

**ORIGINAL CIVIL***Before Harnam Singh, J.***In the matter of the Indian Companies Act VII of 1913  
and of the Karnal Electric Supply Co., Ltd. (in Liquidation).****MR. AMAR NATH GOELA AND ANOTHER,—Petitioners***versus***THE KARNAL ELECTRIC SUPPLY Co., LTD. (IN  
LIQUIDATION) THROUGH ITS OFFICIAL  
LIQUIDATOR,—Respondent****Civil Original No. 181 of 1951.***Indian Companies Act (VII of 1913)—Section 33—Re-  
gistered shareholder—Rights and liabilities of—Lien on  
shares, when can be exercised—Liability—meaning of.*

1952  
June 6th

*Held, that a member who is entered as a shareholder  
in the Register of members, even if he is not the real owner  
of the share, is alone entitled to exercise the rights of a  
shareholder, viz, to vote as such or to receive the dividends  
payable in respect of the share and that he alone is liable  
for calls and other obligations of his membership though*

he may be merely a trustee to the knowledge of the Company.

Amar Nath  
Goela and  
another

v.

The Karnal  
Electric Sup-  
ply Co., Ltd.,  
etc.,

Harnam  
Singh J.

*Held*, that the lien on shares allowed by the Articles of Association can be exercised not only in respect of admitted liabilities but also in respect of disputed ones. Liability or responsibility is the bond of necessity that exists between the wrongdoer and the remedy of the wrong. This *Vinculum Juris* is not one of the mere duty or obligation; it pertains not to the sphere of ought but to that of must. It has its source in the supreme will of the state, vindicating its supremacy by way of physical force in the last resort against the unconforming will of the individual. A man's liability consists in those things which he must do or suffer, because he has already failed in doing what he ought. It is the *ultimatum* of the law.

In *Murshidabad Loan Office, Ltd. v. Satish Chandra Chakravarty* (1), and *Salmond on Jurisprudence, Tenth Edition, page 364*, relied upon.

*Petition under section 183 (5) of the Indian Companies Act and section 151, Civil Procedure Code, praying that orders may be passed directing the Official Liquidator of the respondent company to make the payment of the amount due to the petitioners with interest at 9 per cent per annum from 15th October 1951, to the date of payment and costs of this petition may also be awarded to the petitioner.*

BALRAJ TULI, for Petitioners.

KUNDAN LAL GOSAIN, for Respondent.

#### ORDER

In Civil Original No. 181 of 1951 Mr. Amar Nath Goela and Mr. Ram Nath Goela apply that Mr. Harish Chander Bhatnagar, Official Liquidator of the Karnal Electric Supply Company, Limited, may be directed to pay them 50 per cent of the share-money with interest at 9 per cent per annum from the 15th of October, 1951, to the date of payment with costs.

Briefly summarised the facts of the case are these. Mr. Amar Nath Goela holds 220 shares bearing Nos. 201—300, 636—735, 866—875 and 1344—1353 of the

Amar Nath  
Goela and  
another  
v.  
The Karnal  
Electric Sup-  
ply Co., Ltd.,  
etc.,

Company, while Mr Ram Nath Goela holds 115 shares bearing Nos. 301—350, 556—565, 626—635, 1219—1243, 2177—2191 and 1906—1910. In the liquidation proceedings Mr. Amar Nath Goela and Mr. Ram Nath Goela have been placed on the list of contributories by the Official Liquidator of the Company.

Harnam  
Singh J.

On the 28th of September, 1951, I directed the Liquidator of the Company to pay 50 per cent of the share-money to the contributories. In the present proceedings the applicants maintain that they have not been paid 50 per cent of the share-money in accordance with the order passed by the Court on the 28th of September, 1951.

In the answer put in by the Liquidator it is said that the payments have been withheld because of the pendency of proceedings against Mr. Amar Nath Goela, ex-Managing Director of the Company, under section 235 of the Indian Companies Act. Indeed, it is maintained that the Company has a lien on the share-money under clause 43 of the Memorandum and Articles of Association of the Company. Clause 43 reads :—

“ The Company shall have a first and paramount lien upon all shares (whether fully paid or not) registered in the sole name of any member or jointly with other persons, and also on all dividends or other sums of money due to such member, for his debts, liabilities and engagements to or with the Company, whether joint with other persons or not, and notwithstanding that the time for payment, discharge or fulfilment thereof has not actually arrived. ”

Admittedly, no proceedings under section 235 of the Indian Companies Act are pending against Mr. Ram Nath Goela. Mr. Ram Nath Goela is entered on the register of members and has been brought on the list of contributories in his own right. Section 33 of

the Indian Companies Act provides that no notice of any trust, expressed, implied or constructive, shall be entered on the register, or be receivable by the Registrar. In other words, a member is liable for calls and other obligations of his membership though that member may be merely a trustee to the knowledge of the Company.

