ARTICLE

Strategic Capital Allocation: A New Governance Frontier against Shareholder Activism

The arena of shareholder activism in 2026 has been transformed from the traditional concerns of corporate governance to the very heart of corporate strategy: Capital Allocation. However, in today's digital age, the traditional duties of the Company Secretary are poised for a change as institutional investors turn to advanced AI-powered analyses to uncover lazy balance sheets. Beyond compliance, the contemporary governance professional needs to play a role of linking fiduciary responsibility and strategic financial stewardship. This article examines the "Governance-led Capital Allocation Framework" as one of the key defensive tools to protect against aggressive shareholder intervention. The author provides a conceptual framework that identifies the relationship between Return on Invested Capital (ROIC), dividend transparency and fiduciary duties under Section 166, and contends that the most effective way for a Board to protect itself is to have a proactive, transparent and strategically aligned Capital Deployment policy. The article offers a roadmap for boards that want to go beyond reactive disclosures, to a culture of "Capital Stewardship", with sustainable growth and lower risk of disruptions from activists. It suggests that in a transparent world, capital allocation is not just a finance duty, it's a key governance issue.

Saurabh Khakhkhar
Associate Consultant
Infosys Private Limited
Pune
saurabhkhakhkhar45@gmail.com

INTRODUCTION

In 2026, stakeholders form an interconnected financial ecosystem that is hyper-informed. The Securities and Exchange Board of India (SEBI) has been increasingly targeting transparency and sustainable growth, and so has the role of a corporate board. Compliance is not just about getting forms in on time and up to date or keeping statutory registers. The greatest standard of good government today is the effective and accountable management of capital.

The decision-making regarding dividend payments, share buybacks, mergers and acquisitions, and R&D has traditionally been regarded as a function of finance that happens within the CFO room. But a new trend known as " Value Based Activism" has brought these decisions to the light of day in the boardroom. Shareholder activists are no longer simply "corporate raiders" looking for quick short-term profits: they are now complex institutional groups, armed with high-frequency information and the power of AI predictive modelling that look for companies where money is being locked up or wasted.

A Governance Gap occurs when a company has too much cash on hand with no deployment plan; or when they follow an "empire-building" policy by acquiring assets at low prices with low payback. This gap is one in which the shareholders have lost faith in the Board's capacity to perform its role as a fiduciary steward of their capital: This loss of trust is the main reason towards activism.

Boards need to understand that a fiduciary duty of the highest order is capital allocation, which is part of the ecosystem of "Trust and Transparency". Now it's a governance failure if the balance sheet is lazy. As such, the Company Secretary, as the Chief Governance Officer, should ensure that the Board adopts a strong, strategic and publicly communicated Capital Allocation Framework. In doing so the organization is not only lawful, it creates a "valuation moat" which helps to shield it from the disruptive forces of shareholder activism.

THE "GOVERNANCE GAP" IN CAPITAL ALLOCATION

Shareholder activism is most often a symptom of the Governance Gap, not a violation of the Companies Act. The 'gap' lies in the failure of the disconnect between the financial performance of a company and the communication from the company's board about the stewardship of capital. The Board of Directors with the assistance of the Company Secretary is usually responsible for governing the financial decisions made by the Chief Financial Officer (CFO), who is tasked with managing the balance sheet.

The "Lazy Balance Sheet" Syndrome

With the high interest rates and high volatility, capital has a correspondingly high opportunity cost. The institutional investors view an overly lazy balance sheet, with too much cash that has not been allocated, unused assets, or low ROIC as a sign of low governance. Activists search companies for projects whose Internal Rate of Return (IRR) is less than the Weighted Average Cost of Capital (WACC). If the Board doesn't explain this difference, it leaves a space for mistrust to fill.

Information Asymmetry and the Silent Board

Information asymmetry contributes to the Governance Gap. Boards may have a strategic reason to maintain cash (e.g., to be prepared for a future merger or acquisition, or to have cash as a cushion to systemic risks in the marketplace), but if it is not clearly communicated in the disclosures, shareholders default to the worst scenario. Without some sort of 'Capital Allocation Policy', the market takes the attitude that the Board is passive or, more seriously, a protector of management's 'empire-building' plans.

The Shift in Fiduciary Expectations

A Board's fiduciary responsibility used to be met by maintaining solvency of the company and adherence to regulatory standards. The definition for "Fiduciary" has been broadened in 2026. The "Duty of Care" is now seen by shareholders as a duty to maximise capital. Failure to apply good M&A discipline or inefficient dividend payouts is seen as a failure in oversight by the Board, and is increasingly treated as Value Leakage.

