International Journal of Innovative Research in Engineering and Management (IJIREM)
ISSN: 2350-0557, Volume-9, Special Issue-9, September-2022
Innovative Projects 2022
Organized by Presidency University, Bangalore, India

Mergers and Company Law: Legal Framework and Implications

Sofiul Ahmed
Assistant Professor, Department of Law, Presidency University, Bangalore, India,
Email Id- sofiul.ahmed@presidencyuniversity.in

ABSTRACT

Company law provides the legal foundation for governing mergers and acquisitions, hence there is a tight relationship between mergers and company law. This abstract examines how mergers and corporate law are related, concentrating on the legal considerations, legal requirements, and business-related ramifications of mergers. It explores the important factors that should be taken into account while completing a merger deal, including shareholder approval, regulatory approvals, disclosure obligations, and post-merger integration. The conclusion emphasises the significance of following legal and regulatory standards to guarantee the success and legality of merger transactions. The abstract also covers the keywords related to mergers and company law.

KEYWORDS

Acquisitions, Company Law, Corporate Governance, Mergers, Post-Merger Integration Regulatory, Shareholder.

I. INTRODUCTION

legal entities are capable of merging, the merger of two limited liability firms into one is the one that has the most financial significance. Three fundamental merging forms exist: With one existing firm that survives the merger, one or more businesses might combine merger through acquisition.As an alternative, two or more businesses might combine to create a new business that survives the merger. This is known as a merger through creation of a new business. The merging of a wholly-owned or almost wholly-owned subsidiary with its parent firm is the third fundamental kind of merger. It is a unique merging form since the procedures are streamlined [1]–[3]. Legal justifications for merging. Companies combine for a variety of reasons under company law. Through mergers, the company may purchase large businesses without jeopardising its debt-to-equity ratio. Investors in the firm that will not survive the merger are entitled to compensation for their shares, which is often stock in the company that will survive.

Merger permits the business to acquire a company by allocating its own shares. 2 Mergers, on the other hand, make highly leveraged LBOs possible. The company has the ability to borrow money and buy the targets stock with cash. Those two businesses may combine after the takeovers conclusion. This implies that the assets of the target will really be used to pay off the debts. 3 There are features of control. Despite the general norm that shareholders of the firm that will not survive the merger would get shares in the surviving company, the consideration may alternatively consist of cash, other securities, or a mix of shares, cash, and other securities depending on the applicable legislation. Thus, a merger will provide the company the ability to control the share ownership structure. 4 A few of the causes have to do with the firm’s legal framework. After a takeover, if two businesses combine, only one will remain, as opposed to a parent and a subsidiary. This may lower legal expenses and simplify the firm’s legal framework. Cross-border mergers, for instance, are a way to get rid of a layer of national holding corporations. The business may also alter its incorporation state and its corporate legislation via cross-border mergers [4], [5].

The regulation of mergers serves the following purposes: protecting the interests of shareholders providing shareholders with adequate information in a manner that is as objective as possible safeguarding the interests of creditors and other parties with claims against the merging companies so that the merger does not adversely affect their interests and providing third parties with adequate information. Additional queries. The EU has additional legal tools to regulate the company law elements of mergers, including EU merger control, EU capital markets

legislation, and EU tax law. These additional legal tools also serve to defend the rights of workers. The involved firms are required by EU corporate law to declare how the merger may impact employee positions. Numerous labour law directives govern how workers' rights are preserved in the case of mergers. For instance, Directive 2001/23/EC, which aims to maintain the continuity of employment relationships, protects employees' rights in the event of business transfers. The purpose of Directive 2001/86/EC is to guarantee that workers have a right to participate in discussions and decisions affecting the life of their SE.

Merger Process

The merger procedure is largely based on the terms of such Community instruments if the involved firms are limited liability companies formed in the EU. Like other company purchases, this one will be impacted by industry standards. The national legislation of that Member State determines who the relevant authorities are in a purely domestic merger. Authorities from several Member States may have jurisdiction over a cross-border merger, including authorities from the nation whose laws apply to the entity that will not survive the merger, authorities from the nation whose laws apply to the entity that will survive the merger, and more. Mergers are amicable. The beginning of discussions will be accompanied by the signing of agreements that, on the one hand, safeguard confidentiality and, on the other, lessen the risk involved in investments in the creation of information. As a result, the parties will sign non-disclosure agreements. Project-specific insider lists must be created if one of the parties is a listed business. Additionally, the parties may agree to a variety of exclusivity agreements and good faith negotiation duties.

