

Index

- academics, role** 2–3, 13, 16, 26, 81–2, 84–5
 - Germany 14, 77, 78, 91, 93, 125–7
 - Japan 67, 68, 74, 75, 79, 84, 99, 101, 219, 224–7, 247–8, 251–2, 255–6
 - UK 78–9, 130, 167–8, 170–1, 172
 - US 15, 38–40, 67, 78, 173–4, 188–9, 197–9, 212–13
- alternative dispute resolution mechanisms (including arbitration and mediation)**
 - circumstances conducive to 36, 37
 - Model Remedy as aid 298–9
- appraisal/dissenters' rights**
 - availability (Germany, Japan, US) 30
 - absence (UK) 30 n80
 - definition 30
 - as form of 'exit' 30
 - entitlement 30
 - grounds
 - examples 30
 - statutory determination of 30, 31
 - procedure
 - completion of 'exit' 30–1
 - complex procedural formalities 30, 31
 - dependence on triggering event/examples 31
 - eclectic and incoherent nature of triggers 31 n90
 - limitation of liability to pay for shares to the corporation 31
 - limited applicability 31
 - withdrawal distinguished 31–2
 - liability for payment to shareholder 31
 - link to close corporation conflict 31
 - open-ended nature of grounds for 31
 - standing requirements 31
- arbitration**
 - Commonwealth practice 166
 - creation of new law, limited contribution to 44
 - withdrawal, possible resolution of disputes
 - Germany 120
 - Model Remedy 262, 272, 298
 - UK 137, 166

Australia

- distancing from UK legal system 132 n27
- incorporation (from state to federal) 174 n2

Canada

- distancing from UK legal system 132 n27
- incorporation (federal/provincial options) 174 n2
- reasonable expectations 149: *see also* expectations

Cayman Islands 161 n319, 300

close corporation law overview: *see also* close corporation law (Japan) (historical context/KKs and YKs); close corporation law (Japan) (GKs); close corporation law (Japan) (membership companies); close corporation law (US) (overview); GmbHs (Germany) (overview), legal aspects, business corporation core principles; Ltds (UK) (overview), core features deriving from shared plc ancestry/statutory yoking with plcs; quasi-partnerships (UK), definition/core features; US-CCs (legal aspects), business corporations' five core structural characteristics

business corporation core principles, conformity with

- legal separation of share/equity ownership and management power 21
- separate legal personality (entity shielding) 21

business corporation core principles, deviation from

- management structures/flexibility in involvement of the membership
 - conflict between majority/controlling and minority shareholders as major challenge 23
 - separation between ownership and control as defining feature 22
 - mandatory/constitutional restrictions on the transfer of membership interests 21–2
 - minority's risk of losing all prospect of return on their investment 21

cardinal problems

- conflict between majority/controlling and minority shareholders 13, 20, 23
- difficulty of restoring broken trust/resuming status ante-quo 20
- inter-shareholder exploitation 13

'close corporation', difficulty of definition 21

- Model Withdrawal Agreement 262

[majority–minority] shareholder conflict, causes

- business disagreements 23
- freezeout/squeeze-out/oppression 23–4
- interpersonal relations 23

minority's structural vulnerability/lack of an escape route 24

shareholder exit

- as important source of protection for minority shareholders 13, 24
- issues for consideration
 - definitions 13
 - distinction from related shareholder protection/dispute resolution concepts 13
 - implementation of withdrawal 13
- withdrawal as only category adequately addressing shareholder protection 13

close corporation law (Japan) (historical context/KKs and YKs)

KKs (legal aspects)

- share transfer restrictions, possibility of 220
- simplified management option (*Kaishahō*) 220
- stock corporation status 219–20
 - formalisation (1890 Commercial Code) 220 n13

KKs (use of)

- continuing dominance of the close corporation options 220
- post-WWII popularity with small/very small companies 220, 227
- statistics
 - 1980 221 n14

- 1996 221 n14
- 2005 221 n14
- 2006–19 220, 253
- 2016 220
- target (large, publicly traded corporations) 220
- withdrawal remedies, absence: *see also* withdrawal (Japan) (*taisha*) (history and concept)
- aggrieved shareholders' responses to 15
 - applications for court orders suspending impugned director 223–4
 - legal challenge to alleged non-compliance with legal formalities 223–4
 - success/failure of law suit, relevance 224–5
 - threatening disclosure of illegal activities 223
- contractual/constitution arrangements providing for withdrawal, insignificant evidence of 222
- legal workarounds, problems
 - as abuse of legal system 225
 - judicial discretion, insensitive use of 77, 225
 - restricted-transfer shares exit mechanism, status 222
- withdrawal remedies, opting for corporate forms (Kks/YKs) without evidence of preference 227
 - relevant factors
 - KK/YK accounting standards 228–9
 - limitation to an either-or choice 227
 - social credibility of KK incorporation/director titles 228, 229
 - tax advantages 228
- withdrawal remedies (Reform Proposal (1986))
 - academic support for 227
 - failure of
 - 1989 (Commercial Law Subcommittee's determination (1989) that the issues were too difficult to resolve together) 226 n59
 - 1990 (approval of redrafted Reform Bill (minus withdrawal reforms)) 226 n59
 - failure of, possible reasons
 - enforcement issues 227
 - lack of judicial support 77, 226–7
 - procedural problems 227
 - lack of clarity on key issues
 - appointment of designated purchaser 226 n58
 - 'representative director', role 226 n56
 - text 226
- YKs (legal aspects)
 - German GmbH as model 10, 221
 - introduction (*YK-hō* (1938)) 220
 - YK-hō* as self-standing law 220
 - limited liability corporation status 220
 - repeal of *YK-hō* (2005) 222
 - forced conversion of YKs into Kks 222
 - remaining ex-YKs 222
 - special transitional governing provisions 222
 - suitability for small businesses 221
- YKs (*YK-Kō*'s poor drafting as reason for lack of success) 221
 - YK-Kō*'s poor drafting and structure
 - excessive length/duplication of the *Shōhō* 221
 - poor nomenclature/misunderstanding of 'limited' 221
 - poor reputation 221
 - recruitment problems 221

- close corporation law (Japan) (GKs):** *see also* close corporation law (Japan) (membership companies)
- origins and features
 - LLC (US) as model 230, 233
 - marked differences 233
 - pass-through taxation as objective/Ministry of Finance opposition 230
 - evaluation and prospects
 - disappointments
 - denial of promised pass-through tax advantages 252
 - doubtful success as a legal transplant 252
 - poor brand name recognition 252
 - poor choice of terms/status implications 252
 - foreign influences
 - current predominance of US LLC influence 15, 254–5
 - German GmbH/decline in 83–4, 217, 254–5
 - importance of broadening 254–5
 - issues for the future
 - limited jurisprudence 256
 - uncertainty 15, 256
 - withdrawn member's ability to enforce their entitlement to refund of their membership interest 256
 - joint ventures, distorting focus on 241, 243, 246, 255–6
 - a turning tide
 - GKs as the only viable close corporation form with withdrawal option 256–7
 - likelihood of greater understanding of withdrawal regime 254
 - statistical evidence of 253, 256
 - legal basis (*Kaishahō*) 230
 - membership company status 230
- close corporation law (Japan) (membership companies)**
- classification as
 - GKs: *see* close corporation law (Japan) (GKs)
 - hybrid forms 230
 - incorporated commercial partnerships 230
 - incorporated limited partnerships 230
 - features distinguishing membership companies from KKs
 - absence of pass-through taxation advantage 232
 - conceptual identity of members and corporate organs 231
 - freedom in contractual ordering 231
 - optimisation for small organisations/joint ventures 231–2
 - personalistic nature 231–2
 - scope for transferability of membership interests 232
 - as a new category of corporation 230
 - a category of convenience 230
 - as attempt to resolve issues with the *Shōhō*. 230–1
 - creation by legislative fiat without regard to historical and doctrinal origins 231
 - dedicated section of the *Kaisha-hō* 230
 - prospects
 - GKs as only viable membership company 232
 - incorporated commercial/limited partnerships
 - liability issues 232
 - unpopularity (2018) 232 n110
 - terminology
 - 'corporate constitution' (*teikan*) as preferred term 233
 - 'executive member' vs 'director' 233
 - 'GK', reasons for use of 233
 - 'member' (*sha'in*)

