSN: 2582-6433

presented differently. Raju's confession admitted that there was a mismatch in the company's financial statement of around ₹7,136 crore. Other future investigations and proceedings quoted about ₹7,800 crore. These numbers should not be regarded as the same without taking into account the financial aspects and time frame of the situation. This scandal impacted shareholders, employees, customers, investors and wider Indian business community. It also posed significant concerns regarding the financial reporting, statutory auditing, board supervision and regulatory monitoring.

**3.2 Understanding the Fraud**

In the case of Satyam, the fraud was carried out by altering the company's books of account to give a false impression of the company's financial situation. Revenue, profit and cash balances reported by the company do not adequately reflect the company's actual financial situation. The investigation focused on the production and the application of fake invoices, fake financial statements and false information regarding the balance on bank accounts. The fake entries masked true financial condition from the published numbers of the company. The manipulation was carried out over a number of years and not detected in the company's normal course of business internal controls or external audit. This led to questions regarding the effectiveness of the company's accounting systems and how much the board and auditors had independently reviewed financial information provided by management.

**3.3 The Role of the Raju Brothers and Senior Management**

B. Ramalinga Raju was the founder and chairman of Satyam Computer Services, while his brother, Rama Raju, served as the company's managing director. The investigations examined the role of senior company officials in the manipulation of financial statements and related irregularities.

The company's financial records were manipulated to show higher sales, profits and cash balances than the actual figures. The use of false invoices and other misleading records helped create an inaccurate picture of the company's financial performance.

The proposed acquisition of Maytas Infra and Maytas Properties in December 2008 further increased concerns about the relationship between Satyam and businesses associated with the founder's family.

**3.4 The Maytas Acquisition Controversy**

In December 2008, Satyam's board approved a proposal to acquire Maytas Infra and Maytas Properties, companies associated with the family of B. Ramalinga Raju. The proposed transaction was valued at approximately US$1.6 billion.

The proposal raised serious concerns among shareholders because it involved a transaction

ISSN: 2582-6433

with businesses connected to the company's promoter. Investors questioned whether the acquisition was in the interests of Satyam and whether company resources were being used for the benefit of connected parties.

Shareholders reacted strongly against the proposal, and the transaction was withdrawn shortly afterwards. The controversy exposed weaknesses in the company's decision-making process and highlighted the importance of independent scrutiny of related-party transactions.

The Maytas episode became an important warning sign before the public disclosure of the accounting fraud in January 2009.[2]

**3.5 Confession of B. Ramalinga Raju**

On 7 January 2009, B. Ramalinga Raju sent a letter to the board of directors admitting that the company's accounts had been manipulated. The letter revealed that the reported financial position of Satyam did not represent its actual position.

The confession brought the scandal into the public domain and triggered investigations by government and regulatory authorities. It also led to a serious loss of confidence in the company and its financial reporting.

The Satyam scandal demonstrated how a company that appeared successful could face collapse when its financial statements were based on false information.

**3.6 Government's Reaction to the Satyam Scam**

The Satyam scandal required urgent government intervention to protect employees, investors, customers and other stakeholders.

**Companies Act framework:** The Companies Act, 1956 was the applicable law at the time the scandal came to light. The government took steps to investigate the company's affairs and stabilise its management. The Companies Act, 2013 was enacted later and strengthened the legal framework concerning fraud, directors' duties, auditing and corporate accountability.[3]

**Institute of Chartered Accountants of India (ICAI):** The professional conduct of the auditors was examined through disciplinary proceedings. The case highlighted the importance of professional independence, audit quality and compliance with applicable standards.

**Securities and Exchange Board of India (SEBI):** SEBI investigated possible securities-law violations and misleading financial disclosures. The case also led to increased attention to disclosure requirements and investor protection.

**Serious Fraud Investigation Office (SFIO):** The SFIO examined the company's financial

[2] Companies Act, No. 18 of 2013, § 188 (India); Securities and Exchange Board of India (Listing Obligations and Disclosure Requirements) Regulations, 2015, reg. 23 (India). The 2013 Act and 2015 Regulations are subsequent legal frameworks and are not the laws governing the December 2008 proposal.

[3] Companies Act, No. 1 of 1956 (India); Companies Act, No. 18 of 2013 (India).

ISSN: 2582-6433

irregularities and the conduct of individuals involved in its management. The Companies Act, 2013 subsequently provided a statutory framework for the SFIO.

**Government intervention:** The existing board was replaced by a government-appointed board to help stabilise the company. A process was later undertaken to identify a strategic investor, and Tech Mahindra emerged as the successful bidder in April 2009.[4]

The government's response was significant because it focused not only on investigating the fraud but also on protecting the company's legitimate business operations and stakeholders.

## 4. ROLE AND FAILURE OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS

The board of directors is responsible for supervising company management, approving major business decisions and ensuring that the company operates in the interests of the company and its shareholders. It also plays an important role in monitoring financial reporting, overseeing internal controls and ensuring that material risks are properly addressed.

In the Satyam scandal, the board's effectiveness came under serious scrutiny because the company's financial statements had been manipulated over several years. The scandal raised questions about whether the directors had adequately supervised management and challenged the financial information presented to them.

