Jus Corpus Law Journal

Open Access Law Journal – Copyright © 2023 – ISSN 2582-7820
Editor-in-Chief – Prof. (Dr.) Rhishikesh Dave; Publisher – Ayush Pandey

Delving into the Significance of Salomon v Salomon: An In-Depth Exploration of Corporate Personality in Legal Jurisprudence

Vansh Singh[a]

[a]Symbiosis International University, Pune, India

Received 10 October 2023; *Accepted* 06 November 2023; *Published* 10 November 2023

This research endeavour seeks to undertake a comprehensive examination of the concept of corporate personality within the legal framework. By digging into its historical underpinnings and significant judicial precedents that have left an indelible impact on this theory, this study attempts to untangle the numerous layers of its interpretation and practical execution. The core focus of this research revolves around the historic legal case of Salomon v Salomon, which stands as a cornerstone in the formation of the idea of corporate personhood. Employing a rigorous analytical approach and context-specific interpretation, this study critically dissects the underlying beliefs and important qualities intrinsic to corporate personality.

Furthermore, this study endeavour begins with an exploration of a spectrum of legal scenarios, stretching beyond historical epochs to the modern age, to determine the pragmatic relevance of this notion across varied contexts. Through the integration of a varied variety of legal precedents, scholarly viewpoints, and comparative analyses, this study deepens our grasp of the evolutionary trajectory, implications, and present significance of the doctrine of corporate personhood. The conclusion of this research holds relevance for stakeholders within the legal realm, comprising researchers, legal practitioners, and policymakers. These ideas contribute substantively to the continuing argument surrounding corporate law and its delicate interplay with the concept of legal personhood.

Keywords: *corporate personality, corporate veil, company law, entity.*

INTRODUCTION

The case of Salomon v Salomon Co. Ltd.[1] is widely acknowledged as a crucial landmark in the development and understanding of corporate independence. It is usually recognized as a seminal point of reference in debates involving this subject. The development of present English company law not only reinforced its core concepts but also exerted a major impact on the broader sphere of commercial law on a global scale. Nevertheless, it is important to acknowledge that the House of Lords simply institutionalized a longstanding tradition that dates back to ancient times.[2]

The concept of independent corporate personality emerged at the intersection of legal and economic realms, giving rise to numerous hypotheses aimed at rationalizing its existence. The principal advantage and predominant theory emanate from the inherent characteristics of a distinct corporate entity. This particular attribute fulfills a twofold function by safeguarding stakeholders from boundless liability while also enabling the fair allocation of profits. Moreover, the concept of the 'veil of incorporation' confers upon a corporation nearly identical rights and powers as those enjoyed by an individual, alongside the benefits of perpetual existence and the capacity to transfer ownership. It is worth acknowledging that the legal system and jurisprudence in India duly recognize the existence of the independent corporate form.

LITERATURE REVIEW

To provide a comprehensive understanding of the doctrine, this literature review aims to explore its fundamental themes and ongoing debates while delving into its historical evolution, legal implications, ethical dilemmas, and societal impacts.

---

[1] *Salomon v A Salomon & Co. Ltd*. UKHL 1 AC 22

[2] Arnav Maru, 'Section 32A of the IBC: Shredding the Independent Corporate Personality?' (2020) 10(1) NLIU law Review <https://nliulawreview.nliu.ac.in/wp-content/uploads/2021/01/M117-3.pdf> accessed 04 October 2023

The notion of corporate personality has garnered significant attention and analysis from both philosophical and scholarly perspectives. Hessen (1979)[3] and other academics have conducted an extensive examination of the moral and ethical aspects linked to the conceptualization of a company as a legal organization. Hessen raised significant concerns regarding the potential implications of granting legal entity status to corporations, highlighting the possibility of reduced corporate responsibility. Similarly, scholars in the field of law, such as Berle and Means (1932)[4], focused their attention on the matters about agency and governance that may emerge as a result of the notion of corporate personality. In his seminal work, Freeman (1994)[5] extensively examined the ethical obligations of companies, arguing that corporations ought to be held accountable to a wider range of stakeholders, including employees, consumers, and various other parties, rather than just prioritizing the interests of shareholders.

METHODOLOGY

The present study work predominantly uses the approach of Doctrinal study. To strengthen the reliability of the results, a methodological framework based on analytical research has been employed. This paper undertook a thorough examination of primary sources, such as case laws and legislative texts, to extract and substantiate facts. Additional verification and contextualization are obtained from secondary sources which include published papers, scholarly journals, and reliable web DATABASES.