Amar Nath  
Goela and  
another  
v.  
The Karnal  
Electric Sup-  
ply Co., Ltd.,  
etc.,

Harnam  
Singh J.

*In Murshidabad Loan Office, Ltd., v. Satish Chandra Chakravarty, (1) B. K. Mukherjea and Blank, JJ., said :—*

‘Assuming that the registered share-holder is not the real owner of the share but if he is the member in the books of the company it is he alone who would be entitled to exercise the rights of a share-holder, viz., to vote as such or to receive the dividend payable in respect of the share and it certainly follows that he alone is liable for share calls or to be put on the list of contributories in case the company is wound up.’

In the circumstances of the case Mr. Ram Nath Goela whose name is registered in the register of members kept by the Company has a right to receive 50 per cent of the share-money. That being so, I find that there is no justification for the non-payment of 50 per cent of the share-money to Mr. Ram Nath Goela.

As regards the case of Mr. Amar Nath Goela, Mr. Balraj Tuli urges that clause 43 gives the Company the first and paramount lien upon all shares registered in the sole name of any member or jointly with other persons and also on all dividends or other sums of money due to such member, for his admitted liabilities to the Company and not for disputed liabilities. As stated out by Salmond in his Jurisprudence, Tenth Edition, at page 364 liability or responsibility is the

(1) A.I.R. 1943 Cal. 440.

the Indian Companies Act provides that no notice of any trust, expressed, implied or constructive, shall be entered on the register, or be receivable by the Registrar. In other words, a member is liable for calls and other obligations of his membership though that member may be merely a trustee to the knowledge of the Company.

Amar Nath  
Goela and  
another  
v.  
The Karnal  
Electric Sup-  
ply Co., Ltd.,  
etc.,

Harnam  
Singh J.

*In Murshidabad Loan Office, Ltd., v. Satish Chandra Chakravarty, (1) B. K. Mukherjea and Blank, JJ., said :—*

‘ Assuming that the registered share-holder is not the real owner of the share but if he is the member in the books of the company it is he alone who would be entitled to exercise the rights of a share-holder, viz., to vote as such or to receive the dividend payable in respect of the share and it certainly follows that he alone is liable for share calls or to be put on the list of contributories in case the company is wound up.’

In the circumstances of the case Mr. Ram Nath Goela whose name is registered in the register of members kept by the Company has a right to receive 50 per cent of the share-money. That being so, I find that there is no justification for the non-payment of 50 per cent of the share-money to Mr. Ram Nath Goela.

As regards the case of Mr. Amar Nath Goela, Mr. Balraj Tuli urges that clause 43 gives the Company the first and paramount lien upon all shares registered in the sole name of any member or jointly with other persons, and also on all dividends or other sums of money due to such member, for his admitted liabilities to the Company and not for disputed liabilities. As pointed out by Salmond in his Jurisprudence, Tenth Edition, at page 364 “Liability or responsibility is the

---

(1) A.I.R. 1943 Cal. 440.

Mr. Amar Nath  
Goela and  
another  
v.  
The Karnal  
Electric Sup-  
ply Co., Ltd.,  
etc.,  
Harnam  
Singh J.

bond of necessity that exists between the wrongdoer and the remedy of the wrong. This *vinculum juris* is not one of the mere duty or obligation, it pertains not to the sphere of ought but to that of must. It has its source in the supreme will of the state, vindicating its supremacy by way of physical force in the last resort against the unconforming will of the individual. A man's liability consists in those things which he must do or suffer, because he has already failed in doing what he ought. It is the *ultimatum* of the law."

Judged in this light it must be conceded that it cannot be said that there is no liability of Mr Amar Nath Goela justifying the claim of lien. In case the interpretation sought to be placed upon clause 43 is accepted, any officer of the Company has only to dispute the liability and thereby defeat the lien. In my opinion, the Company has the first and paramount lien, upon shares of Mr. Amar Nath Goela described in paragraph No. 1 of the application for his liability to the Company. In these circumstances, the Liquidator is justified in not paying 50 per cent of the share-money to Mr. Amar Nath Goela.

In the result, I direct that 50 per cent of the share-money may be paid to Mr. Ram Nath Goela and that the payment of 50 per cent of the share-money to Mr. Amar Nath Goela may be withheld till the conclusion of the proceedings under section 235 of the Indian Companies Act, 1913.

No order as to costs.