

WADIA GHANDY & CO

N. M. Wadia Buildings, 123, Mahatma Gandhi Road, Mumbai - 400 001, India. Tel: +91 22 2267 0669, +91 22 2271 5600 | Fax: +91 22 2267 6784, +91 22 2267 0226 General e-mail: contact@wadiaghandy.com | Personal e-mail: firstname.lastname@wadiaghandy.com

DJM/HC/10082/ 6080/ 2012

010

Dated: 25th July, 2012

To, **Special Director,** Directorate of Enforcement Government of India, Ministry of Finance, Department of Revenue, Janambhoomi Chambers, Walchand Hirachand Marg, Mumbai – 400 001

Ref.: Show Cause Notice issued on 20.7.2011 in respect of Complaint bearing No.3/47/B/2010/AD(DKS)/Part (BCCI-1) dated 13.7.2011.

Sub.: Preliminary reply to the Show Cause Notice referred above.

Sir,

- 1. We address this communication under instructions and on behalf of our client Mr. Lalit Kumar Modi.
- 2. We had received the Show Cause Notice issued on 20th July, 2011 alongwith annexed complaint bearing No. T-3/47-B/2010/AD(DKS)/Part (BCCI-I) dated 13th July, 2011 on 2nd August, 2011.

Our Applications:

- 3. Vide our letter dated 22nd August, 2011 and reminder dated 21st September, 2011, we had requested you to supply copies of all documents on which reliance had been placed and for detailed inspection of records and supply of documents. We had made an application seeking supply of complete set of copies of documents relied upon in the Show Cause Notices and Complaint. We had requested you to -
 - provide us with a copy of the compete set of relied upon documents/materials including the documents set out in para 3 of our application dated 22nd August, 2011 and any other document or material collected during the investigation;
 - (ii) confirm if the statements given at serial number 4 to 8 of the Annexure to the Complaint are the only statements recorded by the Enforcement Directorate of the persons mentioned therein and if there are any further or previous statements of

mA.

those persons recorded by the enforcement directorate then a copy of the same may kindly be provided to us;

(iii) grant us an inspection of the records and the file.

4. Vide your letter dated 22nd September, 2011, we were informed that the Special Director has allowed our application that documents referred to in the complaint, but not mentioned in the Annexure to the complaint may be supplied to us. However, when we were not supplied those documents for considerable period of time, we wrote on 18th November, 2011 to Shri D.K. Sinha, the Assistant Director Enforcement, the complainant in the matter, to supply us the documents. Further reminders were sent by us on 29th November, 2011 and 6th December, 2011, but we were not supplied the documents.

5. Subsequently, we received a letter dated 16th December, 2011 from your office where in a complete turn around, we were informed that whatever documents are intended to be relied upon had been supplied, in respect of which we moved an application dated 7th January, 2011 seeking implementation of directions contained in letter dated 22nd September, 2011 as well as seeking recall of letter dated 16th December, 2011.

6. We regret to mention that none of our aforesaid communications have been replied by your office. We further do not know whether the applications we had made are still pending consideration or have been allowed or disallowed by you. In case, if these applications have been disallowed, before such an order being passed we should have been provided opportunity of personal hearing. However we have not been provided any communication or the order(s), if any, passed on these applications or have been intimated about the fate of these applications.

7. We submit that the proceedings initiated by you are quasi judicial proceedings where principles of natural justice are required to be complied with. We wish to record our objections to the manner of conduct of proceedings so far which have indicated complete violation of principles of natural justice.

8. That so as not to prejudice the case of our client pending before you, while reiterating our request to supply the documents sought for in the previous applications we are submitting the instant communication to you putting on record our preliminary reply. This preliminary reply is being filed on a without prejudice basis and we reserve our right to file a detailed reply upon supply of all the documents by you as sought by us.

DA

2

Scope of Show Cause Notice

9. The Foreign Exchange Management (Adjudication proceedings and Appeals Rules) 2000 mandate that for the purpose of adjudication whether any person has committed any contravention, the Adjudicating Authority shall issue a notice to such person requiring him to show cause as to why an inquiry should not be held against him. It is clear from a bare reading of the rule that show cause notice to be so issued is not for the purposes of making any adjudication into alleged contravention but only for the purpose of deciding whether an inquiry should be held against him or not. That after considering the cause, if any, shown by such person, the Adjudicating Authority is required to form an opinion as to whether an inquiry is required to be held into the allegations of contravention. It is only then the real and substantial inquiry into allegations of contravention begins.

We submit that there is no good ground of initiating any substantive inquiry against our client and the proceedings against him are required to be dropped.

