Journal of Management and Science

Eleyon Publishers

16(4) 2026 14-26

OPEN ACCESS

RESEARCH ARTICLE

DOI: https://doi.org/10.26524/jms.16.32

Failure of Corporate Governance: A Case Study of Satyam Computer Services Limited

Vedant V. Pandya[1*], Sanjay J. Bhayani[2*], Butalal C. Ajmera[3*], Jayendrasinh Jadav[4*]

Abstract

The confession of B. Ramalinga Raju on 7 January 2009 that the balance sheet of Satyam Computer Services Limited (Satyam) contained fictitious assets of about Rs 7,136 crore exposed the largest accounting fraud in Indian corporate history. Satyam was then India's fourth-largest IT services firm, NYSE-listed, audited by a Big Four affiliate, and had received a corporate governance award only months earlier. This paper presents an exploratory single-case study of Satyam using secondary evidence: the promoter's confession letter, regulatory and judicial orders, annual reports and the academic and professional literature. It reconstructs the fraud with facts and figures, analyses the failure of the board, the audit committee, the statutory auditors and the regulators through the lens of agency theory and the fraud triangle, and offers a critical assessment of the role of independent directors. It then compares Satyam with firms whose fortunes were shaped by foreign chief executives (Nissan, Olympus, Nokia, Jaguar Land Rover and Sony) to show how governance architecture conditions CEO outcomes. The paper concludes with ten lessons for boards, auditors, regulators and investors. The findings indicate that Satyam failed not for want of rules but because compliance was formal rather than substantive.

Keywords: Corporate Governance, Satyam, Accounting Fraud, Independent Directors, Audit Committee, Agency Theory, Foreign CEO, India.

JEL Classification: G34, G38, M41, M42, K22

Author Affiliation: [1] Dean, Professor and Head, Department of Business Administration, M. K. Bhavnagar University, Bhavnagar, Gujarat, India. [2] Dean and Professor, Department of Business Management (M.B.A. Programme) at Saurashtra University, Rajkot, Gujarat, India. [3] Professor and former Dean, Department of Commerce, Maharaja Krishnakumarsinhji Bhavnagar University, Bhavnagar, Gujarat, India. [4] Professor, S.D. School of Commence, Gujarat University, Ahmedabad – 380009, Gujarat, India.

Corresponding Author: Prof. Vedant V. Pandya, Prof. Sanjay J. Bhayani, Prof. Butalal C. Ajmera, Prof. Jayendrasinh Jadav, Head and Assistant Professor, Department of Business Administration, Auxilium College (Autonomous), Gandhi Nagar, Vellore- 632006, Tamil Nadu, India.

Email: vedantvp@gmail.com, sjbhayani@gmail.com, butalal.ajmera@gmail.com, jayendrasinhj@gmail.com

How to cite this article: Prof. Vedant V. Pandya, Prof. Sanjay J. Bhayani, Prof. Butalal C. Ajmera, Prof. Jayendrasinh Jadav, Failure of Corporate Governance: A Case Study of Satyam Computer Services Limited, Journal of Management and Science, 16(4) 2026 14-26. Retrieved from https://jmseleyon.com/index.php/jms/article/view/992

Received: 17 September 2026 **Revised:** 28 October 2026 **Accepted:** 5 November 2026 **Published:** 10 November 2026

1. Introduction

Corporate governance is the system of rules, practices and processes by which firms are directed and controlled, and its core purpose is to protect the interests of shareholders and other stakeholders when ownership is separated from control (Cadbury Committee, 1992; Shleifer and Vishny, 1997). Where ownership is concentrated, as in most Indian firms, the central problem is not the classic manager-versus-shareholder conflict but the risk that controlling promoters expropriate minority investors (Johnson et al., 2000; Bertrand et al., 2002).

© The Author(s). 2026 Open Access This article is distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License (http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/), which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and non-commercial reproduction in any medium, provided you give appropriate credit to the original author(s) and the source, provide a link to the Creative Commons license, and indicate if changes were made. The Creative Commons Public Domain Dedication waiver (http://creativecommons.org/publicdomain/zero/1.0/) applies to the data made available in this article, unless otherwise stated.

Satyam is the defining Indian illustration. Founded in 1987 in Hyderabad by B. Ramalinga Raju and his brother-in-law, the company grew into a global IT and business-process outsourcing firm with roughly 50,000 employees and operations in dozens of countries. It listed on the NYSE as an ADR in 2001, was a constituent of the BSE Sensex, and reported revenue of about Rs 8,137 crore for FY2008. Yet on 7 January 2009 its chairman admitted that profits, cash and receivables had been manipulated for years. Commentators called it "India's Enron" (Bhasin, 2013; Healy and Palepu, 2003 on Enron).

This paper addresses four questions. (1) What exactly happened at Satyam, in numbers? (2) Which governance mechanisms failed and why? (3) How effective were the independent directors? (4) What can be learned from Satyam and from firms led by foreign CEOs?