This is the sweet spot in which activist funds would like to operate. They're not just capital, they're a competing "Strategic Roadmap" that offers better returns. The gap needs to be bridged by the Company Secretary, who plays a key role in guiding the boardroom culture from a 'numbers game' to a 'governance mandate.'

A MULTI-DIMENSIONAL FRAMEWORK FOR STRATEGIC CAPITAL STEWARDSHIP

The Board should shift from a reactive to a proactive approach from an 'approval-based' to a 'stewardship-based' model, to shield an organisation from the disruptive effects of shareholder activism. Capital in the corporate world isn't only a useful resource; it's a sign of board competence. This transition is supported by the following framework of four pillars, which gives it a firm structure.

Pillar I: The ROIC-WACC Divergence and the "Capital Rationing" Mandate

The biggest weakness that always seems to be there for activists is the difference between the company's Return on Invested Capital (ROIC) and the company's Weighted Average Cost of Capital (WACC). In the volatile interest rate regime, many Indian companies have seen their WACC rising, and at the same time, their internal hurdle rates for projects have remained high on the same level as the historical interest rate periods, which were more cost- and time-efficient.

- ***The Analysis of Failure:*** Boards frequently fall into the "Capital Inertia" trap of funding business units on the basis of past precedent instead of incremental value. This leads to 'diworsification' - putting money into small projects with low returns, which detract from the overall value. Activists employ AI benchmarking to benchmark a company's segment-wise ROICs with the rest of the world. In the case of a "bleeding" value segment, the activist will push for a demerger or divestment.

- ***The Strategic Intervention:*** The Board shall adopt a 'Capital Rationing Policy' which shall be put in place. This includes prioritizing all internal projects by their 'Value Creation Potential'. The Company Secretary must prepare a 'Segmental Value-Add Report' on a quarterly basis and send it to the Board. The Board should not approve an overall CAPEX budget, but should require that management explain the rationale for investing in a 10% ROIC project when the cost of capital in the market is 12%. The Board is in a better position to tell the story if it takes the initiative to remove "Value-Destroying" units before an activist does.

Pillar II: The "Total Shareholder Return" (TSR) and Payout Governance

The "Dividend vs. Buyback" issue is a key governance issue in 2026. Shareholders no longer accept dividends as a 'residual payout' (what's left over); they want a 'Strategic Payout' Roadmap.

- ***The Analysis of Failure:*** Many Boards view dividend payment as a 'feel good' exercise and forget that dividend transparency is missing leading to the 'Conglomerate Discount' in the stock price. If the market thinks the Board is holding on to money for "future needs," the stock will be discounted. But perhaps most importantly, poorly timed share repurchases, which occur when the stock price is too high, are now seen by astute investors as an assail on the "Intrinsic Value," and are considered a violation of the fiduciary duty.

- ***The Strategic Intervention:*** The Board shall adopt a "Tiered Payout Framework". This includes (a) a policy of core dividend payments, supported by Operating Cash Flow, and (b) a "Special Capital Return Triggers" policy. For example, when the cash-to-equity ratio is above a pre-determined "Efficiency Threshold", the Board is obliged to either set a specific M&A target or send the capital back. The Company Secretary has to ensure that these thresholds are recorded and shared. When shareholders' "Contractual Transparency" is in place, the company is "activist-proof" as the market knows exactly what will happen to excess cash.

Pillar III: M&A Rigour – Governance of the "Inorganic Growth" lifecycle

Why Boards Fail at M&A?: CEO Hubris is the No. 1 reason Boards are failing at M&A in the 2025-2026 M&A boom. Boards typically fail in the "pre-deal" phase because they do not question the "Strategic Fit" and in the "post-deal" phase, they overlook "Integration Leakage". Companies that have a history of "overpaying for growth" come under activists' fire. The "smoking gun" for activists to replace a Board is when a Board approves an acquisition at 40% premium based on "blue-sky synergies" that don't happen.

The Governance Intervention: The Company Secretary must facilitate a "Three-Stage M&A Oversight Process":

1. **The 'Pre-Mortem' Session:** It's best for the Board to preform a 'Pre-Mortem' prior to the signing of an LOI (Letter of Intent), where management will need to explain how a "hypothetical failure" could not happen.
2. **The Synergy Accountability Matrix:** All projected synergies (costs or revenues) should be assigned to a 'Management Owner' and a 'Realisation Timeline'.
3. **The Mandatory 24-Month Audit:** Two years following the deal, the Board must undertake a public Post-Acquisition Performance Review. The CS establishes this 'Accountability Loop' by making the Board a 'Disciplined Buyer'. Such a degree of governance discipline makes it almost impossible to have a legitimate argument that the Board is "reckless" when it comes to capital.

