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

Share Exchanges and Securities Markets Law

Pushpita Dutta
Assistant Professor, Department of Law, Presidency University, Bangalore, India,
Email Id-pushpita.dutta@presidencyuniversity.in

ABSTRACT

The legal structure and rules regulating the trading, listing, and operation of securities on stock exchanges are collectively referred to as share exchanges and securities markets legislation. The link between share exchanges and securities market legislation is examined in this abstract, which focuses on the major legal considerations, administrative procedures, and investor safeguards related to securities trading. It looks at the role securities markets play in boosting investor confidence, market efficiency, and capital generation. The conclusion emphasises the significance of strong legal and regulatory frameworks in guaranteeing fair and transparent securities trading. The abstract also addresses the keywords connected with share exchanges and securities markets legislation.

KEYWORDS

Investor Protections, Market Efficiency, Regulatory Requirements, Share Exchanges, Securities Markets, Securities Trading.

I. INTRODUCTION

Parties to the merger or share exchange must abide by the rules of EU securities markets legislation if one of the participating firms is a listed company. The 2007 Eurotunnel case serves as an illustration of their applicability to stock markets. The matter involving Eurotunnel is quite convoluted and even involves a restructuring procedure. The ability to compare French and English law and to comprehend the fundamental principles of laws based on Community law make it intriguing, nonetheless. The case of Eurotunnel. Eurotunnel was a business with two holding companies in the beginning of 2007 Eurotunnel SA, a French firm, and Eurotunnel plc, an English company. Eurotunnel Units with a value of one share of Eurotunnel SA and one share of Eurotunnel plc were approved for listing on Euronext, the Paris stock market, and the London Stock market [1], [2]. Groupe Eurotunnel SA GET SA, a new group holding company, was to be acquired by Eurotunnel as part of the reorganisation. All of the stock of Eurotunnel Group UK plc would belong to GET SA. In England, the latter would serve as a holding corporation.

The shares of GET SA were listed in Paris and London as part of the reorganisation, hybrid Notes Redeemable in Shares NRS were issued by Eurotunnel Group UK plc, and an Exchange Tender Offer ETO was launched by GET SA for the shares of Eurotunnel SA and Eurotunnel plc. In order to acquire the shares of Eurotunnel SA and Eurotunnel plc, GET SA intended to conduct an exchange tender offer. On the other hand, if the target offeree companys securities are admitted to trading on a regulated market in that Member State, the main rule under the Directive on takeover bids is that the authority competent to supervise a bid is that of the Member State in which the target offeree company has its registered office. As a result, some of the transaction was governed by the English regulatory authorities the Financial Services Authority or the Takeover Panel and some of it was governed by the French supervisory authority Autorité des marches financiers, AMF.

The French and English officials had to work together due to the dual jurisdiction and various regulations for each country. It turned out that a number of exemptions had to be granted by the appropriate authorities. Here, one may examine the share exchange offer made by GET SA from their point of view. Announcing the choice to place a bid. The proposal was made public by Eurotunnel plc and Eurotunnel SA in accordance with the rigorous disclosure requirements that apply to listed corporations. GET SA has a responsibility to notify the supervisory body of the bid and to make its decision to submit a bid public [3], [4]. Public share exchange offers are not subject to any specific time restrictions under EU securities markets rules. Therefore, national provisions of Member States legislation controlled the bids timeline. There were disparities between French and English legal systems. The prospectus was created as a distinct document by GET SA. The issuers have access to a fast-track procedure using this option. The relevant material must be separated into a registration document, a securities note, and a summary note in a prospectus that consists of many papers. The registration paperwork includes details about the issuer. Information about the securities issued to the public or set to be admitted to trade on a market that is controlled is included in the securities note.