2. Literature Review and Theoretical Framework

2.1 Agency theory and tunnelling

Jensen and Meckling (1976) show that the separation of ownership and control creates agency costs, and Fama and Jensen (1983) argue that boards, especially outside directors, are the principal device for ratifying and monitoring managerial decisions. In concentrated-ownership settings, "tunnelling", the transfer of resources from the firm to its controllers, becomes the dominant risk (Johnson et al., 2000). Bertrand et al. (2002) found evidence of tunnelling in Indian business groups, which is the context into which Satyam's attempted Maytas deal fits.

2.2 The fraud triangle

Cressey (1953) proposed that fraud requires pressure, opportunity and rationalisation. Raju's letter describes a gap between reported and actual profit that began as a "marginal gap" and grew until it could no longer be sustained. The triangle is a useful organising frame for Section 5.

2.3 Regulatory evolution in India

Indian governance reform followed the Cadbury (1992) model. The Kumar Mangalam Birla Committee (2000) led to Clause 49 of the listing agreement, mandating independent directors and audit committees. The Naresh Chandra Committee (2002) addressed audit independence and the Narayana Murthy Committee (2003) strengthened Clause 49, including the audit committee's role and whistle-blower provisions. Studies before Satyam found that Clause 49 raised measured governance quality but that enforcement and substance lagged form (Black and Khanna, 2007; Chakrabarti et al., 2008; Afsharipour, 2010). Satyam, also subject to the US Sarbanes-Oxley regime through its NYSE listing, was therefore formally compliant with two demanding systems.

2.4 Review of empirical literature

Thirty-seven prior studies are reviewed below under five themes: (A) governance, law and firm value; (B) Indian evidence; (C) boards, independence and financial reporting; (D) director reputation and the consequences of fraud; and (E) foreign directors and executives. Findings are summarised in brief; readers should consult the original papers for samples, methods and caveats. The studies are listed in Tables 1 to 5.

Table 1: Prior studies on governance, law and firm value

No.	Study	Context	Main finding
1	La Porta et al. (1998)	Legal rules across many countries	Investor protection varies with legal origin; ownership is more concentrated where protection is weak
2	La Porta et al. (2002)	27 economies	Stronger minority-shareholder protection is associated with higher firm valuation
3	Gompers et al. (2003)	US firms, 1990s	Firms with stronger shareholder rights had higher valuations and returns
4	Klapper and Love (2004)	14 emerging markets	Firm-level governance is weaker where legal systems are weak; better governance relates to higher performance and valuation
5	Black, Jang and Kim (2006)	Korea	A governance index, including outside-director share, is strongly related to Tobin's q
6	Black, Love and Rachinsky (2006)	Russia	Governance scores are positively related to market value

Source: Compiled from the studies cited.

Table 2. Prior studies on Indian evidence

No.	Study	Context	Main finding
7	Varma (1997)	Indian boards	The core problem is disciplining the dominant shareholder; boards were largely controlled by promoters
8	Sarkar and Sarkar (2000)	Indian listed firms	Ownership structure, including large shareholders, is related to firm value
9	Khanna and Palepu (2000)	Indian business groups	Group affiliation has performance effects that depend on the extent of diversification and outside ownership
10	Black and Khanna (2007)	Introduction of Clause 49	Event-study evidence of positive market reaction among firms more affected by the reform
11	Sarkar, Sarkar and Sen (2008)	Indian boards and earnings management	Board characteristics, including director busyness, relate to earnings management, so independence on paper does not guarantee monitoring
12	Rajagopalan and Zhang (2008)	China and India	Reforms improved formal rules, but enforcement and board effectiveness remain challenges
13	Balasubramanian, Black and Khanna (2010)	Indian firm-level governance index	Better firm-level governance is associated with higher market value
14	Dharmapala and Khanna (2013)	Clause 49 and enforcement	Reform effects on value depend on the quality of enforcement
15	Bhasin (2013)	Satyam	Documents the fraud and attributes it to weak board oversight, auditor failure and promoter dominance

Source: Compiled from the studies cited.

Table 3. Prior studies on boards, independence and financial reporting

No.	Study	Context	Main finding
16	Weisbach (1988)	US CEO turnover	Outsider-dominated boards are more likely to remove CEOs after poor performance
17	Dechow, Sloan and Sweeney (1996)	US earnings manipulation	Manipulating firms tend to have weaker governance, such as insider-dominated boards and CEO-chairman duality
18	Beasley (1996)	US financial statement fraud	Fraud firms have a lower proportion of outside directors
19	Yermack (1996)	US board size	Smaller boards are associated with higher market valuation
20	Agrawal and Knoeber (1996)	US control mechanisms	Governance mechanisms are interdependent, so single-mechanism studies can mislead
21	Bhagat and Black (2002)	US board independence	No convincing evidence that board independence improves long-term performance
22	Cohen, Krishnamoorthy and Wright (2002)	Audit process	The governance of the audit process involves the board, management and auditors jointly, and management's influence is considerable
23	Agrawal and Chadha (2005)	US accounting restatements	Board independence alone does not predict restatement; independent directors' financial expertise does
24	Fich and Shivdasani (2006)	US busy boards	Boards with many multiple-directorship outsiders are associated with weaker governance and lower valuation

25	Adams and Ferreira (2007)	Theory of boards	CEOs may prefer friendly boards, and intense monitoring can reduce the information CEOs share
26	Coles, Daniel and Naveen (2008)	US board structure	One size does not fit all: complex firms benefit from larger boards with more insiders
27	Dahya, Dimitrov and McConnell (2008)	Multi-country	Independent directors add value where a dominant shareholder exists and legal protection is weak
28	Bhagat and Bolton (2008)	US firms	Board independence is not positively related to performance; directors' share ownership is
29	Hermalin and Weisbach (2003)	Review of board research	Boards are endogenously determined, which makes the link between composition and performance hard to interpret

Source: Compiled from the studies cited.

