Natural Resources for Human Health
eISSN: 2583-1194

Original Research

Received 24 May 2026
Revised 27 June 2026
Accepted 19 July 2026

Natural Resources for Human Health 2026, Vol. 6 (10s): 01–08

KEYWORDS:
Corporate Governance; Independent Directors; Non-Executive Directors; Board Accountability; Minority Shareholder Protection; Companies Act, 2013.

Non-Executive and Independent Directors under the Companies Act, 2013: Myth or Meaningful Reform

[1]Shantanu, [2]Dr.Tanu Arora, [3]Dr. Narinder Khubber

[1]Research Scholar, Faculty of Legal Education, Jagannath University, Delhi NCR, Bahadurgarh, Haryana. Email id- shandeswal@gmail.com
[2]Research Supervisor & Assistant Professor, Faculty of Legal Education, Jagannath University, Delhi NCR, Bahadurgarh, Haryana. Email id tanu.arora@jagannathuniversityncr.ac.in
[3]Research Co-Supervisor & Assistant Professor, Department of Law, Tagore Public Law College,
Kotputli, Rajasthan. Email id- deepnarwal20@gmail.com

ABSTRACT: With the adoption of the Companies Act, 2013, an earth-shaking change occurred in corporate governance in India, particularly through the statutory acknowledgment and formalisation of Non-Executive Directors and Independent Directors. The Act was developed against the backdrop of major corporate scandals and the increasing need for accountability, and it attempted to cement board independence, improve transparency, and safeguard minority shareholders. The legislation sought to shift commitment from symbolic compliance to substantive oversight by incorporating, under Section 149 and Schedule IV, eligibility criteria, tenure limitations, duties, and codified standards of independence. Although the Act formally gives Independent Directors specific positions on audit committees, nomination and remuneration committees, and vigil mechanisms, structural limitations persist. Their autonomy and effectiveness can be undermined by issues such as promoter dominance, information asymmetry, board capture, and liability exposure. Moreover, the tension between individual accountability and collective board accountability complicates the operating space between them. This paper assesses whether the statutory framework actually reorganises boardroom power relations or merely institutionalises a veneer of governance. Based on an analysis of legislative intent, regulatory architecture, judicial interpretation and operational challenges, the paper answers this question in the affirmative — that the Companies Act, 2013 provides a substantive normative foundation — although its transformative potential remains predicated on the culture of enforcement, board ethics, and the vigilance of regulatory authorities.

INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background of Corporate Governance Evolution in India

Corporate governance in India has undergone a slow but decisive shift — from a regime of state control toward a framework grounded in transparency, accountability and shareholder protection. Under the Companies Act, 1956, the regulation of corporations was largely compliance-based, with procedural rather than substantive standards. Boards were dominated by promoters and executive management, with little statutory focus on board independence or minority shareholder protection.

The liberalisation reforms of 1991 brought structural changes to the Indian economy. Exposure to international markets made Indian corporations subject to international governance practices, particularly those common in the United Kingdom and the United States. This led to the introduction of Clause 49 of the Listing Agreement by the Securities and Exchange Board of

India (SEBI), which mandated the inclusion of independent directors in listed companies — though as regulatory policy rather than primary legislation.

Subsequent committee reports, such as those of the Kumar Mangalam Birla Committee (1999) and the Naresh Chandra Committee (2002), reiterated the significance of board independence, audit control, and the separation of ownership and management. These reforms, however, remained predominantly regulatory and soft-law based, without complete statutory codification.

The shortcomings of this governance structure were exposed by high-profile corporate scandals, the most significant being the Satyam Computer Services Ltd. fraud of 2009. The accounting fraud — involving massive financial misstatements, distorted reports, and board-level failure — demonstrated the structural vulnerability of existing oversight systems and the poor performance of independent directors in practice.