No Personal Allegation against our Client

- 10. The Show Cause Notice indicates that there is no personal allegation against our Client of having violated any of the provisions of FEMA. Show Cause Notice dated 20th July, 2011 in respect of agreement with International Management Group (IMG) have been issued to the BCCI in which notice has been issued to our Client with the aid of Section 42 (1) of the FEMA which provides for vicarious liability. The other noticees are Mr. N. Srinivasan, Honorary Secretary, BCCI and Mr. M.P. Pandov, Honorary Treasurer, BCCI.
- 11. Our Client through his general counsel and constituted attorney voluntarily received the show cause notice from the office of the Enforcement Directorate so that he can participate in the adjudication proceedings. It is pertinent to point out here that the FEMA permits 'participation in such proceedings through authorized representatives. It is pertinent to point out that the said show cause notice has been issued in respect of agreement dated 24.09.2009 signed between BCCI and IMG and transactions undertaken pursuant to that agreement. The said agreement has been executed by Mr. N. Srinivasan, Secretary BCCI. All the remittances sent were authorized by the Treasurer, BCCI. The adjudication proceedings are essentially directed against the BCCI. The alleged infringement of not obtaining prior approval of the BCCI is also technical in nature and there are various instances where ex post facto approval is given by RBI.
- 12. The Enforcement Directorate (ED) Show Cause Notices reveal that ED has been investigating alleged violations under FEMA in relation to BCCI contracts and in respect of the general conduct of the IPL. The allegations reflect collective responsibilities rather

DA

than personal responsibilities. It is significant to note that the Enforcement Directorate has not identified any specific contravention under FEMA committed by our Client.

 Yet on such allegations the Enforcement Directorate moved the Regional Passport Officer Mumbai ("RPO") to impound the Passport of our Client and the RPO revoked the passport of our Client vide order dated 31.3.2011.

4

- 14. Infact our client fully co-operated with the summons and provided all documents as sought by ED and which were in his possession. However he could not personally appear before ED on account the grave security threat to his life which was also confirmed by Mumbai police. Our Client had at various occasions offered to give evidence either by video link or even on a commission at Indian High Commission in UK but this offer was not responded to by ED. Our client had also given reply to the Show cause notice dated 20.09.2010 issued for alleged non compliance of summons and requested for early hearing of the same but the same has not been heard and decided.
- 15. Given the allegations as set out in the Show Cause Notice under reference, the action seeking impounding our Client's passport was wholly unreasonable, arbitrary and disproportionate action on the part of ED.
- 16. Before making interim submissions on the Show Cause Notice, we wish to place on record certain facts in respect of BCCI and IPL, as these would have bearing upon the allegations leveled in the Show Cause Notices under reference.

BCCI/IPL

- 17. The Board of Cricket Control of India (BCCI) is a society registered under the Tamil Nadu Societies Registration Act, 1975. It has its own Memorandum of Association and Rules and Regulations. The President, the Secretary and the Treasurer are the office bearers of BCCI.
- 18. A separate sub committee unit of BCCI was set up known as Indian Premier League (IPL) to establish and oversee the operation of a domestic Twenty20 competition in India. IPL is not a separate entity but forms part of BCCI and is managed by a Governing Council having 14 members in which the office bearers of the BCCI are ex officio members. IPL as a sub-committee does not have any independent existence. It also does not have financial drawing or disbursing powers and all bank accounts are BCCI bank accounts operated by the Treasurer, BCCI. The Governing Council submits a report of its activities and decisions as well as audited final accounts for the approval of general body of the BCCI at its AGM.



- 19. The IPL as a sub-committee was brought about in existence when on 13th September, 2007 the Working Committee of the BCCI approved the launch of Indian Premier League and set up a sub-committee. Vide amendment in Memorandum of Association and Rules and Regulations of BCCI on 16th December, 2007, IPL was made a standing committee of BCCI.
- 20. Thus IPL like any other committee of BCCI for example Finance Committee, Legal Committee or Marketing Committee is merely to assist and aid the BCCI. The members of such Committees including the Chairman thereof can not be said to be person in-charge of or responsible to the BCCI for the conduct of business of the BCCI. This is so because IPL is merely a sub committee of the BCCI and has no control over the affairs of BCCI rather it is controlled by BCCI. IPL also has no say upon any financial drawings, disbursements or remittances as such matters are controlled by persons who are incharge of BCCI namely the President, the Secretary and the Treasurer. IPL does not also have any separate existence.

Key Role of Mr. N. Srinivasan

- 21. At the time of formation of IPL Mr. N. Srinivasan was the Treasurer of BCCI. Since IPL was not a separate entity but only a sub-committee of the BCCI, all decisions in respect of IPL which had any financial implication or required drawing or disbursing of any funds or providing any guarantees or decisions which required financial compliances including RBI approvals were taken by Mr. N. Srinivasan. Without his being at the centre of such decision making- being incharge of and responsible for all financial matters, none of these decisions could have been made. Further, compliance with obligations of BCCI including giving of funds and guarantees was the responsibility of the Treasurer in the internal working of BCCI. It has been the standard practice of BCCI that all FEMA compliances and RBI approvals are required to be taken by the Treasurer's office.
- 22. Another aspect of the matter is that India Cement Ltd., whose promoter is Mr. N. Srinivasan, participated in the IPL Franchisee Auction and was awarded the Chennai Franchisee of IPL namely the Chennai Super Kings. Thus, Mr. N. Srinivasan as the defacto owner of Chennai Super Kings was at all times well aware both as officer bearer of BCCI and owner of franchisee about the entire working of IPL and was at all times personally interested in its pecuniary and financial matters.
- 23. On 27th September, 2008 Mr. N. Srinivasan became the Secretary of BCCI and Mr. M.P. Pandove became the Treasurer of BCCI. However, even after Mr. N. Srinivasan came to occupy Secretary's chair he continued the old reporting structure by which all clearances of individual bills, payment approvals, disbursement, approvals from regulatory bodies

J.A.

continued to be routed through him. In fact, all of the bills which were sent to the Treasurer's office to pay were routed through the office of the Secretary. Mr. N. Srinivasan as Secretary made the office of Treasurer almost redundant and unconstitutionally took over his work too.