Table 4. Prior studies on director reputation and consequences of fraud

No.	Study	Context	Main finding
30	Srinivasan (2005)	US restatements and audit committees	Outside directors on audit committees lose other board seats after restatements
31	Coffee (2005)	Theory of scandals	Scandals follow from equity-based incentives and the failure of gatekeepers such as auditors
32	Karpoff, Lee and Martin (2008)	US financial misrepresentation	Reputational losses to firms far exceed legal penalties
33	Fich and Shivdasani (2007)	US fraud allegations	Outside directors of fraud firms suffer reputational penalties through lost directorships
34	DeFond and Zhang (2014)	Audit research review	Audit quality depends on auditor incentives, independence and professional scepticism

Source: Compiled from the studies cited.

Table 5. Prior studies on foreign directors and executives

No.	Study	Context	Main finding
35	Oxelheim and Randøy (2003)	Norway and Sweden	Anglo-American board members are associated with higher firm value
36	Masulis, Wang and Xie (2012)	US firms	Foreign independent directors are associated with poorer attendance and monitoring, with mixed performance effects
37	Giannetti, Liao and Yu (2015)	China	Foreign directors improve firm performance, especially where their expertise is relevant

Source: Compiled from the studies cited.

Synthesis and research gap. Three conclusions emerge. First, governance quality is linked to firm value, especially where legal protection is weak (studies 1-6, 10, 13, 14), but the link is weaker for formal board independence than for substantive features such as financial expertise and ownership (21, 23, 28). Second, independent directors have reputational incentives (30, 33), yet their monitoring is limited by information dependence and busyness (11, 24, 25). Third, evidence on foreign directors and executives is mixed (35-37). Few studies examine the Indian case in which a formally compliant board, a Big Four-affiliated auditor and a foreign listing all failed together. This paper addresses that gap through the Satyam case.

3. Research Methodology

The study is an exploratory, descriptive single-case design (Yin, 2014). Evidence is entirely secondary and was triangulated from: (a) the Raju letter to the board of 7 January 2009; (b) orders of SEBI (2015, 2018), the US SEC (2011) and the CBI Special Court, Hyderabad (2015); (c) Satyam's annual reports (Satyam Computer Services Ltd, 2008a), Form 20-F (Satyam Computer Services Ltd, 2008b) and stock-exchange filings; (d) academic and professional case literature; and (e) contemporaneous financial press. Figures are reported in Indian rupees (1 crore = 10 million) as stated in primary documents. Limitations: reliance on secondary sources, a single case, and the absence of interview data from directors, which limits claims about directors' state of mind.

4. The Satyam Case

4.1 Company profile

Table 6 gives the profile of Satyam.

Table 6. Profile of Satyam Computer Services Limited

Item	Detail
Founded	1987, Hyderabad; Chairman B. Ramalinga Raju, MD B. Rama Raju
Listings	BSE/NSE; NYSE ADR from 2001
Business	IT services, consulting, BPO; global clients incl. Fortune 500 firms
Scale (FY2008)	Revenue about Rs 8,137 crore; about 50,000+ employees
Auditor	Price Waterhouse (Bangalore) / Lovelock and Lewes, Pricewaterhouse network
Governance recognition	2008 Golden Peacock Global Award for Excellence in Corporate Governance (awarded and subsequently withdrawn after the fraud)

Source: Satyam Computer Services Ltd (2008b); press reports.

4.2 Warning signs before the confession

- Declining promoter shareholding. Promoters' stake fell from about 25.6% in 2001 to about 8.8% by March 2008 and about 5.1% by December 2008, with almost all of the remaining shares reportedly pledged to lenders. Falling stakes weaken the alignment between controller and minority shareholders, and pledged shares create margin-call pressure.
- World Bank debarment. Satyam was debarred by the World Bank for eight years in 2008 for improper benefits to bank staff and inadequate documentation of work.
- Unusually high reported margins and cash. Satyam held very large cash balances while still borrowing, a classic inconsistency noted by analysts after the event.
- Maytas Infra/Maytas Properties. See below.

4.3 The Maytas episode (16 December 2008)

On 16 December 2008 Satyam's board announced a proposal to acquire 100% of Maytas Properties for about US$1.3 billion and 51% of Maytas Infra for about US$300 million, a total of about US$1.6 billion. "Maytas" is "Satyam" spelt backwards, and both firms were controlled by the Raju family (family holdings of roughly 35-37%). The deal was a related-party transaction, funded from Satyam's cash, in unrelated businesses (real estate and infrastructure) and appears to have been intended to replace fictitious assets with real ones. Reports indicate that the board approved it, and shareholders were not consulted beforehand. Following an investor backlash in India and the US, with Satyam's ADR falling by more than half in a day, the deal was cancelled within roughly 12 hours. The reversal triggered resignations among directors and set the stage for the confession three weeks later.

