

The background of the journal cover features a top-down view of a desk. On the left, a pair of black leather brogue shoes is partially visible. In the center, an open notebook with lined pages and a silver pen lies on a light-colored wooden surface. To the right, a black leather bag with a zipper is partially shown, and a black leather watch with a silver dial is resting on the desk. A large, semi-transparent white rectangular box is centered over the image, containing the journal's title and ISSN information.

INTERNATIONAL LAW
JOURNAL

**WHITE BLACK
LEGAL LAW
JOURNAL**
**ISSN: 2581-
8503**

Peer - Reviewed & Refereed Journal

The Law Journal strives to provide a platform for discussion of International as well as National Developments in the Field of Law.

WWW.WHITEBLACKLEGAL.CO.IN

DISCLAIMER

No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored, transmitted, translated, or distributed in any form or by any means—whether electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording, scanning, or otherwise—without the prior written permission of the Editor-in-Chief of *White Black Legal – The Law Journal*.

All copyrights in the articles published in this journal vest with *White Black Legal – The Law Journal*, unless otherwise expressly stated. Authors are solely responsible for the originality, authenticity, accuracy, and legality of the content submitted and published.

The views, opinions, interpretations, and conclusions expressed in the articles are exclusively those of the respective authors. They do not represent or reflect the views of the Editorial Board, Editors, Reviewers, Advisors, Publisher, or Management of *White Black Legal*.

While reasonable efforts are made to ensure academic quality and accuracy through editorial and peer-review processes, *White Black Legal* makes no representations or warranties, express or implied, regarding the completeness, accuracy, reliability, or suitability of the content published. The journal shall not be liable for any errors, omissions, inaccuracies, or consequences arising from the use, interpretation, or reliance upon the information contained in this publication.

The content published in this journal is intended solely for academic and informational purposes and shall not be construed as legal advice, professional advice, or legal opinion. *White Black Legal* expressly disclaims all liability for any loss, damage, claim, or legal consequence arising directly or indirectly from the use of any material published herein.

ABOUT WHITE BLACK LEGAL

White Black Legal – The Law Journal is an open-access, peer-reviewed, and refereed legal journal established to provide a scholarly platform for the examination and discussion of contemporary legal issues. The journal is dedicated to encouraging rigorous legal research, critical analysis, and informed academic discourse across diverse fields of law.

The journal invites contributions from law students, researchers, academicians, legal practitioners, and policy scholars. By facilitating engagement between emerging scholars and experienced legal professionals, *White Black Legal* seeks to bridge theoretical legal research with practical, institutional, and societal perspectives.

In a rapidly evolving social, economic, and technological environment, the journal endeavours to examine the changing role of law and its impact on governance, justice systems, and society. *White Black Legal* remains committed to academic integrity, ethical research practices, and the dissemination of accessible legal scholarship to a global readership.

AIM & SCOPE

The aim of *White Black Legal – The Law Journal* is to promote excellence in legal research and to provide a credible academic forum for the analysis, discussion, and advancement of contemporary legal issues. The journal encourages original, analytical, and well-researched contributions that add substantive value to legal scholarship.

The journal publishes scholarly works examining doctrinal, theoretical, empirical, and interdisciplinary perspectives of law. Submissions are welcomed from academicians, legal professionals, researchers, scholars, and students who demonstrate intellectual rigour, analytical clarity, and relevance to current legal and policy developments.

The scope of the journal includes, but is not limited to:

- Constitutional and Administrative Law
- Criminal Law and Criminal Justice
- Corporate, Commercial, and Business Laws
- Intellectual Property and Technology Law
- International Law and Human Rights
- Environmental and Sustainable Development Law
- Cyber Law, Artificial Intelligence, and Emerging Technologies
- Family Law, Labour Law, and Social Justice Studies

The journal accepts original research articles, case comments, legislative and policy analyses, book reviews, and interdisciplinary studies addressing legal issues at national and international levels. All submissions are subject to a rigorous double-blind peer-review process to ensure academic quality, originality, and relevance.

Through its publications, *White Black Legal – The Law Journal* seeks to foster critical legal thinking and contribute to the development of law as an instrument of justice, governance, and social progress, while expressly disclaiming responsibility for the application or misuse of published content.

THE ONE PERSON COMPANY: A REVOLUTIONARY CONCEPT IN MODERN CORPORATE LAW

AUTHORED BY - ONAEJA SONKAR¹

Abstract

The One Person Company (OPC) represents a paradigm shift in corporate law, bridging the gap between the informality of a sole proprietorship and the structured formality of a traditional company. This paper critically examines the concept of OPC as introduced by the Companies Act, 2013² in India, tracing its legal and theoretical foundations to the landmark doctrine of separate legal personality established in *Salomon v A Salomon & Co Ltd.*³ It analyses the core features, advantages, and statutory framework governing OPCs, including incorporation, liability, and compliance. The paper further explores the judicial and legislative checks in place, such as the “piercing of the corporate veil,” to prevent misuse. Through comparative analysis and case law, the research concludes that the OPC is a significant innovation that empowers individual entrepreneurs with limited liability and corporate status, fostering economic growth while balancing creditor protection.

