



THE INSTITUTE OF CHARTERED ACCOUNTANTS OF INDIA
(Set up by an Act of Parliament)

[PPR/P/170/2017/DD-154/TAMC/INF/17-DC/1214/2019]

ORDER UNDER SECTION 21B(3) OF THE CHARTERED ACCOUNTANTS ACT 1949 READ WITH RULE 19(1) OF THE CHARTERED ACCOUNTANTS (PROCEDURE OF INVESTIGATION OF PROFESSIONAL AND OTHER MISCONDUCT AND CONDUCT OF CASES) RULES, 2007.

File No.: PPR/P/170/2017-DD/154/TAMC/INF/17-DC/1214/2019

In the matter of:

CA. K SRIDHAR REDDY (M.No.221286)
H NO NEW 2-10-1622 (OLD NO 2-10-1220),
CHAITANYAPURI,
KARIMNAGAR,
TELANGANA-505002

.....Respondent

Members present:

CA. Aniket Sunil Talati, Presiding Officer
Smt. Anita Kapur, Member (Govt. Nominee)
Shri P.K. Srivastava, Member (Govt. Nominee)
CA. Vishal Doshi, Member
CA. Sushil Kumar Goyal, Member

Date of Hearing: 08.04.2022 through Video Conferencing

Place of Hearing: New Delhi

1. That vide report dated 17th December 2021 (copy enclosed), the Disciplinary Committee was of the opinion that **CA. K Sridhar Reddy (M.No.221286)**, was GUILTY of Professional Misconduct falling within the meaning of Clause (1) of Part II of the Second Schedule to the Chartered Accountants Act, 1949 with respect to allegation relating to conducting Tax Audit u/s 44AB of the Income Tax Act, 1961 beyond the limit prescribed by the Institute during the Year 2010-11, 2011-12 and 2013-14 as given hereunder in column (2). After conducting the enquiry into the matter, the Committee held the Respondent guilty of conducting excess tax audits as given hereunder in column (3):

Audits conducted during the Financial Year (1)	No. of Audits alleged to be conducted (2)	Excess No. of Audits (3)
2010-11	188	143
2011-12	411	366
2013-14	128	83

It was noted that Clause (1) of Part II of Second Schedule states as under:-

“Professional misconduct in relation to members of the Institute generally:

A member of the Institute, whether in practice or not, shall be deemed to be guilty of Professional misconduct, if he-

a



THE INSTITUTE OF CHARTERED ACCOUNTANTS OF INDIA
(Set up by an Act of Parliament)

[PPR/P/170/2017/DD-154/TAMC/INF/17-DC/1214/2019]

(1) *contravenes any of the provisions of this Act or the regulation made thereunder or any guidelines issued by the Council*"

2. An action under Section 21B (3) of the Chartered Accountants Act, 1949 was contemplated against the Respondent and communication dated 25th March, 2022 was addressed to him thereby granting him an opportunity of being heard in person and/or to make oral/ written representation before the Committee on 8th April, 2022 through video conferencing.

3. During hearing on 8th April 2022, the Committee noted that the Respondent was not present before it for hearing. It was noted that the Respondent vide email dated 5th April, 2022 accepted the decision of the Committee with respect to excess tax audit done by him during the relevant period of time. He further stated that he had nothing further to submit before the Committee. Accordingly, in terms of Rule 19(1) of the Chartered Accountants (Procedure of Investigations of Professional and Other Misconduct and Conduct of Cases) Rules, 2007, the Committee decided to proceed in the matter.

4. At the outset, the Committee noted that that there was no stay against the proceedings in the extant matter in any Court of law and accordingly it considered the documents/ information available on record with the submissions made by the Respondent. It was noted that the Respondent had admitted to have conducted Tax Audit in excess of limits prescribed by the Institute and also that the Council General Guidelines, No.1-CA(7)/02/2008, dated 8th August, 2008 under Chapter VI "Tax Audit assignments under Section 44AB of the Income-tax Act, 1961", provides that a member of the Institute in practice shall not accept, in a financial year, more than the "the specified number of tax audit assignments" under Section 44AB of the Income-tax Act 1961. Further, in Explanation given in Para 6.1, in sub-para (a) & (b) states that:

"the specified number of tax audit assignments" means –

(a) *in the case of a Chartered Accountant in practice or a proprietary firm of Chartered Accountants, 45 tax audit assignments, in a financial year, whether in case of corporate or non-corporate assesses and*