Pillar IV: Resilience, ESG, and the "Carbon-Adjusted" ROIC

ESG, no longer a 'reporting' requirement, is now a 'capital' requirement. Now, institutional investors are considering a "Carbon-Adjusted ROIC," which discounts the performance of companies that use capital for high-emission resources without a transition plan.

> Trust isn't fixed, it's something that needs to be built over time. Shareholder activism need not be feared, but a warning of higher accountability that is expected of the market.

- ***The Analysis of Failure:*** Boards go wrong if they see "Green Capex" as an expense only. Activists now have a new term, "ESG Underperformance," which is now being adopted as a proxy for "Poor Management." They say that a Board which can't foresee carbon-tax risks is a Board which can't manage capital in the 21^{st} century.
- ***The Strategic Intervention:*** There needs to be a 'Sustainability Lens' to consider how to allocate the capital. The Board should set a 'Green Hurdle Rate' which applies where projects are considered to be accelerating a "Net Zero" transition and thus have a lower long-term risk profile and are thus eligible for a lower cost of capital. The Company Secretary ensures that such 'Forward-Looking Allocations' are emphasized in the Business Responsibility and Sustainability Report (BRSR). When an activist claims that a cash injection represents 'Risk Mitigation' instead of 'Compliance Expense,' the reason why would the company continue to hold back cash? The justification for the company to not spend the cash is that it is for 'Risk Mitigation' and not 'Compliance Expense' and that creates 'Institutional Trust' for the long run.

THE LEGAL NEXUS: RE-INTERPRETING FIDUCIARY DUTY AND THE "PROCESS-DEFENSE" IN CAPITAL ALLOCATION

The strategic approach towards the allocation of capital is not without statutory backing, but is supported by the Companies Act, 2013, and the SEBI (LODR) Regulations, 2015. But these laws have been interpreted differently under the new regulations for 2026. Capital Stewardship, not simply attendance at board meetings, is now needed to meet the "Duty of Care.

a. Section 166: Redefining "Best Interests" as Optimal Stewardship

The requirement of Section 166(2) is that a director should act in good faith for the purpose of promoting the objects of the company for the benefit of the company as a whole. This has traditionally been understood as a prohibition on fraud or egregious mismanagement.

The 'benefit of members' is now considered by proxy advisors and the judiciary as the maximisation of shareholder capital in the era of shareholder activism. The directors of a Board who allow an excessive quantity of capital to be 'lazy' (returning less than the inflation rate or the Company's own WACC) could be said to have not exercised due care in promoting the objects of the company.

Section 166(3) imposes a legal obligation on the Board to 'exercise due and reasonable care, skill and diligence' in making its allocations, which entails it appreciating the financial consequences of its allocation decisions. It is Company Secretary's responsibility to make sure that the Board minutes do not only record the 'approval of the budget' but the 'Interrogation of the IRR' (Internal Rate of Return). The CS documents that the Board asked management about the benefit of the retained earnings, giving the directors the best protection against any future allegations of fiduciary negligence.

b. The Business Judgment Rule (BJR): Evolution of the "Process-Audit"

The "Business Judgment Rule" which has always held sway in Indian courts, meaning that courts will not presume to second-guess the commercial judgement of the Board, has been amended by the judiciary in 2026, with an additional caveat – the Process-Audit.

To claim protection under the BJR, a decision must be 'Informed.' In the context of capital allocation, an 'Informed Decision' requires:

- **A comparative analysis:** Did the Board consider returning the capital to shareholders instead of the proposed M&A?
- **Sensitivity Analysis:** Did the Board review "worst-case" scenarios for the capital outlay?
- **Lack of Interest:** Was the allocation driven by management's desire for growth (Empire Building) or the company's strategic need?

The formalized Capital Allocation Policy (CAP) is the first line of defense. It demonstrates that this was not a random selection by the Board, but part of a 'governed' process. A 'Procedural Fiduciary Duty' is the key characteristic that differentiates a 'Professional Board' and a "Passive Board" in the minds of an activist-aspiring court challenge.

c. *SEBI LODR Regulation 4: Managing the Conflict of Interest*

The SEBI (LODR) Regulations make it clear that it is the duty of the Board to "monitor and manage potential conflicts of interest of management, board members and shareholders" under regulation 4(2)(f) of the SEBI (LODR) Regulations.