Keywords: One Person Company (OPC), Separate Legal Personality, Limited Liability, Piercing the Corporate Veil, Companies Act 2013, *Salomon v Salomon*, Sole Proprietorship, Corporate Law.

I. Introduction: The Genesis of a Hybrid Entity

The corporate legal landscape has been historically dominated by entities requiring a plurality of members, a principle rooted in the traditional view of a company as an association of persons. For the individual entrepreneur, the choice was stark: operate as a sole proprietor with unlimited personal liability for all business debts or navigate the complexities of forming a partnership or a private limited company with at least two members. The former option exposed personal assets to immense risk, while the latter often necessitated the inclusion of nominal

¹ B.A.LL.B.(hons.), 3rd year, Jagran Lakecity University, Bhopal.

² The Companies Act, 2013 (Act No. 18 of 2013).

³ *Salomon v A Salomon & Co Ltd* [1897] AC 22.

shareholders, complicating ownership and control.

The One Person Company (OPC) emerged as a legislative innovation to resolve this dichotomy. Globally, the concept of a single-member company gained traction in the late 20th century, with the European Union's Twelfth Directive in 1989 being a pivotal moment.^{ijllr.com} In India, this concept was formally enacted under the Companies Act, 2013, marking a watershed moment in Indian corporate jurisprudence. An OPC is defined as a company that has only one person as its member.⁴ It is a private company⁵ and incorporates the cardinal principles of corporate law—separate legal personality and limited liability—into a structure designed for a single entrepreneur. This paper delves into the doctrinal foundation of the OPC, its operational framework, its benefits and challenges, and the legal safeguards against its potential abuse.

II. The Doctrinal Bedrock: Salomon v Salomon and Separate Legal Personality

Any discourse on corporate personality, including that of an OPC, is inextricably linked to the landmark 1897 House of Lords decision in *Salomon v A Salomon & Co Ltd*.⁶ Aron Salomon incorporated a company, effectively transferring his successful boot manufacturing business to it. He, his wife, and five children were the seven subscribers, with Salomon holding the vast majority of shares and becoming a secured creditor via debentures. When the company failed, liquidators argued it was a mere sham or agent of Salomon, and he should be personally liable to its unsecured creditors.

The House of Lords resoundingly affirmed the doctrine of separate legal personality. Lord Macnaghten famously stated that the company is “a different person altogether from the subscribers to the memorandum... the company is not in law the agent of the subscribers or trustee for them.”⁷ Once duly incorporated, the company becomes a legal entity distinct from its members, irrespective of their number or control. This principle of “corporate veil” between the company and its owner is the very foundation upon which the concept of limited liability rests. The *Salomon* case established that the motive of limiting liability is perfectly legitimate

⁴ The Companies Act, 2013, Section 2(62)

⁵ The Companies Act, 2013, Section 3(1)(c).

⁶ *Salomon v A Salomon & Co Ltd* [1897] AC 22.

⁷ Full text of *Salomon v A Salomon & Co Ltd*.

and not, in itself, fraudulent.⁸

The OPC takes this doctrine to its logical conclusion. If a company with seven members, one of whom holds 99.99% of the shares and control, is a separate legal entity (Salomon), then a company with a single member is, conceptually, no different. The OPC is thus a direct progeny of the Salomon principle, extending the benefits of incorporation to the individual entrepreneur. It acknowledges that economic activity and enterprise can be, and often are, the endeavour of a single person who deserves the same legal protections available to larger associations.

III. Legal Framework and Features of an OPC under the Companies Act, 2013

The Companies Act, 2013, along with the Companies (Incorporation) Rules, 2014, provides a comprehensive legal framework for the formation and regulation of One Person Companies (OPCs) in India. The Act establishes OPC as a distinct legal entity, offering benefits such as limited liability and perpetual succession to a single entrepreneur. Meanwhile, the Rules prescribe procedural requirements relating to incorporation, nomination, compliance, and conversion of OPCs. Together, they ensure ease of business while maintaining regulatory oversight, transparency, and accountability in the functioning of OPCs. It further streamlines compliance requirements, making OPCs an efficient and accessible corporate structure for small-scale entrepreneurs and individual business owners.

Key Characteristics:

- **Single Member:** Only one natural person, who must be an Indian citizen and resident in India, can be the member of an OPC.⁹ A minor cannot become a member or nominee.
- **Nominee:** The sole member must nominate another natural person (with their prior written consent) who will become the member of the OPC in the event of the member's death or incapacity.¹⁰ This ensures perpetual succession, a hallmark of the corporate form.
- **Limited Liability:** The liability of the member is limited to the amount unpaid on their shares, protecting their personal assets from business liabilities.