- as equity investor 233
 - 'shareholder' (*kabu'nushi*) distinguished 233
 - 'membership companies' (*mochibun kaisha*) 230, 233
 - 'membership interests' (*mochibun*)
 - stock (*kabu*) (KKs) distinguished 233
 - 'refund' (*Kaishahō*, Art. 6(11)) and 'buyout' distinguished 244–5
- close corporation law (US) (overview)**
 - applicable law (*lex incorporationis*) 173
 - contractarianism's long shadow
 - key features 212–13
 - LLCs, particular influence over/as fundamental principle of 201–2, 213, 215
 - peak of influence (1980s/1990s) 212–13
 - economic status 173
 - influence on Japanese law 83–4, 217
 - jurisprudence, citation of in UK courts 132
 - LLCs: *see* LLCs (US)
 - multiplicity of jurisdictions/statutes and bodies of case law 14
 - convergence/harmonisation, limitations 174
 - as obstacle to meaningful understanding and application 212
 - two distinct sets of entities (US–CCs/LLCs) 10, 173, 212
 - sources of corporate law
 - model laws/uniform acts 174
 - state laws 174
 - terminology and general approach to
 - broad-brush approach avoiding singling out a dominant state or law 175
 - 'close corporation' (US–CCs) 175
 - excluded 'territories' 174
 - 'formation' (LLCs) 175
 - 'incorporation' (US–CCs) 175
 - 'Limited Liability Company' (LLC) 175
 - US CCs, diversity of views 213
 - US–CCs: *see* US–CCs
- contractarianism:** *see* close corporation law (US) (overview), contractarianism's long shadow; contractarianism (contractarians' position); contractarianism (contractarians' position), responses to; contractarianism (UK)
- contractarianism (contractarians' position)**
 - basis (essentially contractual nature of corporate law) 39
 - 'everything is negotiable' 39
 - 'prospective shareholders should know the risks'/it's their own fault' 39
 - reasons for classification as contract/contractual elements 40
 - supplementary nature of mandatory forms/need for affirmation 39–40
 - categorisation of legal norms
 - default norms 38
 - 'enabling' norms 38–9
 - 'mandatory' norms 38
 - extra-contractual mechanisms, exclusion as relief from a bad bargain 39
 - market failure as possible exception 39
 - increasing dominance 38
 - shareholders as utility-maximizing rational participants (*homo economicus* model) 44–6
- contractarianism (contractarians' position), responses to**
 - inevitability of incomplete contracting
 - classic contractual relationship, limitations as a model
 - one-off bargain vs long-term commitment 40
 - renegotiation and amendment mechanisms (unanimous consent vs majority rule) 40, 41

- contractarianism (contractarians' position), responses to** (cont.)
 impossibility of eliminating ex ante all risk of shareholder conflict 40, 41
 or of predetermining solutions to individual solutions 41–2
 voluntary majority 'bonding' ex ante to withdrawal access
 reasons for 46
 watertight commitment, poor chances of 46–7
- shareholders as utility-maximizing rational participants (*homo economicus* model) 44
 reasons for prospective shareholders not spoiling the deal/seeking a right to withdrawal 45–6
 erosion of trust 45
 restoration/vindication of trust
 importance 45–6
 withdrawal mechanisms as default/mandatory feature, desirability 46
 waiver/limitation of right to withdrawal, justification 46, 47–55: *see also* withdrawal, waiver/limitation of right to, justification
- withdrawal as solution to the incomplete contracting problem 42–4
 advantages 42
 problems (withdrawal at will) 42
 withdrawal 'on grounds' as solution 42–4: *see also* withdrawal 'on grounds'
- contractarianism (UK)**
 campaigns against mandatory rules 212–13
 judicial attachment to 135–8, 167–70
- convergence (shareholder exit/withdrawal)** 81–9
 corporate law convergence in areas other than withdrawal, possibility of 303
 definitions
 functional convergence 84
 spontaneous convergence 16, 66, 84, 85, 292, 293
 functional convergence (withdrawal on grounds)
 Germany/Japan (insurance model)
 common features 86–7, 292
 regimes as inclusive but contingent forms of member protection 87, 292
 narrow scope of 293
 two-way split (Germany/Japan and UK/US) 86–7, 302–3
 common problem/common aim 88, 89
 UK/US (corrective model)
 common features 87–8, 292–3
 compensatory function 88
 deterrent effect 88
 fault as dominating principle 87–8
 original omission of withdrawal from the debate 84–5
 widespread endorsement of withdrawal remedies 13
- courts, role:** *see* judges, role
- dissolution:** *see* judicial dissolution; LLCs (US) (withdrawal), grounds for withdrawal; US–CCs (withdrawal as remedy for oppression), buyout remedy variants; withdrawal, concept of/terminology
- election statute:** *see* close corporation (US–CCs) (withdrawal as remedy for oppression), buyout remedy variants
- enforcement:** *see* GmbHs (Germany) (withdrawal for good cause) (*Austritt aus wichtigem Grund*) (concept); LLCs (US) (withdrawal); payment obligations following withdrawal; unfair prejudice remedy (UK) (withdrawal: enforcement); US–CCs, oppression relief, analysis of states' approaches to; withdrawal (Japan) (*taisha*) (enforcement of claim to refund (GKs)) (creditor protection)
- equitable expectations:** *see* expectations

- exit:** *see* appraisal/dissenters' rights; judicial dissolution; withdrawal, concept of/terminology
- expectations:** *see* expectations (equitable considerations (UK)); expectations (expectations as to basis of relationship/business); expectations (formal written rules) (UK); expectations (legitimate expectations (UK)); expectations ('reasonable expectations' (New Zealand/Canada)); expectations (unfair prejudice remedy (UK)) (expectations as to participation in management); expectations (unfair prejudice remedy (UK)) (expectations as to returns on investment)
- expectations (equitable considerations (UK))**
- applicability 143, 149–50
 - dependence on company relationship going beyond formal documents 150: *see also* quasi-partnerships
 - pre-*O'Neill* 149 n193
 - burden of proof 150
 - clear promise requirement 148
 - as constraint, restraint or other qualification of written/formal rules 143
 - contractual basis (*O'Neill*) 148
 - straitjacket 149
 - 'equity', limited consideration of theory 148
 - as informal, unwritten expectations 66, 147–8
 - constraining/qualifying formal, written rules 143, 147–8
 - limitation to quasi-partnerships 74, 87
 - 'reasonable expectations' (Commonwealth) compared 148–9
 - unfair prejudice as sole remedy 143
- expectations (expectations as to basis of relationship/business)**
- Hong Kong 155
 - Singapore 155
 - UK 155
- expectations (formal written rules) (UK) 68**
- contractual/statutory expectations 143
 - binding nature 143
 - per se unlawfulness of breach 143
 - remedies 143
 - corporate constitution, breaches as unfair prejudice 143
 - trivial or technical infringement exception 143
 - corporate constitution/shareholder agreement, distinctions 145
 - quasi-regulatory expectations
 - examples of non-qualifying breaches 143, 147
 - Tobian Properties* (Arden LJ) 147
 - shareholder agreement
 - possibility of unfair prejudice 145
 - relief in contract 145
 - withdrawal/exit options 145
 - statutory and common law
 - breach of directors' duties
 - common law avoidance of conflicts duties codified in the Companies Act 2006 146
 - as most important class of cases 146
 - rarity of cases 146 n169
 - statutory skill of care duties 146–7
 - non-compliance as ground for unfair practice relief 146
 - statute/subsidiary legislation 146
 - universal applicability 146
- expectations (informal, unwritten expectations):** *see* expectations (equitable considerations (UK))
- expectations (legitimate expectations (UK)):** *see also* expectations (equitable considerations (UK))
- disruptive impact of *O'Neill* 170

- expectations (legitimate expectations (UK)):** (cont.)
 - judicial development 169–70
 - as a non-contractual code of conduct 169–70
 - post-*O'Neill* redesignation as ‘equitable expectations’ 143, 149, 169
 - quasi-partnerships and 169
- expectations (‘reasonable expectations’ (New Zealand/Canada))**
 - ‘fairness’ vs contractual basis 149
 - promise less than clear, sufficiency 149
 - pros/cons 149
 - quasi-contractual basis, relevance 149
- expectations (‘reasonable expectations’ (US-CCs)):** *see* US-CCs, oppression relief, analysis of states’ approaches to, classic trichotomy
- expectations (unfair prejudice remedy (UK)) (expectations as to participation in management)**
 - as most commonly invoked ground 66, 150
 - removal of directors (Companies Act 168(1)) 150
 - absence of shareholder entitlement to director status 150–1
 - quasi-partnership members’ expectations 151
 - circumvention 150 n202
 - defences
 - consent of petitioner 152
 - fair buyout offer 153
 - fault of petitioner 58–9, 152–3
 - examples
 - absence of protective expectation 151–2
 - presumptively unfairly prejudicial removals 151
- expectations (unfair prejudice remedy (UK)) (expectations as to returns on investment)**
 - dividends
 - circumstances in which non-payment might be unfairly prejudicial 153
 - defences
 - commercial justification 154
 - petitioner’s consent/acquiescence 154
 - directors’ retention of profits in the company in disregard of member’s interests 153–4
 - failure of directors to consider issue of dividends/adopt a dividend policy. 154
 - dividends/remuneration, distinction 153
 - remuneration
 - breach of an understanding that remuneration would be paid as 154
 - defences
 - fair buyout offer 155
 - petitioner’s consent/acquiescence 155
 - excessive remuneration cases post-*O'Neill* 156
 - evidence (expert) 157
 - evidence (publicly available guidelines) 157
 - gross unreasonableness test 157
 - ‘remuneration not justifiable by objective commercial criteria’ test 157
 - non-payment in absence of an understanding 154
 - petitioner’s complaints against remuneration of directors/other employees
 - breach of clear legal rules/formal contractual terms 154
 - breach of informal agreements/understandings 154–5
 - courts’ reluctance to intervene 154
- expulsion**
 - availability (German, Japan, UK, US) 32
 - limitations as a remedy 32

financial liability: *see* payment obligations following withdrawal

foreign influence, modest impact

Germany 81–2

Japan 83–4

UK 82

US 82–3

Germany: *see* GmbHs; judges, role, Germany (in tandem with academics)

GmbHs (Germany): *see* GmbHs (Germany) (overview); GmbHs (Germany) (withdrawal at will)

