

### THE DERIVATIVE ACTION IN ASIA

This in-depth comparative examination of the derivative action in Asia provides a framework for analysing its function, history and practical application and examines in detail how derivative actions law works in practice in seven important Asian jurisdictions (China, Hong Kong, India, Japan, Singapore, South Korea and Taiwan). These case studies allow an evaluation of a number of the leading Western comparative corporate law and governance theories that have come to define the field over the last decade. By debunking some of these critically important theories, this book lays the foundation for an accurate understanding of the derivative action in Asia and a re-examination of the regulation of the derivative action around the world.

DAN W. PUCHNIAK is an Assistant Professor in the Faculty of Law at the National University of Singapore (NUS), where he specializes in company law with an emphasis on comparative corporate law in east Asia.

HARALD BAUM is a Senior Research Fellow and Head of the Japanese Law Department at the Max Planck Institute for Comparative and International Private Law in Hamburg. He also serves as Professor of Law at the Faculty of Law of Hamburg University and as Research Associate at the European Corporate Governance Institute in Brussels.

MICHAEL EWING-CHOW is an Associate Professor at the Faculty of Law, NUS, where he teaches world trade law and corporate law.



### INTERNATIONAL CORPORATE LAW AND FINANCIAL MARKET REGULATION

Corporate law and financial market regulation matter. The global financial crisis has challenged many of the fundamental concepts underlying corporate law and financial regulation; but crisis and reform have long been features of these fields. A burgeoning and sophisticated scholarship now challenges and contextualizes the contested relationship between law, markets and companies, domestically and internationally. This series informs and leads the scholarly and policy debate by publishing cutting-edge, timely and critical examinations of the most pressing and important questions in the field.

#### Series Editors

Professor Eilis Ferran, University of Cambridge

Professor Niamh Moloney, London School of Economics and Political Science Professor Howell Jackson, Harvard Law School

### Editorial Board

Professor Marco Becht, Professor of Finance and Economics at Université Libre de Bruxelles and Executive Director of the European Corporate Governance Institute (ECGI).

Professor Brian Cheffins, S. J. Berwin Professor of Corporate Law at the Faculty of Law, University of Cambridge.

Professor Paul Davies, Allen and Overy Professor of Corporate Law and Professorial Fellow of Jesus College, University of Oxford.

Professor Luca Enriques, Professor of Business Law in the Faculty of Law at the University of Bologna.

Professor Guido Ferrarini, Professor of Business Law at the University of Genoa and Fellow of ECGI.

Professor Jennifer Hill, Professor of Corporate Law at Sydney Law School.
Professor Klaus J. Hopt, Director of the Max Planck Institute of
Comparative and International Private Law, Hamburg.

Professor Hideki Kanda, Professor of Law at the University of Tokyo. Professor Colin Mayer, Peter Moores Professor of Management Studies at the Saïd Business School and Director of the Oxford Financial Research Centre.

James Palmer, Partner of Herbert Smith, London.

Professor Michel Tison, Professor at the Financial Law Institute of the University of Ghent.

Andrew Whittaker, General Counsel to the Board at the UK Financial Services Authority.

Professor Eddy Wymeersch, former Chairman of the Committee of European Securities Regulators, former Chairman of the International Organization of Securities Commissions' European Regional Committee and Professor of Commercial Law at the University of Ghent.



# THE DERIVATIVE ACTION IN ASIA

A Comparative and Functional Approach

Edited by
DAN W. PUCHNIAK,
HARALD BAUM
and
MICHAEL EWING-CHOW





CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS
Cambridge, New York, Melbourne, Madrid, Cape Town,
Singapore, São Paulo, Delhi, Mexico City

Cambridge University Press The Edinburgh Building, Cambridge CB2 8RU, UK

Published in the United States of America by Cambridge University Press, New York

www.cambridge.org Information on this title: www.cambridge.org/9781107012271

© Cambridge University Press 2012

This publication is in copyright. Subject to statutory exception and to the provisions of relevant collective licensing agreements, no reproduction of any part may take place without the written permission of Cambridge University Press.

First published 2012

Printed in the United Kingdom at the University Press, Cambridge

A catalogue record for this publication is available from the British Library

Library of Congress Cataloguing in Publication data

The derivative action in Asia: a comparative and functional approach / edited by

Dan W. Puchniak, Harald Baum and Michael Ewing-Chow.

p. cm. – (International corporate law and financial market regulation)

Includes index.