The proposed acquisition of Maytas in December 2008 further exposed weaknesses in the company's governance. The transaction involved businesses associated with the family of Satyam's founder and raised concerns about conflicts of interest and the use of company resources. The strong reaction from shareholders and the subsequent withdrawal of the proposal demonstrated the importance of independent scrutiny of related-party transactions.[5]

The scandal also raised questions about the effectiveness of independent directors and the audit committee. These mechanisms are intended to challenge management, examine financial information and ensure that corporate decisions comply with legal and ethical standards.

The board should have ensured that significant financial figures were supported by reliable evidence and that unusual transactions received proper scrutiny. Directors must not simply rely on information supplied by senior management without asking relevant questions or examining warning signs.

[4] U.S. Securities & Exchange Commission, Satyam Computer Services Ltd., Form 6-K and related filing concerning the successful bid by Tech Mahindra (2009), https://www.sec.gov/Archives/edgar/data/1106056/000114554909000597/u00201exv99w1.htm.

[5] Companies Act, No. 18 of 2013, § 188 (India); Securities and Exchange Board of India (Listing Obligations and Disclosure Requirements) Regulations, 2015, reg. 23 (India). The 2013 Act and 2015 Regulations are subsequent legal frameworks and are not the laws governing the December 2008 proposal.

ISSN: 2582-6433

The Satyam case demonstrates that the presence of directors and committees does not automatically guarantee good corporate governance. They must have access to accurate information, exercise independent judgement, investigate warning signs and ensure that shareholders' interests are protected.

## 5. AUDITORS' RESPONSIBILITIES AND ACCOUNTABILITY IN THE SATYAM SCANDAL

### 5.1 Introduction

The Satyam Computer Services scandal is one of the most significant corporate accounting frauds in Indian history. It came to light in January 2009, when B. Ramalinga Raju, the company's founder and chairman, admitted that the company's financial statements had been manipulated over several years.[6]

The scandal involved the falsification of financial information, including cash and bank balances, revenues, profits, interest income and debtors. The company's statutory auditors were associated with Price Waterhouse, Bangalore, which audited Satyam for several years. Their failure to detect or report the accounting irregularities raised serious questions about the effectiveness of external auditing, professional ethics and corporate governance.[7]

### 5.2 Responsibilities of Auditors in the Satyam Scandal

#### A. Verification of financial statements

The main job of a statutory auditor is to look at a company's financial statements and provide an independent view on whether the financial statements fairly and truly reflect the financial position of the company. In the Satyam case, there were inflated amounts in the financial statements for cash, bank balances, revenue, debtors and the accrued interest. The company was being shown in a better light than it truly was, with these inflated figures. According to the auditors, audit evidence should be sufficient and appropriate in order to be able to certify the financial statements. The situation uncovered major doubts in respect of the fact that such significant misstatements went undetected over a number of reporting periods.

#### B. Independent verification of bank balances

The most significant failure was the lack of verification of cash and bank balances. Significant bank balances should be ascertained independently by auditors from other banks and not just

[6] B. Ramalinga Raju, Letter to the Board of Directors of Satyam Computer Services Ltd. (Jan. 7, 2009), reproduced in *Full Text of the Letter from Satyam Computers Chairman B. Ramalinga Raju*, Domain-b (Jan. 7, 2009), https://www.domain-b.com/companies/companies_s/Satyam_Computers/20090107_letter_raju.html.

[7] Securities and Exchange Board of India, *Annual Report 2008–09*, Investigation in the Matter of Satyam Computer Services Ltd., https://www.sebi.gov.in/sebi_data/attachdocs/1289364867230.pdf.

ISSN: 2582-6433

relied on documentation or representations from bank management. In Satyam, it was found that there were inconsistencies between the confirmation received from banks used in the audit process and the information received directly from banks. The auditors have been called on for shortcomings in the independent verification process. This was a serious concern as cash and bank balances were a significant share of the reported assets of the company. If it had been properly verified, it may have led to discovery of the fact that the reported financial position was false.

**C. Detection of fictitious revenues and invoices**

Another important responsibility of auditors is to verify whether the revenue reported by a company arises from genuine business transactions.

In the Satyam scandal, investigations identified inflated revenue through fictitious invoices associated with false customers or transactions. Auditors were expected to examine invoices, supporting contracts, customer confirmations and other evidence to establish that the reported sales were genuine.

The case demonstrated the importance of testing transactions rather than simply accepting accounting records supplied by management.

**D. Professional scepticism**

Auditors must exercise professional scepticism, meaning that they should question information provided by management and remain alert to the possibility of fraud or error.

In Satyam, the substantial reported cash balances and other financial figures required careful examination. Auditors should have investigated inconsistencies, sought independent evidence and demanded satisfactory explanations for unusual transactions.