No prospectus shall be published until it has been approved by the competent authority of the home Member State, as stated by the Prospectus Directive. As a result, GET SA submitted a registration form to the French regulatory body. On March 21, 2007, AFM registered the registration papers and informed GET SA of its action.The Prospectus Directive states that a registration document is valid for up to 12 months. Before securities could be issued to the public or admitted to trading on a regulated market, GET SA only needed to create the securities note and the summary note since it already had a registration document that had been authorized by the appropriate authorities. During the early phase, there were perks for accepting the offer, French law stipulates a preliminary acceptance period and a subsequent time see below. It was disclosed to Eurotunnel Unit holders that, if their Units were submitted to the offer within the original acceptance period without the supplementary acceptance period, they would have the ability to subscribe, in cash and within specified parameters, for notes payable in GET SA ordinary shares NRS. It was made clear that the right to subscribe for notes redeemable in GET SA ordinary shares was not included in the consideration provided to owners of Eurotunnel Units and that only shareholders who had tendered their Units during the initial period were eligible to do so. The target offeree companys board is required to draw up and make public a document setting out its opinion regarding the bid and the reasons on which it is based, including its views on the effects of implementation of the bid on all the companys interests and specifically employment, and on the offerors strategic plans for the offeree company and their likely effects on employment and the locations of the companys place. Additionally, the board of the offeree business must convey that opinion to the representatives of its employees or, in the absence of such representatives, to the employees themselves at the same time [5]–[7].

Fairness, Price, Existence of a Market

Fairness, pricing, and the presence of a market are important considerations for shareholders in the participating businesses, company and securities markets regulations often address these issues in the context of mergers and share exchanges. When a firm acquires another business the target by issuing more shares to the targets shareholders, it gains new shareholders and dilutes the stakes of its current owners. If the damage they directly or indirectly experience is not made up for by direct or indirect advantages, the companys current shareholders will continue to lose money. For instance, if the ratio of stock exchanges is excessively high there are too many shares for every target share, or if they lose a qualifying majority or minority that allowed them to influence or obstruct crucial decisions, current shareholders of the offeror business may suffer direct losses.

II. DISCUSSION

Shares as a Means to Purchase Other Goods

Shares may be used as a source of financing for other products. Shares are often issued by the company to finance long-term capital expenditures like the acquisition of property or a business. In a asset deal, the corporation might pay for the acquisition of a business by issuing shares to the firm that is selling the operation. Specific legal dangers. The company has specific legal risks as a result of accepting shares as payment for generic concerns. These risks are principally brought on by the legal capital system in the EU. There is also the matter of time. The general meetings previous approval can be necessary for the issue of shares. If the board is given the authority to make the choice, internal corporate decision-making will happen more quickly. It is common practice in many businesses for the annual general meeting to approve a resolution allowing the board to determine whether to issue shares and waive shareholder’s preemption rights.

The corporation may have purchased too few items for its budget. In Europe, the business must choose the price to be paid for the shares. One may claim that the amount paid for the shares must be reasonable and not less than their market worth in accordance with section a Depending on the applicable law, negative outcomes may occur if the worth of the products is less than the price payable for the shares. The allotted is obligated under English company law to pay the company an amount equal to the amount of the discount, with interest at the appropriate rate but, this obligation may be lessened if it is just and equitable to do so However, in Germany, the agreement to sell such products to the corporation would not be enforceable, and the allotted would be required to pay the sum due for the shares in cash.

There are three significant exclusions from the need that non-cash compensation be given for the shares of a public limited liability company to be evaluated independently, depending on the Member States preferences. These are the merger exemption, takeover exemption, and all shareholder consent requirements Sometimes it depends on how the requirements are interpreted as to whether the corporation must adhere to them. Whether the corporation is considered to have issued shares other than for a financial transaction may not be evident. The purpose of corporate laws may be to prevent circumvention rather than to regulate form. When the allottee deposits cash into the issuers bank account and the issuer then promptly purchases assets from the allottee using those funds, this is a typical illustration of a circumvention that is banned under company law. There may also be variations in what constitutes consideration in cash or consideration other than in cash.

Second Directive: If the subscribed capital is expanded concurrently, no portion of the consulting firm's compensation may be made up of shares awarded to it. If the subscribed capital is not expanded, the Directives language does not prohibit the assignment of shares to the consulting business. In actuality, this is feasible if the advisory firm pays nothing for the shares and the companys shares have no nominal worth nevertheless, this would be problematic due to shareholder's pre-emptive rights. The Directive is silent on the question of whether such restrictions may be avoided by allocating share option rights rather than shares. There are some exceptions. According to the Second Directive, Member States may allow those who undertake to place shares in the exercise of their profession to pay less than the total price of the shares for which they subscribe in the course of this transaction. Contract v company law. It can be difficult to combine the terms of the contract for the purchase of assets with mandatory provisions of company law. When assets are traded for cash, each party plays a clear role. one party acts as the buyer and the other as the seller. When assets are traded for shares, that relationship is complemented by another relationship: the seller of assets acts as the buyer subscriber of shares and the company acts as the seller issuer of shares.