24. Even though Mr. Pandove was the Treasurer, Mr. N. Srinivasan insisted that all approvals regarding finance be taken from him and was defacto also acting as Treasurer of the BCCI. All cheques and financial instruments were signed by Treasurer only after approvals given by the Secretary, BCCI.

Finance Department of IPL:

25. That the IPL itself had a finance department. This finance department was reporting to the office of the Treasurer, BCCI and was headed by Mr. Prasanna Kannan who was the Chief Financial Officer of the IPL. The finance department also functioned in tandem with the Secretary's office. The financial consultant of IPL was Mr. P.B. Srinivasan who was as well the internal auditor of BCCI. These two persons namely Mr. Prasanna Kannan and Mr. P.B. Srinivasan are closely connected to India Cements Ltd. Mr. Prasanna Kannan is employee of India Cements Ltd. while Mr. P.B. Srinivasan is an internal auditor of India Cements Ltd. All contracts and other actions having the financial implication were cleared by the finance department of the IPL. This clearance was done with a priori approval of Mr. N. Srinivasan and then was processed through the Treasurer's office. The financial persons of IPL namely Mr. Prasanna Kannan and Mr. P.B. Srinivasan directly reported to Mr. N. Srinivasan. Thus, Mr. N. Srinivasan was at the fulcrum of the entire financial dealings of IPL. Mr. N. Srinivasan conflict of interest was highlighted at various times by our client and this resulted into Mr. N. Srinivasan harboring malice against our client.

Role of our Client:

- 26. That our client Mr. Lalit Kumar Modi was Chairman of Governing Council of Indian Premier League. The entire functioning of the IPL was undertaken by the Governing Council. All activities of IPL are acts that have documented approval from collective Governing Council or Working Committee Meetings in accordance with BCCI/IPL process. Our client has earlier provided documentary evidence to the complainant which illustrate collective council or board approval for all activities. Thus, no action of our client can be termed as unauthorized, unilateral actions on his behalf.
- 27. In so far as the role of our client is concerned it is significant to point out that the Enforcement Directorate has not identified any specific contravention under FEMA committed by our client. There is nothing in the entire Show Cause Notice that suggests

D'A.

that he has been responsible personally or in his official position for any contravention of FEMA or has committed any foreign exchange violation.

- 28. It is important to state that our client was not in any manner, ever involved in any monetary transactions concerning the BCCI or the IPL. He had no cheque signing power. He was not mandated with any authority to exercise control over BCCI accounts, either operationally or in respect of withdrawals or payments. Thus, he had no role to play in any of alleged contraventions under FEMA.
- That rather than causing loss of any foreign exchange, our client has been 29. singlehandedly responsible for earning huge foreign exchange for the country. It is largely due to him that the BCCI has become financially most powerful board in the world cricket. In this process our client had brought various contracts in BCCI kitty worth over USD 6 Billion which have earned significant foreign exchange for the country. Thus, rather than causing loss of any foreign exchange, our client has contributed to significant amount of foreign exchange coming into the country. Some of the these contracts are Team Sponsorship Deal for Team India with Sahara, Team Apparel Sponsor Deal for Team India with Nike, Media Rights Deal with Nimbus for 4 years, Media Rights for overseas matches with Zee for 4 years, BCCI Sponsorship Deal with WSG, Indian Premier League Eight franchise contracts in 2008, ESPN deal for Twenty20 global rights, IPL Media Rights Deal with Sony, IPL Web Media Rights, IPL Title sponsorship and Ground sponsors, Renegotiated contracts of BCCI-IPL with Sony & WSG for the IPL Media rights, Nimbus Communication's 4 year deal for the rights to India's home international games, IPL Theatrical Rights Deal with UFO and ESD, IPL Entertainment Broadcast deal with Viacom and IPL two new franchise contracts in 2010.

<u>IMG</u>

30.

IMG is a well established and internationally recognised enterprise in the field of media and sports and they were engaged to analyse the feasibility of, and prepare the way for, the implementation of the IPL. The BCCI Working Committee meeting held on 21st August, 2007 authorised our client to work out modalities for engagement of IMG. Copy of minutes of Working Committee meeting are annexed and marked as **Annexure-A**. Consequently with the approval of the BCCI President, our client signed a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) with IMG on 13th October, 2007. This MOU was approved in the Governing Council Meeting held on 18th October, 2007. Copy of Governing Council Meeting dated 18th October, 2007 is annexed and marked as **Annexure-B**. Subsequently Shri N. Srinivasan then Secretary of BCCI signed two long form contracts with IMG on 24th September, 2009 and 18th January, 2010 superceding the earlier MOU dated 13th October, 2007. It is therefore, clear that the appointment of IMG was a BCCI collective

D.A

decision. In the years 2008, 2009 and 2010, remittance of Rs.88.48 crores was made to IMG by the BCCI. Each and every element of the remittance was made by either Shri N. Srinivasan or Shri M.P. Pandove, BCCI Treasurer. All these facts are well documented and capable of being easily verified.

