

	2012-13	2013-14	2014-15	Current Year
No. of cases withdrawn	4912	3375	2182	38

(c) The cases withdrawn relate to defaults in filing of Balance Sheets and Annual Returns for respective years. Broadly, reasons for withdrawal are:

- (i) The companies had already made the default good by filing the Balance Sheets and Annual Returns.
- (ii) The companies were found to be defunct/non-active for a period of three years and above and continuing with prosecution in such cases would have been futile. Such cases were processed for striking off such companies u/s 560 of the Companies Act, 1956.
- (iii) The companies had compounded offences in terms of section 621A (4) (d) of the Companies Act, 1956.

#### **Easing of compliance norms under Companies Act**

940. PROF. M. V. RAJEEV GOWDA: Will the Minister of CORPORATE AFFAIRS be pleased to state:

- (a) the plausible rationale behind easing the compliance norms in the rules under the Companies Act, 2013;
- (b) whether the decision of the Ministry to replace meeting obligations with board resolutions will help mitigate malpractices in companies; and
- (c) if so, the details thereof?

THE MINISTER OF CORPORATE AFFAIRS (SHRI ARUN JAITLEY): (a) to (c) After commencement of various provisions of the Companies Act, 2013 and rules thereunder, various issues received from Industry Chambers and stakeholders were examined in consultation with stakeholders. In order to address the issues received, certain rules have been amended. The compliance norms, wherever changed have been done keeping in view the need to strike a balance between regulatory requirements and ease of doing business and without compromising on the Board's accountability to the members of the company. The objective behind the amendment of Rule 8 of the Companies (Meetings of Board and its Powers) Rules, 2014 is to allow the Board to pass resolutions to take note of appointments or removal of one level below

the Key Managerial Personnel, to take note of disclosure of director's interest and shareholding, etc. as contained in sub-rule (3), (5), (6), (7), (8) and (9) of the said Rule without holding a meeting.

**Decommissioning of INS Sindhurakshak**

941. SHRI RAJ BABBAR: Will the Minister of DEFENCE be pleased to state:

(a) whether Government has decommissioned INS Sindhurakshak, the Kilo class submarine, which catastrophically exploded in Mumbai Naval docks on 14 August, 2013, resulting in the Indian Navy's worst peace time disaster including loss of human lives;

(b) if so, the details thereof;

(c) whether an inquiry was conducted into the reasons for explosion in INS Sindhurakshak;

(d) if so, the result of this inquiry and its recommendation;

(e) the result of other inquiries and recommendations received by Government regarding accidents/incidents involving Indian Navy's Vessels; and

(f) the action taken on each of these inquiries and recommendations thereof?

THE MINISTER OF DEFENCE (SHRI MANOHAR PARRIKAR): (a) and (b) No, Sir.

(c) and (d) Yes, Sir. The Board of Inquiry (BoI) has concluded that the incident onboard INS Sindhurakshak in the night of 13/14 August 2013 was an accident probably induced during the process of arming of the torpedoes. Since none of the officers and sailors present inside the submarine survived, it has not been possible to attribute any blame to any individual for failure or negligence, if any. However, disciplinary action against two officers in the chain of command has been initiated for individual lapses.

(e) and (f) Lessons learnt from the reports of Board's of Inquiry (BoI) are implemented appropriately. Corrective steps have been taken by Naval Headquarters with extensive checks on weapon related safety systems and audit of Standard Operating Procedures on all operational naval units. Safety procedures and professional checks have been re-emphasized. Incidents Study and Analysis Cells have been instituted at professional schools wherein lessons learnt are incorporated into professional training. Safety Audits of various units are being regularly conducted.