

12th July, 2021

Listing Department
BSE Limited
Phiroze Jeejeebhoy Towers
Dalal Street
Mumbai- 400001

Listing Department
National Stock Exchange of India Ltd.,
Exchange Plaza, C-1, Block G,
Bandra Kurla Complex,
Bandra (E) Mumbai – 400 051

Scrip Code: 532349

Scrip Symbol: TCI

Sub: Newspaper Cutting – Dispatch of Annual Report along with the Notice Convening the AGM

Dear Sir/Madam,

In continuation of our letter dated 11th July, 2021 and in terms of Regulation 30 read with Schedule III Para A of SEBI (Listing Obligations and Disclosure Requirements) Regulations, 2015, as amended, we are forwarding herewith copies of newspaper cuttings of the above notice as published in the following newspapers:

Particulars	Date of Publishing
Business Line (English)	12.07.2021
Nava Telangana (Regional Language)	12.07.2021

This will also be hosted on the Company's website at www.tcil.com.

This is for your information and records please.

Thanking you

Yours faithfully,
For **Transport Corporation of India Ltd.**


Archara Pandey
Company Secretary & Compliance officer
Encl.: As Above



Transport Corporation of India Ltd.

Corporate Office : TCI House, 69 Institutional Area, Sector 32, Gurgaon-122 207, Haryana, India www.tcil.com
Tel : 0124-2381-603 - 07 Fax : 0124-2381611 corporate@tcil.com

Regd. Office : Flat Nos. 306 & 307, 1-8-273, Third Floor, Ashoka Bhoopal Chambers, S P Road, Secunderabad - 500 003
Tel : 040-27840104 Fax : 040-27840163

CIN : L70109TG1995PLC019116

Time for decriminalisation of cheque bounce cases?

VINOD SURANA

The Supreme Court in its recent decision dated April 16, 2021, observed that there are around 35 lakh cheque bounce cases pending before various courts. If the deterrent effect of the present provision was working, then such a huge pendency would not have arisen.

The SC, in *Makwana Mangaldas Tulsidas Vs State of Gujarat*, said that decriminalisation of cheque bounce cases involving small amounts may be left to the civil jurisdiction, hinting at decriminalisation. The judiciary has increasingly favoured compensation rather than punishment in cheque bounce cases. In *Meters and Instruments Vs Kanchan Mehta*, the SC even dispensed with the requirement of consent for compounding the offence, if the accused was willing to pay the compensation.

Moreover, pursuing a criminal remedy, may lead to delays. If, in the meantime, the limitation period under the civil action route is exhausted, then the payee is left without any legal recourse. Hence, decriminalisation is necessary. The Section 138 of the Negotiable Instruments Act 1881, treated cheque bounce as a civil wrong, until 1988, when it was brought under 'criminal offence', with a prison term of up to two years, while leaving the right to approach a civil court unaffected. This made violation of Section 138, both a civil wrong as well as a criminal act. Between 2002 and 2018, the Section underwent a myriad of amendments and has been subject of various judicial interpretations. In June 2020, the Ministry of Finance proposed the decriminalisation of various minor economic offences, including the offence of cheque bounce under Section 138. While comments were invited, no conclusive decision has yet been taken till date.



Compensation, not punishment

Those who support the decriminalisation note that the main purpose of the provision is compensation and not punishment. The Negotiable Instruments (Amendment) Act, 2018 inserted Section 143A which linked the interim compensation to be paid to the payee with the cheque amount. Moreover, the offence under Section 138, is compoundable and hence, the main focus is on compensation rather than on punishment. As per the 'reformative theory', the State should make an attempt to reform an offender rather than merely punishing them. A cheque bounce case is an economic offence and hence, reformation can be brought about by imposing suitable compensation. To imprison someone for the offence may not necessarily lead to reformation, but lead to further debasement. The second argument is that giving both civil and criminal redress to the offence of cheque bounce has clogged the judicial system and has led to multiplicity of proceedings. This concern was also recently identified by the Supreme Court wherein directions were given to dispose of Supreme Court cases expeditiously. Directions were given by the Supreme Court to club together multiple Section 138 cases against an individual (in the last 12 months) in a single proceeding. Such multiplicity of proceedings arose because there were two ways through which remedies could be obtained; payees often explored both, leading to increased load on the judiciary.