4.4 The confession (7 January 2009)

In a letter to the board, Raju stated that the balance sheet as of 30 September 2008 carried the fictitious or misstated items shown in Table 7.

Table 7. False items in the balance sheet as at 30 September 2008

Item (as at 30 Sep 2008)	Reported (Rs crore)	Actual / Misstatement (Rs crore)
Cash and bank balances	5,361	Rs 5,040 crore non-existent
Accrued interest on bank deposits	376	Non-existent
Understated liability	–	1,230 (funds arranged by Raju)
Overstated debtors (receivables)	2,651	Rs 490 crore overstated
Total gap between reported and actual position		about 7,136

Source: Raju (2009).

For Q2 FY2009 (July-September 2008) the letter gave the figures in Table 8.

Table 8. Reported and actual results, Q2 FY2009 (Rs crore)

Metric (Q2 FY2009)	Reported (Rs crore)	Actual (Rs crore)	Overstatement
Revenue	2,700	2,112	588 (about 28%)
Operating profit	649 (24% margin)	61 (3% margin)	588

Source: Raju (2009).

The letter described the manipulation as growing from a small gap into one that "attained unmanageable proportions", likening it to riding a tiger he could not dismount. Investigators alleged that the fraud was sustained by thousands of fictitious invoices, fake bank statements and fictitious employee records, with salaries for ghost employees reportedly being drawn, and that diversion of funds was used to acquire land through Raju family entities.

4.5 Market and institutional aftermath

Table 9 lists the main events.

Table 9. Main events after the confession

Date	Event
16 Dec 2008	Maytas acquisition announced and cancelled within a day
7 Jan 2009	Raju resigns and confesses; shares fall by about 78% in a day (to about Rs 40) and later below Rs 10
9 Jan 2009	Raju arrested; Government of India constitutes a new board (including Deepak Parekh, Kiran Karnik and C. Achuthan)
Apr 2009	Tech Mahindra wins a government-run auction, paying Rs 58 per share for about 31% stake (about Rs 1,756 crore)
2009-2011	Company renamed Mahindra Satyam; restated accounts; US class action settled for US$125 million; PwC affiliates agree US$25.5 million settlement; SEC penalties of US$10 million (Satyam) and US$6 million (PwC India)
2013	Mahindra Satyam merges with Tech Mahindra
Apr 2015	CBI Special Court convicts Raju, B. Rama Raju and eight others; seven-year rigorous imprisonment; SEBI orders disgorgement of about Rs 1,849 crore and bars Raju and others from the securities market for 14 years
2018	SEBI bars the PwC network firms from auditing listed Indian companies for two years

Sources: Raju (2009); SEBI (2015, 2018); US SEC (2011); CBI Special Court judgment (2015). Figures are as reported in these documents and the financial press.

A decisive contribution to the survival of the firm was the quick state-led rescue, which prevented a collapse of IT export confidence and protected roughly 50,000 employees.

4.6 Five-year financial position and key facts (FY2004-FY2008)

The table summarises the five years before the fraud was admitted, as reported in Satyam's Form 20-F for fiscal 2008 (US GAAP, audited by Price Waterhouse) and set out in Table 10. These are the figures investors saw. The confession later showed that reported cash and profits were overstated, so they are reported values, not true values (Satyam Computer Services Ltd, 2008b; Raju, 2009).

Table 10. Five-year financial position of Satyam, FY2004-FY2008 (US$ million, as reported)

Measure (US$ million, year ended 31 March)	FY2004	FY2005	FY2006	FY2007	FY2008
Total revenue	566.4	793.6	1,096.3	1,461.4	2,138.1
Operating income	121.1	162.5	219.7	291.6	408.7
Net income	111.9	153.8	249.4	298.4	417.0
Cash and bank deposits	418.8	541.4	696.5	919.8	1,117.2
Total assets	713.8	884.1	1,181.2	1,624.1	2,243.3
Shareholders' equity	633.9	767.9	994.4	1,371.0	1,861.8
Long-term debt (excluding current portion)	1.8	1.2	17.9	22.2	24.8
Employees at year end	not verified	20,690	about 29,000	39,018	50,570

Source: Satyam Computer Services Ltd (2008b). Cash and bank deposits = cash and cash equivalents plus investments in bank deposits. The FY2006 headcount is a press-reported approximation and the FY2004 headcount was not verified.

Revenue grew about 3.8 times in four years, a compound annual growth rate of 39.1% for FY2005-FY2008 according to the 20-F, while net income rose from US$153.8 million to US$417.0 million and employees from 20,690 to 50,570. Table 11 gives other key facts as at 31 March 2008. The balance sheet showed US$1.1 billion of cash and deposits against only US$24.8 million of long-term debt. The confession showed that, by September 2008, Rs 5,040 crore of the Rs 5,361 crore reported cash did not exist (Raju, 2009).