The parties will advance to the next stage of the legal framework if the contractual framework is in place and the parties still wish to complete the transaction. Moral duties and diligence. The next step is to make sure the legal framework permits disclosing more sensitive information to the other party. The parties might, for instance, sign a letter of intent. The proposed agreement structure will be outlined in the letter of intent. Its phrasing indicates that it won't impose any duty to complete the deal. It will nonetheless generate a moral duty. It offers a structure and environment for further discussions and due diligence. The board is more likely to be prohibited from impeding the general meetings or the supervisory board, as the case may be right to decide on the merger if the distribution of power between various corporate bodies is, as in continental Europe, governed by mandatory provisions of company law. Therefore, the application of liquidated damages and break-up costs is subject to limitations. For instance, it would be more challenging for shareholders to decide on the merger on the basis of its merits if they were required to pay a significant break-up fee or sizable amounts as liquidated damages in the event that the general meeting votes against the merger.

On the other hand, it is in the best interests of all parties to concur that consequences will be imposed if the required corporate action is not taken. Without such penalties, it would be riskier to tell the opposite party of facts and start the merger process. Information released by one party during the merger process would presumably be advantageous to the other side should the merger fail, even if the parties had agreed on non-disclosure agreements. Additionally, both sides will spend money throughout the merger process. A participating corporation would be foolish to fail to make sure that it would be compensated for the damage resulting from the disclosure of information to the other party and the expenditures that it has spent. A large portion of such data is included in the merger plans drafting terms of merger. A minimum of one month prior to the scheduled date of the general meeting that will vote on the merger, draught merger terms must be published. Even when shareholders are informed of this information, it could be challenging for a shareholder to comprehend the transaction. For instance, mergers may bring up challenging legal and challenging value issues. The predicted public and private advantages of the proposed transaction are better understood by insiders and controlling shareholders, whereas non-controlling minority shareholders and workers must depend on information intermediaries [6]–[8].

DISCUSSION

The board is the most significant information middleman. The board will be in charge of the general meetings proposed resolutions and the proposed merger conditions. The board is also required to provide a report. For instance, the Third Company Law Directive states that the administration or management bodies of each of the merging companies shall prepare a detailed written report explaining the proposed merger terms and setting forth the economic and legal justifications therefor, including the share exchange ratio. The report must include a description of any unique valuation issues that have emerged. Additionally, the board would often request an

investment banks fairness judgement and present it to the public meeting. The declared goal of fairness opinions is often to confirm that the merger consideration is, financially speaking, fair to shareholders. Additionally, they serve the following purposes to improve the appearance of the proposed merger to encourage shareholders to support the merger and to reduce the possibility that board members may be held accountable for dereliction of duty. The board may include additional recommendations from impartial advisors. Under the relevant securities markets legislation, the submission of a fairness opinion or the content of other independent advice may be required. Even though its not required, it could nevertheless be standard business practice.

Created by a merger, and in international mergers. In accordance with the Directive on Cross-Border Mergers, for instance, a pre-merger certificate conclusively attesting to the proper completion of the pre-merger acts and formalities and an examination of the cross-border mergers legality with regard to the part of the procedure that concerns the completion of the cross-border merger are required. Depending on their own objectives, these intermediary's information may or may not be valuable. For instance, board members will have obligations to the corporation and sometimes even to its shareholders such as fiduciary or care obligations. However, the board is likely to support the merger proposal that it has recently authorized, it may be difficult for shareholders to sue board members for breach of duty, and the board won't hire an investment bank to provide a fairness assessment unless it would be beneficial.

The specialists who prepare the reports for the general meeting or members of the businesss administrative or management bodies might theoretically be held accountable to the company or its shareholders for any damages brought on by a breach of duty. Shareholders are, however, often safeguarded in other ways. The most significant remedy accessible to dissident shareholders is the appraisal remedy. If shareholders follow the prescribed process, they have the right to have the fair market value of their shares evaluated and paid to them in cash as part of the appraisal remedy. Such a remedy is not required under EU merger rules. Member States are, nevertheless, free to implement the assessment remedy. The Third Company Law Directive states that Member States laws may allow for less information to be disclosed to shareholders if the minority shareholders of the entity that will not survive the merger have the right to have their shares acquired by the acquiring company for a sum commensurate to the value of their shares.