Now, the contract for the sale and purchase of assets is likely to contain clauses that are characteristic of that particular contract type, and the contract for the subscription of shares may contain clauses that are characteristic of business acquisition contracts. There are particularly two issues. First, the execution of such contracts may need adherence to certain guidelines about corporate decision-making inside the organisation for more information on counterparty corporate risk, see Volume II. If the transaction should, in accordance with the relevant company law requirements, be agreed upon by the general meeting, the contract for the sale of assets will often be conditional and subject to approval by the general meeting. Second, statutory corporate law rules may limit common remedies for contract breaches. For instance, because distributions to shareholders are restricted by mandatory provisions of company law, the seller of assets might not be able to renounce the contract in the event that the company breaches its representations and warranties or seek compensation for the harm that was caused.

Share-Based Executive Incentive Program

Executive or employee incentive plans may include shares. This poses issues with conventional company law and corporate governance as well as accounting and tax issues, which will not be covered in this book. These issues were previously covered in Volume I. However, a few remarks may be made. Preemption privileges. A right to subscribe for fresh shares may be granted to incentive programme recipients. The preemption rights of existing owners limit the implementation of share-based incentives Preemption rights may be renounced by general meeting resolution. In such situation, the administrative or management body is required to provide the general assembly a written report indicating the reasons for restriction or withdrawal of the right of pre-emption, and justifying the proposed issue price. Within specific parameters, the general meeting may delegate authority to another corporate body to decide on the share issuance and the withdrawal of pre-emption rights. In reality, this is often carried out, and the board of a publicly traded firm is frequently more-or-less automatically empowered to make decisions about share-based executive and staff incentive program.

Plans for buybacks and financial aid. A right to purchase or receive existing shares may also be granted to incentive scheme beneficiaries. The firm may more easily purchase shares to be handed to its workers and advance money to employees who wish to purchase the companys shares thanks to EU company legislation. Artificial choices.

The business may also utilize synthetic choices. From a legal standpoint, it is simpler for the corporation to choose synthetic options since their usage is not as severely restricted by the regulatory capital system.

Share-based reward recipients. Generally speaking, share-based incentive recipients are not constrained by Community legislation. Nevertheless, there may be limits that are particular to a certain industry, such as those imposed by the Directive on Statutory Audits see Volume I regarding the compensation and objectivity of statutory auditors. Since the supervisory board is not a management organ, share options cannot be offered to members of the board in Germany. The Commission approved a non-binding Recommendation738 in April 2009 that said share options should not be a part of the compensation for non-executive or supervisory directors. Monetary value of share-based incentives. Because fundamental issues of corporate governance have not been harmonised in the EU, the rules of EU company and securities markets legislation do not explicitly limit the magnitude of share-based incentives.

For instance, it is a requirement of the German Aktiengesetz that the compensation of each member of the management board be fair in view of the person's responsibilities and the state of the business. The German Corporate Governance Codes guidelines supplement this. English business law does not specify a specific cap on executive bonuses. The Commission issued non-binding recommendations on compensation practises in April 2009. The Recommendations apply to financial services undertakings and listed corporations 741. Share-based incentive disclosure. Additionally, community institutions have made an effort to increase the overall amount of paid compensation as well as the openness of compensation rules. The Commission made a non-binding recommendation on the compensation of directors in October 2004 to serve this function.

Mezzanine Financing

Mezzanine finance is thought of as a kind of financing that incorporates both equity and debt components. Standard mezzanine investments often carry a larger risk than conventional debt instruments but a lesser risk than conventional shares from the investors point of view. Due of this, compared to holders of ordinary debt, mezzanine investors typically demand a larger return on their investment. Mezzanine capital will often only be invested for a brief period of time and be reimbursed before shareholder's capital investment in the event of a companys collapse, similar to regular loan instruments. Mezzanine finance, unlike share capital and debt, is not a term that is generally accepted. The mezzanine technique is used to make mezzanine instruments. Instruments used in mezzanines have four characteristics.