A competition for the allocation of capital is the final battleground. There is a dichotomy between the management who tend to 'hoard' capital for safety or status and the shareholders (particularly activists) who want to see capital released. These interests are not balanced in 2026, and this is a regulatory risk. In absence of a strategic answer to this conflict that a Board ignores the Shareholder's request for Capital Efficiency, then the Board is failing in its duty to manage this conflict. The Chief Governance Officer (Company Secretary) is responsible to conduct transparency sessions through "Governance Roadshows" to explain the logic of capital retention to institutional investors to satisfy the 'Spirit of Regulation 4'.

d. *The "Governance Audit Trail" and Secretarial Standard-1 (SS-1)*

The role of the Company Secretary in capital allocation is institutionalized through a standardized procedure known as Secretarial Standard-1 (SS-1). The CS has the major responsibility to provide the 'Quality of Information' to the Board.

The activist's strongest card is Information Asymmetry. The CS has a professional responsibility to step in if the 'Agenda Notes' that it receives to the Board are unbalanced or are unsupported by extensive financial modelling. The CS should ensure that the Board Pack for any significant capital decision contains the following for a "Governance Audit Trail" that can withstand activist challenge:

1. **A "Value-Impact Assessment":** How the allocation affects the company's ROIC over a 3-year horizon.
2. **A "Compliance-Strategy Mapping":** How the spending aligns with the company's ESG mandates (Green Bond covenants, etc.).
3. **Independent Valuation Reports:** Ensuring that M&A or buyback prices are vetted by third-party experts to avoid 'Overpayment' claims.

The CS makes sure that these documents are a part of the permanent record, which means the "Minutes of the Meeting" becomes a Legal Fortress.

CASE STUDY: A REPRESENTATIVE PARADIGM OF CAPITAL-LED ACTIVISM

This section also explores a typical example of the "New Friction" seen in the 2026 proxy season to put the strategies in play into context. In this analysis, we combine the trends in the cross-section of financial numbers and governance failures, creating a "perfect storm" for shareholder intervention.

a. *The Catalyst: The "Lazy Balance Sheet" and Information Asymmetry*

A leading institutional activist fund started a campaign against a mid-cap market leader in the first half of 2026. The friction was not to the law, but to a Capital Stewardship Gap. The activist issued a comprehensive public mandate on three main governance shortcomings:

1. **Inefficient Capital Hoarding:** The company maintained a cash-to-equity ratio 40% higher than its peer group average, with no articulated roadmap for deployment.
2. **Empire-Building via M&A:** The Board had recently approved an acquisition at a premium. The market priced in a 'Value Destruction' discount as a result of insufficient definition of the "Strategic Synergies" found in the Benchmarking analysis.
3. **Process Opaque:** The Board failed to demonstrate what was expected and called for: 'Skillful Diligence' (per Section 166), by not publicly justifying the retention of capital against a rising weighted average cost of capital (WACC).

b. *The Escalation: The Friction of Boardroom Legitimacy*

The conflict heated up over the proposal by the activist to conduct a "Board Refresh" that would replace the incumbent directors with independent experts in the financial field. This was a direct attack on the Board's Strategic Competence. For the company, stock price volatility was quite marked as proxy advisory firms started to fall in line with the activist's "Balance Sheet Efficiency" message. It was not simply a dispute over a single transaction, it was a vote on the Board's fiduciary stewardship.

c. *The Governance Pivot: Deploying the Strategic Shield*

Rather than litigiously pursuing a defense, the Board, with the assistance of the Governance and Secretarial Office, completed a Governance-Led Capital Pivot. This transition was made using the 4-Pillar Framework to smooth out the friction:

- **Pillar I (The ROIC Audit):** The Board stopped the contested acquisition and issued a Capital Efficiency Report. They acknowledged that the hurdle rates applied to the deal were not reflective of the inflationary landscape in 2026 and further agreed to sell non-core assets that do not perform well.
- **Pillar II (The Resilience Fund):** The Board explained that 60% of the 'excess cash' would be allocated to a 'Sustainability Transition Fund' that would be needed for regulatory compliance by 2028. They made cash retention an asset for governance practices by taking them forward through "Systemic Risk Mitigation".
- **Pillar III (The Accountability Loop):** The Company Secretary established a Capital Stewardship

Committee. They agreed to an annual 'Say-on-Capital' report - providing shareholders with a clear understanding on where each unit of retained capital is being used to generate ROIC.

d. Resolution

When the market went to the AGM in July 2026, the market attitude had changed. Proxy advisors have advised approving the current Board of Directors, saying the "unprecedented transparency" of the new capital allocation framework encourages vote support. The activist fund eventually pulled its nominees and the company's valuation was de-rated by the market reflecting a 'Governance Premium'.