Accepting management's explanations without adequate verification would be inconsistent with the level of professional care expected of statutory auditors. Professional scepticism is particularly important when auditing large companies because unchecked assumptions can conceal significant financial manipulation.[8]

**E. Examination of internal audit reports**

Internal audit reports can assist external auditors in determining any loopholes of the accounting systems, any unusual transactions and potential financial irregularities. The proceedings relating to Satyam, however, highlighted issues with regard to dealing with internal audit reports and discrepancies in invoice reconciliation. The auditor should have

[8] Institute of Chartered Accountants of India, *Standards on Auditing*: SA 200, Overall Objectives of the Independent Auditor; SA 230, Audit Documentation; SA 240, The Auditor's Responsibilities Relating to Fraud; SA 315, Identifying and Assessing the Risks of Material Misstatement; and SA 505, External Confirmations.

ISSN: 2582-6433

reviewed relevant warnings, conducted an investigation of material differences and determined if additional audit procedures were required. Failing to or under-investigating key warning flags hampers the entire audit process and leaves the door open for misleading financial statements to be issued.

**F. Maintaining independence and integrity**

The auditor of company's accounts cannot be associated with the company. They have a professional responsibility to render an opinion rather than to defend the interests or reputation of the management of the company. Satyam scandal cast doubt on the audit process and whether it had adhered to the necessary professional diligence, objectivity and independence. An auditor's professional judgement should not be influenced by management pressure, financial relationships or by the auditor's wish to retain an audit engagement. Suspected fraud and/or material misstatement shall be investigated and reported as necessary.

**G. Protecting investors and shareholders**

Audited financial statements are an important source of information for investors, shareholders, lenders and other stakeholders. They use these statements to evaluate a company's profitability, financial stability and investment potential.

Because Satyam's published financial information overstated its financial position, investors could make decisions based on misleading information. The scandal damaged investor confidence and demonstrated that an ineffective audit can have consequences far beyond the company itself.

Auditors therefore have an important responsibility to support transparency and protect the reliability of financial reporting. Although auditors cannot guarantee that every fraud will be detected, they must conduct their work with appropriate professional care and obtain sufficient evidence to support their conclusions.

**5.3 Accountability of Auditors in the Satyam Scandal**

Auditor accountability means that auditors may face professional, civil, regulatory or criminal consequences when their conduct violates applicable legal or professional obligations. In the Satyam case, several mechanisms were used to examine the auditors' conduct.

**A. Professional accountability under ICAI**

The Institute of Chartered Accountants of India is the statutory professional body responsible for regulating chartered accountants in India. Following the scandal, ICAI initiated disciplinary proceedings against the concerned auditors and audit firms. The proceedings examined whether the auditors had committed professional misconduct or failed to fulfil their responsibilities in

ISSN: 2582-6433

auditing Satyam's accounts.[9]

Professional accountability is important because auditors are expected to comply with auditing standards, maintain professional competence and exercise due care. Where misconduct is established, disciplinary measures may be imposed in accordance with the applicable law and findings.

**B. Regulatory accountability under SEBI**

SEBI examined the auditors' role in relation to the misleading financial statements and their effects on the securities market.

In January 2018, SEBI ordered a two-year restriction on certain Price Waterhouse network firms from auditing listed companies and directed disgorgement of approximately ₹13 crore in fees, with interest, in proceedings concerning the Satyam audit.

However, in September 2019, the Securities Appellate Tribunal set aside the two-year audit ban while allowing the disgorgement direction to stand. The tribunal distinguished negligence in auditing from proof of fraud or collusion and considered the limits of SEBI's powers in relation to professional auditing misconduct.[10]

This distinction is important. An auditor's failure to exercise due care does not automatically establish that the auditor knowingly participated in fraud. The evidence and legal requirements for each allegation must be examined separately.

**C. Criminal accountability**

Criminal accountability occurs where evidence is found that an auditor has committed an offence under the relevant law, for example, knowingly being involved in any form of fraud, bookkept fraud or deliberately facilitating the deception of investors. Satyam investigations explored the part of company officials and auditors. The penalties for the persons who had been charged were dependent on the specific charges, evidence and proceedings against them. It is crucial to remember that all auditors who missed a fraud were not necessarily involved in the fraud. Poor auditing and intentional collusion are not the same thing and must be found by the courts in order to make anyone criminally liable.

**D. Civil liability and compensation**

Civil liability may arise where an auditor's breach of a legal duty causes compensable loss and the applicable requirements for liability are satisfied.

In the Satyam scandal, investors suffered serious financial consequences when the company's

[9] Chartered Accountants Act, No. 38 of 1949, § 21 & Second Schedule (India).
[10] *Price Waterhouse & Co. v. Securities & Exchange Board of India*, Appeal Nos. 6, 7, 190 & 191 of 2018 (Securities Appellate Tribunal Sept. 9, 2019), https://indiankanoon.org/doc/135727153/.

ISSN: 2582-6433

actual financial condition became apparent. The case raised questions about whether investors could recover losses from auditors whose audit work was alleged to have been deficient.

The Ministry of Corporate Affairs' expert report on audit-firm regulation discussed the settlement of US$25.5 million involving PricewaterhouseCoopers in litigation brought by investors in Satyam's American Depository Receipts. It is important to distinguish regulatory recovery from investor compensation: disgorgement of audit fees does not necessarily reimburse shareholders for their losses.[11]

**E. Accountability of the audit firm**

Accountability is not limited to the individual auditor who signs the audit report. The audit firm must also maintain appropriate systems for quality control, supervision, review and compliance with auditing standards.