(*ordentliches Austrittsrecht*); GmbHs (Germany) (withdrawal) (*Austritt*); GmbHs (Germany)

(withdrawal for good cause) (*Austritt aus wichtigem Grund*) (concept)

GmbHs (Germany) (overview)

economic aspects

economic impact 97

popularity (2015 statistics) 96

KG/hybrid growth 96

UG growth 96

popularity (SME sector) 96–7

history in date order

Oechelhäuser's proposal for a limited liability companies Act (1884) 92

enactment of the GmbHG (1892) 92

GmbH-Novelle reforms (1980) 92

ECJ's landmark decisions on the freedom of establishment (1999–2000) 93

establishment of UK Ltds for purpose of business in Germany (2004–8) 93

DJT's vote against easing of minimum share requirements (2006) 93

enactment of the MoMiG in response to the Ltd threat (2008) 93–4

declaration of victory over the UK Ltd (2 September 2010) 93–4

decline in the number of German branches registered by UK companies (2010–2016) 94

reasons for 94

legal aspects

business corporation core principles, conformity with (legal personality/limited liability) 94

business corporation core principles, divergence from 94–6

management structures/flexibility in involvement of the membership 94–5, 104

scope for constitutional deviation 95

transferability of membership interests 94

GmbH, classification

association (*Verein*) 95

'capital-based company' (*Kapitalgesellschaft*) 95

civil law partnership (*Gesellschaft bürgerlichen Rechts*) 95

commercial company (*Handelsgesellschaft*) (Commercial Code) 95

commercial partnership with unlimited liability (*offene Handelsgesellschaft*) (OHG) 96

corporation (*Körperschaft*) (Civil Code) 95

limited partnership (*Kommanditgesellschaft*) (KG) 96

'person-based company' (*Personengesellschaft*) 95

'silent partnership' (*stille Gesellschaft*) 95–6

SME/KMU (*kleine und mittlere Unternehmen*) 97

judicial and academic contribution to development of the law 14, 77, 78, 93, 125–6

other organisational forms 92 111

hybrid entities 96

Mittelstand 97

stock corporation (AG) 95

terminology 11–12, 94–6

GmbHs (Germany) (withdrawal at will) (*ordentliches Austrittsrecht*) (the debate)

arguments against

conflict of recognition of the right to withdraw at will with statutory provision for restrictions on transfer of membership rights 123

inappropriateness of person-based companies (*Personengesellschaften*) rules to GmbHs 122–3

sufficiency of existing possibilities 123

arguments in favour

political arguments 122

restrictions on/obstacles to transfer of membership interests, conflict with legislators' premise of transferability of 121

right to resign from a civil law (non-commercial) partnership (Civil Code) 121

applicability to GmbH members subject to *Nebenleistungen* 121

terminability of all legal relationships of long-term or indefinite duration

examples 120–1

as general principle of the law of obligations 120–1

stalemate, reasons for

German focus on fundamental, across-the-board legal principles 123–4

versatility and flexibility of the *wichtiger Grund* concept as sufficient answer 14, 124

who won?

at law (*wichtiger Grund* faction) 124–5

a draw 124–5

in practice (increasing popularity of withdrawal at will) 124–5

GmbHs (Germany) (withdrawal) (*Austritt*)

history in date order

GmbHG exclusion of unilateral withdrawal rights (1892) 97–8

continued exclusion 98–9

courts' refusal to draw on OHG withdrawal and expulsion provisions (Commercial Code) for

GmbHs (1892–1930) 98

Imperial Court of Justice's decision creating exception for GmbHs that imposed additional obligations on its members (*Nebenleistungs-GmbH*) 98

introduction of '*wichtiger Grund*' ('good cause') concept (Scholz's 1930 lecture) 99

1939 Ministry Draft of a reformed GmbHG 99–100

abandonment (outbreak of WWII) 100

inclusion of provisions for member withdrawal and expulsion 100

Imperial Court of Justice's recognition of expulsion not restricted to *Nebenleistungs-GmbH* (1942) 101

Federal Court's recognition of expulsion (1953) 101

1969 Ministry Draft of a reformed GmbHG 100–1

comparability with 1939 Ministry Draft

criticisms of 100

public consultations/minor changes 100

presentation of 1971 Government Draft to the Bundestag/premature closure of parliamentary session 100

resubmission of 1971 Government Draft (1973 Government Draft) 100

failure to stay the course for pressure of parliamentary business 100–1

as last statutory attempt to introduce withdrawal and expulsion into GmbH law 101

1980 reforms (GmbH-Novelle), omission of matters of exit from 101 n95

express recognition of withdrawal by Federal Court (1995) 77, 102

2008 reforms (MoMiG), omission of matters of exit from 101 n95

terminology

exit by expulsion (*Ausschluss*) and withdrawal (*Austritt*) 97 n64

GmbHs (Germany) (withdrawal for good cause) (*Austritt aus wichtigem Grund*) (concept)

availability

relevant factors

fault on the part of the member seeking withdrawal 105

- personalistic character (from essential to not necessary) 104
- transferability of membership interest 104–5
- test
 - balance of interest test 104
 - multifactorial, judicially developed and administered test of ‘unreasonableness’ or ‘unbearable-ness’ 103
- circumstances giving rise to (category I: behaviour of other members) (*Verhalten der Mitgesellschafter*) 68
- availability of legal alternatives to withdrawal on *wichtiger Grund*, relevance 105–6
- divided opinion 106, 107
- examples
 - freeze-out (*Aushungem*) of the minority 106
 - majority’s failure to take action in the face of a member’s serious breaches of the duty of loyalty 107
 - repeated refusal of the majority to permit the member to transfer membership interest 106
 - serious breakdown in the relationship between members/fault requirement 69, 107
- circumstances giving rise to (category II: GmbH circumstances (*Verhältnisse der Gesellschaft*)) 108–10
- dissolution alternative 108
- examples
 - change in the identity of the controlling majority 109
 - changes in the basis on which the GmbH is run 109
 - changes in the GmbH’s circumstances/detrimental effect on the member’s legal or economic position 108–9
 - non-qualifying changes 109–10
 - shift of the GmbH’s administrative seat to a foreign jurisdiction 109
 - significantly increasing business risk expansion in the GmbH’s scope of business or investment 109
 - sustained unprofitability 69, 108–9
 - withdrawal or expulsion of another member 109
- circumstances giving rise to (category III: personal grounds (*persönliche Gründe*))
 - close connection with the GmbH’s own circumstances/material connection to continued participation in the GmbH, need for/examples 110
 - change of residence 110
 - severe illness over a protracted period 110
 - personal circumstances irrelevant to the GmbH/examples
 - divided opinion 110–11
 - divorce between two co-members 110–11
 - financial difficulties 110
 - insolvency 110
- doctrinal basis (possible analogies)
 - duty of loyalty (*gesellschaftsrechtliche Treuepflicht*) 103
 - long-term relationship with legal obligations (*Dauerschuldverhältnis*) 103
 - resignation from a partnership 102
 - withdrawal from an association or cooperative 102
- enforcement
 - liability for payment (GmbH) 71, 119
 - possibilities for constitutional provisions on withdrawal enforcement 120
 - where GmbH disputes the existence of *wichtiger Grund* 118–19
 - where GmbH is unable to pay the compensation quantum lawfully/capital maintenance problems 72–3, 95 143, 102 1104, 110 1177, 114 1116, 119–20, 121 292
- as last resort/alternatives
 - dismissal of *Geschäftsführer* acting in breach of duty 112
 - exercise of contractual right 111
 - legal proceedings to set aside defective members’ resolutions 111
 - priority of withdrawal over dissolution 112
 - termination/modification of unreasonably onerous *Nebenleistung* 112

- GmbHs (Germany) (withdrawal for good cause) (*Austritt aus wichtigem Grund*) (concept) (cont.)**
- voluntary sale or transfer of membership interests 111
 - as mandatory right
 - exclusion or significant restriction of, prohibition 74, 112
 - scope for modification by agreement
 - addition of new 'significant' grounds for withdrawal 112
 - addition of right to withdraw at will (*ordentliches Austrittsrecht*) 112–13
 - exclusion of specific factual situations as a *wichtiger Grund* 72, 112
 - valuation (default position) 75, 116–18
 - actual value of GmbH as whole/going concern 116
 - court's discretion on method 116
 - elements 116
 - expert evidence, need for 116
 - liquidation value (*Liquidationswert*) 116–17
 - constitutional provision for departure from, restrictions
 - compensation quantum significantly disproportionate to the full market value 75, 117–18
 - on public policy grounds (Civil Code) 75, 117
 - exceptional circumstances permitting restriction of compensation to amount paid for acquisition of membership interest 75, 118
 - full market value (*Verkehrswert*) as starting point 116
 - membership interest's value (enterprise value multiplied by the percentage represented by the membership interest of the total) 117
 - methods
 - book value (*Buchwert*) 117
 - DCF 116, 117
 - determination by reference to the type of exit 118
 - earnings method (*Ertragswertmethode*) 116
 - net asset value method (*Substanzwertmethode*)/justification for use 116–17
 - pro rata share of the business as a going concern as starting point 72
 - valuation date (*Bewertungsstichtag*) 117
 - withdrawal procedure 111–12
 - completion of exit
 - dependence on agreement on compensation 115
 - dependence on GmbH cooperation 114
 - establishment of right to compensation for cancellation of membership interest or assignment to third party 113–14
 - irrevocability without approval of the GmbH 113
 - declaration of withdrawal, effect
 - immediate effectiveness on receipt by the *Geschäftsführer* 113
 - declaration of withdrawal, requirements
 - absence of required form/need for court proceedings 113
 - transmittal to/receipt by the *Geschäftsführer* 113
 - unilateral, unconditional declaration by withdrawing member, sufficiency 113
 - impossibility of lawful payment of compensation/transfer of membership interest
 - possibility of constitutional departure from default position/examples 115
 - revival of membership interest 115
 - liability for payment of compensation 71, 115
 - status of member's rights and obligations between declaration and exit
 - continued full membership status until cancellation or assignment of interest/restrictions 114
 - on income rights 114
 - on voting rights 114
 - continuing applicability of duties/*Nebenleistung* exceptions 114–15
 - non-competition clause 15