Special observations: the share value and the appraisal remedy. When choosing whether to vote against the merger and demand a higher price for their shares, shareholders of the firm that will not survive the merger will take legal regulations governing share value into consideration. Therefore, such restrictions will have an impact on the kind of consideration and the exchange ratio. The precise manner in which shares should be valued in the case of mergers is not governed by EU merger regulation. The national legislation of Member States determines the value of shares in general In addition to the appraisal remedy and other remedies, the relevant authorities may assess the mergers legality to safeguard shareholders. The presence of such a review may make it harder to violate the rights of minority shareholders and may lessen the necessity for some of the other remedies.

The before-after requirements for other limited liability firms are based on the Directive on cross-border mergers. The relevant authorities will secure even the legitimacy of the employee involvement arrangements in cross-border mergers. Filings, filing of the mergers completion. A merger will result in several filing obligations. There are two reasons why filings are required in every transaction. First, a number of merger-re ated actions need the relevant authoritys intervention and, therefore, the submission of paperwork. A merger has to be made public, second. The interests of shareholders, creditors, and workers are safeguarded via filings and disclosures.

The merger must be completed, submitted, and made public by being published in the national gazette. The filing and publishing procedures are governed by the relevant statute or laws. The general disclosure regime that is applicable to listed firms must be followed by listed companies. The Takeover Bids Directive establishes additional disclosure requirements. These responsibilities go to both the offeror and the offeree. Depending on the applicable legislation, a domestic merger may go into force at any time. The laws of the Member States govern it.

Whenever a cross-border merger is finalized and registered following all necessary processes, the merger becomes effective. For instance, one of those procedures is to examine if the merger is lawful. The creation of a new SE becomes effective on the day it is registered. Similar regulations on international mergers were seldom seen in corporate laws. Cross-border mergers were forbidden in the absence of legislative restrictions. Therefore, internal

and external mergers have received different regulation in the majority of Member States. Due to this, businesses were obliged to establish local subsidiaries or pick the SE company structure.

In Sevic Systems, it was determined that the ban on cross-border mergers amounted to discrimination against foreign businesses. While cross-border mergers may result in unique issues, the ECJ did not believe that a general ban on registering them or a harmonization of the law at the Communities level would be required. In essence, the ECJs decision in Service Systems compelled Member States to approve cross-border mergers. The Cross-Border Mergers Directive currently governs cross-border mergers of limited liability firms. All limited liability corporations covered by the First Company Law Directive are subject to this Directive. The SE Regulation 597 and the SCE Regulation also apply to cross-border mergers because, according to private or public limited liability companies may merge to form a SE, and existing cooperative societies may merge to form a SCE.

Even under national law, the companies that may combine to create a SE under the SE Regulation or a SCE under the SCE Regulation may do so. Cross-border mergers of limited liability corporations are only feasible if the involved firms are permitted to combine under national law, in general. Each business taking part in a cross-border merger is subject to the laws of the Member State to which it is a resident. One countrys legal system will deal with one aspect of a cross-border merger, such as that of the entity that will not survive the merger, while another countrys legal system will deal with the other aspect of the merger, such as that of the entity that will survive the merger.

The SE Regulation states that its requirements are principally in control when a SE is formed via a merger. Each firm engaged in the establishment of a SE through merger is subject to the provisions of the law of the Member State to which it is subject that apply to mergers of public limited-liability businesses in accordance with Directive as it relates to matters that are not addressed by the SE Regulation.In the SCE Regulation, the similar idea was used. A corporation participating in a cross-border merger must abide by the rules and formalities of the national legislation to which it is subject, according to the Directive on Cross-Border Mergers. These regulations are supplemented by an opposition mechanism and the inspection of mergers by appropriate authorities. A pre-merger examination of national law compliance and a pre-merger certificate attesting to the appropriate completion of the pre-merger actions and formalities are both required under the Directive on Cross-Border Mergers. A competent authority will also examine whether the creation of a new firm as a consequence of the international merger is legitimate. There are certain guidelines for examining the share exchange ratio.

Cross-Border Mergers and Taxes

The EC Treatys basic freedoms protect the tax treatment of cross-border mergers, just like they do the company law features of such mergers. Additional legislation that governs the tax treatment of cross-border mergers is Directive Tax neutrality serves as Directives fundamental guiding premise. Mergers and other forms of reorganization should be allowed without suffering any immediate tax repercussions. A merger will not, by itself, result in any taxation of capital gains calculated using the difference between the real values of the transferred assets and liabilities and their value for tax purposes, nor will it result in any taxation of the shareholder's income, profits, or capital gains.