Thus our client personally had no role in the payment made to IMG or remittance of foreign exchange out of country.

Non applicability of Section 42(1) of FEMA on our client:

- It is submitted that Section 42(1) of FEMA in which the show cause notice has been 31. issued to our client has no application qua him. It is well settled that Section 42(1) is a highly penal Section as it makes the person who was in-charge and responsible to the company for the conduct of its business vicariously liable for an offence committed by the company. Therefore in accordance with the well-settled principles of interpretation this section should be construed strictly. The Supreme Court in Giridhari Lal Gupta V/s. D.N. Mehta, AIR 1971 SC 28 held that in the context a person in-charge must mean the person should be in overall control of the day to day business of the company or firm.
- It is submitted that our client at the relevant time was one of the Vice President of the 32. BCCI as well as the Chairman of IPL which was a sub-committee of the BECI. He was not an office bearer of BCCI. He was not the person responsible for conduct of business of BCCI nor in-charge thereof. He had no financial powers. He was not involved in making of any remittances a foreign exchange or repatriation thereof. He was also not involved in issuing instructions or giving payment advice to AD. In these circumstances Section 42(1) has no application to him. The provisions of Section 42 of FEMA do not make any person liable for consequences. It is only that person who was in-charge and responsible for the business of the whole organization who can be made liable u/s 42(1).

Submissions:

It is alleged in the Complaint that the above remittances made to IMG were towards consultancy services and that section 5 of the Act read with Item No. 15 of Schedule III to the Rules requires that prior permission of Reserve Bank of India be taken for remittances exceeding \$ 100,000 per project for consultancy services procured from outside India. The show cause notice has been issued stating that BCCI has contravened the Rules to the extent of Rs. 88,48,01,059/- by making the remittances to IMG without obtaining prior permission of Reserve Bank of India.

It is submitted that:

The remittances made to IMG were not towards consultancy services. 1

わら

- In any case, the remittances were not covered by Item No. 15 of Schedule III to the FEM (Current Account Transaction) Rules and did not require prior permission of RBI since the services were not connected to any project.
- 3. Section 42(1) of the Act does not apply to BCCI.
- 4. In any case, our client is not an office bearer of BCCI.
- 5. Our client had no financial powers in the BCCI and has no role whatsoever in the modalities by which payments were to be made to IMG.
- 6. Even if the remittances were in contravention of the Rules, such contravention was not liable for penalty.

1. Remittances to IMG were not in the nature of consultancy services:

We submit that the Complaint is misconceived in that it proceeds on the basis that IMG rendered consultancy services to BCCI, whereas a reading of the documents annexed to the Complaint show that wide ranging complex and execution services were rendered by IMG, which cannot by any stretch of imagination be said to be consultancy in nature.

BCCI had entered into a Memorandum of Understanding dated 13.09.2007 with IMG to assist in the establishment, commercialisation and operation of IPL. The services to be rendered by IPL as set out in Clause 1 of the MoU included inter alia "development of a rights management process in respect of the commercial rights and assets, preparation and execution of marketing strategies, management of the tender process, implementation and management of rights, etc." For these services, Clause 2 provided that IMG was entitled to a commission of 10% of gross income excluding those revenues retained exclusively by the franchisees.

This MOU was superceded by a "Services Agreement" dated 24th September 2009 executed by Mr. N. Srinivasan, wherein Clause 4.2 set out that "IMG shall continue its work in carrying out or providing (as appropriate) the following" and sets out a variety of services to be rendered by IMG including : the on-going execution of the management in respect of the rights of BCCI, preparation and execution of marketing strategies, preparation and registration of controls, implementation and management of the sale and delivery of Rights to the Rights Holders, Management of the annual player trading window, provision of the requisite manpower required to carry on activities.

Even paragraph 4.3 of the Complaint accepts that IMG vide the MOU and the Agreement "undertook the obligation of a wide range of inter-related tasks relating to the formation of the IPL and creation of an operational framework for the League and its management and for achieving the optimum commercial exploitation of the various rights during the contract period."

Further paragraph 2.8 of the complaint accepts that the invoices raised by IMG were shown as commission invoices.

We submit that a plain reading of the MOU and the Agreements show that the nature of services rendered by the IMG were not consultancy services. It was a complex bundle of services to create and operationalize a novel idea to popularise the sport by a unique framework. The expertise of IMG, a necessary component in rendering these services, would not convert these complex services to a "consultancy service". While the term "consultancy service" is not defined in the Act, the Concise Oxford Dictionary defines consultancy as the professional practice of "consultant" and a "consultant" as a person providing professional advice for a fee. Thus the meaning of a consultancy service would be services that are in the nature of rendering advice alone.