In the Satyam case, the role of Price Waterhouse, Bangalore, and the responsibilities of the engagement partners were scrutinised. The case highlighted the importance of ensuring that audit teams independently verify evidence, document their work and properly escalate serious discrepancies.

However, liability of an audit firm or its partners must be determined according to the evidence and the applicable legal proceedings; it should not be inferred solely from their association with the audit.

**5.4 Legal Framework Governing Auditors in India**

The Satyam scandal brought to the fore the significance of the following laws and regulations:

**Companies Act, 1956:** This was the company law that was in operation at the time of the scandal. It included the then law regarding company audit and auditor responsibilities.

**Companies Act, 2013:** The Act enhanced the modern system of auditor duties, independence and accountability. The remaining sections (139, 143, 144, 147) cover auditor appointment, powers and duties, prohibited non-audit services and penalties for specified violations.

**Chartered Accountants Act, 1949:** Act that outlines the professional disciplinary framework for chartered accountants and professional misconduct. SEBI Act, 1992: This Act gives the powers to regulate and act in the securities market as per the statutory powers of SEBI.

**Standards on Auditing:** These standards establish requirements concerning audit evidence, risk assessment, professional scepticism and the auditor's response to suspected fraud. Relevant

[11] Ministry of Corporate Affairs, Government of India, *Report of the Committee on Regulation of Audit Firms*; U.S. Securities & Exchange Commission, *Background to the Satyam Case* (2011), https://www.sec.gov/comments/4-617/4617-76.pdf. The SEC material discusses the investor-litigation settlement involving PricewaterhouseCoopers.

ISSN: 2582-6433

standards include SA 200, SA 230, SA 240, SA 315 and SA 505.[12]

An important legal distinction must be maintained: the Companies Act, 2013 was enacted after the Satyam scandal came to light. Its provisions should therefore be discussed as part of subsequent legal developments and the present framework, not as though all of them governed the original audit.

**5.5 Lessons Learned from the Satyam Scandal**

The scandal provided several important lessons for auditors and corporate management:

1. **Independent verification is essential:** Auditors must obtain evidence directly from reliable external sources when appropriate, particularly for material bank balances and transactions.
2. **Professional scepticism must be maintained:** Auditors should question unusual figures, investigate inconsistencies and avoid relying entirely on management representations.
3. **Audit evidence must be sufficient:** Financial statements should not be certified without adequate evidence supporting material balances and transactions.
4. **Independence and ethical conduct matter:** Auditors must act objectively and avoid conflicts of interest that could affect their professional judgement.
5. **Regulatory oversight must be effective:** Professional bodies and market regulators need appropriate mechanisms to investigate misconduct and impose legally justified sanctions.
6. **Investors need reliable financial information:** An audit is an important safeguard against misleading financial reporting, even though it cannot provide an absolute guarantee that fraud will never occur.
7. **Accountability must be proportionate to the evidence:** Professional negligence, regulatory violations and intentional participation in fraud are distinct matters and must be assessed according to the relevant legal standards.

**5.6 Conclusion on Auditors' Responsibilities and Accountability**

The Satyam scandal demonstrated how deficiencies in auditing can undermine corporate governance, investor confidence and the credibility of financial statements. The auditors associated with Satyam faced serious scrutiny because the company's inflated financial figures remained undetected through repeated audits.

Their central responsibilities included independently verifying financial information,

[12] Institute of Chartered Accountants of India, *Standards on Auditing*: SA 200, SA 230, SA 240, SA 315 & SA 505.

ISSN: 2582-6433

examining supporting evidence, investigating discrepancies, maintaining professional scepticism and issuing an audit opinion supported by sufficient evidence. The subsequent disciplinary and regulatory proceedings highlighted the need for professional accountability while also demonstrating the legal distinction between negligent auditing and intentional participation in fraud.

Ultimately, the Satyam case established an important lesson for corporate governance: auditors must serve the public interest through independent, evidence-based and ethically responsible auditing, and any failure to fulfil their duties must be examined through fair and effective legal processes.

## 6. SHAREHOLDERS' INTERESTS AND DISCLOSURE FAILURES

### 6.1 Shareholders' Interests

Shareholders are the owners of a company who invest their money with the expectation of earning returns, receiving reliable financial information and benefiting from the company's growth. Directors and management have a responsibility to protect shareholders' interests by ensuring transparency, accountability and fair treatment.

In the Satyam scandal, shareholders' interests were seriously affected because the company's financial statements presented a misleading picture of its financial position.

**A. Misleading financial information**

Satyam's management reported inflated cash balances, fictitious accrued interest, overstated debtors and other false financial figures. Investors relied on these published statements to assess the company's performance and value its shares.

When the fraud became public in January 2009, the company's credibility collapsed and its share price fell sharply. Shareholders who had invested on the basis of misleading financial information suffered substantial losses.