Table 11. Other key facts as at 31 March 2008

Item (as at 31 March 2008)	Detail
Total employees	50,570 worldwide, including 3,997 at Satyam BPO
Customers	654 active customers, including 185 Fortune Global 500 or US 500 companies
Board	Reportedly 10 directors, 6 of them independent; Chairman B. Ramalinga Raju and Managing Director B. Rama Raju were brothers
People in management	No verified headcount: the 20-F and other sources used name only the board and senior executives
Insider shareholding	Directors and officers with families about 0.5%; two executive directors controlled SRSR Holdings, which held about 8.3%
Statutory auditor	Price Waterhouse (Bangalore), Pricewaterhouse network; named as the independent registered public accounting firm in the 20-F

Source: Satyam Computer Services Ltd (2008b) and press reports.

4.7 Why Satyam came into conflict with governments and regulators

1. World Bank ban (2008). The World Bank, a multilateral lender and not an Indian government body, suspended Satyam in February 2008 and declared it ineligible for contracts for eight years from September 2008. The Bank cited improper benefits to Bank staff and failure to maintain documentation supporting fees charged for subcontractors (World Bank, 2008). Satyam had written and maintained the Bank's software since 2003 and demanded an apology for the Bank's public statements.
2. Maytas proposal (December 2008). The plan to buy Raju-family companies with Satyam's cash was a related-party deal that provoked an investor revolt and exposed the governance weakness before the confession.
3. Fraud and state action (2009 onwards). After the 7 January 2009 confession Raju was arrested, the Government of India replaced the board, and the CBI, SEBI and the US SEC took action for falsified accounts, leading to the 2011 US settlements and the 2015 conviction and SEBI order (SEBI, 2015; US SEC, 2011).
4. Underlying cause. Falsified revenue, cash and profit breached company law, Indian securities regulation and US securities law at the same time, which is why several authorities acted together.

5. Analysis: Why Governance Failed

5.1 Promoter dominance and the fraud triangle

Pressure: the gap between reported and real profits, falling promoter shareholding and pledged shares created pressure to keep share prices high. Opportunity: the chairman and his brother (the MD) controlled the CFO, the finance function and information flows to the board. Rationalisation: the fraud was framed in Raju's letter as a temporary measure to be resolved through the Maytas merger. The combination of chairman and CEO-type authority in one family weakened internal checks.

5.2 The board and the audit committee

The audit committee is the board's primary check on financial reporting. In Satyam, the audit committee consisted of independent directors and complied with the form of Clause 49 and Sarbanes-Oxley, yet it did not detect the discrepancy between reported cash of more than Rs 5,000 crore and the low interest earned and the continued borrowing. Board papers on Maytas apparently contained little independent valuation or fairness opinion, and the related-party nature of the deal was not subjected to arm's-length challenge.

5.3 External auditors

Price Waterhouse, an affiliate of the global PwC network, audited Satyam for years and certified balance sheets that included fictitious cash balances. Bank balances are among the easiest items to verify through direct confirmation, and the later finding that confirmations were allegedly forged (and that auditors relied on documents provided by management rather than independently obtaining them) points to a basic failure of professional scepticism. The SEC (2011) and SEBI (2018) sanctioned the PwC entities, and two audit partners were prosecuted. Auditor independence was also questioned because of non-audit fees and long tenure.

5.4 Regulators, analysts and markets

The SEBI/Registrar of Companies ecosystem did not detect the fraud despite several observable red flags. Analysts and rating agencies largely endorsed Satyam's reported growth, and governance awards (the 2008 Golden Peacock award, among others) legitimised the firm. Markets reacted to Maytas, not to the accounts, showing that investors can discipline related-party deals faster than regulators can detect reporting fraud.

6. Critical Assessment of the Role of Independent Directors

Satyam's board is an uncomfortable case for the doctrine that independent directors protect shareholders. The board reportedly comprised ten directors, of whom six were independent: Mangalam Srinivasan, Krishna Palepu (Harvard Business School professor), Vinod K. Dham, T. R. Prasad, M. Rammohan Rao (then Dean of the Indian School of Business) and V. S. Raju (former IIT Delhi director). Five points of critique follow.

1. Formal compliance without functional independence. The board had the required

proportion of independent directors and a fully independent audit committee, yet independent directors were appointed on the chairman's recommendation, so their position depended on the person they were meant to monitor. Reputation and remuneration, including commission and fees, created an incentive not to challenge the controlling family.

2. Failure of oversight on Maytas. All independent directors present were reported to have approved the Maytas acquisition in the 16 December 2008 meeting, a related-party transaction of US$1.6 billion that deployed a significant fraction of the company's reported cash into industries unrelated to Satyam's IT business. A prudent independent director would have insisted on a fairness opinion, a competitive process, abstention by interested directors and shareholder approval. The approval suggests either insufficient scepticism or insufficient information.
3. Information asymmetry. Independent directors depend on management-provided information. The CFO, the MD and the chairman controlled that information. Yet directors can demand direct access to auditors, internal audit and bank confirmations. The failure to meet auditors without management present, or to question why a cash-rich company needed to borrow, is a process failure rather than an information failure alone.
4. Over-commitment and expertise. Several independent directors were distinguished academics and executives with multiple commitments. Eminence is not a substitute for time and forensic attention. Palepu, a leading scholar of corporate governance and of Enron, was later criticised by commentators precisely because of the mismatch between expertise and outcome, although he and the other independent directors were not among the accused in the CBI trial and no evidence of complicity was established.
5. Ex-post behaviour. After the Maytas reversal, several independent directors resigned in the weeks around the confession. Resignation without reporting concerns to regulators or shareholders limits the protective value of independent directors, a point that the whistle-blower and vigil mechanism provisions of the Companies Act 2013 were designed to address.