Those who oppose decriminalisation anchor themselves in the 'retributive theory' - severely punish an offender so that it sets an example in the society. They argue that decriminalisation would enable people to issue post-date cheques without an intent to pay, without impunity. The government has not yet made up its mind. Decriminalisation is a welcome step but it should not obstruct the smooth operation of economic activity and sufficient measures should be in place to assure the payees that the cheques presented to them would be honoured.

(The author is Managing Partner & CEO, Surana and Surana, a law firm)

TECH START-UPS

The merits of superior voting rights

SEBI is reviewing if the ICDR regime needs further modifications

SAURYA BHATTACHARYA



Almost two years to the day, the Securities and Exchange Board of India ("SEBI") introduced the concept of superior voting equity shares ("SR Shares") in the SEBI ICDR Regulations of 2018 (ICDR - 'Issue of Capital and Disclosure Requirements') to ease initial public offers of tech-based start-up companies. Founders of such companies are inclined to use SR Shares where their company (expectedly) has multiple rounds of fund raise requirements from various financial investors and ordinary voting right equity shares would dilute a founder's control. SEBI is now reviewing whether the present ICDR regime needs further modifications to facilitate a company with SR Shares meaningfully achieve listing.

The whole issue has several features of interest. For example, which shareholders with SR Shares ("SR Shareholders") should be considered?

Key models

A company can have founder equity shareholding control structured in a few key models: (a) direct equity holding by one or more individual founders; (b) founder may have relatives hold equity shares; or (c) founder holding is through trusts/holding companies (special purpose vehicle or SPV).

Notwithstanding variations to the structure, the crux would be in the individual founder exercising control. Thus, SEBI's focus may well be on the founder's direct or indirect holding of SR Shares, and such founder would be the relevant SR Shareholder for the purposes of the ICDR.

SEBI may even consider allowing SR Shares only for individual founders for a company going the IPO route, as they are the ones who would effectively need to exercise control rather than relatives with passive shareholding. If required, the maximum permissible voting ratio of 10:1 could be increased

threshold of ₹750 crore for a single founder and, where there are two or more founders, an aggregate of ₹1,500 crore for all individual founders combined may be considered. Given that the investments into the company would not be considered, if there is a SPV, its investment into the company might not matter.

Furthermore, what should be the minimum period of holding SR Shares? At present, the ICDR mandates that the SR Shares should be held for a minimum period of six months prior to filing of the red herring prospectus. While six months is not unreasonable, a shorter period could also be considered to allow founders greater flexibility to prepare a company for an IPO. Also, if there is a SPV, the minimum holding period should apply on it as well. As a corollary, if the founder holding of SR Shares in the company is a combination of direct holding and SPV holding, the minimum holding period should apply to both. Any time-period beyond minimum holding need not be identical for both. Also, given that the voting ratio could be tested through holding of direct SR Shares (either for individual founder or vehicles) and the net worth test could be limited to individual founders minus investment in the company; during the six-month period inter se transfer between individual founder and his SPV could also be permitted.

In sum, to aid founders and tech-based start-ups to best use SR shares en route to a main board IPO, a shift in focus from promoter/promoter group to individual founders and their controlled investment vehicles may provide the right balance.

(The author is a Mumbai-based Corporate Partner with HSA Advocates, and additionally heads the practice for the Firm's Kolkata Office. Views expressed herein are personal and not to be construed as legal advice.)

The taxing issue of making the tech giants pay their due

Amending 'permanent establishment' in treaties is key to taxing the tech majors



Massive numbers Global e-commerce retail sales rose 265 per cent between 2014 (\$1.3 trillion) and 2021 (\$4.9 trillion)

KARTHIK NATARAJAN

Information Technology lowered barriers for trading without physical presence in a region. Historically, countries have sought to tax businesses conducted within their territories. This has been shaken up by the blistering pace of the internet.

Global e-commerce retail sales rose 265 per cent between 2014 (\$1.3 trillion) and 2021 (\$4.9 trillion). Nations with substantial markets have felt the need to recognise and address the tax imbalance (which the pandemic has exacerbated).

For, after all, it is their population that contributes to the coffers of the technology companies, most of which are located in the developed nations, where they pay their taxes.

'Digital tax challenges'

The Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD)'s concerted efforts gave birth to BEPS Action-1 in 2015, addressing the "Tax Challenges Arising from Digitalisation", suggesting taxation of cross-border digital transactions from three points: Nexus based on Significant Economic Presence ("SEP"); withholding tax on digital transactions; and equalisation levy.