As described in the MOU and the Agreements as well as the nature of service set out in the attached statements, it is clear that IMG was not just providing advice. The preamble to the MOU itself makes it clear that the responsibilities are wide-ranging. The scope of services delineated in Clause 4.2of the Agreement dated 24th September 2009 is wide-ranging and involves considerable "execution" and "implementation". Execution and implementation are not lending advice or consultancy.

The CESTAT in Glaxo Smithkline Consumer Healthcare Ltd. v CCE Mumbai 2007(7) STR334 held that comprehensive services in relating to market development, marketing sales and other connected services are not in the nature of management consultancy services. Likewise, in CCE Vadodara v Arvind Narayan PrasadNopany 200811STR353, the CESTAT held that services relating to market development, marketing, sales not being related to consultancy or technical assistance cannot be treated as management consultancy services.

We further submit that the initial arrangement with IMG was to pay them a percentage of revenues. Although this was later revised to a lump sum fee, this clearly indicates that the services rendered were not consultancy. This is further buttressed by IMG raising "commission invoices" as pointed out in paragraph of the Complaint.

We submit that the income tax proceedings further support that IMG was not rendering consultancy. Under the Double Tax Avoidance Treaty between India and the United Kingdom, consultancy services rendered by a UK resident in India are governed by Article 13(4) dealing with fees for technical services which "make available technical knowledge, experience, skill, know-how or processes". These are subject to a flat rate of tax at 10%.

D'A

On the other hand, if the income is not for technical services but for other services, these are taxable under Article 5 and Article 7. The Income Tax Department had ordered the deduction of tax at 13.72% though the tax rate for payment of Consultancy Services is 10%. Thus the payments were not in the nature by the tax authorities of management consultancy services.

Though our client was not involved in FEMA compliances. Yet in Forms A-2 furnished to the authorised dealer, BCCI had apart from one instance, always stated that the purpose of the remittance was "contractual obligation for IPL" and not as consultancy services.

Set against these facts, the reliance in paragraph 4.11 of the complaint on minutes, statements, etc. is not proper as these are not documents drafted with rigorous legal meaning. We also submit that reliance cannot be placed on the statements of Mr. Peter Griffiths, Senior Vice-president and Director of Operations IMG and Mr.Nazeer Khan, Chief Manager, State Bank of Travancore, in these proceedings unless the right of cross examination is granted to us. The Authorised Dealer on being informed that the remittances required RBI approval made an application seeking ex-post facto approval. This action was taken on account of an anxiety to conform to the law and as a measure of abundant caution and this act of the AD cannot prejudice the rights of our client.

 Item 15 of Schedule III to Rules does not apply since the services were not rendered for a project:

Without prejudice to our submission that the services rendered by IMG were not consultancy services, we further submit that in any case Item 15 of the Rules do not apply to these remittances since these services were not connected with any project. Item 15 of Schedule III to the Rules requires a remitter to seek prior permission of Reserve Bank of India for:

"15. Remittance exceeding US\$ 1,000,000 per project for any consultancy service procured from outside India".

We submit, however, that this Item 15 has no application to the remittance to IMG as BCCI did not pay for services in connection with a project. It is instructive to note that until 30th March 2001 the said Item read as follows:

"15. Remittances exceeding US\$ 100,000 for architectural / consultancy services procured from abroad."

From 1st April 2001, it read as follows:

"15. Remittances exceeding US\$ 100,000 per project for any consultancy services procured from outside India."

12

Further this was amended from 22.05.2009 to read as follows:

"15. Remittances exceeding US\$ 10,000,000 per project for any consultancy services in respect of infrastructure projects and US\$1,000,000 per project for other consultancy projects procured from outside India.

Explanation: for the purposes of this item "infrastructure project" is those related to

- i. Power
- ii. Telecommunication
- iii. Railways
- iv. Roads including bridges
- v. Sea Port and Airport
- vi. Industrial parks and
- vii. Urban infrastructure (water supply, sanitation and sewage".

From these amendments to Item 15 it is clear that there has been a progressive liberalisation in remittances for consultancy services. Upto 30.03.2001 all consultancy services exceeding \$100,000 required prior approval of the RBI. After 30.3.2001 remittances for consultancy services in excess of US\$ 1,000,000 for "projects" alone required prior RBI prior approval. Thereafter, the limit for remittances for consultancy services to infrastructure projects was enhanced to US\$ 10,000,000. Admittedly in the present case all remittances were made after 30.04.2007 and hence prior approval of RBI, if at all, was required only for remittances made for consultancy for projects and not for other consultancy services.

While the term "project" is not defined, it is used to mean an industrial or infrastructure project that is being set up. The term project is not used for a sequence of sporting or similar events. If one looks at the way terms like project office, project finance have been used in the FEMA Rules, it is clear that a sequence of sporting events is not considered a project. Thus, even if the services rendered by IMG are considered to be consultancy services, the services were not in connection with any project and hence were not covered by item 15 and thus prior approval was not required from RBI for the said remittances.