Even with independent directors on the board, the fraud persisted over several years, raising concerns that board independence was, in practice, a mere formality. The Satyam episode revealed that regulatory requirements, absent statutory accountability provisions, were insufficient to curb managerial opportunism and promoter control. It intensified pressure for legislative change to institutionalise board independence and to clearly define the duties and liabilities of non-executive directors. The Companies Act, 2013 marked a paradigm shift in Indian corporate regulation, introduced by Parliament in response to these governance failures and evolving international standards. Unlike its predecessor, the 2013 Act formally recognised the category of Independent Directors under Section 149 and introduced a statutory Code for Independent Directors under Schedule IV.

This new statutory structure made a minimum number of independent directors mandatory for listed companies and certain classes of public companies. It further introduced tenure limitations, cooling-off periods, restrictions on pecuniary relationships, and enhanced disclosure requirements. It also consolidated committee-based governance by mandating audit committees and nomination and remuneration committees with substantial representation of independent directors.

The replacement of the 1956 Act by the 2013 Act thus signalled a shift from regulatory experimentation to the legislative codification of corporate governance norms. The statutory recognition of Non-Executive and Independent Directors rests on the theoretical foundation of agency governance — agency costs and opportunistic behaviour arise wherever the separation of ownership and management occurs in companies with dispersed or promoter-driven shareholding structures. Independent directors are expected to act as impartial watchdogs, protecting shareholder interests, maintaining financial integrity, and preventing the corporate misuse of power.

Through the codification of eligibility standards, responsibilities and accountability norms, the legislature sought to transform independent directors into institutional custodians of corporate governance. The introduction of a defined code of conduct under Schedule IV signals a normative shift toward active ethical stewardship rather than passive regulation.

Research Problem: Symbolic Compliance vs. Substantive Reform

Despite the sound statutory framework, a central question persists: has the formal institutionalisation of independent directors actually produced substantive corporate change, or does it amount to symbolic compliance? While the 2013 Act strengthens the normative basis of board independence, effective board functioning may still be undermined in practice by promoter dominance, information asymmetry, limited autonomous remuneration and exposure to liability.

This paper examines whether the statutory acknowledgment of Non-Executive and Independent Directors under the Companies Act, 2013 represents a transformative governance reform or a largely procedural reaction to crisis-driven reformism. The study analyses legislative intent, structural design and functional realities to determine whether independence is substantive in practice or largely formalistic in effect.

Objectives

1. To examine the statutory framework governing Non-Executive and Independent Directors under the Companies Act, 2013.
2. To analyse the theoretical foundations of board independence, including agency theory and stewardship theory, in the Indian corporate context.

3. To evaluate the effectiveness of statutory safeguards — eligibility criteria, tenure limitations and committee participation — in ensuring substantive rather than nominal board independence.
4. To assess whether the statutory recognition of independent directors under the 2013 Act constitutes a transformative corporate governance reform or remains, in operation, a form of symbolic compliance.

Hypothesis

H0: The statutory recognition of Non-Executive and Independent Directors under the Companies Act, 2013 has not produced any substantive change in boardroom power relations or governance outcomes in India.

H1: The statutory recognition of Non-Executive and Independent Directors under the Companies Act, 2013 has produced a substantive, though incomplete, transformation in corporate governance practices in India.

Review of Literature: The evolution of board independence in India has been examined from regulatory, theoretical and doctrinal perspectives, and the available literature may be organised around three broad themes: the pre-2013 regulatory foundations of independence, the theoretical underpinnings of the independent director model, and the operational effectiveness of the statutory framework.

The J.J. Irani Committee (2005) Report on Company Law examined the deficiencies of the Companies Act, 1956 and recommended a comprehensive statutory recasting of director duties and board composition, laying part of the groundwork for the 2013 reform. Around the same period, SEBI's Clause 49 of the Listing Agreement (as amended in 2004) introduced the first structured requirement for independent directors on the boards of listed companies, although as a regulatory rather than legislative mandate. The Kumar Mangalam Birla Committee (1999) and the Naresh Chandra Committee (2002) reinforced these themes, recommending stronger audit oversight and clearer separation between ownership and management, though their prescriptions remained largely in the domain of soft law.

The Government of India's Ministry of Corporate Affairs Report on the Affairs of Satyam Computer Services Ltd. (2009) provided a detailed account of the governance failure that catalysed the 2013 reforms, documenting how the presence of independent directors did not prevent large-scale financial fraud and board-level complicity.