Initially, India went for the equalisation levy as a separate chapter in the Finance Act, 2016 at the rate of 6

per cent of gross consideration on services which broadly covered the digital advertising space.

Effective April 1, 2020, e-commerce companies came within the ambit of the equalisation levy with a flat 2 per cent charge on gross revenues (both goods and services) of non-resident e-commerce operators (including providers of online trading platforms, advertisements targeting Indian customers and dealing in data of Indian origin).

Significant Economic Presence

In May 2021 (effective April 1, 2021), India operationalised the SEP for non-resident e-commerce companies by including 'download of data or software' worth revenues exceeding ₹2 crore from Indians or a threshold of 3 lakh Indian users with whom such companies solicit systematic and continuous business activities or engage in interaction'.

Until recently, Indian tax courts have almost consistently held the view that payments to non-resident companies for online advertisement campaigns (Income Tax Appellate Tribunal, Kolkata in the Right Florists case) or banner ads on portals (Mumbai Tribunal in Pinstorm Technologies) to expand business prospects were not liable for taxation in India, especially in the absence of an Indian Permanent Establishment, effectively tak-

ing them out of the ambit of Indian tax.

The question of violating the tax treaties in case of equalisation levy may not arise since it has been brought in via Finance Act, 2016 and not by amending the Income-tax Act, 1961 ('the Act').

Though the introduction of SEP came by way of amendment to the Act, the definition of 'permanent establishment' used in the tax treaties has not yet been amended and therefore, until that is done, the Indian taxman cannot yet tax such global technology giants. SEP terms such as 'systematic and continuous soliciting of business' or 'engaging in interactions' have not been defined, which is a sure-shot invitation to increased litigation.

We also have to consider how tax authorities will gather the data required to implement SEP, let alone verifying it. Like other countries, India is attempting to get a fair share of the tax pie of profits earned by tech giants like Google, Facebook, Amazon, and Microsoft.

However, the fear is of retaliatory, punitive tariffs, as has happened to France. In the absence of a multilateral tax body transcending national self-interests, global digital and e-commerce business is poised for turbulent headwinds.

(The author is a Partner, Bhuta Shah Co. LLP)

WhatsApp and the wait for Data Protection Bill

M RAMESH

Harish Salve, WhatsApp's counsel, has pressed the pause button on a legal brawl by telling the Delhi High Court that the messaging service provider will not enforce its new 'privacy policy and terms of service' until the Personal Data Protection (PDP) Bill, 2019, becomes law.

WhatsApp can afford to wait. A Joint Committee of the Parliament that is examining the PDP Bill was given more time to do its work in March this year - till the first week of the monsoon session of 2021 of the Parliament. Since the monsoon session is scheduled to begin in July 19, the extended time is

coming to an end very soon. Unless, yet another extension - the fifth - is given. Some experts have wondered whether the government is trying to cover up its own failure to pass such an important legislation as the PDP, which is more granular than the existing laws relating to personal data, by narrowly interpreting the existing laws to suit its convenience.

"Rather than vilify a company for following the letter of the law, India should focus on why there isn't a better one," writes Probir Roy Chowdhury, an advocate with the law firm, J Sagar Associates, in Mondaq.

SPDI Rules

Under the Information Technology (Reasonable Security Practices and Procedures and Sensitive Personal Data or Information) Rules, 2011, or 'SPDI Rules', a service provider such as WhatsApp is not barred from collecting 'personal information' such as contact list details, usage or log information or other location-based information; for 'sensitive personal data', the service provider should get express consent from the customer; use the data so collected for a lawful activity, provide opportunity to the customer to withdraw consent and not share the data with a third party,

unless expressly consented to by the customer. Chowdhury notes that during the hearing, the Delhi High Court observed that WhatsApp users do not have to agree to WhatsApp's privacy rules as they could easily shift to other messaging networks if they don't like the rules. Users could also go to other independent platforms of business or avail themselves of other hosting services.

Chowdhury observes that the WhatsApp issue seems to bring back the famous caveat

emptor principle - or 'buyer beware' - which expects the buyer to exercise diligence over his purchase first before blaming the seller for selling a defective

product. (Caveat emptor is a part of a sentence in Latin, whose translation is 'let a buyer beware, for he ought not to be ignorant of the nature of the property that he is buying'. It argues that the mere fact that the take-it-or-leave-it nature of WhatsApp's privacy policy, where you either click on the 'I Agree' button or not, with no scope for negotiations, does not make the policy unconscionable.