ISBN 978-1-107-01227-1

 Stockholders' derivative actions – Asia. I. Puchniak, Dan W., 1976– II. Baum, Harald. III. Ewing-Chow, Michael. KNC319.D47 2012

NC319.D47 201 346.5'0666-dc23 2011033574

ISBN 978-1-107-01227-1 Hardback

Cambridge University Press has no responsibility for the persistence or accuracy of URLs for external or third-party internet websites referred to in this publication, and does not guarantee that any content on such websites is, or will remain, accurate or appropriate.



### CONTENTS

List of tables page xiv
List of contributors xv
Foreword xvii
Preface xix
List of abbreviations xxi

1 The derivative action: an economic, historical and practice-oriented approach 1

HARALD BAUM AND DAN W. PUCHNIAK

- I Introduction 1
- II The derivative action from an economic and functional perspective 7
  - Definition, characteristics and delimitation 7
    - a Definition
    - b Characteristics 8
    - c Delimitation 10
  - 2 Economic efficiencies and inefficiencies 12
    - a Function 12
    - b Empirical studies on the derivative action's compensatory value 15
    - c The comparative value of the empirical research 19
    - d The ambiguous empirical picture is compounded by the deterrence effect 23
    - e Illuminating the potential negative effects of derivative actions 26
  - 3 Key elements of regulatory design 31
    - a The need for economic incentives and disincentives 31
    - b Designing appropriate economic incentives 35
    - c Sufficient access to corporate information 43



vi

Cambridge University Press 978-1-107-01227-1 - The Derivative Action in Asia: A Comparative and Functional Approach Edited by Dan W. Puchniak, Harald Baum and Michael Ewing-Chow Frontmatter More information

. . . . . . . . . . . . .

		CONTENTS
		d Making the company the first option 46 e Filtering out unmeritorious actions 47 f Settlement and abandonment 58  4 The derivative action in context: functional alternatives 60
	III	The derivative action from a historical perspective  Historical development in the United States  Historical development in the United Kingdom  Germany's historical rejection of the derivative action  72
	IV	The derivative action from a practical perspective 1 Procedure and practice in the United States 74 2 Procedure and practice in the United Kingdom 77 3 Procedure and practice in France 82 4 Procedure and practice in Germany 84
2		complexity of derivative actions in Asia: an onvenient truth 90
	DAN	W. PUCHNIAK
	I	Introduction 90
	II	The seven leading Asian jurisdictions 98
	III	An overview of the derivative action in Asia 100  1 Japanese derivative actions: the rise of non-economic litigiousness 100  2 South Korean derivative actions: moderately litigious and intriguingly unpredictable 104  3 Taiwanese derivative actions: the chill of financial disincentives and domestic cultural norms 108  4 Chinese derivative actions: a complex pathway to minority shareholder protection 111  5 Hong Kong derivative actions: a late and partial break with common law tradition lays a path for reform 114  6 Singapore's derivative actions: mundanely non-Asian, intriguingly non-American and at the forefront of the Commonwealth 117  7 Derivative actions in India: explaining the rarity of derivative actions in a sea of litigation 120
	IV	The complexity of derivative actions in Asia: a less convenient, but more realistic, truth 124



CONTENTS vii

3 Land of the rising derivative action: revisiting irrationality to understand Japan's unreluctant shareholder litigant 128

MASAFUMI NAKAHIGASHI AND DAN W. PUCHNIAK

- I Introduction 128
- II Applying the assumption of the economically motivated and rational shareholder litigant to Japan 132
  - 1 The economically motivated and rational explanation for the absence of shareholder litigation in postwar Japan 132
  - 2 Japan's explosion of derivative actions (mis)understood through the lens of the economically motivated and rational shareholder litigant and its testable hypotheses 139
- III Putting the hypotheses of the economically motivated and rational Japanese derivative litigant to the test 144
  - 1 Testing the economically motivated and rational shareholder hypothesis: do shareholders benefit financially from derivative actions in Japan? 144
  - 2 Testing the economically motivated and rational attorney hypothesis: do economically motivated and rational attorneys drive derivative litigation in Japan? 150
  - 3 Testing the financial tracking hypothesis: does the rate of derivative actions track changes in their financial costs/benefits? 155
- IV Providing a rational explanation for 'economically irrational' derivative litigation in Japan 158
  - Demarcating the boundaries between rational and irrational behaviour 158
  - 2 Quasi-rational (non-economically motivated) behaviour drives derivative litigation in Japan 160
  - 3 Purely irrational behaviour as a potential driver of derivative litigation in Japan 163
- V Conclusion 168