(b) *in the case of firm of Chartered Accountants in practice, 45 tax audit assignments per partner in the firm, in a financial year, whether in respect of corporate or non-corporate assesses.*

4.1 The Committee further noted that the tax audit assignment under Section 44AB of the Income-Tax Act 1961 is a time-bound assignment unlike other professional fields, and the work of audit requires precision. The certificate of audit issued by a Chartered Accountant under Section 44AB of Income Tax Act, 1961 has statutory force for the purpose of Income Tax whereas a Chartered Accountant in practice is free to accept audits under Sections 44AD and 44AE of the Income-Tax Act, 1961 without any limit. Thus, considering all these relevant factors, the Committee viewed that it cannot be said that ceiling of tax audit limit is in any way unreasonable or discriminatory.

4.2 The Committee further noted that the Guidelines do not in any way affect the rights of the Chartered Accountant under the Constitution of India being only a reasonable restriction as in the



THE INSTITUTE OF CHARTERED ACCOUNTANTS OF INDIA
(Set up by an Act of Parliament)

[PPR/P/170/2017/DD-154/TAMC/INF/17-DC/1214/2019]

process of regulating and maintaining the status of Chartered Accountant, the measures taken to put a cap on tax audit assignments are intended to maintain and improve the quality of work and cannot in any way be stated to be an unreasonable restriction. The Committee also noted the observations of the Supreme Court in Jyoti Prasad's case stating as follows:

"Where the legislatures fulfil its purpose and enacts laws, which in its wisdom, to considered necessary for the solution of what after all is a very human problem the tests of "reasonableness" have to be viewed in the context of the issues which faced the legislature. In the constitution of such laws and particularly in judging of their validity the Courts have necessarily to approach it from the point of view of furthering the social interest which it is the purpose of the legislation to promote, for the Courts, are not in these matters, functioning as it were in vacuum, but as parts of a society which is trying by enacted law to solve its problems and achieve a social concord and peaceful adjustment and thus furthering the moral and material progress of the community as a whole."

4.3 The Committee, accordingly, after consideration of all relevant facts and material on record as also the nature of tax audits, had found such a ceiling to be necessary in the larger interest of the profession and the guidelines on the tax audit assignment under Section 44AB of the Income Tax Act, 1961.

5. The Committee thus viewed that the misconduct on the part of the Respondent has been held and established within the meaning of Clause (1) of Part II of Second Schedule and keeping in view the facts and circumstances of the case as aforesaid, ordered that the name of the Respondent **CA. K Sridhar Reddy (M.No.221286)** be removed for a period of 1 (One) month from the Register of members alongwith a fine of Rs 5,00,000/- (Rupees Five Lakhs Only) that shall be payable within a period of 3 (three) months from the date of receipt of the Order and in case he failed to pay the same as stipulated, the name of the Respondent be removed for a further period of 1 (one) month from the Register of members.

Sd/-
[CA. Aniket Sunil Talati]
Presiding Officer

Sd/-
[Smt. Anita Kapur]
Member (Govt. Nominee)

Sd/-
[Shri P.K. Srivastava]
Member (Govt. Nominee)

Sd/-
[CA. Vishal Doshi]
Member

Sd/-
[CA. Sushil Kumar Goyal]
Member

प्रमाणित सत्य प्रतिलिपि / Certified true copy

Date:14/06/2022

Place: New Delhi

सीए. ज्योतिका गोवर / CA. Jyotika Gower
सहायक सचिव / Assistant Secretary
अनुशासनिक विभाग / Discipline Section
इंस्टीट्यूट ऑफ चार्टर्ड अकाउंटेंट्स ऑफ इंडिया
The Institute of Chartered Accountants of India
आईसीएआई नगर, विश्वास नगर, शहदोल, दिल्ली-110032
ICAI Bhaban, Vishwas Nagar, Shahdola, Delhi-110032

CONFIDENTIAL

DISCIPLINARY COMMITTEE [BENCH – III (2021-22)]
[Constituted under Section 21B of the Chartered Accountants Act, 1949]

Findings under Rule 18(17) of the Chartered Accountants (Procedure of Investigations of Professional and Other Misconduct and Conduct of Cases) Rules, 2007

Ref No.: [PPR/P/170/17-DD/154/TAMC/INF/17]—DC/1214/2019

In the matter of :

CA. K SRIDHAR REDDY (M.No.221286)
H NO NEW 2-10-1622 (OLD NO 2-10-1220),
CHAITANYAPURI,
KARIMNAGAR,
TELANGANA-505002

---Respondent

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Smt. Anita Kapur, Member (Govt. Nominee) & Presiding Officer
Shri Ajay Mittal, Member (Govt. Nominee)
CA. Chandrashekhar Vasant Chitale, Member
CA. P.K. Boob, Member