Umakanth Varottil has produced some of the most detailed scholarship on Indian board independence. In "Evolution and Effectiveness of Independent Directors in Indian Corporate Governance" (2010), he traces the regulatory history of the independent director concept in India and argues that promoter-dominated ownership structures fundamentally alter the agency problem the concept was designed to solve. In a later work, "Independent Directors and Corporate Governance in India: Taking Stock" (2012), Varottil evaluates the post-2013 statutory design and concludes that formal compliance does not automatically translate into functional autonomy, given persistent information asymmetry and board capture.

On the theoretical foundations, Jensen and Meckling's "Theory of the Firm: Managerial Behavior, Agency Costs and Ownership Structure" (1976) remains the foundational text for agency-cost analysis of the separation of ownership and control, and underpins much of the justification for independent oversight of management. Davis, Schoorman and Donaldson's "Toward a Stewardship Theory of Management" (1997) offers a competing account, in which senior managers and directors are conceived as responsible stewards of organisational resources rather than self-interested agents requiring restraint — a perspective that reframes independent directors as strategic advisors rather than mere monitors.

Comparative and doctrinal perspectives are offered by Davies and Worthington in Gower: Principles of Modern Company Law (2016), which situates the Indian independent director model within broader Commonwealth developments in board governance, and by Afra Afsharipour's "Corporate Governance Convergence: Lessons from the Indian Experience" (2009), which examines how Indian corporate law has selectively converged with, and diverged from, Anglo-American governance norms, particularly in the treatment of promoter-controlled companies.

Taken together, this literature suggests that while the statutory design introduced by the Companies Act, 2013 is doctrinally robust, its transformative effect is contingent on factors that lie outside the text of the statute itself — board culture, enforcement intensity, and the practical autonomy afforded to independent directors within promoter-dominated ownership structures.

CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK

2.1 Meaning and Nature of Non-Executive Directors (NEDs)

The professionalisation of contemporary corporate governance rests on the structural distinction between executive and non-executive directors. The Companies Act, 2013 broadly divides directors into executive directors (whole-time or managing directors) and non-executive directors. Executive directors are concerned with the day-to-day running of the firm and assume operational and administrative control. Non-Executive Directors (NEDs), by contrast, are not involved in daily operations but in strategic decision-making and oversight.

This conceptual distinction turns chiefly on the character of the functions discharged. Executive directors act as management agents implementing board policy, whereas NEDs are expected to offer an objective view of corporate affairs. Their role is supervisory rather than managerial. They participate in board deliberations, review performance indicators, scrutinise financial reporting, and serve on committees such as audit and remuneration committees.

The oversight function of NEDs aligns with the broader goal of ensuring checks and balances within corporate systems. They are positioned to assess management performance without the conflict of interest that arises from direct involvement in executive authority. Nevertheless, the absence of an executive role does not, by itself, guarantee independence or objectivity — a distinction that is especially significant in jurisdictions such as India, where promoter dominance can shape both board composition and functioning.

The development of NEDs within Indian corporate governance began through regulatory means — Clause 49 of the Listing Agreement enacted by SEBI — before acquiring statutory status under the 2013 Act. The legal codification of board independence can thus be understood as an effort to convert non-executive involvement from a symbolic advisory role into a form of enforceable accountability.

It follows that while every independent director is a non-executive director, not every non-executive director qualifies as independent. Independence introduces a distinct normative and legal standard, layered above mere non-involvement in daily management. The independent director model draws principally on agency theory. As formulated by Jensen and Meckling, the separation of ownership and control in modern corporations generates agency costs arising from managerial opportunism. Independent directors function as a checking mechanism intended to minimise these costs by monitoring management on behalf of shareholders.

The agency problem takes a distinct form in the Indian context, where ownership is typically concentrated among promoters rather than dispersed among shareholders. Here, the principal conflict is between minority shareholders and majority (promoter) shareholders. Independent directors are accordingly expected to act as custodians of minority interests, ensuring that controlling shareholders do not engage in related-party transactions or governance practices that disadvantage other stakeholders.