Any business is entitled to follow the letter of the law - it is up to the governments to bring the letter of the law in complete sync with the spirit of the law. That is where enter the importance of the PDP, which is modelled on the European Union's General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR), but only more stringent. For example, as Vijay Pal Dalmia, Partner, Vaish Associates, notes, the GDPR does not concern itself with non-personal or anonymised data, but under clause 91 of the PDP, the government may ask for non-personal data for policy making decisions. So, as of now, WhatsApp's case rests. One has to see how well WhatsApp's privacy policy holds up against the PDP. But it is only when the PDP Bill becomes an Act, would one remind himself of the famous words of Gabbar Singh in Sholay: 'Ab aayega maza'.

Lambodhra Textiles Limited
Registered Office: 3A, B Block, Pioneer Apartments
1075-B, Aninashi Road, Coimbatore - 641018
CIN No. L1711TZ1994PLC004929 | Telephone: 0422-2494938
Website: www.lambodhratextiles.com | Email: info@lambodhratextiles.com

NOTICE
Notice is hereby given to the shareholders of the Company pursuant to Rule 6 of the Investor Education and Protection Fund Authority (Accounting, Audit, Transfer and Refund) Rules, 2016 as under: In accordance with Section 124(3) of the Company act, 2013 read with amended Provision of Rules 6 of the Investor Education and Protection Fund (Accounting, Audit, Transfer and Refund) Rules, 2016 effective from September 07, 2016, all the shares in respect of which the dividend has not been claimed / paid for 7 consecutive years or more are liable to be transferred to the IEPF account. Hence, the shareholders may note that all the shares in respect of which the dividend has not been claimed / paid for 7 consecutive years since the FY 2013-14 are liable to be transferred to the Investor Education and Protection Fund authority (IEPFA) account as per the said rules.

The Company has sent individual notices on 10.07.2021 through registered post to the concerned shareholders whose dividends are lying unclaimed / unpaid since 2013-14, advising them to claim their dividend amounts expeditiously.

The statement containing the details of name, address, folio number / demat account number and number of shares liable for transfer to IEPF account is made available in our website www.lambodhratextiles.com for necessary action by the shareholders.

The concerned shareholders, holding shares in physical form and whose shares are liable to be transferred to IEPF account, may note that the company would be issuing duplicate share certificate in lieu of original share certificate held by them for the purpose of transfer of shares to the IEPF account as per the rules and upon such issue, the original certificates which are registered in their name will stand automatically cancelled and be deemed non-negotiable.

The shareholders are requested to contact M/s. S.K.D.C. Consultants Limited, Surya 35, Mayflower Avenue, Behind Senthil Nagar, Sowripalayam Road, Coimbatore - 641028, Registrar & Share Transfer Agent, behind Senthil Nagar, Sowripalayam Road, Coimbatore - 641028, to claim their dividends which is lying unclaimed / unpaid since 2013-14. In case the Company does not receive any valid communication from the concerned shareholders within three months from the date of this notice, the Company shall transfer such shares to the IEPF account as per the rules. The shareholders may note that they can claim back both the unclaimed dividend and the shares including all benefits accruing on such shares, if any, by making separate application to the IEPF Authority, in the prescribed Form IEPF-5, as stipulated under the said Rules and the same is available at IEPF website i.e., www.iepf.gov.in

For any further queries / clarification on the above subject matter, the shareholders may contact M/s. S.K.D.C. Consultants Limited, Registrar & Share Transfer Agent, behind Senthil Nagar, Sowripalayam Road, Coimbatore - 641028, to claim their dividends which is lying unclaimed / unpaid since 2013-14. In case the Company does not receive any valid communication from the concerned shareholders within three months from the date of this notice, the Company shall transfer such shares to the IEPF account as per the rules. The shareholders may note that they can claim back both the unclaimed dividend and the shares including all benefits accruing on such shares, if any, by making separate application to the IEPF Authority, in the prescribed Form IEPF-5, as stipulated under the said Rules and the same is available at IEPF website i.e., www.iepf.gov.in

For Lambodhra Textiles Limited
Sd/- Bosco Guilla,
Whole-Time Director
DIN: 01898020