Date of Final Hearing: 9th September, 2021 through Video Conferencing
Place of Final Hearing: New Delhi

PARTY PRESENT:

CA. K Sridhar Reddy- the Respondent (appeared from his personal location)

Charges in Brief :

1. The allegation against the Respondent is that he had conducted Tax Audit u/s 44AB of the Income Tax Act, 1961 beyond the limit prescribed by the Institute during the Financial Year 2010-2011, 2011-2012 and 2013-2014. It is observed that as per letters dated 14th August, 2014 and 25th February, 2015 along with the reminder letters dated 4th June, 2016 (A-3) and 14th July, 2015 (A-4) in addition to letters dated 1st June, 2015 (A-4A) and 3rd August, 2016 alongwith the reminder letter dated 3rd February, 2017 forwarded by Tax Audit Monitoring Cell, the tax audits done by the Respondent during the financial year 2010-11, 2011-12 and 2013-14 are as under

B (P)

Financial Year	No. of Tax Audits
2010-11	188
2011-12	411
2013-14	229

2. The Committee noted that as per the Prima-Facie Opinion formed by Director (Discipline) in terms of Rule 9 of the Chartered Accountants (Procedure of Investigations of Professional and Other Misconduct and Conduct of Cases) Rules, 2007, the Respondent is guilty under Clause (1) of Part II of the Second Schedule to the Chartered Accountant Act 1949. The aforesaid Clause (1) of Part-II of the Second Schedule states as under:-

"Professional misconduct in relation to members of the Institute generally:

A member of the Institute, whether in practice or not, shall be deemed to be guilty of professional misconduct, if he –

(1) contravenes any of the provisions of this Act or the regulations made thereunder or any guidelines issued by the Council"

x

x

x"

Brief facts of the Proceedings:

3. At the time of hearing on 9th September 2021, the Committee noted that the Respondent appeared before the Committee from his personal location and submitted the information as sought by the Committee during its previous hearing held on 14th June, 2021. Accordingly, the submissions made by him were considered by the Committee and he was examined on the said submissions. The Respondent was thereafter asked to make his final submissions in the matter. The Respondent made his final submissions.

Based on the documents available on record and after considering the oral and written submissions made by the Respondent, the Committee concluded the hearing in the matter.

Submissions made by the Respondent:

3A. The Respondent submitted that he had not exceeded tax audit limit prescribed under the Chartered Accountant Act 1949 and had submitted fee register as maintained by him for the alleged years. He also stated that somebody might have mis-utilised his signature for which he couldnot be held guilty.

Findings of the Committee:

4. Before taking decision in the matter, the Committee noted the following background about the facts which are given here-in-below:

3/10

- 4.1 Section 44AB of the Income-tax Act, 1961 came into force w.e.f. 01.04.1985. The Government of India, Ministry of Finance, Department of Revenue (CBDT), New Delhi, examined the tax audit reports submitted by Chartered Accountants in a large number of cases, pursuant to introduction of Section 44AB, in the next two years or so. It was noticed by the Government that some of the auditors were completing around fifty (50) audits in a month, which resulted in deterioration of the quality of audit. It was therefore suggested to the Government by the Tax Authorities in the field, that the Government may fix the maximum number of audits, which an auditor may be allowed to undertake under the provisions of Section 44AB of the Income-tax Act, 1961, on the same lines, as Section 224 of the Companies Act, 1956, whereby the number of company audits which a Chartered Accountant could do had been restricted to twenty (20).
- 4.2 In light of the aforesaid facts, the Government of India, Ministry of Finance, Department of Revenue (CBDT), New Delhi wrote a letter dated 19th January 1988 to the then Secretary of the Institute, seeking his comments, regarding the suggestion of restricting the number of tax audits which a Chartered Accountant might be permitted to complete in a year, under section 44AB of the Income Tax Act, 1961.
- 4.3 The aforesaid letter dated 19th January, 1988 was considered firstly by the Professional Development Committee (PDC) of the Institute, and thereafter by the Council of the Institute, in its 133rd meeting held on 28th/30th April, 1988. After detailed deliberations, the then Council of the Institute in its said meeting decided to put a ceiling of thirty (30) tax audit assignments w.e.f. 1st April, 1989.
- 4.4 Pursuant to the above, and in exercise of the powers conferred by Clause (ii) of Part II of the Second Schedule to the Act (as it then stood), the Council of the Institute issued a notification bearing No. 1-CA(7)/3/88 dated 13th January, 1989 specifying that a member of the Institute in practice shall be deemed to be guilty of professional misconduct, if he accepted in a financial year, more than specified number of tax audit assignments under Section 44AB of the Income-tax Act, 1961. The then specified number being 30 in a financial year, whether in respect of corporate or non-corporate assessees. Subsequent to the above, the matter was considered number of times by Council with regard to revision of ceiling on the number of tax audits and the same was increased from 30 to 45 in the year 2007, which has been further increased to 60 in the year 2014 by the Council of the Institute. Considering that the turnover of the limit of tax audit has been increased from Rs. 40 Lakhs to Rs. 1 Crore in recent years, the Council decided, that no change is require in the existing tax audit limit prescribed by the ICAI by way of Guidelines.
- 4.5 It may be noted that Section 15 of the Act enumerates the functions to be performed by the Council apart from the general functions to carry out the objects of the Act. Under Section 15(2)(j), it is one of the functions of the Council **"to regulate and maintain the status and standard of professional qualifications of members of the Institute"**. Accordingly, each of these Notifications had been issued by the Council of the Institute after considering the report of the PDC; and the **whole object thereof was to ensure efficiency, improve the quality of service, ensure maintenance of high standards of performance in the field of tax audit assignments, ensure timely completion of**