Stewardship theory offers an alternative conceptual lens. Unlike agency theory's assumption of self-interested managers, stewardship theory assumes that senior managers may act as responsible stewards of organisational resources, oriented toward organisational success rather than personal gain. Under this model, independent directors are more than monitors — they function as strategic advisors whose knowledge, experience and judgment enhance board performance through collaboration rather than adversarial oversight.

Contemporary corporate governance discourse also emphasises stakeholder protection, recognising that corporations affect not only shareholders but employees, creditors, consumers and the broader community. Section 166 of the Companies Act, 2013 reflects this enlarged conception of responsibility by codifying director accountability under statutory fiduciary duties. The detached position of independent directors is intended to ensure that corporate decisions serve long-term sustainability rather than short-term profit maximisation.

LEGISLATIVE ARCHITECTURE UNDER THE COMPANIES ACT, 2013

3.1 Statutory Recognition (Section 149)

The Companies Act, 2013 provides the first comprehensive statutory acknowledgment of Independent Directors under Indian company law. Section 149 institutionalises board independence by requiring the appointment of independent directors in listed public companies and such other prescribed classes of companies. This legislative codification marks a clear break from the regime under the Companies Act, 1956, where board independence was addressed primarily through regulation rather than statute.

Section 149(4) requires that at least one-third of the total number of directors in every listed public company be independent directors. The Companies (Appointment and Qualification of Directors) Rules, 2014 extend similar requirements to certain unlisted public companies that meet prescribed thresholds of paid-up share capital, turnover, or outstanding loans and borrowings. Board independence is thus not confined to listed entities but extends to large public companies with significant public interest implications.

This compositional requirement reflects an effort to balance managerial power with oversight capacity. By prescribing a minimum numerical threshold, the legislature seeks to avoid tokenism and ensure meaningful engagement of independent voices on the board. The Act additionally requires certain categories of companies to include at least one woman director, incorporating diversity considerations into the governance framework.

The statutory treatment of independent directorship under Section 149 thus converts what was previously a matter of best practice into a legally binding requirement. Section 149(6) sets out detailed eligibility criteria designed to ensure objectivity and the absence of conflicts of interest. It requires an independent director to be a person of integrity with relevant expertise and experience, while imposing restrictions intended to prevent pecuniary and relational entanglement with the company.

A key safeguard concerns pecuniary relationships: no material pecuniary relationship should have existed between the independent director and the company, its holding, subsidiary or associate companies, or their promoters or directors, during the two immediately preceding financial years or the current financial year. This restriction is designed to prevent financial dependence that could compromise independent judgment. Independence is not, however, disqualified merely by receipt of sitting fees, reimbursement of expenses, or profit-linked commission approved by members within statutory limits.

The Act extends independence criteria to relational protections as well, excluding persons whose relatives have significant pecuniary dealings or security interests in the company. The definition of "relative" under Section 2(77), read with the associated rules, widens the scope of scrutiny to prevent indirect influence or circumvention of statutory restrictions.

Section 149(6) further excludes any person who is, or was, a promoter of the company or its related entities, or who held a key managerial position during a prescribed cooling-off period. These measures collectively aim to protect independent directors from managerial capture and promoter control.

By prescribing a structured set of financial, relational and positional disqualifications, the Act attempts to operationalise independence as an objective legal status rather than a matter of subjective judgment. Whether these protections hold in practice — and whether formal compliance is reliably mirrored in functional autonomy — remains central to assessing the transformative character of the 2013 reform.

3.3 Tenure, Appointment, and Removal

The statutory framework of independence is reinforced by clear rules on tenure, re-appointment and removal. Under Section 149(10), an independent director may hold office for up to five consecutive years. Re-appointment for a second term requires a special resolution of shareholders, with the justification disclosed in the Board's Report, imposing a heightened standard of accountability.

The Act further limits total tenure: no independent director may serve for more than two consecutive terms, or beyond a maximum of ten years. Following two successive terms, Section 149(11) prescribes a mandatory three-year cooling-off period, during which the individual may not be directly or indirectly associated with the company. This cooling-off requirement is intended to prevent familiarity bias and the erosion of objectivity over time.