⁸ "Salomon v A Salomon & Co Ltd [1897] AC 22." Record Of Law.

⁹ The Companies (Incorporation) Rules, 2014, Rule 3.

¹⁰ The Companies Act, 2013, Section 3(2) & Rule 4 of the Incorporation Rules.

- **Private Company Status:** An OPC is deemed a private limited company ¹¹and must suffix “OPC Private Limited” to its name.
- **No Minimum Paid-up Capital:** The Act does not prescribe any minimum paid-up capital for an OPC, lowering the entry barrier.

Incorporation and Compliance:

The incorporation process is streamlined. The sole subscriber is the sole director as well, though an OPC can have a maximum of 15 directors. The memorandum of association must mention the nominee’s name. Compliance requirements are relaxed compared to other private companies:

- **Financial Statements & Audit:** An OPC need not include a cash flow statement as part of its financial statements unless its turnover exceeds a specified limit. ¹²Audit requirements apply, but certain small OPCs may be exempt from mandatory rotation of auditors.
- **Board Meetings:** Only one board meeting in each half of the calendar year is required, with a minimum gap of 90 days between the two meetings.¹³
- **Annual General Meeting (AGM):** The provisions related to holding an AGM do not apply to an OPC. The annual return can be signed by the director alone.¹⁴

Conversion and Cessation:

An OPC must convert into a private or public company if its paid-up share capital exceeds fifty lakh rupees or its average annual turnover during the relevant period exceeds two crore rupees. ¹⁵Furthermore, an OPC cannot be incorporated or converted to undertake non-banking financial investment activities or hold investments in other corporate bodies.

IV. Critical Analysis: Advantages, Concerns, and the Piercing of the Veil

Advantages:

The OPC structure offers compelling advantages, particularly for micro-entrepreneurs and professionals:

¹¹ The Companies Act, 2013, Section 3(1).

¹² The Companies Act, 2013, Section 2(40) proviso.

¹³ The Companies Act, 2013, Section 173(5).

¹⁴ The Companies Act, 2013, Section 96(1) proviso & Section 92(1).

¹⁵ The Companies Act, 2013, Section 18(2).

- **Limited Liability:** The primary benefit. It encourages risk-taking by insulating personal wealth.
- **Corporate Identity and Perpetuity:** Enhances credibility with clients, vendors, and financial institutions. Business continuity is assured through the nominee mechanism.
- **Easier Access to Funding:** An OPC, as a corporate entity, finds it easier to attract equity investment or debt financing compared to a sole proprietorship.
- **Reduced Compliance Burden:** The relaxed norms for meetings and filings make it a more manageable corporate form for a single owner.

Concerns and Criticisms:

Despite its benefits, the OPC model has faced scrutiny:

- **Creditor Protection:** The central criticism is the potential prejudice to creditors. Where a single individual controls all operations, there is a heightened risk of commingling personal and company assets, fraudulent transactions, or undercapitalization, leaving creditors with claims against a corporate shell with no assets.
- **Risk of Misuse:** The structure could be misused as a vehicle for tax evasion, money laundering, or shielding personal assets from legitimate claims by operating through multiple OPCs.
- **Operational Informality:** The very informality that is an advantage can blur the lines between the individual and the company, undermining the separate entity principle in practice.

The Counterbalance: Piercing the Corporate Veil

Corporate law has long developed the doctrine of “piercing” or “lifting” the corporate veil to prevent abuse of the separate legal entity principle. This judicial exception allows courts to look behind the corporate facade and hold the members personally liable where the company is used as a mere cloak or sham for fraudulent or improper purposes. The grounds for piercing the veil, established through precedents like *Gilford Motor Co Ltd v Horne* (1932) and *Jones v Lipman* (1962), include:

Fraud or Improper Conduct: Where the corporate form is used to perpetrate a fraud, evade a legal obligation, or circumvent a statute.

Enemy Character: In times of war, if a company is controlled by persons in an enemy country.

Group Enterprises (Enterprise Theory): In some jurisdictions, for tax or liability purposes within a corporate group.

Agency or Trust: Where the company is acting as an agent or trustee for its members.

For an OPC, the risk of veil-piercing is arguably higher because the evidence required to show that the company was a mere alter ego of the individual is more straightforward—there is only one will directing the company. Indian courts have demonstrated a willingness to pierce the veil in OPC-like situations even before the 2013 Act. In cases where a corporate entity is used to defraud creditors, courts will not allow the Salomon principle to be used as an instrument of fraud. The statutory framework itself contains provisions (e.g., liability for fraudulent trading under Section 339 of the Companies Act, 2013) that serve as legislative mechanisms to pierce the veil.