B (M)

audits and filing of tax returns by the assesseees, for better and equitable distribution of work amongst Chartered Accountants, as also to avoid monopolization of professional work in a few hands. In other words, there was a definite public purpose involving the very object of preventing evasion of taxes, plugging loopholes, enabling tax avoidance, and also facilitate tax administration to ensure that the economic system does not result in concentration of wealth to the common detriment, with which the Parliament enacted section 44AB of the Income-tax Act, 1961, as already discussed hereinabove; as also for better and equitable distribution of work amongst Chartered Accountants, which object was also noticed and recorded by the Wanchoo Committee, while recommending compulsory audit of accounts, as early as December, 1971 (**emphasis provided**).

4.6 The Chartered Accountants Act, 1949 was amended by the Parliament by the Chartered Accountants (Amendment) Act, 2006, which came into force on 17th November, 2006. After, the amendments in the Chartered Accountants Act, 1949 in 2006, the notifications were superseded by the guidelines.

4.7 After the Amendment Act of 2006, the erstwhile Notifications were superseded by Guidelines bearing No.1-CA (7)/02/2008 dated 8th August, 2008.

- Para 1.2 of the said Guidelines, 'Applicability of the Guidelines', states that it shall be applicable to all the Members of the Institute, whether in practice or not, wherever the context so requires.
- Chapter VI of the said Guidelines deal with "Tax Audit Assignments under section 44AB of Income Tax Act, 1961", It is submitted that the said Chapter VI of the Guidelines is the subject matter of various Writ Petitions filed before different High Courts and it is for transfer of these Writ Petitions from various High Courts to the Supreme Court of India.
- It may also be noted that Chapter VIII of the said Guidelines supersedes the said earlier Notification dated 08.05.2001; and Chapter IX supersedes the said earlier Notification dated 8th March, 2002.

4.8 It is pertinent to note that the said restriction confines only to the audit assignments under Section 44AB of the Income Tax Act, 1961. There is no restriction as far as the other audit works. Further, Tax audit assignment is a time-bound assignment in the case of those coming under Section 44AB of the Income-tax Act and unlike other professional fields, the work of audit requires precision. The certificate of audit issued by a Chartered Accountant has statutory force for the purpose of Income Tax whereas a Chartered Accountant in practice is free to accept audits under Sections 44AD, and 44AE of the Income-tax Act, 1961 without any limit. Taking note of all these relevant factors, it cannot be said that ceiling of tax audit limit is in any way unreasonable or discriminatory. Therefore, there is no basis for the contention that there is violation of Article 14 or Article 19(1)(g) of the Constitution of India.

4.9 Such restriction on audit assignment is similar to that as imposed under Section sub-section (1B) of section 224 of the Companies Act, 1956 read with Explanations 1 & 2 there under or that imposed under Section 141(3)(g) of the Companies Act, 2013 wherein a Chartered Accountant is not permitted to audit more than 20 companies in a financial year. The said limit earlier excluded

18

private limited companies. However, later Act excludes one person companies, dormant companies, small companies and private companies having paid-up share capital less than Rs. 100 crores.