3. <u>Section 42(1) does not apply to a BCCI since it is a society of associations and not a</u> company, firm, body corporate or association of individuals:

Even if BCCI has contravened section 5 of the Act as alleged, no adjudication proceedings can be held against our client and the reference to section 42(1) is wholly misplaced. Section 42(1) provides that:

"Where a person committing a contravention of any of the provisions of this Act or of any rule, direction or order, made thereunder is a company, every person who at the time the

D.A.

contravention was committed, was in charge of and was responsible to the company for the conduct of the business of the company shallbe deemed to be guilty of the contravention and shall beliable to be proceeded against and punished accordingly:

Provided that nothing in this sub-section shall render any/such person liable to punishment if he proves that the contravention took place without his knowledge or that he exercised due diligence to prevent such contravention."

The Explanation to section 42 provides that:

"For the purposes of this section

- (i) "Company" means anybody corporate and includes a firm or other association of individuals and
- (ii) "Director" in relation to a firm means a partner in the firm."

The above section 42(1) read with the Explanation does not apply to BCCI for several reasons.

First, BCCI is a society registered under the Tamil Nadu Societies Registration Act 1975. As such it is not a Company or a Firm. It is not an association of individuals as its members are not individuals but other associations. It is not a body corporate as it has no corporate existence apart from its members. A body corporate has an entity apart from its constituent members and can hold property in its own name. However, the property of a registered society is vested in its Committee; section 18 of the Tamil Nadu Societies Registration Act 1975 states that "All property movable and immovable, belonging to a registered society, whether required before or after its registration, if not vested in trustees, shall vest in the committee and any such property may in legal proceedings be referred to as the property of the committee." Therefore Section 42(1) has no application to a society.

Secondly, as section 42(1) refers to a person in charge of the business of the company it can apply only to entities carrying on business. It cannot be applied to a not-for-profit body whose activity is to promote a sport and whose charter prohibits it from using the funds for any purpose other than promotion of the objects.

BCCI is a Society and all its office bearers are in honorary position only.

The Hon'ble Supreme Court of India in GiridharLal Gupta v D. N. Mehta AIR 1971 SC 28 has held that a person in charge must mean the overall control of the day to day business of the company or firm. Neither of them fulfil this criterion. The Supreme Court has also observed that section 23C (1) of Foreign Exchange Regulation Act 1973 (parimateria with

D.A.

section 42 of the Act) is a highly penal section since it makes a person vicariously liable for an offence committed by the person and therefore it must be construed strictly.

In any case, there is no reason to proceed against the Society and the the office bearers for the same alleged contravention. Following the Calcutta High Court decision in Sarah North Sen v Union of India AIR 1975 Cal 337, the FERA Board has held that a separate penalty on the partners of the firm u/s 42(1) in addition to penalty on the firm is not justified. (Seek B S H Export House v Director of Enforcement (1988) 41 Taxmann 138, B L Sajdeh v DOE 92 Taxmann 290, Diamant Carbon Products v DOE 1998 96 Taxmann 571 and Sudharshan Exporters v Directorate of Enforcement 81 SCL 101).

As has been pointed out BCCI is a not-for-profit society and its office bearers are not paid employees nor do they get any profits or dividends. They oversee a professional organisation to promote the sport of cricket. The office bearers take professional expert advice. Besides all relevant documents were furnished to the Authorised Dealer such as Agreements, Invoices, etc. The Authorised Dealer had not pointed out that the remittances required prior approval of RBI. All the remittances were made through normal banking channels. Income tax was withheld in accordance with law.Thus the office bearers had exercised due diligence and cannot be proceeded against as specifically provided in the _ proviso to section 42(1).

4. Our client is not office bearer of BCCI.

The office bearers of the BCCI are Honorary President, Honorary Secretary and Honorary Treasurer. Our client was Chairman of IPL, which was a sub-committee of BCCI. IPL had no separate existence or identity. A copy of BCCI's Memorandum of Association is enclosed and marked as **Annexure-C**. Only an office bearer can be treated to "person in charge" of the society. For these reasons, we request you to drop the proceedings against our client.

5. In any case no penal action is called for:

We finally submit that even assuming that a contravention of section 5 of the Act had taken place, it was by inadvertence. BCCI had provided full information to the Authorised Dealer. BCCI is a non-profit body with the object of promoting sport. BCCI has not gained by the alleged contravention. The Hon'ble Supreme Court in Hindustan Zinc Limited case had observed that penalties are leviable only for contumacious conduct or when a person does not act bonafide. In the present case, there is no allegation in the Complaint that was wilful contravention of the provisions or that there was reckless disregard for law of that foreign exchange transactions were conducted outside normal banking channels. On the contrary,

WADIA GHANDY & CO.

the transactions are between reputed entities, all documents were furnished to the Authorised Dealer. In these circumstances, we submit that no penalty is leviable.

Request for personal hearing

We request you to treat this as an interim reply and request you to grant us a personal hearing.