Place : Coimbatore
Date : 12.07.2021

COURTROOM

Re-opening disallowed
The Income Tax Appellate Tribunal has dismissed an appeal filed by the Deputy Commissioner of Income Tax, Mumbai, who wanted to re-open the tax assessment of a corporate assessee, because the assessing officer changed his opinion about the depreciation claim. In doing so, the Tribunal has established the principle that in the absence of any new material, a case cannot be re-opened, merely on the basis of a change of opinion. Morries Energy of Mumbai, which owns a 1.25 MW wind turbine, claimed 100 per cent depreciation. The claim was examined by the assessing officer and allowed. But he later said that the fact that the wind turbine had not been put to use for 180 days, as required for claiming 100 per cent depreciation, had escaped his attention. He said that the company was entitled to only 50 per cent depreciation. The company petitioned the Central Income Tax Tribunal, which declared the reassessment invalid, following which the department approached the Appellate Tribunal. The Tribunal said: "It is quite evident that the original return of income stood scrutinised u/s 143(3) wherein assessee's claim of depreciation was duly examined by Ld. AO. The claim was allowed after due application of mind. The requisite documents and details were already furnished by the assessee during original assessment proceedings. However, subsequently, on the basis of existing material as available on record, Ld. AO formed an opinion of escapement of income which was nothing but mere change of opinion. There was no new tangible material which would demonstrate any escapement of income in the hands of the assessee. CIT(A) was quite justified in declaring the reassessment proceedings as invalid. Finding no infirmity in the same, we dismiss the appeal."

Limitation
In the case of *Silpi Industries and Ors Vs Kerala State Road Transport Corporation*, the Supreme Court has held that the Limitation Act, 1963 is applicable to the proceedings under the Arbitration and Conciliation Act, 1996. The case relates to a dispute over non-payment of a portion of dues under a purchase order. The question for consideration before the apex court was whether the provisions of Indian Limitation Act, 1963 is applicable to arbitration proceedings initiated under Section 18(3) of MSMD Act and whether counter claim is maintainable in such arbitration proceedings. A reading of Section 43 of 1996 Act itself makes it clear that the Limitation Act, 1963 shall apply to the arbitrations, as it applies to proceedings in court, the Supreme Court observed.

No fraud, no penalty
In the case of *Shubh Labh Reality Limited Vs Commissioner, Central Goods and Service Tax and Central Excise*, the Appellate Tribunal held that when a non-payment of tax is not due to fraud, collusion, wilful misstatement or suppression of facts, penalty cannot be imposed.

VENKY'S (INDIA) LIMITED
CIN: L01222PN1976PLC017422.
Regd. Office: "Venkateshwara House", S. No. 114/A/2, Pune - Sinhagad Road, Pune - 411 030, Tel. No.: 020-71251530
Website: www.venkys.com, Email: corp.shares@venkys.com

NOTICE

Notice is hereby given that the 45th Annual General Meeting of the Members of the Company will be held on Wednesday, the 11th August, 2021 at 10.30 a.m. through Video Conferencing (VC) / Other Audio Visual Means (OAVM) as per the provisions of Companies Act, 2013 and related circulars issued by Ministry of Corporate Affairs and SEBI. The 45th Annual Report of the Company, including the Notice of 45th AGM, will be sent only through email to those members whose email id are registered with the Registrar and Transfer Agent or Depository Participant. The Annual Report and Notice will also be made available on the website of the Company at www.venkys.com and the websites of BSE and NSE at www.bseindia.com and www.nseindia.com.

Members can register their email id by following the below process:
1. For Physical shareholders - please provide necessary details like Folio No., Name of shareholder, scanned copy of the share certificate (front and back), PAN (self attested scanned copy of PAN card), AADHAAR (self attested scanned copy of Aadhaar Card) by email to corp.shares@venkys.com and / or rohan.bhagwat@venkys.com and / or investor@bigshare.com.
2. For Demat shareholders - please provide Demat account details (CDSL-16 digit beneficiary ID or NSDL-16 digit DPID + CLID), Name, client master or copy of Consolidated Account statement, PAN (self attested scanned copy of PAN card), AADHAAR (self attested scanned copy of Aadhaar Card) to corp.shares@venkys.com and / or rohan.bhagwat@venkys.com and / or investor@bigshare.com.

Members are requested to go through the e-voting instructions available alongwith the notice and in case of any queries are requested to refer the Frequently Asked Questions ("FAQs") and e-voting manual available at www.evotingindia.co.in under help section or write an email to helpdesk.evoting@cdslindia.com . or alternatively contact Mr. Rohan Bhagwat, Company Secretary at 020-71251530 or email id: rohan.bhagwat@venkys.com.