**B. Loss of shareholder wealth**

Investors purchased or retained Satyam shares believing that the company was financially sound. The revelation that the reported financial position was false led to a severe decline in market confidence and share value.

This demonstrated how financial manipulation can harm small investors, institutional investors and other shareholders who do not have access to the company's internal records.

**C. The Maytas acquisition controversy**

On 16 December 2008, Satyam's board approved a proposal to acquire Maytas Infra and Maytas Properties, companies associated with the family of Satyam's founder, for a transaction

ISSN: 2582-6433

valued at approximately US$1.6 billion.

The proposal raised serious concerns about conflicts of interest and the use of Satyam's resources for transactions connected to its promoters. Shareholders reacted strongly against the proposal, and it was withdrawn shortly afterwards.

This episode demonstrated that shareholders must be given adequate information and that management decisions should be made in the company's and its shareholders' interests, rather than for the private benefit of controlling individuals.[13]

**D. Failure of corporate governance**

The scandal raised concerns about the effectiveness of the board of directors, independent directors and audit committee in supervising management.

These mechanisms are intended to protect shareholders by questioning major transactions, monitoring financial reporting and ensuring that conflicts of interest are appropriately managed.

The Satyam case showed that the existence of a board and an audit committee is not sufficient by itself. They must exercise genuine oversight and challenge questionable decisions.

**6.2 Disclosure Failures**

Disclosure means providing shareholders, stock exchanges and the public with accurate, complete and timely information about a company's financial position, business activities, risks and significant transactions.

In Satyam, the failure to disclose truthful financial information prevented shareholders from making informed investment decisions.

**A. False disclosure of financial statements**

The company's published financial statements contained inflated cash and bank balances, non-existent accrued interest, understated liabilities and overstated debtors. These irregularities concealed the company's actual financial position.

Consequently, investors could not accurately assess the company's assets, liabilities, profits or financial stability.

**B. Failure to disclose the true financial position**

The company's financial reports gave investors an inaccurate impression of its profitability and liquidity. Material discrepancies were not properly revealed through the company's ordinary financial reporting.

[13] Companies Act, No. 18 of 2013, § 188 (India); Securities and Exchange Board of India (Listing Obligations and Disclosure Requirements) Regulations, 2015, reg. 23 (India). The 2013 Act and 2015 Regulations are subsequent legal frameworks and are not the laws governing the December 2008 proposal.

ISSN: 2582-6433

This failure undermined the purpose of disclosure requirements, which is to ensure that investors receive information that is reliable enough to support investment decisions.

**C. Failure to disclose conflicts of interest**

The proposed Maytas acquisition raised questions about related-party transactions and the potential conflict between the interests of the promoters and those of Satyam's shareholders.

A related-party transaction is a transaction between a company and a person or entity connected to it, such as a promoter or a promoter-controlled business. Such transactions require appropriate scrutiny and disclosure so that shareholders can evaluate their commercial purpose, fairness and potential risks.

The controversy demonstrated the importance of transparent reporting and independent oversight of transactions involving related parties.

**D. Failure to disclose pledged promoter shares**

Another important issue involved the pledging of shares held by the company's promoter. Such pledges can create financial risks because lenders may sell pledged shares if the borrower fails to meet its obligations.

At the time, the lack of adequate disclosure of promoter share pledges left other shareholders unaware of an important risk. The Satyam episode contributed to increased regulatory attention to disclosure of pledged and encumbered promoter shares.[14]

This development showed that shareholders need information not only about company accounts but also about circumstances that may affect share prices and control of the company.

**6.3 Consequences of Disclosure Failures**

The failures relating to shareholders' interests and disclosures had several consequences:

- **Financial losses:** Shareholders suffered losses when the company's actual financial condition was revealed.
- **Loss of confidence:** Investors became less confident in the company's management and financial reporting.
- **Regulatory investigations:** Authorities investigated the financial irregularities and potential violations of securities and company law.
- **Corporate governance reforms:** The scandal strengthened attention to independent oversight, auditor accountability and disclosure requirements.

[14] Securities and Exchange Board of India, *Annual Report 2008–09*, Investigation in the Matter of Satyam Computer Services Ltd., https://www.sebi.gov.in/sebi_data/attachdocs/1289364867230.pdf. The specific historical disclosure requirements concerning promoter pledges should be checked against the regulations in force at the relevant time before making a more precise claim.

ISSN: 2582-6433

- **Damage to reputation:** The company's credibility and standing in the market were seriously affected.

### 6.4 Conclusion on Shareholders' Interests and Disclosure Failures

The Satyam scandal demonstrated that shareholders' interests can be seriously harmed when management manipulates financial statements and fails to disclose material information. Investors were misled about the company's financial health, while the Maytas controversy exposed concerns about conflicts of interest and corporate governance.

The case highlights the importance of accurate financial reporting, timely disclosure, independent board oversight and fair treatment of shareholders. The central lesson is that transparency is essential for protecting investors, maintaining market confidence and ensuring accountability in corporate management.

