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

Venture Capital Transactions: Funding Innovation and Startup Growth

Neha Saxena
Assistant Professor, Department of Law, Presidency University, Bangalore, India,
Email Id-nehasinha@presidencyuniversity.in

ABSTRACT

In venture capital transactions, start-up businesses with great growth potential are financed by venture capital firms or investors. This abstract addresses the idea of venture capital transactions with an emphasis on its essential traits, procedures, and legal implications. It looks at the function of venture capital in promoting innovation, assisting business endeavours, and providing funding for expansion. The conclusion emphasises the significance of good due diligence, contractual agreements, and investor safeguards in successful venture capital investments. The abstract also analyses the keywords connected with venture capital transactions.

KEYWORDS

Companies, Contractual Agreements, Diligence, Financing, High-Growth, Venture Capital, Investor Protections, Transactions.

I. INTRODUCTION

Venture capital is a good example of how to employ mezzanine instruments. When an entrepreneur wishes to get outside money to support future development or in the context of a management buy-out MBO or buy-in MBI, venture capital is often utilized. Investors in venture capital will start looking for an exit in the next three to five years. This might be accomplished by an IPO, a trade sale, a refinancing by another institution, or by management repurchasing the whole capital. An investor in venture capital may provide a combination of debt, equity, and mezzanine finance [1]–[3]. The many phases of finance are outlined in detail such as seed investment, prototype testing, early development, growth stage, and so on. Just enough money is provided at each level for the business to advance to the next. A single exit. At any point, the venture investor has the power to unilaterally halt financing. The right of the venture capitalist to request repayment of all or part of the money previously invested may sometimes exist. For this, debt instruments may be utilized.

Normal Exit

The venture capitalist hopes to gain from a rise in the companys worth. Owning stock that can be sold to other investors is necessary for this.

Dilute-Resisting

Venture capitalists have the ability to regulate future investment thanks to preemptive rights and other anti-dilution procedures.

Conversion Rights and Preference Shares

In the event of liquidation, preference shares will take precedence over the entrepreneur’s common shares. The option to convert preferred shares or convertible loans to common shares gives a venture capitalist the power to take over the company, remove management if a major investment goal is not achieved, or profit from a rise in the firm’s value. Constraints on control rights improve management incentives and increase borrowing capacity.

Non-Compete Agreements

Non-competition agreements for business owners, senior management, and workers are meant to minimise commercial risk. A venture capital Company invests largely in shares since doing so will allow it to benefit from the ventures success. By purchasing preference shares, which guarantee that the venture capital firm receives first dibs on the companys revenues in the form of dividends and may also be convertible into common shares, the venture capital firm may reduce commercial risk. The issue of dilution will arise with the issuance of new shares. Any additional claimant diminishes the current claimant's percentage interests in the firm's assets and/or profits. As share of claims on the companys future earnings is diminished if B acquires freshly issued shares that will make up 25% of all shares while A holds 100% of the stock. On the other side, B may provide assets that allow the company to boost its future revenue by 50%. If so, theres a chance that A will get more money overall. The majority of voting rights are typically kept by current shareholders. When the company issues additional shares as part of subsequent fundraising rounds, new investors work to keep their holdings from being diluted. The majority of venture capital financings include anti-dilution clauses to safeguard financial investors. Investors who buy shares in venture financings want structural protection against changes in the business structure as well as protection against future share sales at lower prices.

Anti-dilution protection is attainable for investors in a variety of methods. A There is no established anti-dilution defense. However, there are a few common models that venture capital companies use. a The number of shares issued following a conversion may be calculated using a method known as anti-dilution price protection. If the corporation has issued convertible bonds or shares, the conversion terms may vary from those presented to prospective investors. More shares will be issued upon conversion to convertible bonds or convertible shares if the firm later issues securities at a price lower than that paid by the investor. By altering the conversion ratio and speeding up the pace at which previously issued bonds or preference shares are converted into common shares, price-based ant dilution protection is thus achieved. c After a decline in company values, for instance, anti-dilution price protection may become crucial. Weighted average and full ratchet are the two most often used techniques [3], [4].