Balanced view. Independent directors were not the architects of the fraud and had no evident personal gain. The more defensible conclusion is that independent directors are a necessary but insufficient safeguard: their effectiveness depends on the selection process, information rights, time commitment, liability regime and the culture of the boardroom. The 2013 Act addresses part of this by prescribing independence criteria and a code for independent directors (Section 149 and Schedule IV), limiting liability to acts of omission or commission occurring with their knowledge, attributable through board processes, or with their consent or connivance (Section 149(12)), prohibiting stock options (Section 149(9)), and requiring audit committee and vigil-mechanism processes (Section 177).

7. Foreign CEOs: Success and Failure Cases

Satyam was a founder-led, family-controlled firm, whereas many of the best-known CEO turnarounds involve professional, often foreign, executives brought into a different governance setting. The evidence in Table 12 is illustrative, not statistical, and shows that CEO nationality matters less than the strength of board oversight, alignment of the CEO with the firm's culture and authority, and the checks on CEO power.

Table 12. Companies and foreign chief executives

Company	Foreign CEO	Outcome	Governance lesson
Nissan (Japan)	Carlos Ghosn (Brazilian-born French-Lebanese), 1999-2017	Success then failure: the Nissan Revival Plan moved the firm from a loss of about 684 billion yen in FY1999 to profit within a year; in 2018 Ghosn was arrested for alleged under-reporting of compensation and misuse of company funds, and later fled Japan	Long tenure and concentrated power without checks turned a turnaround hero into a governance risk
Olympus (Japan)	Michael Woodford (British), 2011	Failure of the board: Woodford was dismissed within weeks after questioning large advisory fees in the Gyrus acquisition; Olympus later admitted to hiding losses of about 117.7 billion yen over two decades; former chairman received a suspended sentence (2013)	A foreign CEO acted as whistle-blower against an insider-dominated board (Woodford, 2012)
Nokia (Finland)	Stephen Elop (Canadian), 2010-2014	Failure: the "burning platform" strategy (Elop, 2011) bet on Windows Phone, handset market share collapsed and the devices business was sold to Microsoft for about EUR 5.44 billion in 2013	Strategy and culture mismatch; outsider-CEO risks without board expertise in the new strategy
Jaguar Land Rover (Tata Motors, India)	Ralf Speth (German), 2010-2020	Success (initially): after Tata acquired JLR from Ford for US$2.3 billion in 2008 (Tata Motors, 2008), JLR delivered record profits in the mid-2010s and cross-subsidised Tata Motors; later impairments and the China/diesel slowdown showed cyclical risk	Parent-level governance gave an autonomous foreign CEO the freedom to execute while monitoring through the board
Sony (Japan)	Howard Stringer (Welsh-born American), 2005-2012	Mixed to weak: the first non-Japanese CEO of Sony restructured the firm but Sony reported repeated net losses in the late 2000s and early 2010s	Even an outsider CEO could not overcome entrenched silos without strong board backing

Source: Compiled from the sources cited in the references.

Relevance to Satyam. Satyam had no outsider CEO to challenge the founder. Olympus shows how a foreign CEO's independence from an insider network can surface fraud, while Ghosn shows that foreign status offers no immunity from the same governance weakness of unchecked authority. The common thread is that board structure, information rights and accountability determine outcomes more than the passport of the CEO.

8. Lessons from the Satyam Case

1. Substance over form. Compliance with Clause 49 and SOX did not prevent the fraud. Boards must test whether committees actually challenge management.
2. Separate the chair from the executive and limit family control. Dual roles and family-run management concentrate information and authority.
3. Scrutinise related-party transactions. Require independent valuation, abstention by interested directors and majority-of-minority shareholder approval, as the 2013 Act and SEBI LODR (2015) now require for material transactions.
4. Strengthen audit committees. Members should have financial expertise, meet the

auditors privately, review cash and bank confirmations, and ask why cash-rich firms borrow.

5. Audit independence and scepticism. Mandatory rotation (Companies Act 2013, Section 139(2)), restrictions on non-audit services, direct confirmation of bank balances and an auditor duty to report fraud (Section 143(12)).
6. Independent directors need information, time and accountability. Appointment through a nomination committee rather than the promoter, access to internal audit and risk reports and limits on directorships.
7. Effective whistle-blowing. Vigil mechanisms with access to the audit committee chair (Section 177).
8. Regulatory enforcement and audit oversight. Establishment of the National Financial Reporting Authority (2018) and stronger SEBI enforcement.
9. Do not rely on governance awards and ratings. Awards are lagging, subjective and sometimes commercial.
10. Crisis management matters. Rapid state-led board replacement, transparent re-auditing and a credible acquirer (Tech Mahindra) preserved value, jobs and India's IT brand.