- Japan:** *see* close corporation law (Japan); withdrawal (Japan) (*taisha*)
- joint ventures (Japan)** 231–2, 241, 243, 246, 255–6
- judges, role:** *see also* academics, role; legislators, role
 overview
 crucial importance of 79, 291
 judicial intransigence/foot-dragging 296
 judicial overturn/neutralisation of precedent/statute, risk of 297–8
 protection against 297–8
 legitimacy of judges' leadership in development of the law 79–80, 291, 297
 Germany (in tandem with academics)
 circumvention of GmbHG exclusion of withdrawal 14, 67, 91, 125–7
 filling the GmbHG vacuum 101
 Nebenleistungs-GmbH exception (1930) 77, 98–9, 101
 opposition to withdrawal/expulsion (pre-1930) 98
 Japan
 1980s reform attempt, reluctance to support 72, 80, 226–7
 2005 introduction of GK withdrawal regime, absence of jurisprudence 77
 UK
 commitment to contractarian vision of company law 135–8, 167–70
 failure to develop 'withdrawal' as alternative to judicial dissolution 135
 a poor track record 78, 80, 129–30
 restrictive interpretation of 'oppression' remedy 135–6
 continuing preference for judicial dissolution 136
 unfair prejudice/*O'Neill* 14, 130, 137–8, 168–9
 absence/suppression of articulated dissent 170–1
 unfettered discretion, effect/scope for misuse 78, 135–6, 139
 US
 LLCs (an open question) 78
 US–CC (positive/not hostile) 78
 valuation issued 298
- judicial dissolution:** *see also* LLCs (US) (withdrawal), grounds for withdrawal; US–CCs (withdrawal as remedy for oppression), buyout remedy variants; withdrawal, concept of/terminology
 definitions
 'administrative dissolution' 28 n66
 'dissolution' 28
 'judicial dissolution' 28
 effect of 29
 as form of 'exit' 29
 as oldest method of exit from a close corporation 28
 unpopularity of, reasons
 risk of failed attempt worsening the situation 29–30
 risk of rewarding the majority for squeezing out the minority 29
 serious negative consequences for stakeholders and society 29
- legislators, role:** *see also* academics, role; judges, role; Model Withdrawal Remedy
 civil law jurisdictions (a back seat)
 Germany (failure of legislative attempts at reform)/judicial development of the law 76, 291
 Japan
 1986 reform attempts, failure 76: *see also* close corporation law (Japan) (historical context/KKs and KYs)
 2005 Kaishahō 89
 statutory basis of withdrawal remedies 291
 common law jurisdictions (decisive role)

legislators, role: (cont.)

UK

Companies Act 1980 ('a great legislative achievement') 76

Companies Act 2006 ('no credit') 76

statutory basis of withdrawal remedies 291

US

LLCs (prioritisation of tax policy issues)/statutory basis 77, 291

US-CCs ('a fair job')/non-statutory basis 77, 291

prospects

Model Withdrawal Remedy as contribution 295–6

risks

judicial intransigence/foot-dragging 296

unwilling legislators 296

UNCITRAL/EU Models (inclusion of right to withdrawal) 295

legitimate expectations: *see* expectations (legitimate expectations (UK))**LLCs (US):** *see* LLCs (US) (overview); LLCs (US) (withdrawal)**LLCs (US) (overview)**

history in date order

Kintner Regulations (1960) 200–1

Hamilton Brothers attempt to establish an alternative business entity

in Alaska (1975–76) (failure) 199

in Florida (1982) (success) 199

in Wyoming (1977) (success) 199

adoption of statutes by all US states 200

IRS Revenue Ruling 88–76 (1977) (right of entities to choose their own taxation status) as turning point 14–15, 200, 215–17

reversal of statutory provision for withdrawal at will 200–1, 215–16

gradual codification of withdrawal as oppression relief 216–17

economic aspects

apparent widening of the gap in favour of LLC 203

statistics

absence of national statistics 202–3

commentators' 201–2

IRS 202

legal aspects

contractarianism as fundamental principle 201–2

state statutes as supplementary fallback 202

LLCs as blend of partnerships and business corporations 201–2

management structure 202

management/transferable interests 202

non-negotiable business corporations' five core structural characteristics 202

state statutes

diversity 202

increasing harmonisation with Uniform Acts 201

LLCs as creatures of 201

Uniform Acts (ULLCA 1996, RULLCA 2006 and ULLCA 2013) 201

LLCs (US) (withdrawal): *see also* LLCs (US) (withdrawal); unfair prejudice remedy (UK) (procedure);

US-CCs (withdrawal as remedy for oppression), buyout remedy variants, liability for payment

enforcement

LLC statutes/RULLCA/ULLCA 2013, absence of provisions 211

ULLCA 1996, detailed provision for 210

facilitation of flexible payment including by instalment 211

legal and expert expenses, possibility of payment 211

prioritisation of dissociated member's monetary claim/subordination 211, 212

- procedural framework for determining purchase price 211
 - rules on parties' obligations 211
 - structured proceeding in case of default 211
- grounds for withdrawal
 - 'not reasonably practicable to carry on'/deadlock (judicial dissolution)
 - ULLCA/most state statutes 209
 - withdrawal as alternative to dissolution option 209–10
 - oppression (buyout as direct statutory remedy) 209
 - Michigan's provision for 209
 - possibility of contractual opt-out 209
 - oppression (buyout as dissolution alternative)
 - growing popularity/inclusion in LLC statutes and ULLCA 207
 - liability for payment 70, 71
 - US–CC oppression doctrine as appropriate standard 207
 - qualification of dissolution mechanism as a form of withdrawal remedy
 - examples 208
 - indirect remedies ('election statute') 208
 - judicial facilitation of plaintiff member's interest requirement 74, 208
 - right to mix and match grounds and remedies 208
 - RULLCA/ULLCA 2013 provisions 208
 - Uniform Act states' express provision for 208
 - states offering judicial dissolution but not withdrawal 210
- terminology
 - 'dissociation' 203–4
 - 'membership'/'transferable interest' distinction 202, 204
 - 'withdrawal at will' 204
- valuation
 - default valuation date 210
 - 'fair value'/'fair market value' 211
 - interest, provision for
 - rarity 211
 - ULLCA 1966-type statutes 211
 - minority and marketability discounts 72, 211
 - operating agreement provisions on 211
 - rarity of LLC provision for 201
- withdrawal at will (dissociation etc)
 - entry into effect when the LLC 'knows or has express notice' of member's intention 206
 - legal consequences
 - loss of status and rights as a member 206
 - termination of member's obligations with respect to matters arising after dissociation 206
 - personal obligations to the LLC or other members distinguished 206
 - provision for
 - default vs mandatory right 74, 204–5, 215
 - non-ULLCA states. 204–5
 - ULLCA/Uniform Act states 204
 - rights to payment 205–6, 215–16
 - wrongful dissociation, remedies (including damages)
 - absence of statutory provision 207
 - examples of statutory provision 206–7
- Ltds (UK) (overview)**
 - background/history 9–10
 - company vs partnership (Joint Stock Companies Act 1844) 130
 - incorporation
 - conferral (statute) 130

Ltds (UK) (overview) (cont.)