- 4.10 In view of above, the Council, which is duty-bound to regulate the professionals, i.e. the Chartered Accountants, has considered it fit to put such restrictions in the interest of the profession. It is regulatory in nature and such regulation is permissible under the Chartered Accountants Act, 1949. The Guidelines do not in any way affect the rights of the Chartered Accountant under the Constitution of India being only a reasonable restriction.
- 4.11 In the process of regulating and maintaining the status of chartered accountant, the measures taken to put a cap on tax audit assignments are intended to maintain and improve the quality of work and cannot in any way be stated to be an unreasonable restriction. Such restrictions are necessary for maintaining the status of Chartered Accountants and also for ensuring quality of work by Chartered Accountants.
- 4.12 This Act seeks to regulate the profession and hence the guidelines is made to ensure maintenance of quality and standards in the work done by the Chartered Accountants which is indisputably in furtherance of the statutory duty cast upon the ICAI to regulate the profession of Chartered Accountants.
- 4.13 In view of the above, the Council after consideration of all relevant material and facts as also the nature of tax audits, had found such a ceiling to be necessary in the larger interest of the profession and the guidelines on the tax audit assignment under Section 44A of the Income Tax Act, 1961.
- 4.14 The Committee also noted the similar restrictions are upheld in number of other activities in the interest of society at large. In the case of Virginia Tobacco Growers Association Vs. Respondent: Union of India and Ors. (MANU/AP/0745/2000) there was charges for discrimination under Section 8 of Tobacco Board Act and Article 19 (1) (g) of Constitution of India to check whether Tobacco Board had authority to declare crop holiday for FCV virginia tobacco in State of Andhra Pradesh and whether it was a reasonable restriction on tobacco trade as under Section 19 (1) (g) by declaring crop holiday to save exploitation wherein it has held by Hon'ble High Court that Board is justified in treating State of Andhra Pradesh as different and distinct area for declaration of crop holiday.
- 4.15 The Committee also noted the observations of the Supreme Court in Jyoti Prasad's case stating as follows:

"Where the legislature fulfil its purpose and enacts laws, which in its wisdom, to considered necessary for the solution of what after all is a very human problem the tests of "reasonableness" have to be viewed in the context of the issues which faced the legislature. In the constitution of such laws and particularly in judging of their validity the Courts have necessarily to approach it from the point of view of furthering the social interest which it is the purpose of the legislation to promote, for the Courts, are not in these matters, functioning as it were in vacuum, but as parts of a society which is trying by enacted law to solve its problems and achieve a social concord and peaceful adjustment and thus furthering the moral and material progress of the community as a whole".

4.16 The Committee noted in the case of State of Uttar Pradesh v. Kaushailya MANU/SC/0091/1963 : [1964]4SCR1002 (a decision of 5 Judges Bench), it was held:

“The reasonableness of a restriction depends upon the values of life in a society, the circumstances obtaining at a particular point of time when the restriction is imposed, the degree and the urgency of the evil sought to be controlled and similar others. If in a particular locality the vice of prostitution is endemic degrading those he live by prostitution and demoralising others who come into contact with them the Legislature may have to impose severe restrictions on the right of the prostitute to move about and to live in a house of her choice. If the evil is rampant, it may also be necessary to provide for deporting the worst of them from the area of their operation. The magnitude of the evil and the urgency of the reform may require such drastic remedies. It cannot be gainsaid that the vice of prostitution is rampant in various parts of the country. There cannot be two views on the question of its control and regulation. One of the objects of the Act is to control the growing evil of prostitution in public places. Under Section 20 of the Act the freedom of movement and residence are regulated, but, as we have stated earlier, effective and safe judicial machinery is provided to carry out the objects of the Act. The said restrictions placed upon them are certainly in the interests of the general public and, as the imposition of the restrictions is done through a judicial process on the basis of a clearly disclosed policy, the said restrictions are clearly reasonable”.