9. Conclusion

Satyam demonstrates that governance failure is rarely the result of missing rules; it arises when promoters dominate, boards defer, auditors accept management representations and regulators and markets rely on reputation. The company's overstated cash of Rs 5,040 crore, inflated operating margin (24% reported against 3% actual) and a failed related-party acquisition proposal of about US$1.6 billion were visible failures of oversight. Independent directors, although eminent and numerous, did not provide effective challenge, which supports calls for a stronger selection process, information rights and accountability. The comparison with foreign-CEO cases shows that CEO origin is secondary to institutional checks. Future research could use larger samples of post-2013 frauds in India and evaluate whether the Companies Act 2013 reforms measurably improved board effectiveness.

References

1. Adams RB and Ferreira D. A theory of friendly boards. Journal of Finance 62 (1) (2007): 217-250.
2. Afsharipour A. Corporate governance convergence: Lessons from the Indian experience. Northwestern Journal of International Law and Business 29 (2) (2010): 335-402.
3. Agrawal A and Chadha S. Corporate governance and accounting scandals. Journal of Law and Economics 48 (2) (2005): 371-406.
4. Agrawal A and Knoeber CR. Firm performance and mechanisms to control agency problems between managers and shareholders. Journal of Financial and Quantitative Analysis 31 (3) (1996): 377-397.
5. Balasubramanian N, Black BS and Khanna V. The relation between firm-level corporate governance and market value: A case study of India. Emerging Markets Review 11 (4) (2010): 319-340.
6. Beasley MS. An empirical analysis of the relation between the board of director composition and financial statement fraud. The Accounting Review 71 (4) (1996): 443-465.
7. Bertrand M, Mehta P and Mullainathan S. Ferreting out tunneling: An application to Indian business groups. Quarterly Journal of Economics 117 (1) (2002): 121-148.
8. Bhagat S and Black B. The non-correlation between board independence and long-term firm performance. Journal of Corporation Law 27 (2) (2002): 231-273.
9. Bhagat S and Bolton B. Corporate governance and firm performance. Journal of Corporate Finance 14 (3) (2008): 257-273.
10. Bhasin ML. Corporate accounting scandal at Satyam: A case study of India's Enron. European Journal of 5906+3 *9-*-Business and Social Sciences 1 (12) (2013): 25-47.
11. Black B, Jang H and Kim W. Does corporate governance predict firms' market values? Evidence from Korea. Journal of Law, Economics, and Organization 22 (2) (2006): 366-413.
12. Black B and Khanna V. Can corporate governance reforms increase firms' market values? Evidence from India. Journal of Empirical Legal Studies 4 (4) (2007): 749-796.
13. Black B, Love I and Rachinsky A. Corporate governance indices and firms' market values: Time series evidence from Russia. Emerging Markets Review 7 (4) (2006): 361-379.
14. Cadbury Committee. Report of the Committee on the Financial Aspects of Corporate Governance. London: Gee. (1992).