- as of right (Joint Stock Companies Act 1844) 131
- limited liability, introduction
 - Joint Stock Companies Act 1856 131
 - Limited Liability Act 1855 131
 - in Scotland 131
- non-statutory origins
 - legislation (close corporation withdrawal), problems with 129–30
- private vs public company, emergence of distinction 130–1
 - circumvention of the seven-member statutory requirement pre-1907 131
 - single-member companies (statutory endorsement of judicial precedent (1907)) 131
 - statutory recognition of private company (Companies Act 1907) 131
- continuity/ongoing popularity of Ltds 131
 - in non-UK jurisdictions 134
 - statistics
 - 1907–2005 132–3
 - 1997–2006 (Germany) 134
 - 2006–20 (table) 133
 - 2011 (EU member states) 134
- core features deriving from shared plc ancestry/statutory yoking with plcs
 - centralised management 131
 - distinguishability from plcs 9–10
 - investor ownership 131
 - limited liability 131
 - popularity and dominance 131, 132–4
 - powers/constraints 131–2
 - separate legal personality 131
 - transferability of shares 131
- cross-fertilisation
 - impact in Germany 93–4
 - ongoing influence of UK law on Commonwealth law 14, 129, 132
 - as pre-Brexit choice for operating within the EU 129
 - UK citation of non-UK jurisprudence
 - Commonwealth decisions 132
 - Hong Kong 29
 - USA 132
- equitable expectations: *see* expectations
- UK's international economic and legal status
 - UK Ltd pre-Brexit 129
- unfair prejudice *see* unfair prejudice remedy (UK)
- withdrawal, methodology for exploring 130

membership companies: *see* close corporation law (Japan)

methodology

- choice of jurisdictions, reasons for 8–9, 295–6
- comparative law alternative
 - creation of broad framework/use of hypothetical cases, limitations 6–7
 - 'leximetrics'/numerical comparative law', definition and limitations 5–6
 - limitation of analysis to a small number of jurisdictions/languages, limitations 6
 - multi-author approach (thematic/conceptual framework chapters plus jurisdiction-specific chapters), limitations 7
 - tripartite approach (author's choice)/summary of application 7–8, 12–16, 301–2: *see also* tripartite approach, summary of application *below*
- entities selected for analysis

- as distinct categories 10
- GmbHs (Germany)
 - as earliest close corporation form 9
 - influence on close corporation forms in other jurisdictions including Japan 9, 10, 221
- KKs/YKs/GKs (Japan) 10
- Ltds (UK)
 - non-statutory origin 9
- US-CCs/US LLCs
 - multiplicity of jurisdictions/statutes and bodies of case law 10
- terminology 11–12: *see also* close corporation law (Japan) (membership companies), terminology; GmbHs (Germany) (overview), terminology; LLCs (US) (withdrawal), terminology; withdrawal, concept of; withdrawal, concept of/terminology
- tripartite approach, summary of application 12–16, 201–2: *see also* close corporation law overview
 - operation (comparative overview/jurisdiction-specific analyses of withdrawal remedies) 13–14
 - model withdrawal remedy 14, 15–16
 - salient features differentiating approaches to withdrawal 14
 - suitability/unsuitability for use 301–2
 - theory (close corporation/withdrawal) 13
- Model Withdrawal Remedy:** *see* Model Withdrawal Remedy (overview); Model Withdrawal Remedy (text); Model Withdrawal Remedy (text) (commentary on)
- Model Withdrawal Remedy (overview)** 259–62
 - deviating from the Model Remedy 282–5
 - ex post agreements (§ 36) 284–5
 - mandatory core (§§ 29 and 33) 283
 - simple defaults (§§ 31 and 35) 284
 - sticky defaults and enhanced requirements (§§ 30, 32 and 34) 283–4
 - guiding principles
 - finality 261, 293–4
 - functionality 261–2, 294
 - structured flexibility 261, 294
 - key features
 - balance between mandatory and default norms 260, 285
 - freedom from jurisdiction-specific rules 204
 - integration of insurance and correctional models 204
 - a third way 294
 - target readership
 - academic jurists working in areas other than corporate law 301
 - corporate law scholars 260
 - law reformers 260, 301
 - litigators and judges 260, 285
 - shareholders 285
 - transactional lawyers planning exit mechanisms 260, 285
- Model Withdrawal Remedy (text)** 262–85
 - definitions (§ 1)
 - agreement 262
 - close corporation 262
 - complainant 262
 - controller 262
 - equity 262
 - respondent 263
 - election to purchase
 - failure to complete election to purchase, complainant's enforcement rights (§ 22) 268
 - notification of notice of intent to all members (§ 18) 267

Model Withdrawal Remedy (text) (cont.)

- revocation of election, exclusion (§ 20) 268
- right of any member to elect to purchase complainant's equity in whole (§ 19) 267–8
- right to commence a valuation proceeding (§ 21) 268
- enforcement proceedings
 - complainant's right to commence proceedings (§ 13) 266
 - court's obligation to issue order (§ 15) 266
 - court's obligation not to make an order other than that under § 15/exceptions (§ 16) 267
 - respondent's right to challenge liability to pay (§ 24) 14
- monetary claim (§ 8(ii))
 - complainant's right to dissolve close corporation as of right 266
 - enforcement in case of default (§ 11(ii)) 266
 - equal ranking with claims of unsecured creditors (§ 12(1)) 266
 - exclusion of offset (§ 11(i)) 265
 - liability to pay in case of
 - § 4(i) withdrawal on fault grounds (§ 9(i)) 265
 - § 4(ii) withdrawal on non-fault grounds (§ 9(ii)) 265
- power to cure irregularities, join parties etc (§ 27) 270
- scope (§ 2) 263
- valuation proceedings
 - Court's role (§ 23) 268–9
 - methodology (§ 26) 269–70
 - other actions open to the court unless otherwise agreed by the parties (§ 26) 269–70
 - valuation formula (§ 24) 269
- withdrawal (effect)
 - date of entry into effect (§ 7) 264
 - establishment of complainant's monetary claim (§ 8(ii)) 265
 - release of complainant from obligations/indemnification in respect of outstanding obligations (§ 10) 265
 - termination of complainant's membership status (§ 8(i)) 265
- withdrawal grounds
 - at will, fault: non-fault (§ 3) 263
 - on a fault basis (§ 4i) 263
 - on a non-fault basis (§ 4(ii)) 263–4
- withdrawal procedure (notice of intent)
 - content (§ 5) 264
 - service (§ 6) 264

Model Withdrawal Remedy (text) (commentary on)

- challenges against withdrawal (§§ 16, 17) 276
- definitions (§ 1)
 - agreement 262
 - close corporation 262
 - controller 262
 - mandatory nature of 270, 272
 - third party arbiter 262
- election to purchase
 - notification of notice of intent to all members (§ 18) 273
 - purpose of provision 278
- enforcement
 - by dissolution (§ 12(ii)) 279
 - purpose 279
 - as sticky default 279
 - transfer of complainant's equity (§ 8(iii)) 278–9
 - flexibility options 278–9

- liability to pay
 - on default of persons at fault (§ 11(ii)) 278
 - equal ranking of claim with claims of unsecured creditors (§ 12(1)) 278
 - exclusion of offset (§ 11(i)) 282
 - striking the balance 276–7
 - withdrawal at will (§ 9(iii)) 278
 - withdrawal on fault grounds (§ 9(i)) 277
 - withdrawal on non-fault grounds (§ 9(ii)) 265, 277
- procedural provisions, status as 273
- valuation proceedings
 - adjustments, structuring payments, interest (§ (ii)–(iv)) 281
 - court's role 279, 280
 - equity portion (§ 8(ii)) 280–1
 - compensation element (§ 8(ii)(b)/§ 25(ii)) 281
 - mandatory nature 281
 - finality, structured flexibility, and comprehensive functionality as target 279
 - mandatory nature (§ 29) 280
 - methodology (§ 26(i)) 280–1
 - valuation date (§ 25(1)) 280
 - valuation formula (§ 24)
 - as sticky default subject to enhanced requirements 280
 - without discounts 280
- withdrawal (effect)
 - release of complainant from obligations/indemnification in respect of outstanding obligations (§ 10) 281–2
- withdrawal grounds
 - at will, fault: non-fault (§ 3) 273
 - at will (§ 3(ii)) 276
 - on a fault basis (§ 4i) 273–4
 - 'act, omission, or course of conduct' 274
 - 'bad faith'/'non-bad faith' distinguished 274–5
 - on a non-fault basis (§ 4(ii))
 - examples 275
 - 'insurance model' as 275
 - liability for payment 275
 - sticky defaults 275, 276
- withdrawal procedure (notice of intent (§§ 6, 7 and 8)) 273–4
- New Zealand**
 - distancing from UK legal system 132 n27
 - reasonable expectations 149: *see also* expectations
- 'non-exit' solutions**
 - duties 34–6
 - expulsion 32
 - external interventions 36
 - judicial orders invalidating or restraining the execution of prejudicial acts 36–7
 - limitations 36–8
 - mediation 36
 - voice 33–4
- non-fault withdrawal (summary)** 291: *see also* unfair prejudice remedy (UK) (relationship with withdrawal ('share purchase order')); US–CCs, oppression relief, analysis of states' approaches to, non-fault judicially-ordered buyouts
- norms, definition** 26–7, 44

payment obligations following withdrawal

- effectiveness as protection of withdrawing shareholder's interests
 - compensation function 72
 - onerous capital maintenance rules (Germany/Japan/US) as obstacle to enforcement 72–3
 - valuation 72
- liability for
 - corporation itself 71, 115
 - co-shareholders at fault 70
 - innocent co-shareholders 71

private company limited by shares (UK): see Ltds (UK)**Privy Council (UK/Commonwealth)**

- appeals to (Cayman Islands) 161 n319
- appeals to (gradual abolition) 161 n319
- decisions as UK precedent 131 n110, 161 n319

protected expectations: see expectations**quasi-partnerships (UK)**

- applicable law
 - Companies Act/corporate constitution 149
 - equitable expectations/legitimate considerations 149–50: *see also* expectations
- as a close corporation 131
 - choice of director 132 n23
- definition/core features 143, 150
 - relevant factors (*Ebrahimi*)
 - personal relationship, involving mutual confidence 150
 - restriction upon the transfer of the members' interest in the company 150
 - shareholders' participation in the conduct of the business 150, 151 n204
 - relevant factors (*Kam Leung Sui Kwan*)
 - family company status 150
- statistics (1970) 133 n13
- unfair prejudice: *see* unfair prejudice remedy (UK) (valuation)

reasonable expectations: see expectations**rule/standard/norm, definitions** 26–7, 44**scholars, role: see** academics, role: *see also* judges, role; legislators, role**shareholders' participation in the conduct of the business: see also** expectations (unfair prejudice remedy (UK)) (expectations as to participation in management)**Singapore**