Appendices 170



viii CONTENTS

4	Invigorating shar	eholder	derivative	actions
	in South Korea	186		

HYEOK-JOON RHO AND KON-SIK KIM

- I Introduction 186
- II Basics of derivative actions: law and reality in South Korea 187
  - 1 Background: the shareholding structure and the legal institutions for shareholder protection 187
    - a The shareholding structure 187
    - b Legal institutions for shareholder protection: shareholder direct suits and class actions 189
  - 2 Overview of the structure of a derivative action 192
  - 3 Some statistics and features 193
- III Standing for plaintiffs 196
  - General shareholding requirement under the KCC 196
  - 2 Double derivative actions 198
    - a Concept of a double derivative action and a recent Supreme Court case 198
    - b Analysis: why are double derivative actions necessary in South Korea? 199
- IV Entrepreneurial lawyers: fees and incentives 200
  - 1 Lack of shareholders' incentives and the role of entrepreneurial lawyers in derivative actions 200
  - 2 Who will pay the plaintiff's lawyer? 201
  - 3 How much will the plaintiff's lawyer be paid? 203
    - a Limitation on contingency fees 203
    - Limitation of directors' liability 205
- V Regulation of frivolous actions 206
  - 1 Demand requirement 206
    - a Introduction 206
    - b A corporation's decision not to sue 207
    - A derivative action filed without going through the demand process
       207
    - d Analysis 209
  - 2 Limiting collusive settlements 210
- VI A new trend in case law: digression from the passive role model? 211
- VII Concluding remarks 213

Appendix 214



CONTENTS

ix

5	Derivative actions in Taiwan: legal and	cultural hurdles
	with a glimmer of hope for the future	215

WANG RUU TSENG AND WALLACE WEN YEU WANG

- I Introduction 215
- II The legal mechanism for conducting a derivative action: requirements for maintaining a derivative action 216
  - 1 The shareholder rules 219
  - 2 The 'continuing ownership' rule 220
  - The 'security for damages or costs' rule 220
- III The ambiguity of civil procedure in Taiwanese derivative actions 223
  - 1 Notification of and intervening in a derivative action 224
  - 2 Ambiguity in an involuntary decrease in a plaintiff's shareholdings 225
  - 3 The binding effect of settlements in derivative actions 227
    - Court fees in derivative actions: a flat rate or a percentage? 227
- IV Derivative actions versus direct suits 228
- V The relationship between culture, institutional background and the derivative action 230
  - 1 The controlling shareholder system 230
  - 2 Weak company code 231
  - 3 Emphasis on criminal/administrative sanctions 233
  - 4 Taiwan's legal culture 233
  - 5 Paternalism and mass dispute resolution: 'Asian values' after all? 234
- VI The impact of the derivative action on corporate governance 235
- VII The perception of the derivative action and professional services in the marketplace 237
- VIII Idiosyncrasies in derivative actions: the role of the government-sanctioned non-profit organization 240
  - IX Concluding remarks 241