15. Central Bureau of Investigation v. B. Ramalinga Raju and Others. Judgment, Special Court for CBI Cases, Hyderabad, 9 April. (2015).
16. Chakrabarti R, Megginson W and Yadav PK. Corporate governance in India. Journal of Applied Corporate Finance 20 (1) (2008): 59-72.
17. Coffee JC. A theory of corporate scandals: Why the USA and Europe differ. Oxford Review of Economic Policy 21 (2) (2005): 198-211.
18. Cohen J, Krishnamoorthy G and Wright AM. Corporate governance and the audit process. Contemporary Accounting Research 19 (4) (2002): 573-594.
19. Coles JL, Daniel ND and Naveen L. Boards: Does one size fit all? Journal of Financial Economics 87 (2) (2008): 329-356.
20. Cressey DR. Other People's Money: A Study in the Social Psychology of Embezzlement. Glencoe, IL: Free Press. (1953)
21. Dahya J, Dimitrov O and McConnell JJ. Dominant shareholders, corporate boards, and corporate value: A cross-country analysis. Journal of Financial Economics 87 (1) (2008): 73-100.
22. Dechow PM, Sloan RG and Sweeney AP. Causes and consequences of earnings manipulation: An analysis of firms subject to enforcement actions by the SEC. Contemporary Accounting Research 13 (1) (1996): 1-36.
23. DeFond M and Zhang J. A review of archival auditing research. Journal of Accounting and Economics 58 (2-3): 275-326.
24. Dharmapala D and Khanna V (2013) Corporate governance, enforcement, and firm value: Evidence from India. Journal of Law, Economics, and Organization 29 (5) (2014): 1056-1084.
25. Elop S. Nokia "burning platform" memo to employees, 8 February. (2011)
26. Fama EF and Jensen MC. Separation of ownership and control. Journal of Law and Economics 26 (2) (1983): 301-325.
27. Fich EM and Shivdasani A. Are busy boards effective monitors? Journal of Finance 61 (2) (2006): 689-724.
28. Fich EM and Shivdasani A. Financial fraud, director reputation, and shareholder wealth. Journal of Financial Economics 86 (2) (2007): 306-336.
29. Giannetti M, Liao G and Yu X. The brain gain of corporate boards: Evidence from China. Journal of Finance 70 (4) (2015): 1629-1682.
30. Gompers P, Ishii J and Metrick A. Corporate governance and equity prices. Quarterly Journal of Economics 118 (1) (2003): 107-155.
31. Government of India. The Companies Act, 2013. New Delhi: Ministry of Corporate Affairs. (2013).
32. Healy PM and Palepu KG. The fall of Enron. Journal of Economic Perspectives 17 (2) (2003): 3-26.
33. Hermalin BE and Weisbach MS. Boards of directors as an endogenously determined institution: A survey of the economic literature. Economic Policy Review (Federal Reserve Bank of New York) 9 (1) (2003): 7-26.
34. Jensen MC and Meckling WH. Theory of the firm: Managerial behavior, agency costs and ownership structure. Journal of Financial Economics 3 (4) (1976): 305-360.
35. Johnson S, La Porta R, Lopez-de-Silanes F and Shleifer A. Tunneling. American Economic Review 90 (2) (2000): 22-27.
36. Karpoff JM, Lee DS and Martin GS. The cost to firms of cooking the books. Journal of Financial and Quantitative Analysis 43 (3) (2008): 581-611.
37. Khanna T and Palepu K. Is group affiliation profitable in emerging markets? An analysis of diversified Indian business groups. Journal of Finance 55 (2) (2000): 867-891.
38. Klapper LF and Love I. Corporate governance, investor protection, and performance in emerging markets. Journal of Corporate Finance 10 (5) (2004): 703-728.
39. Kumar Mangalam Birla Committee. Report of the Committee on Corporate Governance. Mumbai: SEBI. (2000).
40. La Porta R, Lopez-de-Silanes F, Shleifer A and Vishny RW. Law and finance. Journal of Political Economy 106 (6) (1998): 1113-1155.
41. La Porta R, Lopez-de-Silanes F, Shleifer A and Vishny R. Investor protection and corporate valuation. Journal of Finance 57 (3) (2002): 1147-1170.
42. Masulis RW, Wang C and Xie F. Globalizing the boardroom: The effects of foreign directors on corporate governance and firm performance. Journal of Accounting and Economics 53 (3) (2012): 527-554.
43. Naresh Chandra Committee. Report of the Committee on Corporate Audit and Governance. New Delhi: Department of Company Affairs. (2002).
44. Narayana Murthy Committee. Report of the SEBI Committee on Corporate Governance. Mumbai: SEBI. (2003).
45. Oxelheim L and Randøy T. The impact of foreign board membership on firm value. Journal of Banking and Finance 27 (12) (2003): 2369-2392.
46. Rajagopalan N and Zhang Y. Corporate governance reforms in China and India: Challenges and opportunities. Business Horizons 51 (1) (2008): 55-64.
47. Raju BR. Letter to the Board of Directors of Satyam Computer Services Limited, 7 January, filed with BSE and NSE. (2009).

48. Sarkar J and Sarkar S. Large shareholder activism in corporate governance in developing countries: Evidence from India. International Review of Finance 1 (3) (2000): 161-194.
49. Sarkar J, Sarkar S and Sen K. Board of directors and opportunistic earnings management: Evidence from India. Journal of Accounting, Auditing and Finance 23 (4) (2008): 517-551.
50. Securities and Exchange Board of India. Final order in the matter of Satyam Computer Services Ltd, 15 April. Mumbai: SEBI. (2015).
51. Securities and Exchange Board of India. Order in the matter of Price Waterhouse and associated entities (Satyam), January. Mumbai: SEBI. (2018).
52. Securities and Exchange Board of India. SEBI (Listing Obligations and Disclosure Requirements) Regulations, 2015. Mumbai: SEBI. (2015).
53. Satyam Computer Services Ltd. Annual Report 2007-08. Hyderabad. (2008).
54. Satyam Computer Services Ltd. Form 20-F: Annual report for the fiscal year ended March 31, 2008. Washington, DC: US Securities and Exchange Commission. (2008b).
55. Shleifer A and Vishny RW. A survey of corporate governance. Journal of Finance 52 (2) (1997): 737-783.
56. Srinivasan S. Consequences of financial reporting failure for outside directors: Evidence from accounting restatements and audit committee members. Journal of Accounting Research 43 (2) (2005): 291-334.
57. Tata Motors (2008) Tata Motors completes acquisition of Jaguar and Land Rover. Press release, 2 June.
58. US Securities and Exchange Commission. Administrative proceedings against Satyam Computer Services Ltd and Price Waterhouse (India) affiliates. Washington, DC: SEC. (2011).
59. Varma JR. Corporate governance in India: Disciplining the dominant shareholder. IIMB Management Review 9 (4) (1997): 5-18.
60. Weisbach MS. Outside directors and CEO turnover. Journal of Financial Economics 20 (1988): 431-460.
61. Woodford M. Exposure: Inside the Olympus Scandal. London: Portfolio Penguin. (2012)
62. World Bank. Statement on the debarment of Satyam Computer Services Ltd, December. Washington, DC: World Bank. (2008).
63. Yermack D. Higher market valuation of companies with a small board of directors. Journal of Financial Economics 40 (2) (1996): 185-211.
64. Yin RK. Case Study Research: Design and Methods, 5th edn. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE. (2014)