- distancing from UK legal system 132 n27

SMEs

- economic importance 2–4
- legal forms
 - close corporation (frequency of) 2, 4
 - sole proprietorships/partnerships 4 n5
 - UNCITRAL's draft legislative guide on a new business organization form 4

standard/rule/norm, definitions 26–7, 44

- 'sticky defaults' 13, 16, 56–9, 261, 275, 276, 277, 279, 280, 281, 282, 290, 294: *see also* withdrawal, striking the default/mandatory balance
- enhanced requirements 283–4

terminology (summary) 66: *see also* close corporation law (Japan) (membership companies); GmbHs (Germany) (overview); GmbHs (Germany) (overview), terminology; LLCs (US)

(withdrawal), terminology; Model Withdrawal Remedy (text), definitions; withdrawal, concept of; withdrawal, concept of/terminology

unfair prejudice: *see* expectations (unfair prejudice remedy (UK)) (expectations as to returns on investment); unfair prejudice remedy (UK) (history and development in date order); unfair prejudice remedy (UK) (a missed opportunity (relevant factors)); unfair prejudice remedy (UK) (as a second resort); unfair prejudice remedy (UK) (procedure); unfair prejudice remedy (UK) (relationship with withdrawal ('share purchase order')); unfair prejudice remedy (UK) (unfairness); unfair prejudice remedy (UK) (valuation); unfair prejudice remedy (UK) (withdrawal: enforcement)

unfair prejudice remedy (UK) (history and development in date order)

pre-1948 (judicial dissolution) 135

Joint Stock Companies Winding-up Act 1848/Insolvency Act 1986 135

right to petition for 'just and equitable winding-up' 135

'oppression' remedy (Companies Act 1948) 14

Cohen Committee Report (1945) 135

deficiencies 135

early successes 135–6

purpose 135

recommendation for replacement of 'oppression' with 'unfair prejudice' (Jenkins Committee (1962)) 136

restrictive interpretations of 'oppression'/judicial preference for winding-up 135–6

unfettered judicial discretion 135

withdrawal as a possible relief 136

from success to stagnation (1980–2001) in date order

Companies Act 1980 (replacement of 'oppression' with 'unfair prejudice') 136

'a great legislative achievement' 76, 171

as remedy of choice (1980s) 14, 136

unfair prejudice petitions as popular, protracted, and pricey 14, 136–7

Law Commission's reform proposals (1996) 136–7

increase in courts' case management powers 137

'presumptions' to facilitate purchase of minority's shares 137

rejection of right to exit at will 167

self-help options 137

Law Commission's reform proposals (1997) (rejection of right to exit at will) 167

Company Law Review (1998) (under CLRSG management) 138

O'Neill (1999) 137–8

as death-knell 14, 78, 137–8, 149 n190

disruptive impact 170

public backlash 149

summary of the case/Lord Hoffman's opinion 137–8

CLRSG's response to Law Commission's 1996 proposals (2000)

acceptance of stronger case management 138

rejection of 'exit article' and presumptions 138

CLRSG's endorsement of O'Neill/recommendation against legislative reversal 138, 170–1

continuation of courts' pre-O'Neill treatment of excessive remuneration cases 156–7

unfair prejudice' (Companies Act 1980) 136

unfair prejudice remedy (UK) (a missed opportunity (relevant factors)): *see also* judges, role

academic attacks on Law Commission's proposals/support for O'Neill 167–8, 171

chronic dissension amongst the courts, practitioners, legislature and academics 130, 170–1

CLRSG shortcomings 170–1

high costs 14, 136–7, 169

judicial unwillingness to endorse/commitment to contractarianism 135–8, 167–70

perceived overload of the judicial system 169

- unfair prejudice remedy (UK) (a missed opportunity (relevant factors)):** (cont.)
 popularity contributing to judicial overload 171
 unfortunate timing (*O'Neill* decision/Woolf reforms) 169
- unfair prejudice remedy (UK) (as a second resort)**
 fair buyout offer
 applicability
 'breakdown in relations between the parties' 158–9
 Category II unfairness 159
 examples 159
 parties' equal access to corporate information affecting valuation 158
 qualification as 158
 respondent's right to have petition dismissed without full trial 158
 valuation by expert without formal arbitration/reasons 158
- gap-filling function
 limitation to situations in which the petitioner has failed to remedy the situation on their own 157
 majority members' exemption 157–8
 judicial dissolution, courts' discouragement of 158
 petition for withdrawal and order to purchase petitioner's shares
 judicial preference for an out-of-court settlement 158
- unfair prejudice remedy (UK) (constituent elements)**
 introduction
 statutory basis (Companies Act 2006, s 994(1)) 139
 summary of requirements 139
- conduct of the company's affairs
 affairs of the 'company' and affairs of a 'director'/'member' distinguished 140–1
 definition/classification as 140
 as requirement of standing 139
- interests of the member
 current sufficiency of prejudice to their interests in any capacity connected with their sharehold-
 ings 141
 petitioner's burden to prove damage to interests *qua* member 141
 petitioner's original burden to prove damage to interests *qua* member 141
 as requirement of standing 139
 status as a director/participation in management of the company as interest of the members 141
- prejudice as proof of loss or damage 139
 broad judicial interpretation 141
- examples
 of prejudice to member's non-financial interests 142
 of successful petitions 141–2
 of unsuccessful petitions 141–2
- unfairness: *see also* expectations; unfair prejudice remedy (UK) (unfairness)
 prejudice distinguished 142
 as substantive legal basis for relief 139
- unfair prejudice remedy (UK) (contractual avoidance)**
 arbitration clause
 limitation of effect to parties to the agreement 166
 total exclusion of courts' unfair prejudice jurisdiction 166
- contractual exit and valuation mechanisms
 as bar to remedy 74, 166
 examples 165
 judicial attitudes towards enforcing, changes in
 adoption of principles governing judicial review of expert determination (2014) 166
 from initial willingness to enforce to interventionism and back again 75, 165–6
 mandatory nature of remedy 74, 165

unfair prejudice remedy (UK) (procedure)

applicable law (Companies (Unfair Prejudice Applications) Proceedings Rules 2009) 160
 parties (respondent)

company as

nominal status 160
 special circumstances 160

courts' right to order non-member/member not a direct perpetrator to purchase petitioner's shares 160

exhaustive listing by petitioner, desirability 160

liability for payment of financial relief

co-members/third parties 70

notice of petition to other parties interested in the proceedings/right to be heard 161

wide spectrum/involvement in unfairness warranting relief 160

petitioner's rights during proceedings, dependence on nature of the petition 160

unfair prejudice remedy (UK) (relationship with withdrawal ('share purchase order'))

courts' discretion to reject even where appropriate 139

expulsion of the wrong-doer option 139

limitation of availability to unfair prejudice remedy 138

as the most popular remedy 138

as one of many reliefs available under 'unfair prejudice' 138–9

withdrawal at will, rejection

absence of support from legal community/failure to explore flaws 167

commitment to contractarianism as explanation 167

Law Commission (1996/1997) 167

O'Neill endorsement 167

withdrawal on non-fault grounds, support for 167–8

absence of strongly articulated judicial statement 168

closing of the window of opportunity 69, 168

Law Commission (1996) 167–8

O'Neill's uncompromising stance against 168

unfair prejudice remedy (UK) (unfairness): see also expectations

categories

category 1: formal written rules 143

category 1I: informal written rules 143

general principles

bad faith/intention to cause, relevance 144

strict liability (UK contract law) and 144 n132

petitioner's behaviour/fault

consequences 68–9, 144

examples 144

petitioner's consent/acquiescence as a bar 144

in absence of good reasons for respondent not to rely upon 144

right of revocation of consent/acquiescence to presumptively unfairly prejudicial course of conduct 144

unjustified delay in commencement of proceedings by the petitioner, effect 144

unfair prejudice remedy (UK) (valuation)

general principles

factors determining the choice of base 161–2

judicial discretion 161

possible bases of valuation 161

sale as a going concern, preference for 161

judicial adjustments (valuation on basis that unfairly prejudicial conduct did not occur)