## 7. WHO EXPOSED THE SATYAM SCAM?

The Satyam scandal came to public attention when B. Ramalinga Raju, the founder and chairman of Satyam Computer Services, admitted to the manipulation of the company's accounts in a letter dated 7 January 2009. The admission revealed that the financial statements published by the company did not reflect its actual financial position.[15]

The scandal was therefore publicly exposed through Raju's confession rather than through a single external whistleblower or regulator discovering the entire fraud first. His letter acknowledged serious discrepancies in the company's financial records and triggered investigations by government and regulatory authorities.

Following the admission, the Ministry of Corporate Affairs, the Serious Fraud Investigation Office, SEBI, the CBI and ICAI examined different aspects of the case. These authorities investigated the financial irregularities, the conduct of company executives, potential securities-law violations and the responsibilities of the auditors.

The events leading to the admission also included the controversy over the proposed Maytas acquisition in December 2008. The transaction raised concerns among shareholders and increased scrutiny of Satyam's management. However, the formal public disclosure of the accounting fraud occurred when Raju admitted to the manipulation in January 2009.

The case demonstrates that corporate fraud may remain concealed for years when internal controls, audit procedures and board oversight fail to identify irregularities. It also highlights

[15] B. Ramalinga Raju, Letter to the Board of Directors of Satyam Computer Services Ltd. (Jan. 7, 2009), reproduced in *Full Text of the Letter from Satyam Computers Chairman B. Ramalinga Raju*, Domain-b (Jan. 7, 2009), https://www.domain-b.com/companies/companies_s/Satyam_Computers/20090107_letter_raju.html.

ISSN: 2582-6433

the importance of whistleblower mechanisms, independent investigations and regulatory coordination in exposing and addressing corporate misconduct.

## 8. LEGAL AND REGULATORY RESPONSE TO THE SATYAM SCANDAL

### 8.1 Introduction

The Satyam Computer Services scandal exposed serious weaknesses in financial reporting, auditing and corporate governance in India. On 7 January 2009, founder and chairman B. Ramalinga Raju admitted that the company's accounts had been manipulated and that its reported financial position was misleading.

Following this disclosure, several authorities, including the Ministry of Corporate Affairs, SEBI, the Central Bureau of Investigation, the Serious Fraud Investigation Office and ICAI, initiated investigations and proceedings. The legal and regulatory response aimed to investigate the fraud, hold responsible individuals accountable, protect investors and strengthen corporate governance.

### 8.2 Investigation by Government Authorities

#### A. Ministry of Corporate Affairs

The Ministry of Corporate Affairs took action under the Companies Act, 1956, which was the applicable company law at the time. The government ordered an investigation into Satyam's affairs through the SFIO and took steps to replace the company's existing board.

The Company Law Board suspended the previous board of directors and appointed six new directors to help stabilise the company and protect stakeholder interests.

This intervention was important because it prevented the existing management structure from continuing without independent government oversight while the company faced a major financial crisis.

#### B. Serious Fraud Investigation Office

The SFIO investigated the company's financial irregularities and examined the conduct of those involved in its management and financial reporting.

Its role was to investigate potential corporate fraud, examine records and identify violations of company law. The investigation formed part of the wider effort to establish how the manipulation had occurred and who was responsible.

#### C. Central Bureau of Investigation

The CBI conducted a criminal investigation into the Satyam fraud. It examined the alleged falsification of financial statements, the roles of company executives and other individuals, and possible criminal offences arising from the manipulation.

ISSN: 2582-6433

The criminal proceedings helped distinguish accounting irregularities from conduct that could attract criminal liability, such as fraud, forgery and conspiracy, where the relevant legal elements were established.

**8.3 Action by SEBI**

SEBI investigated Satyam's financial statements and possible violations of securities laws. Its investigation examined false financial disclosures, misleading information provided to investors and possible manipulation of the company's shares.

SEBI also examined whether the company's management had violated the SEBI Act, 1992, and regulations prohibiting fraudulent and unfair trade practices in the securities market.

In subsequent proceedings, SEBI imposed market restrictions and disgorgement directions against certain individuals associated with the fraud. Disgorgement means requiring a person to surrender gains obtained unlawfully.

**Action against the auditors**

In January 2018, SEBI ordered a two-year restriction on certain Price Waterhouse network firms from auditing listed companies and directed the recovery of approximately ₹13 crore in audit fees, with interest.

However, in September 2019, the Securities Appellate Tribunal set aside the two-year audit ban. It held that the evidence did not establish collusion merely from alleged negligence in auditing, while allowing the fee-disgorgement direction to stand.

This demonstrates that regulatory action remains subject to judicial and appellate review. It also highlights the distinction between inadequate audit procedures and intentional participation in fraud.[16]

**8.4 Action by ICAI Against Auditors**

The Institute of Chartered Accountants of India initiated disciplinary proceedings against the concerned auditors following the scandal.

The proceedings examined whether the auditors had complied with professional standards and exercised appropriate care while auditing Satyam's financial statements. ICAI also considered broader issues concerning accounting practices, audit quality and professional ethics.

This response highlighted the importance of professional accountability. Auditors must maintain independence, verify financial information and exercise professional scepticism rather than rely unquestioningly on company management.

