A PROJECT REPORT ON "RELEVANCE OF NAV METHOD IN VALUATION OF SHARES"

Submitted By

JYOTHI MEGHASHREE K

(4AL21BA037)

Submitted To



Visvesvaraya Technological University, Belagavi

In partial fulfilment of the requirements for the award of the degree of MASTER OF BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION

Under the guidance of

DR. CATHERINE NIRMALA DAVID

Professor, PG Department of Business Administration AIET, Mijar



Alva's Institute of Engineering & Technology Shobhavana Campus, Mijar, Moodbidri, D.K – 574225 2022- 2023



ALVA'S INSTITUTE OF ENGINEERING & TECHNOLOGY

(A Unit of Alva's Education Foundation ®, Moodbidri) Affiliated to Visvesvaraya Technological University, Belagavi Approved by AICTE, New Delhi & Recognised by Government of Karnataka Accredited by NAAC with A+ Grade and NBA (CSE & ECE)

Date: 02-09-2023

CERTIFICATE

This is to certify that JYOTHI MEGHASHREE K bearing USN 4AL21BA037 is a bonafide student of Master of Business Administration course of the Institute in 2021-23, affiliated to Visvesvaraya Technological University, Belgaum. Project report on "RELEVANCE OF NAV METHOD IN VALUATION OF SHARES" is prepared by her under the guidance of Dr. Catherine Nirmala, Professor PG Department of Business Administration in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the award of the degree of Master of Business Administration of Visvesvaraya Technological University, Belgaum Karnataka.

Signature of Internal Guide

DEAN Dept. of Business Administration Alva's Institute of Engg. & Technology MIJAR - 574 225

Alva's Institute of Engg. & Technology, Miljar. MOODBIDRI - 574 225, D.K

DECLARATION

I Jyothi Meghashree K hereby declare that the Project report entitled "Relevance of NAV Method in Valuation of Shares" is a record of independent work carried out by me under the guidance of Dr. Catherine Nirmala David, Professor, MBA department, Alva's Institute of Engineering & Technology, Mijar.

I also declare that this project work is towards the partial fulfilment of the university regulations for the award of the degree of Master of Business Administration by Visvesvaraya Technological University, Belgaum.

I have undergone a summer project for a period of six weeks. I further declare that this Project is based on the original study undertaken by me and has not been submitted for the award of any degree/diploma from any other University/Institution.

Place: Mijar

Date: 4-09-2023

Signature of the Student

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

Writing this project report happens to be one of the greatest achievements in this phase of my life. Express my heartiest thanks to those who provided me tremendous support to those who provided me tremendous support and making it a useful firsthand experience.

The Project that I have undertaken independently was a great chance for learning and professional development. Therefore, I consider myself as a very lucky individual as I was provided with an opportunity to accomplish project.

I am very much grateful to Dr. Peter Fernandes, Principal, Alva's Institute of Engineering and Technology, Mijar and I'm privileged to thank our Mrs. Priya Sequeira, HOD of MBA, Alva's Institute of Engineering and Technology, Mijar.

I would like to convey my heartiest thanks Dr.Catherine Nirmala David, Professor, MBA department, Alva's Institute of Engineering and Technology, Mijar, Who took time to hear, guide and keep me on correct path and allowed me to carry out my project.

Last but not the least I would also like to express my thanks to my parents, friends and benefactors who have helped me directly and indirectly throughout my Project.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Sl. No	Contents	Page No's.
Chapter-1	Introduction	1-3
Chapter-2	Conceptual Background And Literature Review	4-13
Chapter-3	Research Design	14-18
Chapter-4	Data Analysis and Interpretation	19-79
Chapter-5	Findings, Suggestions and Conclusion	80-83
Bibliography		84-85

LIST OF TABLES

Sl. No	Particulars	Page no's.
4.1.1	5 years assets and liabilities of HUL	20
4.1.2	Comparison of intrinsic value with market value of HUL	21
4.1.3	Percentage comparison between market value and intrinsic value	22
4.2.1	5 years assets and liabilities of ITC	23
4.2.2	Comparison of intrinsic value with market value of ITC	24
4.2.3	Percentage comparison between market value and intrinsic value	25
4.3.1	5 years assets and liabilities of Dr. Reddy's Laboratories	26
4.3.2	Comparison of intrinsic value with market value 4.3of Dr. Reddy's Laboratories	27
4.3.3	Percentage comparison between market value and intrinsic value	28
4.4.1	5 years assets and liabilities of Cipla	29
4.4.2	Comparison of intrinsic value with market value of Cipla	30
4.4.3	Percentage comparison between market value and intrinsic value	31
4.5.1	5 years assets and liabilities of Ultratech	32
4.5.2	Comparison of intrinsic value with market value of Ultratech	33
4.5.3	Percentage comparison between market value and intrinsic value	34

4.6.1	5 years assets and liabilities of Ambuja Cements	35
4.6.2	Comparison of intrinsic value with market value of Ambuja Cements	36
4.6.3	Percentage comparison between market value and intrinsic value	37
4.7.1	5 years assets and liabilities of Wipro	38
4.7.2	Comparison of intrinsic value with market value of Wipro	39
47.3	Percentage comparison between market value and intrinsic value	40
4.8.1	5 years assets and liabilities of Infosys	41
4.8.2	Comparison of intrinsic value with market value of Infosys	42
4.8.3	Percentage comparison between market value and intrinsic value	43
4.9.1	5 years assets and liabilities of JSW Steel	44
4.9.2	Comparison of intrinsic value with market value of JSW Steel	45
4.9.3	Percentage comparison between market value and intrinsic value	46
4.10.1	5 years assets and liabilities of Tata Steel	47
4.10.2	Comparison of intrinsic value with market value of Tata Steel	48
4.10.3	Percentage comparison between market value and intrinsic value	49
4.11.1	5 years assets and liabilities of Hero Motocorp	50
4.11.2	Comparison of intrinsic value with market value of Hero Motocorp	51