Procedural protections concerning appointment and removal are equally significant. Section 150, read with Rule 6 of the Companies (Appointment and Qualification of Directors) Rules, 2014, establishes a databank of individuals eligible for appointment as independent directors and requires a proficiency self-declaration, professionalising the board-appointment process. Removal of an independent director is governed by the general removal provisions applicable to directors under Section 169, which are intended to prevent arbitrary removal aimed at stifling dissent.

The combination of term limits, special-resolution requirements and cooling-off periods reflects a legislative attempt to balance continuity with accountability. Critics nonetheless observe that the shareholder re-election requirement can expose independent directors to promoter influence, particularly in companies with concentrated ownership structures.

3.4 Duties and Code (Schedule IV)

A central feature of the 2013 Act is the codification of a dedicated Code for Independent Directors under Schedule IV. Unlike the Companies Act, 1956, which contained no specific governance code for independent directors, the 2013 framework sets out detailed guidelines on professional conduct, roles and responsibilities.

Schedule IV emphasises integrity, objectivity and the exercise of independent judgment in board deliberations. It requires independent directors to uphold ethical standards, safeguard the interests of all stakeholders — particularly minority shareholders — and ensure that financial information is accurate and reliable. The Code further requires independent directors to devote sufficient time to their duties, including attendance at board meetings and participation in relevant committees. In addition to Schedule IV, Section 166 imposes a general fiduciary duty on all directors, encompassing good-faith conduct, due and reasonable care, skill and diligence, and avoidance of conflicts of interest. Although applicable to every director, these obligations assume heightened significance for independent directors, whose principal function is oversight rather than management.

This statutory codification of duties reflects a shift from moral expectation toward enforceable legal obligation, embedding ethical standards within the legislative framework and rendering independence a legally intelligible standard of conduct under the Act.

3.5 Committee Participation

The effectiveness of independent directors is most evident in their mandatory participation in key board committees. Under Section 177 of the Companies Act, 2013, every applicable company must constitute an Audit Committee comprising a minimum of three directors, with independent directors forming the majority. The Audit Committee plays a central role in monitoring financial reporting, internal controls, auditor independence and related-party transactions, with majority independent representation intended to strengthen financial oversight and reduce the risk of accounting irregularities.

Section 178 requires the constitution of a Nomination and Remuneration Committee (NRC) comprising three or more non-executive directors, of whom at least one-half must be independent directors. The NRC is responsible for identifying suitable candidates for directorship, making appointment recommendations, and formulating criteria for evaluating board performance — an institutional mechanism designed to enhance objectivity in appointments and executive compensation decisions.

Section 177(9) and (10) additionally mandate a Vigil Mechanism for certain classes of companies, establishing a whistle-blower framework through which genuine concerns may be reported. Oversight of this mechanism is vested in independent directors in cases involving managerial misconduct, reinforcing their role as guardians of ethical governance.

Statutory Provision	Core Requirement
Section 149(4)	Minimum one-third of the board must comprise independent directors in listed public companies.
Section 149(6)	Prescribes independence criteria — integrity, expertise, and absence of material pecuniary or relational ties to the company, its promoters, or key managerial personnel.
Section 149(10)(11)	Tenure capped at two terms of up to five years each, followed by a mandatory three-year cooling-off period.
Section 150; Rule 6, 2014 Rules	Establishes a databank of eligible individuals and a self-declaration mechanism for appointment as independent director.
Section 166	Imposes general fiduciary duties of good faith, due care, skill and diligence, and avoidance of conflicts of interest.

Schedule IV	Codifies the Code for Independent Directors — standards of conduct, ethics, and stakeholder protection.
Section 177	Requires an Audit Committee with a majority of independent directors, overseeing financial reporting and related-party transactions.
Section 178	Requires a Nomination and Remuneration Committee with at least one-half independent directors.
Section 177(9)–(10)	Mandates a Vigil Mechanism (whistle-blower framework) overseen by independent directors.