More information

X CONTENTS

6 Pathway to minority shareholder protection: derivative actions in the People's Republic of China 243

DONALD C. CLARKE AND NICHOLAS C. HOWSON

- I Introduction 243
- II Economic and legal reform in the PRC and the derivative action 244
  - 1 Introduction: the derivative lawsuit and corporate governance in the Chinese context 244
  - 2 Corporatization and its effects 245
  - 3 The LLC form and other non-Company-Law forms 249
  - 4 The legal representative 253
  - 5 The Chinese judiciary: local protectionism, Party control and the avoidance of 'mass' litigant cases 254
  - 6 Derivative versus representative 257
  - 7 Costs, cost allocation and cost-benefit analysis for shareholder plaintiffs 258
- III Derivative actions before 2006 260
  - Non-statutory rule making: CSRC principles, SPC utterances, local 'opinions', and the (draft) 'Omnibus' regulation on the 1994 Company Law 260
  - 2 Pre-2006 cases 263
    - a Genesis of the 1994 SPC Approving Response and other LLC cases 263
    - b Widely held companies 267
- IV The 2006 Company Law and statutory authorization for derivative actions 269
  - 1 Standing 270
  - 2 Demand 272
  - 3 Defendants and associated causes of action 273
  - V The reality of derivative actions in the PRC from 1 January 2006 to date 275
    - 1 Absence of CLS or publicly listed CLS-related cases 275
    - 2 'Straddling' actions: 2006 Company Law application to pre-2006 transactions 278
    - 3 Avoidance of derivative pleadings 279
    - 4 Autonomy and acceptance 280
    - 5 Technical competence 282
    - 6 Difficulties regarding underlying substantive claims 284



CONTENTS

VI VII

III

IV

	<ul> <li>Confusion between derivative and representative lawsuits</li> <li>Judge-made direct litigation right for supervisors</li> <li>Allocation of court fees and 'loser pays all'</li> <li>287</li> </ul>
	• •
VI	Critique of article 152 and reform suggestions 288
II	Conclusion 293
-	parallel path to shareholder remedies: Hong Kong's ivative actions 296
PΑŪ	UL VON NESSEN, S.H. GOO AND CHEE KEONG
LOV	N
I	Introduction 296
II	The common law derivative action: <i>Foss</i> v. <i>Harbottle</i> and its exceptions 297
II	The reform process in Hong Kong 304  1 The consultancy report 304
	2 The report of the Standing Committee on Company Law Reform 305
	3 The SCCLR corporate governance consultation paper (July 2001) 307
	4 Companies (Amendments) Bill 2003 308
V	How successful is Hong Kong's statutory derivative action? 310
	1 The judicial pronouncements 311

Derivative actions in Singapore: mundanely non-Asian, intriguingly non-American and at the forefront of the 323 Commonwealth

Should Hong Kong adopt the British reforms?

Conclusions and observations on future success

319

MENG SENG WEE AND DAN W. PUCHNIAK

2 Coexistence with the common law

- Introduction 323
- Law of minority protection 326
  - History and development 326
    - a English tradition and seeds of change 326
    - b Development of company law
    - c Evolution of minority protection law 330

xi



xii

Ш

### CONTENTS

	CONTENTS
2	Common law derivative action 331 a Introduction 331 b Critique 332 c Conclusion 336
3	Statutory derivative action 336 a Impetus for reform 336 b Scope 338 c The law 341
5	Personal right, corporate right and section 216 348 a Introduction 348 b Giving corporate relief under section 216 349 Conclusion 351
Dε	ebunking Western stereotypes 351
1	Western stereotypes of Singapore 351
2	Realities 354
	a The evolution of Singapore society and the concurrent
	rise in shareholder litigation 354
	b Singapore's shareholder litigation defies the 'nanny state'

IV Intriguingly non-American in its success 365

## 9 The rarity of derivative actions in India: reasons and consequences 369

and 'Asian values' stereotypes

VIKRAMADITYA KHANNA AND UMAKANTH VAROTTIL

- I Introduction 369
- II Why have derivative actions? 371
  - 1 The desirability of derivative suits to enforce corporate laws 371
  - 2 Application to the Indian context 378
- III The derivative action in India 380
  - 1 Foss v. Harbottle and its exceptions 381
    - a Ultra vires transactions or illegality 382
    - b Matters requiring special resolution 382
    - c Fraud on the minority 382
  - 2 Procedural constraints 383
    - a The 'clean hands' doctrine 384
    - b Order I, rule 8, Civil Procedure Code 1908 384