[16] *Price Waterhouse & Co. v. Securities & Exchange Board of India*, Appeal Nos. 6, 7, 190 & 191 of 2018 (Securities Appellate Tribunal Sept. 9, 2019), https://indiankanoon.org/doc/135727153/.

ISSN: 2582-6433

### 8.5 Criminal Proceedings and Punishment

The criminal investigation led to proceedings against Satyam's founder, senior executives and other accused individuals.

On 9 April 2015, a special CBI court in Hyderabad convicted B. Ramalinga Raju and nine others in the principal criminal case and sentenced them to seven years' imprisonment. The convictions involved offences including cheating, criminal conspiracy, breach of trust, forgery and falsification of accounts.[17]

The proceedings demonstrated that manipulating company accounts can result in criminal consequences, not merely reputational damage or financial penalties.

### 8.6 Government Intervention to Save the Company

The government intervened to prevent Satyam's collapse from causing further harm to employees, customers, creditors and shareholders.

The previous board was suspended and replaced by government-appointed directors. A bidding process was conducted to identify a strategic investor. Tech Mahindra emerged as the successful bidder in April 2009, helping stabilise the business. The government-appointed board subsequently withdrew as the company moved towards recovery.[18]

This intervention was significant because the regulatory response focused not only on punishing wrongdoing but also on protecting the company's legitimate business operations and stakeholders.

## 9. CORPORATE GOVERNANCE REFORMS AFTER THE SATYAM SCANDAL

The Satyam scandal prompted renewed attention to corporate governance and auditor accountability in India. Important developments included the following.

### 9.1 Companies Act, 2013

The Companies Act, 2013 strengthened provisions relating to directors' duties, statutory audits, auditor independence and penalties for fraud. Section 166 sets out the duties of directors, while sections 139, 143, 144 and 147 address auditor appointment, powers and duties, prohibited non-audit services and penalties for specified violations. Section 177 provides for audit committees and vigil mechanisms in the circumstances covered by the Act.[19]

---

[17] *CBI Court Convicts B. Ramalinga Raju and Nine Others in Satyam Case* (Apr. 9, 2015). The precise case title, court record and judgment citation should be inserted after checking the certified judgment or an authoritative reported source.

[18] U.S. Securities & Exchange Commission, Satyam Computer Services Ltd., Form 6-K and related filing concerning the successful bid by Tech Mahindra (2009), https://www.sec.gov/Archives/edgar/data/1106056/000114554909000597/u00201exv99w1.htm.

[19] Companies Act, No. 18 of 2013, §§ 139, 143–44, 147, 149, 166 & 177 (India).

ISSN: 2582-6433

### 9.2 National Financial Reporting Authority

The Companies Act, 2013 established the National Financial Reporting Authority as a statutory body. The NFRA provides an institutional framework for oversight of accounting and auditing standards and professional misconduct within its statutory jurisdiction.

Its establishment strengthened the system of financial reporting supervision and auditor accountability.

### 9.3 Stronger Audit Practices

The Satyam case highlighted the need for direct bank confirmations, better audit documentation, stronger internal controls and effective audit committee oversight.

Auditors are expected to obtain sufficient and appropriate evidence, assess the risk of material misstatement and investigate unusual transactions rather than relying entirely on management representations.

### 9.4 Improved Disclosure Requirements

SEBI strengthened regulatory attention to promoter share pledges, related-party transactions and timely disclosure of material information to investors. The SEBI (Listing Obligations and Disclosure Requirements) Regulations, 2015 provide an important framework for disclosure and corporate governance requirements applicable to listed entities.[20]

These measures were intended to reduce the risk of similar failures and improve the reliability of financial reporting.

## 10. CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

### 10.1 Conclusion

The Satyam Computer Services scandal demonstrated how serious corporate governance failures can undermine financial reporting, investor confidence and the credibility of an entire business. The manipulation of financial statements, the failure to identify significant irregularities and the controversy surrounding the proposed Maytas acquisition exposed weaknesses in corporate supervision, auditing and financial disclosure.

The scandal affected shareholders, employees, customers, investors and other stakeholders. It also raised questions about the effectiveness of the board of directors, the independence and performance of statutory auditors and the ability of regulatory authorities to detect and prevent corporate fraud.

[20] Securities and Exchange Board of India (Listing Obligations and Disclosure Requirements) Regulations, 2015 (India), https://www.sebi.gov.in/legal/regulations/jul-2024/securities-exchange-board-of-india-listing-obligations-and-disclosure-requirements-regulations-2015-last-amended-on-july-10-2024-_84817.html.

ISSN: 2582-6433

The legal and regulatory response included criminal investigations, professional disciplinary proceedings, securities-market enforcement and government intervention to stabilise the company. Subsequent reforms, particularly the Companies Act, 2013 and strengthened disclosure requirements, reflected the need for better accountability, more reliable auditing and stronger corporate governance mechanisms.

However, the existence of laws and formal governance structures alone cannot prevent fraud. Directors must exercise independent judgement, management must provide accurate financial information, auditors must verify evidence and regulators must investigate misconduct effectively.

The Satyam scandal remains an important lesson that transparency, professional ethics and accountability are essential for protecting shareholders and maintaining public confidence in corporate institutions.

