

Contents

<i>Table of Cases</i>	xxi
<i>Table of Legislation</i>	xxv
<i>List of Tables</i>	xxix
<i>Glossary of Terms</i>	xxxii
<i>A Bird's Eye View of the Functional and Focused Model (FFM)</i>	xxxiii

Introduction	1
1. Background	1
2. The Primary Objectives of the Book	2
3. The Derivative Action: A Unique Procedure?	5
4. Public and Private Companies	7
5. The New Proposed Framework Advanced by the Book	9
6. An Overview of the Book	11

I. THEORY AND PRACTICE ANALYSIS

1. Shareholder Litigation and Corporate Governance	17
1.1 Introduction	17
1.2 Shareholder Litigation and Corporate Governance	18
1.2.1 Limitations of traditional view	18
1.2.2 Derivative actions and agency costs	20
1.3 Alternative Devices to Control Agency Costs	24
1.3.1 Internal mechanisms	24
1.3.1.1 The right to vote	25
1.3.1.2 The company's internal dispute-resolution machinery	28
1.3.2 External mechanisms for reducing agency costs	31
1.3.2.1 Public enforcement	31
1.3.2.2 Non-executive directors	32
1.4 Derivative Actions versus Market Forces	36
1.4.1 The market in corporate control—an effective functional substitute for litigation?	37
1.4.2 Flaws in the operation of the market for corporate Control	41
1.5 Conclusion	44
 2. The Choice of Rationales and the Social Meaning of Derivative Actions	 46
2.1 Introduction	46
2.2 Merits and Demerits of Derivative Actions	47

2.3	The Choice of Rationales: Deterrence versus Compensation	54
2.3.1	The primary purposes of derivative actions in the US	54
2.3.2	Compensation	56
2.3.2.1	The rationale and decision rule	56
2.3.2.2	Limitations	56
2.3.3	Deterrence	59
2.3.3.1	The rationale and decision rule	59
2.3.3.2	Limitations	62
2.3.3.3	How does deterrence operate?	64
2.4	Understanding the Social Meaning of Derivative Actions	66
2.4.1	Introduction	66
2.4.2	Construction and deconstruction	67
2.4.2.1	Ambiguity of the action's objective	68
2.4.2.2	Tying derivative actions to a failed objective	71
2.4.3	Applying the right inhibitions	72
2.4.4	Procedural requirements and settlements	73
2.5	Conclusion	74
3.	The Difficulties with Conferring Rights on Shareholders to Litigate	76
3.1	Introduction	76
3.2	The Nature of the Problem with Conferring Rights on Shareholders to Litigate	77
3.2.1	Introduction	77
3.2.2	The policy problem: can a shareholder adequately represent the company?	80
3.2.2.1	Perverse incentives	84
3.2.2.2	Access to information	85
3.2.2.3	Expertise	87
3.2.2.4	Shareholders' long-term commitment to a policy of suit	87
3.2.2.5	Costs	88
3.3	The Common Law Response	88
3.3.1	The 'majority rule' and 'proper plaintiff' principles	88
3.3.2	Fraud on the minority	90
3.3.2.1	Fraud and wrongdoer control	90
	Fraud	90
	Wrongdoer control	92
3.3.2.2	When fraud and control must be shown	94
3.3.3	Ultra vires transactions	94
3.3.4	Breaches of special resolution procedures	97
3.3.5	The 'interests of justice'?	99
3.3.6	Additional restrictions on members' ability to bring actions on behalf of the company	100
3.3.6.1	'Independent organ' does not wish the action to proceed	100

3.3.6.2 Ratification	100	
3.3.6.3 Inequitable conduct of the minority shareholder	101	
3.3.6.4 Availability of other adequate remedies	101	
3.3.6.5 Companies in liquidation	102	
3.3.7 Conclusion	102	
3.4 Policy Evaluation: Old Myths and New Realities		103
3.4.1 Policy response number one: reallocating the responsibility to determine the merits of the action	103	
3.4.1.1 Committee of independent directors	104	
3.4.1.2 Independent organ	107	
(a) Conceptual problems	108	
(b) Policy issues	109	
3.4.1.3 Judicial oversight	109	
3.4.2 Policy response number two: formulating proper screening mechanism	111	
3.4.2.1 Current screening mechanisms	111	
3.4.2.2 Issues relevant to the grant of leave	112	
3.4.2.3 Rationales	114	
3.4.2.4 Applicant's good faith	115	
3.4.2.5 Interests of the company	117	
3.5 Conclusion		121