CONTENTS XIII

3 Availability of other remedies 386

a Oppression and mismanagement 386

b Securities laws and SEBI 388

4 Other constraints 390

a Directors' duties 390

b Controlling shareholders' duties 391

c Cultural concerns 392

d Costs 393

IV Recent developments and reform efforts 394

V Conclusions and recommendations for the future 396

10 The derivative action in Asia: some concluding observations 398

DAN W. PUCHNIAK AND HARALD BAUM

Legislative appendix 404 Bibliography 422 Index 443



### TABLES

3A.1	Number of cases of shareholders' derivative actions in Japan page 170
3B.1	Results of derivative actions filed 171
3B.2	Average per share recovery in judgment for plaintiff (listed companies
	only) 174
3B.3	Average per share recovery in settled cases (listed companies only) 175
3B.4	Event study on stock price reaction to derivative actions filed 176
3B.5	Event study on stock price reaction to derivative actions settled 176
3B.6	Average amount of damages claimed (1993–2009) 177
3B.7	Average amount of settlement, KO versus non-KO 178
3B.8	Statistics in actions in which the court orders the plaintiff to post a
	bond 180
3B.9	Average length of a derivative action 184
3C.1	Suggested attorneys' fees pursuant to the post-1994 Fee Rules 185
4A.1	Derivative actions in South Korea (1 January 1997–30 May 2010) 214
9.1	Comparison of key features of direct and derivative suits 373



### CONTRIBUTORS

HARALD BAUM Senior Research Fellow, Max Planck Institute for Comparative and International Private Law, Hamburg; Professor of Law, Faculty of Law, University of Hamburg.

BRIAN R. CHEFFINS Professor of Law, Faculty of Law, University of Cambridge.

DONALD C. CLARKE Professor of Law, George Washington University Law School, Washington, DC.

MICHAEL EWING-CHOW Associate Professor of Law, Faculty of Law, National University of Singapore.

s. н. Goo Professor of Law, Faculty of Law, University of Hong Kong.

NICHOLAS C. HOWSON Professor of Law, University of Michigan Law School, Ann Arbor.

VIKRAMADITYA KHANNA Professor of Law, University of Michigan Law School.

KON-SIK KIM Professor of Law, School of Law, Seoul National University.

CHEE KEONG LOW Associate Professor of Corporate Law, CUHK Business School, Chinese University of Hong Kong.

MASAFUMI NAKAHIGASHI Professor of Law, School of Law, Nagoya University.



xvi

### LIST OF CONTRIBUTORS

PAUL VON NESSEN Professor of Law, Department of Business Law and Taxation, Monash University, Melbourne.

DAN W. PUCHNIAK Assistant Professor of Law, Faculty of Law, National University of Singapore.

HYEOK-JOON RHO Associate Professor of Law, School of Law, Seoul National University.

WANG RUU TSENG Professor of Law, College of Law, National Taiwan University.

UMAKANTH VAROTTIL Assistant Professor of Law, Faculty of Law, National University of Singapore.

WALLACE WEN YEU WANG Professor of Law, College of Law, National Taiwan University.

MENG SENG WEE Assistant Professor of Law, Faculty of Law, National University of Singapore.



### **FOREWORD**

Brian R. Cheffins

For those interested in analysing corporate law and corporate governance from a comparative perspective, these are intriguing times. Crossborder portfolio investment has grown dramatically in recent decades, meaning that investors have pragmatic reasons to familiarize themselves with laws and governance arrangements on a multi-jurisdictional basis. Moreover, a burgeoning 'law and finance' literature implies that corporate and securities law need to supply ample investor protection for capital markets to flourish, underpinned by empirical analysis using numerical coding to quantify the quality of law in countries around the world.

The Derivative Action in Asia, edited by Dan W. Puchniak, Harald Baum and Michael Ewing-Chow, is a lively, timely and informative addition to the comparative corporate law literature. As Puchniak and Baum point out in the opening chapter of the volume, the derivative action could be 'a potentially powerful elixir for corporate governance ills'. Correspondingly, the derivative action has captured the attention of various comparative corporate law scholars. As Puchniak and Baum point out, however, analysis of the law in the United States and key European jurisdictions, such as the United Kingdom and Germany, dominates the relevant literature. The Derivative Action in Asia reorients matters in an Asian direction, as it provides detailed, chapter-length studies of derivative litigation from seven major Asian jurisdictions.