However, under EU tax law, artificial arrangements that have the intention of evading or avoiding national tax legislation are not recognized as deserving of protection. The business should convey to its current shareholders that voting in favor of the transactions is in their best interests, as well as to the shareholders of the target company that it is in their best interests to accept the offer. Applying for typical regulatory clearances may also be required. The publishing of an offer document or prospectus may need the approval of the appropriate authorities or the market place operator when one of the parties is a listed firm. There could be elements of competition law. The relevant authorities may need to approve the change of control in certain regulated businesses, such as banking, insurance, or defense.

According to the Second Directive, shares must be offered on a first-come, first-served basis to shareholders in proportion to the capital represented by their shares if the capital is increased by consideration in cash. The capital will not be raised by consideration in cash after a share exchange. Existing shareholders may still have pre-emption rights in this situation, according to the rules of certain Member States, and the board may also be given the authority to determine whether to remove such preemption rights. Legally speaking, it would be more difficult in practice to allow the general meeting determine whether to relinquish pre-emption powers. For instance, there is

the issue of time. Additionally, it would compel the board to provide additional details. The board must provide the general meeting with a written report indicating the reasons for restriction or withdrawal of the right of pre-emption, and justifying the proposed issue price, according to the Second Directive [1], [9], [10].

II. CONCLUSION

Company law is important in controlling and regulating mergers since they are major occurrences in the business environment. To guarantee the legitimacy and success of mergers, compliance with legal and regulatory criteria is crucial. The legal framework and regulations for executing mergers and acquisitions are provided by company law. It lays out the processes and specifications that businesses must adhere to, including getting shareholder approval, meeting legal requirements, and making sure stakeholders are properly informed. Companies involved in a merger may directly depend on any national regulations that provide tax neutrality in the event of a domestic merger if the requirements of are not implemented.

REFERENCES

[1] T. Jakupak and Z. Bregeš, Digitalization: Balance and protection - state-of-The-Art, InterEULawEast, 2020, doi: 10.22598/IELE.2020.7.2.8.
[2] K. Yoga and A. Putra, Hak-Hak Pekerja Yang Diberhentikan Karena Penggabungan Usaha Merger, J. Kertha Semaya, 2021.
[3] M. Glick and C. Ruetschlin, Big Tech Acquisitions and the Potential Competition Doctrine: The Case of Facebook, Inst. New Econ. Think. Work. Pap. Ser., 2019, doi: 10.36687/inetwp104.
[4] I. Dobos, Mergers and acquisitions in the law of the European union and their economical background, Acta Juridica Hungarica, 2012, doi: 10.1556/AJur.53.2012.3.4.
[5] S. Sami, Mergers and Acquisitions in Indias Pharmaceutical Sector, Transnatl. Corp. Rev., 2014, doi: 10.1080/19186444.2014.11658383.
[6] M. A. Khan and M. R. Bin Zakaria, An analysis on the legal framework for disclosure in prospectus and the standard of disclosure in determining takeovers and mergers activities post IPO, Int. J. Bus. Soc., 2020.
[7] O. I. Ni Wayan Anggita Darmayoni Gede Yusa, Merger Terkait Dengan Indikasi Penguasaan Pangsa Pasar Menurut Undang-undang Nomor 5 Tahun 1999 Tentang Larangan Praktek Monopoli Dan Persaingan Usaha Tidak Sehat, Kertha Semaya, 2017.
[8] N. D. Priyohadi and M. Saleh, Legal Implications of Authority Over the Merger of Port Soes Reviewed from the Create Work, Int. J. Multicult. Multireligious Underst., 2021, doi: 10.18415/ijmmu.v8i10.3079.
[9] I. K. Sridana, I. N. P. Budiartha, and I. P. G. Seputra, Perlindungan Hukum Terhadap Pemegang Saham Minoritas Pada Perseroan Terbatas Yang Melakukan Merger, J. Analog. Huk., 2020, doi: 10.22225/ah.2.1.1618.59-62.
[10] K. Ghosh and M. Mukhopadhyay, Review of Company Law on Merger and Acquisition in India Using SCP Paradigm, SSRN Electron. J., 2020, doi: 10.2139/ssrn.3545442.