The company may attempt to weaken the anti-dilution protective clauses. as For instance, the company might decide that the anti-dilution provisions do not apply when shares are issued for fair value, only apply for a limited time, or are approved in a particular way for instance, by a majority of the class of financial investors covered by the term. b The majority of venture capital transaction agreements have clauses that allow the companys articles of association and venture capital agreements to be changed with the approval of the board of directors and a certain qualified majority of investor votes. These paragraphs are there to enable for updates to be made to the documentation even if certain investors disagree. Therefore, a substantial investor would make sure that it has a share block that provides it an enough number of votes to prevent any amendments to the articles of organization.

II. DISCUSSION

Loan-based Mezzanine Instruments

Loan-based mezzanine securities are characterized by their subordination. When a borrower enters into a subordination agreement, one lender or group of lenders agrees that they won't get payment from the borrower until the creditors of another lender or group of lenders have been paid. Additionally, holders of mezzanine instruments can be eligible to share in the issuers earnings. This is often accomplished using an equity kicker. Subordination might be contractual, statutory, or based on various payback schedules. It can also be structural. Payments in stages. There may be contractual payment waterfalls that generate subordination between various holders of mezzanine instruments under the provisions of an intercreditor agreement, in addition to subordination compared to typical senior loans.

Prepayment and covenants. The restrictions normally cannot be stricter than those used in senior loan facilities since loan-based mezzanine instruments often rank junior to senior loans. Sanctions caused by a default occurrence follow the same rules. Although the same types of financial covenants may be used in both senior loan facilities and mezzanine loan facilities, for instance, the parties typically agree that a breach of a financial covenant under the mezzanine loan facility will not trigger any right to terminate the mezzanine loan unless the circumstances already have triggered senior creditors right to do so. Additionally, there might be a protracted grace period before any right to cancel the mezzanine loan is activated, such as 120 days.

If investors have the option to exit the investment, if there is a fixed maturity, if distributions are at the issuers discretion, if the issuer has the option to exit the investment, if payment obligations are triggered by external events, or if the issuer becomes insolvent, and if payment obligations are triggered by insolvency, determine whether loan-based mezzanine instruments are considered equity or debt instruments. A qualified majority at the targets annual general meeting is often needed to approve a merger. On the other hand, if that majority has been reached, the surviving company will obtain full control of the company that will not survive the merger. Minority rights must be taken into consideration by the buyer in a share exchange for information on block ownership.In order to fully control the target, the buyer often requires a sizable block of shares. Squeeze-out rights may be required to gain complete control. d Under the national legislation of Member States, even shareholders who disagree with a merger might be compelled to sell their Because of this, dissenter rights are often protected by corporate legislation. Shareholders who disagree may be eligible for an appraisal remedy. Dissenting shareholders cannot always be compelled to sell in a share exchange. They do not gain from dissenter rights as a result. However, if the acquirers proportion of votes or capital surpasses a level that activates a squeeze-out right, minority owners may be compelled to sell [5]–[7]. According to the MiFID, a financial instrument that is no longer compliant with the rules of the regulated market may be suspended or removed from trading by the stock exchange operator regulated market, unless doing so would significantly harm investor interests or the markets ability to operate in an orderly manner. Competent authorities of Member States may demand the withdrawal of a financial instrument from trade or the suspension of trading in a financial instrument. For instance, in England, when a listed business completes a reverse takeover, the FSA would often revoke the listing of the firm’s securities.

Particular Legal Risks

Mergers and share exchange offers result in the combination of two or more enterprises, but they also have certain legal risks: a takeover is difficult to reverse, the possibility of drawn-out litigation might thwart an acquisition. The risk of lawsuit is influenced by the value of securities. Reversal of takeovers. Company regulations often prevent mergers from being undone and discourage litigation that may thwart mergers. There are often relatively few rights for shareholders of a firm that cannot survive the merger to challenge the merger in court ex post. Instead, they are safeguarded by appraisal rights and a right to sell their shares at a reasonable price. The laws that apply to stock exchanges differ from one another. However, they are subject to company law regulations regarding the issuance of shares for non-cash compensation. For breaking these laws, there are penalties. The possibility that the resolutions that provided for the issue of shares was based would be deemed unlawful depends on the governing legislation and the violation of legal restrictions based on Community law. This is due to the need that sanctions for violations of Community Law be effective, proportional, and deterrent.

Structural Subordination of Debt

There is a difference between structural subordination and subordination of obligations. When a groups primary assets are held by one or more subsidiaries yet the borrowing is done by the parent firm, structural subordination often results. Structure subordination is based on the fact that a firm’s distributions to its shareholders are subject to company law restrictions and need the presence of distributable assets. Because assets are often invested in running companies, those company’s obligations are fundamentally more senior than those of their holding companies. In other words, since they are creditors of a shareholder rather than the business that owns the assets, junior creditors of the holding company actually rank behind senior creditors of the operational company.