Bringing an Asian dimension to the table could not be timelier. As is well known, China and India have recently joined Japan and South Korea as major global economic players. Asia has simultaneously become a hive of corporate activity. In 2010 nearly two-thirds of all initial public offerings (IPOs), measured in terms of value, were carried out on stock exchanges in the Asia-Pacific region, up from one-fifth in 2000. There is also a strong cross-border dimension involved. In 2010 IPOs by Chinese companies accounted for nearly one-quarter of all IPO activity in the United States.

xvii



XVIII FOREWORD

The Derivative Action in Asia's virtues extend well beyond its topical nature. Each of the country-specific chapters is thoroughly researched and provides crucial institutional background in addition to providing an instructive overview of the essential legal details. Puchniak and Baum place the country-specific studies in context, using Chapters 1, 2 and 10 to provide a detailed analysis of derivative litigation from a functional, institutional and theoretical perspective (Chapter 2 was authored solely by Puchniak). Correspondingly, *The Derivative Action in Asia* constitutes an invaluable resource not only for those wanting to learn about minority shareholder rights in key jurisdictions in Asia but also generally for students of comparative corporate law.

As Jack Coffee, a law professor at Columbia Law School, observes in a 2010 working paper, theorists can be divided into 'lumpers', who seek broad, gestalt-like patterns and emphasize similarities rather than differences, and 'splitters', who focus on differences and emphasize institutional detail. Puchniak and Baum, in their overview chapters, mark themselves out clearly as 'splitters', arguing that the country-specific studies in *The Derivative Action in Asia* call into question three 'grand theories' that might be expected to account for the structure and operation of the derivative action. Specifically, they maintain that the chapters in the book show that derivative litigation cannot be explained by reference to a supposed Asian cultural aversion to litigation, they cast doubt upon the law and finance claim that minority shareholders are protected differently – and better – in common law jurisdictions, and they demonstrate that derivative litigation patterns cannot be accounted for purely by reference to economic rationality.

Ultimately, it falls to readers to judge whether *The Derivative Action in Asia* demonstrates, as Puchniak and Baum maintain, that a myriad of factors within a particular country, such as the specific regulatory framework, case law, corporate governance institutions and socio-political environment, do a better job of explaining derivative litigation than 'grand theories'. Regardless of what readers conclude on this particular point, they will find that this book provides them with numerous fascinating insights concerning derivative litigation, Asian corporate law and Asian corporate governance.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> J. C. Coffee, 'Dispersed ownership: the theories, the evidence, and the enduring tension between "lumpers" and "splitters" (2010), Columbia Law School Center for Law and Economic Studies Working Paper no. 363: 6.



### **PREFACE**

It always feels nice to be proved right. Often, however, greater understanding comes from being proved wrong. Indeed, in this book project, most of the understanding we have gained – which we hope to pass on to our readers – has come from being proved wrong.

When we started this project, in late 2009, the idea was to discover common features in derivative actions across Asia. We solicited top experts with the hope of enticing them to come together in Singapore to provide the fuel for our discovery – the 'common features' in derivative actions across Asia. We are extremely thankful that our co-authors 'took the bait' and joined us in our quest to discover a grand theory to explain how the derivative action in Asia functions.

We failed, however. Our failure certainly was not the fault of our co-authors, as they masterfully analysed the derivative action in their respective jurisdictions. It was not the fault of the Faculty of Law of the National University of Singapore, the Asian Law Institute or the Centre for Commercial Law Studies, all of which generously sponsored and supported this project by providing funding to bring our experts together. It was definitely not the fault of the fine administrators at NUS (particularly Elizabeth Chua) or the student research assistants (particularly Lance Lim, Seah Hui Wen and Timothy Woon), who all did an exceptional job facilitating our research. The editors cannot even blame their wives, Norah and Karen, as they provided much more care and support than the editors could ever have hoped for or deserved. Perhaps the failure was not the fault of the editors either.

Rather, the blame lies squarely with the fascinating, but intensely complex, reality of the derivative action in Asia. As this book explains, this reality does not lend itself to the production of grand theories or universal themes. To the contrary, in the course of illuminating the complexity of the derivative action in this book, we challenge several of the grand theories that have defined comparative corporate law over the last two decades. In addition, by doing so, this book illuminates the



XX PREFACE

critical importance of each jurisdiction's domestic context (which includes its unique laws, institutions, economic incentives and sociopolitical environment) for reaching an accurate understanding of how the derivative action in Asia functions.