**10.2 Recommendations**

**1. Strengthening the independence of the board**

Boards of directors should exercise genuine and independent oversight of company management. Independent directors must question unusual transactions, review financial performance carefully and ensure that decisions are taken in the interests of the company and its shareholders.

**2. Improving audit committee effectiveness**

Audit committees should regularly examine financial statements, internal controls, risk-management procedures and the findings of internal and external auditors. Significant discrepancies must be investigated promptly.

**3. Ensuring auditor independence and accountability**

Auditors should maintain professional independence and avoid relationships that may affect their objectivity. Audit firms must establish appropriate quality-control systems, supervision and review procedures. Auditors should verify material financial information independently and follow applicable reporting requirements where fraud or material misstatements are suspected.

**4. Strengthening internal controls**

Companies should establish effective internal financial controls to prevent unauthorised transactions, manipulation of records and misuse of company resources. Internal audit systems should regularly assess accounting procedures and identify unusual transactions.

**5. Improving transparency and financial disclosure**

Companies should provide accurate, complete and timely financial information to

ISSN: 2582-6433

shareholders, stock exchanges and regulators. Material changes in financial performance, related-party dealings and other relevant risks should be disclosed in accordance with applicable legal requirements.

**6. Strengthening related-party transaction oversight**

Transactions involving promoters, directors, senior management or connected businesses require careful scrutiny. Companies should ensure that related-party transactions comply with applicable legal requirements, receive the necessary approvals and are disclosed appropriately.

**7. Enhancing whistleblower protection**

Companies should maintain effective mechanisms through which employees and other individuals can report suspected fraud, unethical conduct and financial irregularities. Whistleblower procedures should provide confidentiality, protect individuals against retaliation and ensure that complaints are examined independently.

**8. Strengthening regulatory supervision**

Regulatory authorities should continue to strengthen their ability to identify financial irregularities, investigate corporate fraud and enforce applicable legal requirements. Coordination between SEBI, the Ministry of Corporate Affairs, SFIO, ICAI and NFRA can help improve the effectiveness of investigations.

**9. Promoting an ethical corporate culture**

Companies should develop an organisational culture that values honesty, accountability and responsible decision-making. Directors, executives, employees and auditors should receive appropriate training on ethical conduct, financial reporting and their legal responsibilities.

**10. Increasing shareholder participation**

Shareholders should have meaningful opportunities to question management, participate in company meetings and receive relevant information about important decisions. Companies should encourage responsible engagement with shareholders and respond appropriately to concerns about financial reporting and corporate governance.

## SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

### LEGISLATION AND REGULATIONS


- Chartered Accountants Act, No. 38 of 1949 (India).
- Companies Act, No. 1 of 1956 (India).
- Companies Act, No. 18 of 2013 (India).
- Securities and Exchange Board of India Act, No. 15 of 1992 (India).

ISSN: 2582-6433


- SEBI (Prohibition of Fraudulent and Unfair Trade Practices Relating to Securities Market) Regulations, 2003 (India).
- SEBI (Listing Obligations and Disclosure Requirements) Regulations, 2015 (India).
- Companies (Audit and Auditors) Rules, 2014 (India).

**CASES AND TRIBUNAL DECISIONS**

- *Price Waterhouse & Co. v. Securities & Exchange Board of India*, Appeal Nos. 6, 7, 190 & 191 of 2018 (Securities Appellate Tribunal Sept. 9, 2019).

**OFFICIAL REPORTS AND PRIMARY MATERIALS**

- B. Ramalinga Raju, Letter to the Board of Directors of Satyam Computer Services Ltd. (Jan. 7, 2009).
- Securities and Exchange Board of India, *Annual Report 2008–09*.
- Securities and Exchange Board of India, Order in the Matter of Satyam Computer Services Ltd. (2015).
- U.S. Securities & Exchange Commission, *Background to the Satyam Case* (2011).
- Institute of Chartered Accountants of India, *Standards on Auditing*: SA 200, SA 230, SA 240, SA 315 & SA 505.

**ONLINE SOURCES**

- India Code, *Companies Act, 2013*, https://www.indiacode.nic.in/bitstream/123456789/2114/5/A2013-18.pdf.
- Securities and Exchange Board of India, *SEBI (Listing Obligations and Disclosure Requirements) Regulations, 2015*, https://www.sebi.gov.in/legal/regulations/jul-2024/securities-exchange-board-of-india-listing-obligations-and-disclosure-requirements-regulations-2015-last-amended-on-july-10-2024-_84817.html.
- Securities Appellate Tribunal, *Price Waterhouse & Co. v. SEBI* (Sept. 9, 2019), https://indiankanoon.org/doc/135727153/.
- U.S. Securities & Exchange Commission, *Background to the Satyam Case* (2011), https://www.sec.gov/comments/4-617/4617-76.pdf.
- Domain-b, *Full Text of the Letter from Satyam Computers Chairman B. Ramalinga Raju* (Jan. 7, 2009), https://www.domain-b.com/companies/companies_s/Satyam_Computers/20090107_letter_raju.html.