choice of valuation date 163

examples 163

quasi-interest 164

- unfair prejudice remedy (UK) (valuation) (cont.)**
 - reflective loss 72, 163
 - minority discounts/majority premiums (other than quasi-partnerships)
 - acquisition of shares without expectation of participation in management 162–3
 - court's discretion to choose intermediate discount 163
 - current judicial preference for a pro-rata valuation without discount 72, 162–3
 - discount justified by petitioner's conduct 162–3
 - early cases imposing discount 162
 - minority discounts/majority premiums (quasi-partnerships)
 - contributory fault of petitioner/application of minority discount 68–9, 162
 - no fault/order to buy out (no minority discount) 162
 - advantages of refusal of minority discount 162
- unfair prejudice remedy (UK) (withdrawal: enforcement)**
 - binding effect of decision ordering 164
 - courts' discretion to order payment on deferred terms 164
 - court's order to company to purchase petitioner's share/capital reduction 71, 165
 - liability for 71
 - personal civil liability rules, applicability 73, 164
 - impecuniosity of the respondent, irrelevance 164
 - specifics of compulsion to pay as matter for the petitioner 164
- United Kingdom:** *see* Ltds (UK); quasi-partnerships (UK); unfair prejudice remedy
- United States:** *see* close corporation law (US); LLCs (US); US-CCs (US)
- US-CCs (history in date order)**
 - colonial period corporations
 - creation by colonial/state charter 176
 - first business corporation (Philadelphia Contributionship for Insuring Houses from Loss by Fire (1768)) 176
 - public character of activities 176
 - summary 176
 - post-independence
 - authority of incorporating legislature over 176
 - 'public interest' purpose/examples 176
 - statistics 176
 - emergence of corporation as a 'private' entity (Story, 1819) 176
 - growth of jurisprudence 176
 - inconvenience of state charters 176
 - popularity of business corporations 176
 - as stepping-stone to the development of recognisably modern business corporation law 176
 - post-1830 developments
 - 1830–7 (attack on state charters under President Jackson) 176
 - 1836–52 (widespread adoption of general incorporation statutes) 176–7
 - introduction of limited liability 177
 - local, closely held firms as focus of the legislation 177
 - survival of special charters until the twentieth century 177
 - Great Merger Movement (1895–1904) 177
 - tailoring of legislation to attract large public corporations 177
 - weakening of shareholder power/strengthening of managerial power 177
 - close corporations in the twentieth century
 - early twentieth-century legislative disregard for interests of 177
 - post-1950 judicial and legislative treatment of the close corporation as *sui generis* 177
- US-CCs (economic aspects)**
 - difficulties of quantifying/absence of incorporated US-CC statistics 179
 - S-Corporation status
 - advantages 179

- liberalisation of restrictions on 180
- risk of minority shareholder oppression 179
- as useful proxy measure of US–CC economic realities 179
- S-Corporations/C-Corporations compared
 - tax filings 181
 - total business receipts 180
 - total net income 180–1
- statutory close corporations as small minority of all US business corporations 179
 - including non-statutory functionally close corporations as great majority 179
- US–CCs (legal aspects)
 - applicable law
 - MBCA (2016) 178
 - Model Supplement 178
 - discontinuance (2008)/continuing availability 178
 - state incorporation statutes 178
 - business corporations' five core structural characteristics
 - negotiable characteristics 178
 - Model Supplement/MBCA approach to 178
 - share transfer restrictions 178
 - shareholder agreements restricting directors' discretion 178
 - non-negotiability of legal personality/limited liability 178
 - definitions
 - formal-legalistic criteria ('statutory close corporation') 178
 - functional criteria ('closed'/ 'closely held') 178–9
 - partnership compared 179
 - substantial overlap between share ownership and management 179
 - as subset of business corporations 178
 - subsets (statutory close corporations/non-statutory close corporations) 179
- US–CCs, oppression relief, analysis of states' approaches to
 - introduction
 - diversity 187
 - methodology 187–8
 - scope of discussion 187–8
 - classic trichotomy
 - 'burdensome, harsh and wrongful' 188
 - fiduciary duty
 - Donahue* 188
 - Wilkes* 188
 - reasonable expectations doctrine
 - circularity 189
 - ex post facto* adjustment of parties' relationship 189, 214
 - implied contract, role of 189
 - influence of English law 83, 87, 189
 - non-exclusiveness 189
 - sensitivity to differences from public companies and between US–CCs 189
 - Thomson/O'Neal, contributions of 188–9
 - contractual exclusion/limitation of judicial dissolution, possibility of 74, 192–3
 - effect of seeking oppression relief 193
 - enforcement of buyout order
 - difficulties where the corporation is the purchaser 196
 - failure to pay purchase price, effect 197
 - liability for payment 71
 - payment by instalment 197
 - as a regular court judgment 196

- US–CCs, **oppression relief, analysis of states' approaches to** (cont.)
 security for payment of expenses 197
 evaluation
 courts' contractarian ideology/undermining of oppression/withdrawal regime 214
 current statutory provision 213–14
ex post facto adjustment of parties' relationship, importance 189, 214
 risks posed by ideological/state divides 214
 withdrawal regimes, absence of data on effectiveness/business owners' preferences 214
 non-fault judicially-ordered buyouts 74
 deadlock as non-fault ground 69, 191–2
 description 191
 rarity 191–2
 in states adopting indirect remedies (election statutes) 192
 'perspective' framework
 definitions (Moll)
 'majority fault' 190 n171
 'minority fault' 190 n172
 majority perspective
 dependence of liability on fault 189
 legitimate business purpose, sufficiency as a defence 189–90
 minority fault, sufficiency to negate majority liability 69, 190
 minority shareholder interests as secondary consideration 190
 propriety of the majority's conduct as focus 189
 minority perspective
 absolute protection of minority as aim 190
 impact of majority actions on minority as focus 190
 presence/absence of majority or minority fault, irrelevance 190
 modified majority perspective 190–1
 modified minority perspective 191
 Moll's contributions to 189–91
 valuation
 date of 194
 examples 194–5
 'fair value', absence of consensus 194
 interest 195
 judicial adjustments for misconduct affecting the value of the corporation/share 72, 195–6
 party agreements, eligibility for consideration by court 75, 194
 non-binding effect 194
 withdrawal at will
 absence of any US statutory provision for 197
 Oregon attempt 197
 academic rejection
 contractarian opposition (Easterbrook and Fischel) 198–9
 impact on corporations' ability to attract debt and equity financing (Hillman) 198–9
 academic support for (Hetherington and Dooley) 197–8
 legislative proposal/2007 update 198
 incompatibility with oppression of the minority approach 197
- US–CCs (**withdrawal as remedy for oppression**)
 oppression, scope for purposes of current study 181
 withdrawal remedies as subset of oppression-type remedies 181
 focus on buyout remedies 181
 oppression-type remedies, examples 181
- US–CCs (**withdrawal as remedy for oppression**), **buyout remedy variants**
 early examples (judicial dissolution based on oppression) 181

- Illinois/Pennsylvania legislation (1933) 181
 - modern approaches to 181–2
- liability for payment 70
- variant i (direct statutory remedies in date order)
 - South Carolina (1962) 182
 - British influence 182
 - influence on other US states 182
 - Michigan (1973) 182
 - North Carolina (1973) (abolished in 1989) 182
 - Illinois (1983) 182
 - Montana (1991) (codification of equity powers) 182
 - Oregon (2001) (codification of equity powers) 182
 - North Dakota (2013) (codification of equity powers) 182–3
 - Louisiana (2017) (explicit reference to ‘withdrawal’) 183
- variant ii (non-statutory judicial remedies)
 - bases for ordering buyouts in absence of statutory authority 183–5
 - election-type statute 184
 - equitable/fiduciary powers 183, 184
 - lack of clarity 183–4
 - examples 184–5
- variant iii (indirect remedies (‘election statutes’))
 - description of 185
 - examples 186
 - MBCA as 185
 - non-fault buyouts and 192
 - as non-‘judicial’ remedy/justification for inclusion 185, 186
- variant iv (no buyout remedy)
 - contractarian basis 186
 - Nixon* (Delaware) 186, 214
 - Richie* (Texas) 187
- valuation, overview:** *see also* GmbHs (Germany) (withdrawal for good cause) (*Austritt aus wichtigem Grund*) (concept), valuation (default position); LLCs (US) (withdrawal); Model Withdrawal Remedy (text), valuation proceedings; Model Withdrawal Remedy (text) (commentary on), valuation proceedings; unfair prejudice remedy (UK) (valuation); US–CCs, oppression relief, analysis of states’ approaches to, valuation; withdrawal (Japan) (*taisha*) (valuation (*Kaishahō*, Art. 61))
 - applicable principles and discounts, importance 72
 - equitable interest in the close corporation as main component 72
 - judicial adjustments (valuation on basis that unfairly prejudicial conduct did not occur) (reflective loss) 72
 - methodology 72
- voice (Hirschman)**
 - definition 33
 - examples 33–4
 - ‘exit’ and 33
 - as a political concept 33
 - positive use of 32
 - absence of serious shareholder conflict, need for 34
 - risks and limitations 33–4
 - veto rights 33–4
- withdrawal:** *see* close corporation law overview; close corporation law (Japan) (historical context/KKs and KYs), withdrawal remedies; GmbHs (Germany) (withdrawal); LLCs (US) (withdrawal);