Table 1: Statutory Framework Governing Independent Directors under the Companies Act, 2013

CONCLUSION:

The statutory recognition of Non-Executive and Independent Directors under the Companies Act, 2013 represents one of the most significant governance reforms in recent Indian corporate law. The legislature sought to convert board independence into a legal standard rather than an aspirational one, through eligibility rules, tenure constraints, fiduciary obligations, and committee-membership requirements. The combination of Schedule IV (the Code for Independent Directors), Section 149, and Section 166 signals a normative shift toward the systematisation of board accountability and ethical stewardship.

Nonetheless, the transformative potential of this framework must be evaluated against its operational realities and not merely its textual robustness. Promoter dominance in closely held companies and information asymmetry between management and non-executive directors continue to constrain effective supervision. Although independent directors are placed at the centre of key committees such as the Audit Committee and the Nomination and Remuneration Committee, the autonomy with which they can act often depends on the availability of accurate information and adequate institutional support.

Judicial interpretation has sought to balance accountability with protection against indiscriminate prosecution. In Pooja Ravinder Devidasani v. State of Maharashtra and Sunil Bharti Mittal v. Central Bureau of Investigation, courts have held that liability requires evidence going beyond mere designation — knowledge, consent, connivance, or a failure of due diligence, as contemplated under Section 149(12), must also be established. This calibrated approach preserves the integrity of oversight functions while guarding against over-criminalisation.

Regulatory oversight of listed entities has been further strengthened through the SEBI (Listing Obligations and Disclosure Requirements) Regulations, 2015, which reinforce disclosure norms and board-evaluation mechanisms. Even so, administrative heterogeneity can give rise to compliance formalism, whereby adherence is measured procedurally rather than substantively.

The question of whether the institution of independent directors constitutes myth or substantive reform therefore does not admit a simple binary answer. The Companies Act, 2013 establishes a normatively ambitious and structurally sound framework. Yet the realisation of independence in practice depends on board culture, professional integrity, and regulatory vigilance. Where independent directors exercise informed, uncontrolled judgment, the reform functions as a meaningful safeguard of shareholder and stakeholder interests. Where independence remains nominal, the framework risks devolving into ceremonial conformity.

REFERENCES

[1] Afsharipour, A. (2009). Corporate governance convergence: Lessons from the Indian experience. Northwestern Journal of International Law & Business, 29(2), 335–402.

[2] Companies Act, 2013 (India), §§ 2(34), 2(77), 2(94), 149, 150, 166, 169, 177, 178.

[3] Companies (Appointment and Qualification of Directors) Rules, 2014 (India).

[4] Davies, P. L., & Worthington, S. (2016). Gower: Principles of modern company law (10th ed.). Sweet & Maxwell.

[5] Davis, J. H., Schoorman, F. D., & Donaldson, L. (1997). Toward a stewardship theory of management. Academy of Management Review, 22(1), 20–47.

[6] Government of India, Ministry of Corporate Affairs. (2009). Report on the affairs of Satyam Computer Services Ltd.

[7] Irani Committee. (2005). Report on company law. Ministry of Company Affairs, Government of India.

[8] Jensen, M. C., & Meckling, W. H. (1976). Theory of the firm: Managerial behavior, agency costs and ownership structure. Journal of Financial Economics, 3(4), 305–360.

[9] Kumar Mangalam Birla Committee. (1999). Report of the committee on corporate governance. Securities and Exchange Board of India.

[10] Naresh Chandra Committee. (2002). Report on corporate audit and governance.

[11] Pooja Ravinder Devidasani v. State of Maharashtra, (2014) 16 SCC 1.

[12] SEBI (Listing Obligations and Disclosure Requirements) Regulations, 2015, Reg. 17.

[13] Securities and Exchange Board of India. Clause 49 of the Listing Agreement (as amended 2004).

[14] Sunil Bharti Mittal v. Central Bureau of Investigation, (2015) 4 SCC 609.

[15] Varottil, U. (2010). Evolution and effectiveness of independent directors in Indian corporate governance. National Law School of India Review, 6, 281–338.

[16] Varottil, U. (2012). Independent directors and corporate governance in India: Taking stock. Asian Journal of Comparative Law, 8(1), 1–39.