CRITICAL ANALYSIS

Lord Blackburn in the case of Pharmaceutical Society v London and Provincial Supply Association Ltd.[6] astutely noted the expansive nature of the term 'person,' which encompasses not just real beings but also artificial entities such as companies. The author proposed that, in

---

[3] Robert Hessen, 'A new concept of corporations, a contractual and private property model' (1979) 30(5) Hastings Law Journal <https://repository.uclawsf.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=2612&context=hastings_law_journal> accessed 04 October 2023
[4] Adolf A. Berle and Gardiner C. Means, *The Modern Corporation and Private Property* (1932)
[5] *Ibid*
[6] *Pharmaceutical Society v London &. Prooincial Supply Association* (1880) 6 App. Cas. 857

the context of parliamentary legislation, it is appropriate to understand the term 'person' as inclusive of both categories, unless specified differently.

This remark highlights the perceptible existence of artificial entities, establishing a comparison between their being and that of any composite entity. An exemplification of this idea can be observed in the judicial case of Bank Islam Malaysia Bhd. (BIMB) v Adnan Bin Omar (1994)[7] under the jurisdiction of Malaysia. A question about jurisdiction emerged with regard to which court, the Civil Court or the Sharfah court, possessed authority over the matter. Although BIMB operates as an Islamic bank, it has been established that the Sharfah court holds primary jurisdiction. Nevertheless, the aforementioned case was presented to the Civil Court, whereupon it was determined that the bank, which had been lawfully registered in compliance with the provisions of the Companies Act of 1965, possessed a separate legal personality that was distinct from its members. The bank's operations were conducted outside the jurisdiction of the Sharfah court due to its absence of religious affiliation.

Dhimmah, referred to as legal personhood, is a foundational principle of Islamic jurisprudence that pertains to the rights and obligations of capable individuals (mukallaf). Although the primary application of this idea is to conscious creatures possessing cognitive powers, there is no explicit prohibition found in the Quran or Sunnah that restricts the extension of legal personhood to artificial entities such as corporations. This is consistent with the principles and values of Sharia.[8]

The notion of a corporation, instead of being a fictitious construct, is widely recognized as an authentic and intrinsic entity. This perception aligns with that of a military organization or any conscious entity. The idea of corporate personality, which originated in Germany and subsequently gained global acceptance, is underpinned by a fundamental premise that forms the basis of its validity.

---

[7] Anowar Zahid, 'Corporate Personality from an Islamic Perspective' (2013) 27(2) Arab Law Quarterly <https://brill.com/view/journals/alq/27/2/article-p125_2.xml> accessed 04 October 2023

[8] *Ibid*

In his 1926 article, John Dewey posited the notion of inherent indeterminacy within legal conceptions, contending that the definition of the term 'person' is shaped by the construction of legal standards.

A firm adopts a distinct dual role, displaying attributes of both a legal 'person' and an inanimate 'entity. The presence of this duality is apparent in the corporation's concurrent possession' of assets and its ownership by shareholders. The legal structure in question highlights a key division: with regards to property, the firm operates as a legal entity that exercises property rights, while with respect to individuals, it is considered an object that is subject to property rights. It is imperative to acknowledge that despite the absence of inherent personality or materialism, a firm is bestowed with traits of both personhood and objecthood through legal construction. The existence of this duality poses a challenge to traditional classifications of entities, as it blurs the distinctions between living organisms and non-living entities, especially in the context of legal frameworks.[9] In general, individuals who adopt a corporate persona are typically not granted the authority to reveal their own identities.

The Companies Act of 2013[10] in India is responsible for regulating the idea of corporate personality, which encompasses the legal aspects of incorporating, operating, and overseeing firms in the country. The Act establishes certain guidelines for shareholder rights, corporate governance, and other elements of a company's corporate identity.

The Kondoli Tea Co. Ltd. case[11] serves as a significant precedent for elucidating the core principles of the corporate personhood concept within the specific context of India. The ruling effectively exonerated shareholders from any obligations related to the firm. The Supreme Court, in the case of Delhi Development Authority v Skipper Construction Co. (P.) Ltd[12] rendered remarks about the court's capacity to disregard the corporate entity. By taking this

[9] Katsuhito Iwai, 'Persons, Things and Corporations: The Corporate Personality Controversy and Comparative Corporate Governance' (1999) 47(4) The American Journal of Comparative Law <https://www.jstor.org/stable/841070> accessed 04 October 2023

[10] Companies Act 2013

[11] *In re, Kondoli Tea Co. Ltd* ILR 13 Cal 43

[12] *Delhi Development Authority v Skipper Construction Co. (P) Ltd* (1996) 4 SCC 622

move, the court would have the ability to reveal the true identities of the individuals involved in the corporate structure who have been participating in fraudulent and unlawful actions, intentionally disregarding the court's directives. The case of Tata Engineering and Locomotive Works Ltd. v State of Bihar[13] also resulted in a comparable legal decision.