Following in the Index of Annexures attached with this letter:

Sr.No.	Particulars	Page No.
1.	Annexure A- Copy of minutes of BCCI Working Committee meeting held on 21 st August, 2007	16-19
2.	Annexure B- Copy of minutes of Governing Council Meeting dated 18 th October, 2007	20-22
3.	Annexure C - copy of BCCI's Memorandum of Association	23-50

Yours truly,

For Wadia Ghandy & Co.

lahan

Encl: a.a. GG:SL

कार्यालय विश्वेष निविधाव कायालाय विद्यालय मुंबई प्रवेतन ABAI T. Munnet

<text><text><text><text><text><text><text></text></text></text></text></text></text></text>
An a docurand at
The free of the fr



	ē	R.	T.	in the	and .	pre-	No		Ja-	đ	<u>3</u> .3		軍	- Hel	1-	51	0
	press experid/une to the tune of Fis. 1.00 crows for Archival mes approved.	The larged in TADA for Unpires in Domesia matches for the second 2007/2008 as paracted to wais opposed	Pitas Meney lar Domaelo Toumonania Amounting lo Pie-430.25 lakins Nas approved	It was decided to reveare the utilicontris (in Prada Manavi for this years boots 2009 and 2000-2007 based on the approval of the Wiching Commission in December 2005	The March Foe component pairs to Domestic Service Orioketters was hereaded to Re. 10.0004- puriday as applical Re. 4.0004 por dary.	The balance amount paywine based on the Orbeit Revenue will bee paid also: AOM:	The following purment to Saledwin for watching millional multiches Intrida wate expressed		Indian/sampry lour adread shall be paid equivalent of 70.05D-f.or Se- rice (sammaint equivalent ed. 40.050 for Junio fraema Balgrose perment of US \$ 05,1747, released for Adalaysian Origiter	Association (of DLFI Cup MA, N. Silaivatum (article) the insemblers ethou) the statule of procession for passo	The Chairman congraturated Mr. N. Brhivesen and his Jearn Yor the ecceleral clowing on sex matters which has resulted in the knoom a Tex	pleus	To fix the date and venue and aganda for the Amrue Garani Meetho.	The Oha/man announced that he Annual Ganarul Maximu will be hald on Friday, 28% Soptember 2007 at Cristeri Danva, Mumbal, at 1 0:00 am			
	lakuna ka the lune ei	The literature in TADA for Unpires in Domes season 2007/2008 as per activities was approved	ielo Toumamania àr	ese the dillocande fr 1-2007, besed on th wr 2005	chew paid to found	which has been on the	4 to Salackina for wa	por Teal	broad shah be paid of a model of the paid	oup retain briefed the in-	utulated Mr. N. Bry www.methors.which.h.	Internet sound recovered for several years. The report of Finances Committee was applied.	date and yanue ar	noso Usel his Annua Nosr 2007 at Crickel	8		
	The duti phase expend materials was approved	a lingratuan in TAV allon 2007/2008 as	Prize Money for Dom- was approved.	vas decided to rele 05-2008 and 2006 aminitee in Decemb	e March Fee conig Heased in Hs. 10,0	The belance amount s after AQM.	e following paymer brista were eportrue	Ri, 26,000+ per ODI Bi, 50,000+ per Teat	diamhann on tour a br tearn and equive alarbee payment of	Association for DLF C	No Chairmun congr ceilista icitos up cn	rvice paint prison	7 To fix the date Garans Meeting.	he Chairman sonou n Friday, 287 Sopher		+ *	
0	44 •	F4 -		≦288 *	F\$	手筆	ές •	83	22 m • •	₹. <u>₹</u> .	Fa		Jum No. 7 -	F.e.			
	Audoot for	atity the year	AC World Cup es la upgrade	a give krierest		the Finance	by the Renance	esh Kartnik le en June 2007	ho purchasa di asurar'a O I (da a. 10,0004 and	a, S.B. Billinicia		were upperheed	sed to Vidarbha octation was apr	Instantia de lo the dalm of chal Atsociation			
	unaluer and anicova Ana draft Annual Rudget for year 2007-2008	ned the salient statutes of the proposed budget for the year	cosad that as the Associations attains) the ICO World Cup guinn an interest pee advente of File, 20 oncies to upgrede mum.	ira. oližel not bia propiir	assured he mundors that he vould shuth this marke and nat Wouling Commisso Meeting.	200 F-2008 was passed unterimburgy of all minute were an automatic and approve the report of the Finance	omplates weating this out of the measure of the firm of a firm of the firm of	uity private for constanted players, Mr. Cinesh Kartilik is constant under statebory Ci wurt alloct trom 201 June 2007	ce Cermiliae spiraved and recommendative prioritad of the time Hon, 5, Sabreanys Oficial Hon, Treature's Office Saprearys Office alls cost of Ratiop.cody. Flat, 10,0004 and	our researces. Ang auch see for the year 2007 - 2003 to Mar. 8 13 Billinole. Biulocy Audiors of the Board.	Fa. 15/00 living Fa: 2.50 lacre	Augerangments Dou (Charlened Accolometris were appered al Auctions of DOOI and NCA as por subthy Terms and 16.	5 orgreis was feloe Gujarmi Orjokat Ast	n principile supportion verification by the from treasured a con- con. Treasurer was authoritzed to look into the deam of streasurer was authoritzed to Assam Orichel Association.			
0	ter and approve	is suffert/subtres o	her at the Associa A injerest the advi	vars supported by mombars, points and the view star hwold	d the morroors the ciking Committee 1	adda was pussed	A Print of the second of the s	Wile for complete al under cela pory	a Hon, Jr. Secretar a Hon, Jr. Secretar	datase for the year Audiors of the Bo	Makingry Audit Fees	unavan 8 Do. Cha tilora ol pool an	iulaidy ol Ra. 10.6 Non. The sigin by	(pio subjectito veri espurar y a a uli da inimalruqura su	40	-	
	o, 5 - To sonal	kasan explained e 06.	nthe pro- ones ba n the etau	ala Vierra Diseante	vance. Ha assure a report at noxt.W	he deel buckel for 2007 am No. 6 - To dehe	SUDAL COMPANY	ha vindbile entri	The Finance Co new sample of the	The following au & Co., Sigiulory	b) Blahio b) Audr	MM P.B. VIUVEL BL. JOHENNI, AU Conditions,	Antrastructure S	proved in prine lice. Hon. Ti adverce towar			
	-A. hom N	Mr.Brin 2007/21	Mr. 18.8 2011 mai facilities	Chr. Diversio	ine ad aubrit	The M	AB. IM.	et et									
																1 	
1											***		A CARLES OF				
						2 de											
													2				
							30										