This interplay—between the absolute principle in Salomon and the equitable exception of veil-piercing—creates the necessary balance for the OPC. It grants the entrepreneur the benefit of incorporation while reserving judicial power to impose personal liability in cases of manifest injustice or wrongdoing. As one scholar notes, the OPC “adds features of sole-proprietorship to the classical concept of limited liability and joint stock,” but this hybrid nature demands vigilant application of veil-piercing doctrines to protect third parties.¹⁶

V. Recent Reforms in the One Person Company Framework

The regulatory framework governing One Person Companies (OPCs) in India has evolved significantly since its introduction under the Companies Act, 2013. A key development was the Companies (Incorporation) Second Amendment Rules, 2021, which removed the earlier requirement of mandatory conversion of an OPC into a private or public company upon exceeding prescribed thresholds of paid-up capital or turnover.¹⁷ This reform reflects a shift in legislative intent from treating OPCs as transitional entities to recognizing them as sustainable business structures.

Additionally, the eligibility criteria have been expanded to allow Non-Resident Indians (NRIs) to incorporate OPCs, thereby aligning Indian corporate law with global practices and

¹⁶ *Gilford Motor Co Ltd v Horne* [1933] Ch 935 and *Jones v Lipman* [1962] 1 WLR 832.

¹⁷ Ministry of Corporate Affairs, Companies (Incorporation) Second Amendment Rules, 2021.

encouraging cross-border entrepreneurship. These changes enhance flexibility and reduce procedural burdens, enabling individual entrepreneurs to retain complete control while benefiting from limited liability.

However, the removal of conversion thresholds raises concerns regarding regulatory arbitrage, as larger entities may continue to operate under the relatively relaxed compliance regime applicable to OPCs.¹⁸ This may affect transparency and creditor protection, particularly where financial disclosures remain minimal. Comparative jurisdictions such as the United Kingdom permit single-member companies but offset such flexibility through stricter disclosure and director liability norms. These developments highlight the need for a balanced approach between ease of doing business and effective regulatory oversight.

VI. Conclusion

The One Person Company is a transformative legal innovation that democratizes access to the corporate form. By embracing the core doctrine of *Salomon v Salomon*, it grants the individual entrepreneur the holy grail of business: limited liability with sole control. The Indian legislature, through the Companies Act, 2013, has skilfully crafted a regime that promotes ease of doing business for solo entrepreneurs while incorporating safeguards like mandatory nomination and conversion thresholds.

The success of the OPC model hinges on a balanced application of the law. Entrepreneurs must rigorously maintain the separateness of the OPC—through separate bank accounts, proper bookkeeping, and distinct contracting—to uphold its legal personality. Concurrently, creditors and regulators must remain vigilant. The judiciary's role in cautiously applying the doctrine of piercing the corporate veil in cases of abuse is crucial to maintain the integrity of this corporate form and prevent it from becoming an instrument of fraud.

In essence, the OPC is more than a legal novelty; it is a recognition of the solo entrepreneur as a significant engine of economic growth. It provides a structured, credible, and protected platform for individual enterprise, fostering a culture of formalized business creation. As corporate law continues to evolve, the OPC stands as a testament to the law's ability to adapt

¹⁸ Divya Khatri, "Should the Doctrine of Separate Legal Personality be Re-examined to prevent Corporate Fraud?" *International Journal of Research Publication and Reviews* (2025).

to economic realities, extending the legacy of Salomon from the industrial age of the 19th century to the entrepreneurial age of the 21st.

References:

I. Primary Sources:

Statutes

- The Companies Act, 2013 (Act No. 18 of 2013).
- The Companies (Incorporation) Rules, 2014.
- Ministry of Corporate Affairs, Companies (Incorporation) Second Amendment Rules, 2021.

Case Laws

- Salomon v A Salomon & Co Ltd [1897] AC 22.
- Gilford Motor Co Ltd v Horne [1933] Ch 935.
- Jones v Lipman [1962] 1 WLR 832.

II. Secondary Sources:

Journal Articles

- “A Critical Evaluation Of The Concept Of One Person Company.” Indian Journal of Law and Legal Research.
- Khatri, Divya. “Should the Doctrine of Separate Legal Personality be Re-examined to prevent Corporate Fraud?” International Journal of Research Publication and Reviews, vol. 6, no. 8, Aug. 2025, pp. 4669–78.

Case Law Commentaries / Legal Databases

- “Salomon v A Salomon & Co Ltd [1897] AC 22.” Record Of Law.
- Full text of Salomon v A Salomon & Co Ltd.

Textbooks / Commentaries

- Singh, Avtar. Company Law. 17th ed., Eastern Book Company, 2018.
- Gower, L.C.B. Principles of Modern Company Law. 9th ed., Sweet & Maxwell, 2012.