Mezzanine instruments arent considered a specific kind of contract. Therefore, a mezzanine instrument will belong to another class of instruments, a legal class. A mezzanine investor will often be either a shareholder or a lender since a mezzanine instrument is either a loan or a share from a legal standpoint. An alternative to a mezzanine instrument, which is neither a loan nor a share, is a profit-sharing instrument. The use of the equity technique for more information on the e, the selection of payment obligations that cause the value of the instrument to behave like the value of an equity instrument for a taxonomy of payment obligations, Volume II, the use of a right to an equity instrument or a combination of two or more of those methods, are a few examples of how the debt instrument might be supplemented. An equity kicker is a loan that is linked with a standard mezzanine investment.

Subordinated loans, second-lien loans, loans with an equity kicker, convertible bonds, and bonds with options are all examples of mezzanine indebtedness. They could also include loans from shareholders or share sellers. Most mezzanine debt is unsecured. Alternatively, the loan may be secured but the collateral would rank lower than that of senior debt for second lien debt, see below. Thirdly, the instrument will be adjusted to act more like a debt instrument if it is a share. For instance, a credit enhancement Volume II, a responsibility to pay a certain amount of money, a right to refund or redeem the instrument, or a combination of two or more of those techniques will be added to the instrument.

The equity ratio and the recognition of paid expenses are both impacted by the categorization on the balance sheet. Any compensation given to holders of such mezzanine instruments will be considered an interest expense if the mezzanine capital is regarded as debt. Any compensation will be a distribution of profits if the mezzanine capital is treated as equity [8]–[10]. IAS/IFRS states that the economic content of the money instrument should be the primary consideration substance over form. According to the content of the contract, not its formal structure, a financial instrument should be categorised as either a financial obligation or an equity instrument under IAS 32.

III. CONCLUSION

The legal framework and rules required for the fair and open trading of securities are provided by share exchanges and securities markets legislation. Securities markets legislation attempts to uphold integrity, trust, and confidence in securities trading by creating listing standards, regulatory control, investor safeguards, and fostering market efficiency. In order to react to changing market dynamics and safeguard the interests of investors and market players, ongoing improvements to legal and regulatory frameworks are essential.

REFERENCES

[1] S. Y. K. Fung, L. N. Su, and R. J. Gul, Investor legal protection and earnings management: A study of Chinese H-shares and Hong Kong shares, J. Account. Public Policy, 2013, doi: 10.1016/j.jaccpubpol.2013.06.004.

[2] S. Hirst and K. Kastiel, Corporate governance by index exclusion, Bost. Univ. Law Rev., 2019.

[3] J. Lee, Synergies, risks and the regulation of stock exchange interconnection, Masaryk Univ. J. Law Technol., 2017, doi: 10.5817/MUJLT2017-2-5.

[4] L. J. Gagnon and G. A. Karolyi, The Economic Consequences of the U.S. Supreme Courts Morrison v. National Australia Bank Decision for Foreign Stocks Cross-Listed in U.S. Markets, SSRN Electron. J., 2012, doi: 10.2139/ssrn.1961178.

[5] V. A. Atanasov, C. S. Ciccotello, and S. B. Gyoshev, How Does Law Affect Finance? An Empirical Examination of Tunneling in an Emerging Market, SSRN Electron. J., 2005, doi: 10.2139/ssrn.670362.

[6] T. W. Bell, Prediction Markets for Promoting the Progress of Science and the Useful Arts, Georg. Mason Law Rev., 2006.

[7] A. Y. Lin and P. E. Swanson, The Effect of Chinas Reform Policies on Stock Market Information Transmission, Q. J. Financ. Account., 2008.

[8] C. Roche, T. Olweny, and T. Nasieku, Fundamental Anomalies and Firms Financial Distress Evidence from Nairobi Securities Exchange, Kenya, J. Appl. Financ. Bank., 2020, doi: 10.47260/jafb/1121.

[9] F. W. S. Tuigong, W. K., Jagongo, A. O., & Ndede, Effects of Dividend Policy on Share Price of Firms Listed at the Nairobi Securities Exchange , Kenya, Res. J. Financ. Account., 2016.

[10] S. Chakraborty, Exploring the Role of Merchant Banker as Capital Market Intermediary: With Special Reference to Role Played Under Stock Market, Int. J. Manag. Humanit., 2020, doi: 10.35940/ijmh.j1016.0641020.