II. MAKING DERIVATIVE ACTIONS WORK

4. The Way to Reform and a New Statutory Derivative Action: Much Ado About Nothing?		125
4.1 Introduction		125
4.2 Deficiencies in the Present Law and the Approach to Reform		126
4.2.1 Introduction	126	
4.2.2 Problems in the common law derivative action	126	
4.2.3 Guiding principles for resolving the problems identified	127	
4.2.4 The Law Commission's recommendations	129	
4.2.5 The Company Law Review Steering Group	131	
4.3 The Derivative Action Under the Companies Act 2006		132
4.3.1 Introduction	132	
4.3.2 General principles	134	
4.3.3 Scope of application	135	
4.3.3.1 The three key elements	135	
4.3.3.2 Extending the types of breaches under which a derivative claim may be brought	135	
4.3.3.3 Derivative claims against third parties	138	
4.3.3.4 Can the applicant bring a derivative claim in respect of wrongs committed prior to his becoming a member?	139	

4.3.3.5	Derivative claims against a former director and a shadow director	142
4.3.4	Procedural requirements	143
4.3.4.1	General principles	143
4.3.4.2	Permission to continue claim as a derivative claim	144
4.3.4.3	An assessment	145
4.3.5	Criteria for the grant of leave	146
4.3.5.1	Background	146
4.3.5.2	The new framework	148
4.3.5.3	The specific criteria	150
4.3.5.4	Matters that the court must take into account when considering an application for permission to proceed with a derivative claim	155
4.3.5.5	What is <i>not</i> there?	158
4.4	An assessment of the likely impact of the new regime	159
4.5	Conclusion	165
5.	A Proposed Model for Derivative Actions: the Functional and Focused Model (FFM)	167
A.	The Foundations	167
5.1	Introduction	167
5.2	The Role of Derivative Actions in a Changing Menu of Governance	168
5.2.1	Introduction	168
5.2.2	Enhanced protection of minority shareholders	170
5.2.3	Historical perspective	173
5.2.4	Policy shift	175
5.3	The Derivative Action as a Constraint on Management Misconduct	178
5.3.1	Public companies—constraints and limitations of other mechanisms	178
5.3.2	Policing management in closely held corporations	183
5.4	Synthesis—the Functional and Focused Model	183
5.4.1	Introduction	183
5.4.1.1	Aims of the model	183
5.4.1.2	Outline of the model	184
5.4.1.3	Policy premises	185
5.4.2	The value of deterrence against corporate misconduct	187
5.4.2.1	Introduction	187
5.4.2.2	The deterrence rationale in company law	187
5.4.2.3	‘Private’ remedies or ‘non legally enforceable norms’	189
5.4.2.4	Infrequency of proceedings	191
5.4.2.5	A note on insurance and indemnity	193

5.4.3	Enhancing the social meaning of the derivative action	195
5.4.3.1	Reorienting the judiciary's focus—confirming the public nature of derivative actions	195
5.4.3.2	Providing adequate incentives to shareholders	197
B.	Procedural and Substantive Aspects	197
5.4.4	Introduction	197
5.4.4.1	Nature of cases arising under the derivative action	198
(a)	Type of conduct	198
(b)	Multiple derivative actions	202
(c)	Types of companies	203
5.4.4.2	Who may be qualified to bring a derivative action?	204
5.4.4.3	Formulating an expeditious screening mechanism	206
(a)	The proposed rule: identifying those actions that appear likely to increase corporate value	206
(b)	How will the inquiry operate?	207
(c)	What should be the relationship between the compensation and deterrence rationales?	211
(d)	An illustration of the proposed inquiry	212
(e)	An assessment of the benefits of the proposed inquiry	212
(f)	Shareholder standing	215
(g)	Access to information	216
(h)	Notice to the company	219
5.4.4.4	Funding derivative actions: a re-examination of costs and fees as incentives to commence litigation	220
5.4.4.5	Maintaining doctrinal consistency	220
5.5	Conclusion	221
6.	Funding Derivative Actions: Costs and Fees as Incentives to Commence Litigation	222
6.1	Introduction	222
6.2	The Economics of Derivative Action Litigation	223
6.2.1	Introduction	223
6.2.2	The US rules on derivative action fees	226
6.2.3	The risk of litigation is shifted from the claimant to the attorney	228
6.3	A Re-examination of Indemnity Costs Orders	229
6.3.1	Introduction	229
6.3.2	The common law recognition of the problems of the impecunious shareholder	229
6.3.3	Fundamental flaws in the operation of indemnity costs orders	232
6.3.3.1	Lack of incentives	232
6.3.3.2	The problematic interrelationship between the application for an indemnity and the application for leave to proceed	234
(a)	Procedure may result in a costly mini trial to establish entitlement	234