- Unfair prejudice remedy (UK); US–CCs, oppression relief, analysis of states' approaches to;
 - US–CCs (withdrawal as remedy for oppression); withdrawal (Japan) (*taisha*); withdrawal 'on grounds'
- withdrawal, concept of/terminology:** *see also* contractarianism (contractarians' position)
 - introduction 20–1
 - convergence: *see* convergence (shareholder exit/withdrawal)
 - definitions
 - 'at will'/'on grounds': *see also* withdrawal 'on grounds'
 - importance of distinction 26
 - rule vs standard 26–7, 42, 44, 290
 - difficulty of 24–7
 - 'exit' 28: *see also* 'exit' *below*
 - changes in usage 24 n45
 - 'exit' to 'withdrawal' 24 n45
 - 'withdrawal'/'dissociation' to 'withdrawal' (UNCITRAL) 24 n45
 - 'remedy'/'regime', preference for 25 n49
 - rule/standard/norm 26–7, 44
 - 'withdrawal' 25, 290
- 'exit'/subtypes
 - appraisal 30–2: *see also* appraisal/dissenters' rights
 - as broader term than 'withdrawal' 28
 - dissolution 28–30: *see also* judicial dissolution
- extending knowledge and understanding of
 - absence of withdrawal from existing studies 299–300
 - applicability of the tripartite method 301–2: *see also* methodology, tripartite approach, summary of application
 - extension of current study to other jurisdictions/geographical areas, suggestions for 300–1
- legal basis (statute vs judicial development) 67, 291
- 'non-exit' alternatives 32–8
 - duties 34–6
 - expulsion 32
 - limitations 36–8
 - voice 33–4
- 'withdrawal', reasons for choice of term
 - as neutral and functional term free of legal-doctrinal baggage 25
 - as a broad term suitable for cross-jurisdictional comparison 25
 - as precise term recognisable to jurists across jurisdictions 25
- 'withdrawal'/'withdrawal rights and remedies', common features
 - enforceability of rights/obligations by coercive force of the state 26
 - mandatory core/modification option 291
 - as outcome resulting from/enforceable by a direct suit 25
 - references to constitutional alternatives, relevance 25 n51
 - termination of the legal relationship
 - at withdrawal seeker's election 26
 - third-party arbiter 26
 - voluntary election to terminate relations with the close corporation and other shareholders 25
 - withdrawer's obligation to transfer membership interest to another party 26
 - withdrawer's right to claim compensation 26
- withdrawal (Japan) (*taisha*) (history and concept)**
 - definition/scope 66, 236
 - 'exit' 236, 242 n72, 242 n172, 244 n189
 - Kaishahō* confusion 236 n137
 - 'withdrawal at will' 236
 - 'withdrawal on unavoidable grounds' 236

- legislative provisions (*Kaishahō* (2005))
 - applicability to GKs of both withdrawal *at will* and *on grounds* 234
 - confusion of terminology 236 n137
 - consolidation of *Shōhō* rights and extension to GKs 234
 - failure to consider rationale 234–5
 - legislation by accident 15, 219, 235
- legislative provisions (*Shōhō* (1899) (withdrawal rights of commercial and limited partnerships)) 234
- withdrawal (Japan) (*taisha*) (enforcement of claim to refund (GKs)) (creditor protection)**
 - credit protection rules as severe impediment to withdrawn member securing legal rights 251
 - creditor protection procedures
 - capital maintenance obligation 72–3, 235 n124
 - situation i (refund quantum less than the ‘distributable surplus’) 249
 - situation ii (refund quantum between the distributable surplus and the company’s net asset book value) 249–50
 - situation iii (refund quantum exceeding the company’s net asset book value) 250
 - ‘distributable surplus’ 249
 - failure to follow necessary creditor protection procedures
 - avoidance/limitation of liability
 - absence of negligence 251–2
 - unanimous consent to offered sum 251–2
 - waiver of liability of withdrawn member 252
 - consequences 250
 - incorporated commercial/limited partnerships distinguished 249
 - liability for, limitation to the company 71, 249
 - withdrawn member’s remedies in case of company refusal to perform required procedures
 - suit for judicial dissolution 251
 - direct dissolution action 251
 - problems 251, 256
- withdrawal (Japan) (*taisha*) (*Kaishahō*, Art. 606)**
 - effect of withdrawal
 - dissolution of rights and obligations pertaining to GK membership or management 244
 - entitlement to refund of membership interest (Art. 611(1)) 244–5
 - termination at will 244
 - termination on unavoidable grounds 244
- ‘exit’ (*Kaishahō*, Art. 607)
 - description 236 n137
 - distinguished 236 n137
 - statutory default grounds for 242 n72
- withdrawal at will (Art. 606(1))
 - effect of withdrawal (termination of membership at the end of the fiscal year) 244
 - procedure
 - notification to representative member 237
 - reasons, absence of need for 237
 - six-months’ notice/reasons for 237
 - rationale 237
 - text 236–7
 - withdrawal by advance notice (*yokoku ni yoru taisha*) as alternative formulation 237
 - as withdrawal initiated voluntarily and unilaterally by the member 236 n137
- withdrawal at will, constitutional provision for deviation from (Art. 606(2)) 237
 - unresolved issues 237
 - withdrawal on unavoidable grounds, exclusion from deviation (Art. 606(2)) 74, 237, 238
- withdrawal ‘on grounds’: *see* withdrawal ‘on grounds’
- withdrawal on unavoidable grounds (Art. 606(3))
 - effect (termination of membership on notification of intent to withdraw) 244

- withdrawal (Japan) (*taisha*) (*Kaishahō*, Art. 606) (cont.)**
 purpose (protection of right of withdrawal) 243
 text 238
 withdrawal at will distinguished
 immediate effect/no notice 238
 mandatory nature of Art. 606(3)/exclusion of deviation 238
 withdrawal on unavoidable grounds (Art. 606(3)) ('unavoidable grounds') (historical precedent and doctrine)
 alternative theories
 personal circumstances of the withdrawing member plus overall circumstances 69, 239–40
 strict limitation to personal circumstances of the withdrawing member 69, 239
 constraints on usefulness (limitation of membership to natural persons/unlimited liability issues) 240
 jurisprudence 239–40
 withdrawal on unavoidable grounds (Art. 606(3)) ('unavoidable grounds') (legislative obscurity)
 Commentary on the *Kaishahō* 238
 limited jurisprudence 238–9
 withdrawal on unavoidable grounds (Art. 606(3)) ('unavoidable grounds') (modern doctrine (GKs))
 agreement on inclusion of
 deadlock and squeeze-outs 69, 241
 matters beyond the member's personal circumstances 241
 arguments for narrower GK scope/*desiderata*
 desirability of ex ante contractual arrangements/recommended terms 243
 exclusion/limitation of personal circumstances 241
 mandatory status/contractual freedom in internal corporate ordering as key issue 240
 primacy of negotiated agreement on withdrawal grounds and procedures 241
 withdrawal on unavoidable grounds as last resort 241, 243–4
 doctrinal baggage (focus on personal circumstances) 240, 241–4
 applicability of pre-*Kaishahō* jurisprudence to GK joint ventures 241–2, 243
- withdrawal (Japan) (*taisha*) (valuation (*Kaishahō*, Art. 611))**
 as basis for calculating the refund quantum 245
 default position (*Kaishahō* 611(2)), elements/approaches to
 book value, reservations on use of 245
 DCF
 hypothetical sale value of the business as alternative 245–6
 move in favour of 245
 risks associated with 247
 going concern basis 245
 jurisprudence consistent with 246–7
 joint ventures and 246
 liquidation value 246 n195
 mark-to-market valuation of assets and liabilities 245
 academic debate 75, 247–8
 inclusion of future earnings 245
 net asset value 247
 text 245
 default position (*Kaishahō* 611(2)), whether mandatory
 holistic approach (reconciliation of *Kaishahō*, Art. 611(2) and Art. 606(3)) 248–9
 reasonableness test 248–9
 right to include valuation mechanism in corporate constitution/constraints
 academic views 225–7, 247–8
 arguments against 248
 uncertainty/legislative inconsistency 75, 247–8

- withdrawal ‘on grounds’**: *see also* expectations (equitable considerations (UK)); expectations (formal written rules) (UK); GmbHs (Germany) (withdrawal for good cause); LLCs (US) (withdrawal), grounds for withdrawal; unfair prejudice remedy (UK); US-CCs, oppression relief
- BCE (authoritative status) 43 n180
 - contracting out, risks 44
 - eligibility (dependence on circumstances verifiable by a third-party arbiter) 27, 42–3
 - evidence found useful to an arbiter 42–3
 - grounds
 - contributory fault of withdrawal seeker, relevance 68–9
 - fault of other participants 68
 - acquiescence in, effect 68
 - fault/non-fault basis 43
 - jurisprudence establishing as implied term of shareholders’ ‘bargain’ 43
 - non-fault
 - definition 69
 - examples 69–70
 - responsibility for determining whether case made (arbiter/court) 43–4
 - target jurisdictions compared 291
 - as a rule 26–7
 - as a standard 26–7, 42–3, 68, 69
 - target jurisdictions compared 291–2
- withdrawal, striking the default/mandatory balance (operation)** 73–5, 88, 276–7, 293
- access to withdrawal/grounds
 - parties’ right in general to make withdrawal more available 73–4
 - review of practice 74
 - valuation
 - parties’ right in general to make valuation arrangements 75
 - review of the practice 75
- withdrawal, striking the default/mandatory balance (theory)**
- mandatory core approach, pros and cons 59–60, 290
 - ‘sticky defaults’ 290
 - advantages 57
 - aim (blocking of more socially problematic opt-outs) 57
 - definition 56–7
 - examples
 - Hetherington and Dooley (1977) 57
 - possibilities 57–9
 - withdrawal at will as a default rule, problems 55–6
 - withdrawal on grounds as an open-ended standard, pros and cons 56
- withdrawal, waiver/limitation of right to, justification** 46, 47–55
- conscious, informed agreement by majority and minority
 - corporate joint ventures 49
 - minority hold-up 49–50
 - special circumstances in connection with the minority’s share acquisition 50–1
 - technology start-ups 48
 - human limitations/irrationality
 - examples of 52–3
 - close corporation bargains, particular applicability to 53
 - non-exclusiveness/potential value 55, 299
 - solutions
 - comparison between 55
 - insulating strategies 54–5
 - libertarian paternalists’ 54
 - self-enforcement or extralegal sanctions 51–2