By order of the Board of Directors
of Venky's (India) Limited

Rohan Bhagwat
Company Secretary & Compliance Officer
M. No. A 26954

Place : Pune
Date : 9th July, 2021

TCI
LEADERS IN LOGISTICS
Transport Corporation of India Ltd.

Regd. Office: Flat Nos. 306 & 307, 3rd Floor, 1-8-271, to 273, Ashoka Bhoopal Chambers, S.R. Road Secunderabad - 500 003, Telangana
Corp. Office: TCI House, 69 Institutional Area, Sector-32, Gurugram - 122 001, Haryana
Tel: +91 124 2381603-07, E-mail: secretariat@tci.com, Website: www.tci.com

NOTICE

NOTICE is hereby given that 26th Annual General Meeting ("AGM") of the Members of Transport Corporation of India Ltd. ("the Company") is scheduled to be held on Tuesday, the 3rd August, 2021 at 11:00 AM through Video Conferencing (VC) / Other Audio Visual Means (OAVM) to transact the business items as set out in the notice of AGM.

In compliance with the General Circular No.14/2020 dated 8th April 2020, General Circular No. 17/2020 dated 13th April 2020, General Circular No. 20/ 2020 dated 05th May, 2020 issued by the Ministry of Corporate Affairs (MCA) and Circular No. SEBI/HO/CFD/CMD/IR/P/2020/6 dated 12th May, 2020 issued by the Securities and Exchange Board of India (SEBI), electronic copies of the Notice of the 26th AGM and Annual Report of the Company for the financial year 2020-21 have been sent on 11th July, 2021 to all the Shareholders whose email addresses are registered with the Company/ Depository Participant(s).

Members who have not registered their e-mail address are required to register the same in respect of the shares held in electronic form with the Depository through their Depository Participant(s) and in respect of shares held in physical form through an e-mail to the Registrar and Share Transfer Agent (RTA) of the Company, KFin Technologies Pvt. Ltd., Selenium Tower B, Plot number 31 & 32, Financial District Gachibowli, Hyderabad 500 032, Tel: +91 040 67161524, email: info@rtadsl.com

Members may note that the Notice calling the AGM and Annual Report for the FY 2020-21 will also be made available on the website of the Company at www.tci.com, website of Stock Exchanges at www.bseindia.com and www.nseindia.com and on the website of Central Depository Services (India) Ltd. at www.evotingindia.com.

The Details required pursuant to the provisions of the Companies Act, 2013 and Rules made thereunder are given below:

Item No.	Particulars	Day, Date & Time
1	The date for reckoning Voting rights of the Members i.e. Cut-off date	Wednesday, 28 th July, 2021
2	Date of dispatch of AGM Notice and Annual Report in Electronic Mode	Sunday, 11 th July, 2021
3	Date & time of Commencement of remote e-voting	Saturday, 31 st July, 2021 at 09:00 AM (IST)
4	Remote e-voting shall be not be allowed beyond given Date & Time/ End of remote e-voting	Monday, 2 nd August, 2021 at 5:00 PM (IST)
5	Contact Details, in case of any query/ grievance related to remote e-voting or need assistance before or during the AGM	Mr. Rakesh Dahi Central Depository Services (India) Ltd., Wing, 25 th Floor, Marathon Futures, Mafatal MII Compounds, N M Joshi Marg, Lower Parel (East), Mumbai - 400013; Ph: 1800225533 E-mail: helpdesk.evoting@cdslindia.com

In case a person has become Member of the Company after dispatch of the notice but on or before the cut-off date for remote e-voting or has registered the email address after the dispatch of notice, such Member may obtain the login ID and password in the manner as provide in procedure and instructions for e-voting.

The facility of e-voting will also be made available during the AGM and the members attending the meeting who have not cast their vote by remote e-voting, shall be able to exercise their right during the meeting through e-voting system available during the AGM.

A member may participate in the AGM even after exercising his right to vote through remote e-voting but shall not be allowed to vote during the meeting.

Pursuant to applicable statutory provisions, the Register of Members and Share Transfer Books of the Company will remain closed from Thursday, 29th July, 2021 to Tuesday, 3rd August, 2021 (both days inclusive).

For Transport Corporation of India Ltd.
Archna Pandey
Company Secretary & Compliance Officer

Place: Gurugram
Date: 11th July, 2021