This paradigm proves that, the most effective defense against the friction of activism is not legal obstruction, but the disciplined, transparent, and fiduciary-led allocation of capital.

STRATEGIC RECOMMENDATIONS: THE ROADMAP FOR THE BOARD AND THE CS

The following are actionable measures that companies can take for a "valuation moat" to prevent activism in 2026:

1. **Adoption of a Formal Capital Allocation Policy (CAP):** The Board should approve and publish a CAP that sets in order the use of funds for cash: (a) Organic growth, (b) M&A criteria, (c) Debt reduction and (d) Shareholder returns. The primary 'legal and strategic shield' is this policy.

2. **Quarterly "Strategy and Capital" Reviews:** The Board should go beyond the basic sessional functions of the Audit Committee and conduct regular "Capital Stewardship" sessions. These sessions should review the performance of capital expenditures made in the past and their corresponding "Synergy Roadmaps."

3. **Enhanced Investor Relations (IR) Collaboration:** The Company Secretary should actively collaborate with the IR team to make sure that the "Governance Narrative" becomes a part of the investor presentation. The Board's communication to the market should be in the 'Capital Efficiency' language.

4. **Integrating Capital Discipline into Board Evaluation:** The Board and the Committees should have an annual measure of "Strategic Oversight of Capital" as part of their evaluation. This will make sure that directors are responsible for the long-term management of the company's resources.

CONCLUSION

Trust isn't fixed, it's something that needs to be built over time. Shareholder activism need not be feared, but a warning of higher accountability that is expected of the market. In effect, Boards are bringing Capital Allocation from 'back office' finance to 'front office' governance, which is more than simply avoiding disruption, it is their most important fiduciary duty. The 'interconnected web' of the financial world is becoming increasingly complex; and the organizations which survive and prosper, will be the ones that treat every rupee of capital as a sacred trust.

REFERENCES:

i. *BlackRock Investment Stewardship. (2026). Investment Stewardship 1Q 2026 Statistics: Global Trends in Capital Accountability. [Available at blackrock.com/stewardship].*

ii. *Companies Act, 2013. Section 166: Duties of Directors.*

iii. *Grant, R. M. (2025). Contemporary Strategy Analysis: The Governance of Capital Markets. (12th ed.). Wiley.*

iv. *Institute of Company Secretaries of India (ICSI). (2024). Guidance Note on Corporate Governance Certificate.*

v. *Institute of Company Secretaries of India (ICSI). (2025). Guidance Note on Meetings of the Board of Directors (Revised).*

vi. *Institute of Company Secretaries of India (ICSI). (2025). The Masterclass on Boardroom Strategy and Capital Governance.*

vii. *Jensen, M. C. (1986, updated 2024). Agency Costs of Free Cash Flow, Corporate Finance, and Takeovers. American Economic Review.*

viii. *Mauboussin, M. J. (2023). The Psychology of Capital Allocation: Fiduciary Duty in a Volatile Market. Columbia Business School Publishing.*

ix. *McKinsey & Company. (2026). The New CEO-CFO-CS Alliance: Driving Capital Productivity in Volatile Markets. [Strategy & Corporate Finance Practice].*

x. *Porter, M. E., & Kramer, M. R. (2024). Creating Shared Value: The Link between Capital Efficiency and Corporate Trust. Harvard Business Review.*

xi. *SEBI (Listing Obligations and Disclosure Requirements) Regulations, 2015 (as amended up to June 2026).*

xii. *Securities and Exchange Board of India (SEBI). (2024). Guidance Note on Board Evaluation and Strategic Oversight.*

xiii. *Securities and Exchange Board of India (SEBI). (2025). Disclosure Requirements for Material Events and Capital Restructuring.*

xiv. *Securities and Exchange Board of India (SEBI). (2025). Trends in Shareholder Activism and Proxy Advisory Impact.*

xv. *Securities and Exchange Board of India (SEBI). (2026). Consultation Paper on Enhanced Disclosures for Capital Utilization.*

xvi. *Securities and Exchange Board of India (SEBI). (2026). Report on the Evolution of Shareholder Activism in India.*

xvii. *See, E. (2025). Activists on Board: Shareholder Activists and their Influence on Firm Strategic Change. Journal of General Management.*

xviii. *Supreme Court of India. (2024). Landmark Rulings on Fiduciary Responsibility and Minority Shareholder Rights.*