



**Securities and Exchange Commission of Pakistan**

**Company Law Division  
Corporatization & Compliance Department**

\*\*\*\*

*Before*

**Director  
(Corporatization and Compliance Department)**

*In the matter of*

***HYLINK CONSTRUCTIONS (PVT.) LIMITED***

**ORDER**

**under section 7 of the Companies (Appointment of Legal Advisers) Act, 1974**

Number and date of show cause notice:

No. LA/102-IAN-2427/2017-7938  
dated May 15, 2017

This Order shall dispose of proceedings initiated against M/s. Hylink Constructions (Pvt.) Limited (the "Company") and its Chief Executive for default made in compliance with the requirements of sub-section (1) of section 3 of Companies (Appointment of Legal Advisers) Act, 1974 (the "Act").

2. The brief facts leading to the show cause notice are that the Company was required in terms of sub-section (1) of section 3 of the Act to appoint atleast one legal adviser on retainerhip to advise such Company in the performance of its functions and the discharge of its duties in accordance with law. Sub-rule (1) of rule 4 of the Companies (Appointment of Legal Advisers) Rules, 1975 (the "Rules") provides that every Company shall within fifteen days of the appointment of a legal adviser by it furnish in duplicate to the Registrar of the region in which its registered office is situated, the name, names of the partners in case of a firm, address and remuneration of the legal adviser. However, from the perusal of record, it has been observed that the Company has failed to do so for which a show cause notice dated May 15, 2017 (the "SCN") was issued calling upon the Company and its Chief Executive to explain in writing and to appear in person or through authorized representative for hearing on June 05, 2017 to clarify the position.


3. In response to the above "SCN", no one appeared on the date fixed for hearing for which the hearing was re-fixed for December 04, 2017, on which date neither anyone appeared nor any written explanation received to the Commission. Thereafter, a copy of show cause notice was also sent on the registered office address of the Company which was also returned undelivered. Subsequently, the record has been perused and it has been observed that the Company has not appointed its legal advisor. It appears that the Company has not taken

necessary steps for appointing its legal advisor, therefore, the default is considered willful and deliberate.

4. I have gone through the relevant provisions of the Act, and other record of the Company and observed that sub-section (1) of section 3 of the Act requires the Company to appoint atleast one legal adviser on retainership to advise such Company in the performance of its functions and the discharge of its duties in accordance with law. Further, sub-rule (1) of rule 4 of the Rules requires that every Company shall, within fifteen days of the appointment of a legal adviser by it, furnish in duplicate to the Registrar of the region in which its registered office is situated the name (names of the partners in case of a firm), address and remuneration of the legal adviser. I have also perused section 7 of the Act which provide penalty for contravention of the Act.

5. Based on the above, it is apparent that the Company has violated the mandatory requirements of sub-section (1) of section 3 of Companies (Appointment of Legal Advisers) Act, 1974 (the "Act") by not appointing its legal advisor. I, therefore, in exercise of powers conferred under section 7 of the Act, impose a fine of Rs. 5,000/- (Rupees Five thousand only) on the Chief Executive of the Company. The Chief Executive is, hereby, directed to deposit the amount of penalty in the Commission's account within 30 days of the receipt of this Order and furnish original receipt/challan of the same to this office for record and immediately file Form 29 notifying the appointment of legal advisor with the registrar concerned. In case of non-payment of penalty within the specified time, the same will be recovered under the provisions of law.

6. This order is issued without prejudice to any other action(s) that may be initiated against the Company and its Chief Executive officer responsible for the violations of the aforesaid provisions of the law.

  
(Mubasher Saeed Saddozai)  
Director (CCD)

**Announced:**  
January 10, 2018