In this sense, our 'failure' may perhaps be our success. We feel that it is time for the field of comparative corporate law to leave aside grand theories and move towards focusing on the reality of the complex details of how corporate law actually works in practice across multiple jurisdictions. Our book aims to make a start in this direction.

Dan W. Puchniak Harald Baum Michael Ewing-Chow Singapore/Hamburg, May 2011



### **ABBREVIATIONS**

A.C. Law Reports Appeal Cases

ACSR Australian Corporation and Securities Reports

AIR All India Reporter

AktG Aktiengesetz (German Stock Corporation Act)

ALI American Law Institute
All ER All England Law Reports

art. Article

ASIC Australian Securities and Investment Committee

B.C.C. British Company Law Cases
BCLC Butterworths Company Law Cases
CA 2006 Companies Act 2006 (UK)

CASAC Companies and Securities Advisory Committee (Australia)

CEO chief executive officer

Ch, Ch D Law Reports, Chancery Division

CLB Company Law Board

CLRFC Company Legislation and Regulatory Framework Committee

(Singapore)

CLS company limited by shares

Cmnd Command Paper

CMS controlling minority shareholder
COR contemporary ownership rule
CPR Amended Civil Procedure Rules

CSRC China Securities Regulatory Commission

Ct. court

D&O directors' and officers' (liability insurance)

DA derivative action

DEC Dutch Enterprise Chamber

Del. Delaware
Dist. Ct. district court

DLR Dominion Law Reports

Doc. document

ECGI European Corporate Governance Institute

ER England Reports

EWCA England and Wales Court of Appeal

FIE foreign-invested enterprise

xxi



Cambridge University Press

978-1-107-01227-1 - The Derivative Action in Asia: A Comparative and Functional Approach Edited by Dan W. Puchniak, Harald Baum and Michael Ewing-Chow

Frontmatter

More information

XXII LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

FRCP Federal Rules of Civil Procedure (United States)
FSC Financial Supervisory Commission (Taiwan)
GVIO gross value of industrial output (China)

Hare Hare's Chancery Reports

HC, High Ct. High Court
HKC Hong Kong cases

HKCFAR Hong Kong Court of Final Appeal Reports
HKLRD Hong Kong Law Reports and Digest
IMF International Monetary Fund

inc. incorporated

J for D judgment for defendant J for P judgment for plaintiff

JORF Journal Officiel de la République Française (France, Official

Gazette)

JV joint venture

KCC (South) Korean Commercial CodeKO Kabunushi Onbuzuman (Japan)Lah Lahore Series (Indian Law Reports)

LLC limited liability company

LR Law Reports

MBCA Model Business Corporation Act (United States)

NASDAO National Association of Securities Dealers Automated Quotations

NCLT National Company Law Tribunal (India)

NGO non-governmental organization NPO non-profit organization NYSE New York Stock Exchange

OECD Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development

OTC over the counter

PACAP Pacific-Basin Capital Markets

PC Privy Council

plc public limited company PRC People's Republic of China

PSLRA Private Securities Litigation Reform Act (United States)
Q.B. Queen's Bench / Law Reports, Queen's Bench cases

r., rr. rule, rules

ROHGE Entscheidungen des Reichsoberhandelsgerichts (Germany,

decisions of former Supreme Court)

s., ss. section, sections SC Session cases

SCAA Securities Class Action Act (South Korea)

SCAP Supreme Commander for the Allied Powers (Japan)
SCCL Security Cares Consultancy Limited (Hong Kong)



LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

xxiii

SCCLR Standing Committee on Company Law Reform (Hong Kong)

SEBI Securities and Exchange Board of India

SEC Securities and Exchange Commission (United States)
SER Solidarity for Economic Reform (South Korea)

SFIPC Securities and Futures Investors Protection Center (Taiwan)

SGCA Singapore Court of Appeal (unreported judgments)
SGHC Singapore High Court (unreported judgments)
SIAC Singapore International Arbitration Centre

SLC special litigation committee
SLR Singapore Law Reports
SOE state-owned enterprise

SPC Supreme People's Court (China)
UCLA University of California, Los Angeles

UMAG Gesetz zur Unternehmensintegrität und Modernisierung des

Anfechtungsrechts (Germany, Act regarding the Integrity of

Companies and Modernization of Shareholder Rights to Bring

Actions)

WLR Weekly Law Reports