Annexuse - B PAGE 1 MINUTE BOOK HELD AT GRICKET CENTER, MYMEAL ON 18-10-07 TIME 11-34 an Minutes of the Opening IPL Governing Council Meeting held on 38th October 2007 at the Cricket Center, Mumbai, 1. The Chairman opened the meating at 11.34am and welcomed everyone to the first IPL Coverning Council Meeting: Present were: Lalit Modi - Chaliman/ Convenor IS Bindra Chirayu Amin Arun Jaitty Rajiv Shukla Sunil Gavaskar Ravi Shastri Andrew Wildblood - IMG John Lofihagen - IMG Catherine Simpson - IMG Michael Fordham - IMG Balu Nayer - IMG Amit Sibal - Legal Counsel BCCI Shashank Manoher - BCCI President Elect Sharad Pawar MP Pandove Niranjan Shah Prof. Shetty. 2. Leave of absence was given to : Mansoor Ali Khen Pataudi N Srinivasan - Treasurer BCCI The President Elect, Shashank Manchar was invited to become a member of the Governing Council. The Chairman then introduced the special invitees from IMG. John Loffangan from IMG gave an overview of the Governing Council Constitution and the Charman asked for further comments from the members on the draft document, it was noted that there was one minor err in the document to be changed which was regarding the point that the document states that the appointed CEO would be in charge of the bank accounts while the BCCI Treasurer would be the person to be the same. Refer to point K 5 of the said ī CHAIRMAN'S UNITIALS and P. Penne, Barning 3.

	-	
l	Ì	
۰.	A	

100	MON	UTE	B	DOB	đ	ŝ
200	141.00	1940	2:29	1000	63	

HELD AT

PAGE 2

TIME

ON

document,

Amendment: It was decided at the office bearers meeting prior to the second IPL meeting on 17th November 2007 in Jaipur that all payments relating to IPL would be made by the BCCI Treasurer's office.

5. Item 5 was deferred to the IMG Presentation and the new IPL Logo presented by IMG was approved.

5. The Chairman explained that the basic contract is at a lower value which is guaranteed by the BCCI while the tirm contract is one that is not dependent on the franchize and lass popular with the players. It was suggested that point (I) in the contract should be claimed in detail as it could lead to legal issues in the future. Aron Jaitly also reccommended that instead of disputes being subject to the jurisdiction of the Courts of Mumbai a separate legal panel should be formed to settle the disputes in arbitration.

7. The Chairman confirmed the signing of the list of players shown in Item 7.

8. The Chairman confirmed the signing of 3 Pakistan players: Youns Khan, Mohairmed Asii and Stoceb Melik. The Chairman commend that discussion were being held with Australian players. Unfortunately, they were unable to participate in the League in 2008 due to FTP commitments. The dilemma of them not being allowed to play for and Indian Franchise team in 62020 is still under discussion. It was also noted that if an exception was made for Crickel Australia then the other boards would expect the same.

The issue of the ECB not giving their players NOC was also raised and the Chairman asked the members to think of an edequate solution for the same. The board authorised the Treasurer to go shead and make payment to all players signed as per the contracts skined by the chairman on behalf of the IPL.

9. The MOU signed with IMG was noted.

10. Approval was given to hire the premises for the IPL offices at Cricket Center,

11. The legal notice sent by Sheridan to BCCI, IMG and the PCB was noted and summarized.

12. The response to Sheridan from IMG was noted.

 After noting the bling of Adfactors, Andrew Wildblood recommended that, they design an international PR strategy with the said agency which was approved by the Council.

14. It was agreed that IPL TA/DA would be the same as the BCCI TA/DA.

15. During the presentation by IMC, it was recommanded that the following be

CHAIRMANS INITIALS

General P., Press, Bombay 3.









11 Õ isteerd under Act XXI MEMORANDUM ASSOCIATION 05 5 of \$360 at Madras on EU-17-3940)




























and the standard state of the Antonia Second





n network and a set of the set of the set of the set of a set of the All of the set of the set

AL 2207 214 140

