Within the context of intricate multinational corporations, the notions of penetrating the corporate veil and corporate social responsibility are undergoing constant evolution in terms of their practicality and pertinence. In some legal jurisdictions, directors are currently subject to personal liability in instances where wilful misconduct or gross negligence is involved.

SALOMAN V SALOMAN

The transition of Salomon's sole proprietorship boot-making enterprise into 'Salomon Ltd.' required the conversion of business ownership into shares and debentures, together with the establishment of a floating charge on the company's assets. The implementation of this reorganization enabled Salomon to give precedence to the repayment of debentures over unsecured creditors in the event of the company's collapse, resulting in the non-compensation of the latter.

The subsequent legal conflict centred on the crucial inquiry of whether the company's separate legal existence could be disregarded, possibly exposing Salomon to personal liability as if he had persisted in operating as an individual business. The focal point of the lawsuit revolved around assertions made by certain unsecured creditors throughout the process of liquidating Salomon Ltd. These creditors aimed to assign boundless personal liability to Salomon, who held the highest ownership stake in the company, surpassing his initial capital investment.

The Court of Appeal initially asserted that the corporation operated as a mere facade, thereby holding Salomon accountable for its financial obligations. Nevertheless, the House of Lords reversed this ruling, emphasizing the distinct legal position of the corporation and the accompanying rights and responsibilities. This served to strengthen the understanding of the

---

[13] *Tata Engineering and Locomotive Co. Ltd. v State of Bihar* (1964) 6 SCR 885

'corporate veil', a legal principle that establishes a distinct division between a corporation and its proprietors or managers. Therefore, the Salomon case emphasized the concept of corporate autonomy.[14]

Moreover, this particular case brought forth the concept of 'piercing the corporate veil' which denotes a situation wherein a court disregards the separate legal identity of a corporation and instead directs its attention toward the individuals who hold managerial responsibilities within the organization. This practice is commonly utilized to attribute legal responsibility to individuals for the acts or financial commitments of the organization.

In the legal matter of Macaura v Northern Assurance Co Ltd[15], the proprietor of a wood estate engaged in the sale of the estate's timber to a firm in which he possessed a controlling interest. Despite holding the position of the corporation's primary creditor, he procured fire insurance for the timber under his name. Following the occurrence of a fire that destroyed the timber, the insurance company refused to honor the claim.

To establish an insurable interest in a property, the House of Lords ruled that an individual must possess a legally or equitably recognized stake in the property. As a result, the insurance claim was denied based on the distinction between a majority shareholder and the corporation itself. The legal or equitable ownership of the assets of the corporation, including those held by the shareholder in question, cannot be claimed by any creditor of the organization.

CONCLUSION

The influential legal case of Salomon v A. Salomon & Co. Ltd[16]. originated the notion of corporate personality, which has become a fundamental premise in the field of company law and remains a fundamental aspect of modern business practices. This philosophy provides concrete benefits by promoting investment and aiding economic progress. Nevertheless, this also presents the possibility of inequitable outcomes and reduced accountability. Ensuring a

[14] *Salomon v A Salomon & Co. Ltd* UKHL 1 AC 22
[15] ***Macaura v Northern Assurance Co Ltd* [1925] AC 619**
[16] *Salomon v A Salomon & Co. Ltd* UKHL 1 AC 22

harmonious coexistence between the facilitation of business endeavours and the maintenance of ethical conduct holds the utmost importance. As a result, there have been continuing talks pertaining to prospective revisions to this theory that have been launched.

The concept of corporate personality experiences a parallel transition as societal norms evolve in conjunction with changes in economic circumstances. A thorough investigation is crucial for examining current advancements pertaining to the incorporation of environmental, social and governance factors, the rise of benefit firms, and the differentiation between shareholder and stakeholder capitalism. The aforementioned achievements necessitate comprehensive scrutiny, particularly with regard to their potential ramifications for future legislative revisions, the influence of technology on the notion of corporate personhood, and the evolving frameworks within the domain of corporate legal theory.