(b) The relationship between the indemnity procedure and the exceptions to the rule in <i>Foss v Harbottle</i> and its effect on the economics of litigation	236
(c) The court may more readily be persuaded against making an indemnity order	237
(d) Danger of under-settling the action	237
6.3.3.3 The problematic 'financial need test'	238
6.3.3.4 On what basis are indemnity costs orders awarded?	240
6.3.3.5 The shareholder may not be compensated if the company becomes insolvent	241
6.4 Conclusion	242
7. Pursuing the Resolution of the Funding Problem	244
7.1 Introduction	244
7.2 Menu of Options: Solutions Involving the Company and the Shareholder	244
7.2.1 Option One: a mandatory requirement for the company to pay the costs of the action	244
7.2.2 Option Two: rewarding the claimant with part of the proceeds of litigation	246
7.2.2.1 Outline of proposal	246
7.2.2.2 Rationale explained	248
7.2.2.3 Rewarding the claimant and the 'reflective loss' rule	250
7.3 Solutions Involving the Claimant's Attorney	252
7.3.1 Option Three: conditional fee agreements	252
7.3.1.1 How do conditional fee agreements work?	252
7.3.1.2 Conditional fee agreements and derivative actions	253
7.4 Introducing Contingency Fees for Derivative Actions?	257
7.4.1 Introduction	257
7.4.2 Argument One: a change in the climate	258
7.4.3 Argument Two: contingency fees versus conditional fees	259
7.4.3.1 The case for simplicity	259
7.4.3.2 Settling the case too low?	259
7.4.3.3 Charging excessive fees?	260
7.4.3.4 Increasing the costs?	261
7.4.4 Argument Three: the myth about contingency fees and ethics	261
7.4.5 Argument Four: the experience with contingent fees in US derivative action litigation	262
7.4.6 Argument Five: contingency fees are more compatible with derivative action	264
7.4.7 Argument Six: comparative perspective	266
7.4.8 The difficulties in introducing contingency fees into a system in which costs follow the event	267

7.4.8.1 The first objection	267
7.4.8.2 The second objection	267
7.4.8.3 The third objection	268
7.4.9 Formulating proper safeguards	269
7.4.9.1 Regulation and methods to calculate fees	269
7.4.9.2 Approval of the court	270
7.4.9.3 Is there a need to reform attorneys' professional ethics?	271
7.4.9.4 Final adjustments	271
7.5 Conclusion	272
8. The Interrelationship between the Derivative Action and the Unfair Prejudice Remedy	274
8.1 Introduction	274
8.2 The Interaction between the Unfair Prejudice Remedy and the Derivative Action	276
8.2.1 Introduction	276
8.2.2 Towards amalgamation of the two remedies?	278
8.3 The Case for Retaining Two Separate Remedies	280
8.3.1 Leaving a gap in the enforcement mechanisms of corporate governance	280
8.3.2 The unfair prejudice remedy and breaches of fiduciary duties	283
8.3.3 The Law Commission's arguments	284
8.3.4 The question of relief	288
8.3.5 The 'alternative remedy' argument revisited	288
8.3.6 Both remedies can operate together to ensure added value for the aggrieved shareholder and the company	290
8.3.7 Comparative perspective	291
8.4 The Way Forward—Practical Steps	294
8.4.1 Redressing the balance—the case for duality	294
8.4.2 A new test for obtaining costs orders	295
8.5 Conclusion	298
9. Conclusion and Future Directions	299
9.1 The Approach of the Book	299
9.2 The Proposed New Framework	300
9.3 Beyond This Book: Future Directions	302
<i>Appendix 1. Companies Act 2006, Pt 11, Chap 1</i>	307
<i>Appendix 2. The Civil Procedure (Amendment) Rules 2007 S12204/2007 (extracts only)</i>	310
<i>Selected Bibliography</i>	314
<i>Index</i>	331