4.11.3	Percentage comparison between market value and intrinsic value	52
4.12.1	5 years assets and liabilities of Maruthi	53
4.12.2	Comparison of intrinsic value with market value of Maruthi	54
4.12.3	Percentage comparison between market value and intrinsic value	55
4.13.1	5 years assets and liabilities of Berger Paints	56
4.13.2	Comparison of intrinsic value with market value of Berger Paints	57
4.13.3	Percentage comparison between market value and intrinsic value	58
4.14.1	5 years assets and liabilities of Asian Paints	59
4.14.2	Comparison of intrinsic value with market value of Asian Paints	60
4.14.3	Percentage comparison between market value and intrinsic value	61
4.15.1	5 years assets and liabilities of Pidilite	62
4.15.2	Comparison of intrinsic value with market value of Pidilite	63
4.15.3	Percentage comparison between market value and intrinsic value	64
4.16.1	5 years assets and liabilities of UPL	65
4.16.2	Comparison of intrinsic value with market value of UPL	66
4.16.3	Percentage comparison between market value and intrinsic value	67
4.17.1	5 years assets and liabilities of Godrej	68

4.17.2	Comparison of intrinsic value with market value of Godrej	69
4.17.3	Percentage comparison between market value and intrinsic value	70
4.18.1	5 years assets and liabilities of Voltas	71
4.18.2	Comparison of intrinsic value with market value of Voltas	72
4.18.3	Percentage comparison between market value and intrinsic value	73
4.19.1	5 years assets and liabilities of ONGC	74
4.19.2	Comparison of intrinsic value with market value of ONGC	75
4.19.3	Percentage comparison between market value and intrinsic value	76
4.20.1	5 years assets and liabilities of Reliance industries	77
4.20.2	Comparison of intrinsic value with market value of Reliance industries	78
4.20.3	Percentage comparison between market value and intrinsic value	79

LIST OF FIGURES/ CHARTS/ GRAPHS

Sl. No	Particulars	Page no's.
4.1	Line graph showing Comparison of intrinsic value with market value of HUL	22
4.2	Line graph showing Comparison of intrinsic value with market value ITC	25
4.3	Line graph showing Comparison of intrinsic value with market value of Dr. Reddy's Laboratories	28
4.4	Line graph showing Comparison of intrinsic value with market value of CIPLA	31
4.5	Line graph showing Comparison of intrinsic value with market value of Ultratech	34
4.6	Line graph showing Comparison of intrinsic value with market value of Ambuja Cements	37
4.7	Line graph showing Comparison of intrinsic value with market value of Wipro	40
4.8	Line graph showing Comparison of intrinsic value with market value of Infosys	43
4.9	Line graph showing Comparison of intrinsic value with market value of JSW Steel	46
4.10	Line graph showing Comparison of intrinsic value with market value Tata Steel	49

4.11	Line graph showing Comparison of intrinsic value with market value HeroMotocorp	52
4.12	Line graph showing Comparison of intrinsic value with market value of Maruthi Suzuki	55
4.13	Line graph showing Comparison of intrinsic value with market value of Bergers Paint	58
4.14	Line graph showing Comparison of intrinsic value with market value of Asian Paints	61
4.15	Line graph showing Comparison of intrinsic value with market value of Pidilite	64
4.16	Line graph showing Comparison of intrinsic value with market value of UPL	67
4.17	Line graph showing Comparison of intrinsic value with market value of Godrej	70
4.18	Line graph showing Comparison of intrinsic value with market value of Voltas	73
4.19	Line graph showing Comparison of intrinsic value with market value of ONGC	76
4.20	Line graph showing Comparison of intrinsic value with market value of Reliance Industries	79

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The "Relevance of NAV Method in Valuation of Share" project presents a comprehensive analysis of the Net Asset Value (NAV) method as a valuation tool for shares in financial markets. The study involved comparing the intrinsic value calculated through the NAV method with the respective market values of 20 companies' shares. The findings revealed a substantial and consistent gap between the intrinsic value and market value, leading to the conclusion that the NAV method is irrelevant in valuing shares.

The research methodology involved a thorough examination of each company's financial statements and assets to determine their net asset value. The intrinsic value was then calculated using the NAV method by deducting liabilities from the total assets and dividing by the number of outstanding shares. This intrinsic value was compared with the prevailing market price of the shares on various dates to assess the degree of deviation.

Key reasons for the significant gap between intrinsic value and market value, leading to the irrelevance of the NAV method, include; Market Sentiment, Intangible Assets, Market Efficiency, Liquidity and Market Depth and many more factors that the balance sheet of the company does not include.

Based on the findings, the project concludes that the NAV method is not a relevant tool for valuing shares due to its inability to account for market dynamics, intangible assets, and investor sentiment. Consequently, relying solely on the NAV method for investment decision-making may lead to suboptimal choices and missed opportunities for investors.

The study recommends the analysts to consider the inflation, technological changes, and organizational capital. It suggests a more comprehensive approach to share valuation than NAV method valuation. By considering a diverse range of factors and market conditions, investors can make more informed decisions and gain a better understanding of share valuation in the complex financial landscape