5. The Committee noted that the details as appearing in the abstract of fee register brought on record by the Respondent vis a vis that submitted by the CBDT from its records. It was noted that the Respondent had maintained his fee register in a diary whereby entries for the three Financial Years under questions excluding F.Y 2012-13 were made on consecutive pages under one handwriting and identical fees of Rs. 3500/- was charged from every client during the F.Y 2010-11 and 2011-12 and that Rs. 5,000 during the F.Y. 2013-14. It was further noted that the said abstract only provided the name of the assessee and the fees charged against it. It did not contain any PAN number of any assessee whereas the information supplied by CBDT include PAN number, Name of assessee as per return, Assessment Year, Form ID, filing date of return etc. for each alleged period . It was noted that when the said details were provided to the Respondent to give his submissions on the information, so received from the CBDT, the Respondent instead making any submissions resent the data sheets by putting tick in front of the names of certain assesses to demonstrate that he had conducted only 45 tax audits out of the list provided by CBDT. However, on perusal of the data provided by the Respondent himself vis a vis that ticked by him on information received from CBDT, it was noted that even name of the assessee as appearing in the two records were not reconciling. The Committee did not find the fee register as submitted by the Respondent to be reliable since it did not contain the PAN number of assesses which is considered as basic information for identifying any client especially when one is dealing with tax matters. Further, the fact that same amount was charged across all the clients was also questionable because degree of complexity might differ from case to case basis. Other facts like same handwriting across a diary containing information of only the alleged periods on consecutive pages of same diary raised question on its genuineness. The Committee further noted that although the Respondent had argued that someone might have misuse his signature to sign the tax audit reports due to which the number of Tax audits conducted under his membership number had exceeded the prescribed limit but he had failed to

✓ (H)

take any action on the said information not even informing the CBDT regarding misuse of his signature. Hence, his stated argument was not acceptable.

5.1 The Committee noted that originally CBDT had alleged that the Respondent had conducted 188, 411 and 229 Tax audits during the year 2010-11, 2011-12 and 2013-14 respectively, however, while providing the details of alleged matter CBDT provided information of 414, 427 and 128 Tax audits conducted during the year respective periods. The Committee viewed that since for the F.Y. 2013-14 the CBDT was able to provide information only in respect of 128 cases, the Respondent could be held liable for only 128 number of tax audits instead of 229 as originally alleged.

Thus, based on the documents and submissions available on records, the Committee was of the considered opinion that the Respondent had conducted 188, 411 and 128 Tax Audits during the Financial Years 2010-11, 2011-12 and 2013-14 respectively which is apparently in violation of the Council General Guidelines, No.1-CA(7)/02/2008, dated 8th August, 2008, wherein under Chapter VI "Tax Audit assignments under Section 44AB of the Income-tax Act, 1961", in Explanation given in Para 6.1, in sub-para(a) & (b) it states that : "the specified number of tax audit assignments" means –

- (a) in the case of a Chartered Accountant in practice or a proprietary firm of Chartered Accountants, 45 tax audit assignments, in a financial year, whether in case of corporate or non-corporate assesses.
- (b) in the case of firm of Chartered Accountants in practice, 45 tax audit assignments per partner in the firm, in a financial year, whether in respect of corporate or non-corporate assesses.

6. It may further be noted that vide Announcement dated 11.02.2014, hosted on Institute's website, the said limit was increased to 60 in place of 45 for the Financial year 2014-15 and onwards. However, the same is not applicable in the instant matter as the same pertains to the financial years 2010-2011, 2011-2012 and 2013-14.. It was viewed that being a member of the Institute, the Respondent is expected to adopt highest standard of ethical behavior and professional compliance of the Council General Guidelines. Thus the Respondent is, accordingly held **GUILTY** of Professional Misconduct falling within the meaning of Clause (1) of Part II of the Second Schedule to the Chartered Accountant Act, 1949.

Conclusion :

7. In view of above noted facts and discussion, in the considered opinion of the Committee, the Respondent is held **GUILTY** in under Clause (1) of Part II of the Second Schedule to the Chartered Accountant Act, 1949.

✓ (10)

Sd/-
[Smt. Anita Kapur]
Member (Govt. Nominee) & Presiding Officer

Sd/-
[Shri Ajay Mittal, IAS (Retd)]
Member (Govt. Nominee)

Sd/-
[CA. Chandrashekhar Vasant Chitale]
Member

Sd/-
[CA. P.K. Boob]
Member

DATE: 17th December, 2021

PLACE: New Delhi

प्रमाणित सत्य प्रतिलिपि / Certified true copy

सीए, मोहिता खन्ना / CA. Mohita Khanna
सहायक सचिव / Assistant Secretary
अनुशासनात्मक निदेशक / Disciplinary Directorate
इंस्टीट्यूट ऑफ चार्टर्डेड अकाउंटन्ट्स ऑफ इंडिया
The Institute of Chartered Accountants of India
आइसीएआई भवन, विश्वा नगर, शान्दरा, दिल्ली-110032
ICAI Bhawan, Vishwa Nagar, Shandra, Delhi-110032