Through holding corporations and debt push-up, the parties may establish structural subordination.The structural subordination will rise as a result of using holding corporations as borrowers. When a debt is pushed up, the debtors parent business receives the obligation. The previous approval of the creditor and the security provider such as a guarantor or the owner of collateral are often required for the assignment of a debt. The debts of the holding company may be assigned to its operational subsidiary by the parties in order to eliminate structural subordination. Company laws may nonetheless impose restrictions on this. The assignment of a shareholder’s obligations to the subsidiary firm may or may not be considered a distribution of assets to the shareholder, depending on the applicable law and the concept of the equal treatment of shareholders. Additionally, the subsidiarys declared objectives and overall purpose may place restrictions on the debt assignment.

Repayment Schedules as a Form of Subordination

Subordination differs from the use of several payback plans. In a loan transaction, the equity strategy is often used to produce the mezzanine impact. Senior term loans, junior term loans, and mezzanine debt, for instance, may be produced with the use of various repayment plans. Senior term loans are characterized by having the lowest maturity and being paid back during the loans length in recurring installments. The junior tranche may mature later than the senior tranche and require fewer installment payments.

Contractual Subordination of Debts

One of the most popular equity strategies is contractual subordination, which is enforceable in the event of insolvency, and subordinated loans are the most popular kind of mezzanine instruments. Junior debt is another name for subordinated debt. The pari passu rule has a contractual exemption known as contractual subordination. The following are some of the most crucial justifications for using subordinated loans, according to Finch to allow shareholders or directors to inject funds into a company where existing creditors will not allow further unsubordinated borrowings to allow parent companies to enhance the credit of a subsidiary that is issuing securities so that an appropriate rating for the securities will be obtained to allow companies to appeal to investors who seek substantial returns in return for their investment.

Bilateral Contract

There isnt just one method to order claims. A contract is required for subordination. When the debtor and a mezzanine lender agree that a loan should be subordinated, their agreement is final. Other lenders senior lenders would not necessarily get any rights, and senior lenders prefer subordination arrangements that they may execute on their own contract between creditors. The borrower, the senior lenders, the mezzanine lenders, the agent of the senior lenders, the agent of the mezzanine lenders, and the security agent will normally sign the intercreditor agreement. Equity investors, such as the borrower’s shareholders, may also sign it. Despite this, pari passu may be contracted out of. According to German law, a multilateral agreement involving senior lenders, junior lenders, and the debtor shall be binding on the bankruptcy administrator. A bilateral arrangement between senior lenders and junior lenders will not bind the bankruptcy administrator since the debtor is not a participant. However, the agreement between the debtor and a creditor, pursuant to which the creditors’ claims would be ranked after all other debt, shall bind the bankruptcy administrator. The primary rule is that a subordination agreement does not obligate the liquidator to pay out in a non-pari passu manner when a companys liquidation is regulated by English law.

The assets of an insolvent company that have not been the subject of a valid security and which are not required to pay off claims preferred by statute should be available for the discharge of the claims of unsecured creditors on an equitable, this is a fundamental principle of English insolvency law. In British Eagle v. Air France, the House of Lords upheld this principle of public policy. In the Maxwell Communications case, however, contracting out of the pari passu rule on subordination was allowed since there were no compelling public interest justifications for its enforceability. Trust subordination and contingent debt subordination were the two techniques in use before to Maxwell for implementing subordination without violating the idea of pari passu treatment [8], [9].

Generally speaking, senior lenders want to make sure that mezzanine loans are as close to share capital as possible, that senior lenders receive all of their principal and interest before mezzanine lenders receive any principal and, if possible, interest, and that senior lenders have the most flexibility to agree changes to the senior debt with the borrower. For instance, they want that any current or future financing they extend be subordinate to the mezzanine loan and that the mezzanine lenders have just the minimum authority to declare the mezzanine debt in default and initiate bankruptcy. Senior lenders also want to prevent the following from occurring: modifications to the arrangements without their consent junior lenders ability to assign or otherwise dispose of their claims before their senior debt has been fully repaid and the debtors ability to offset its claims against junior lenders claims.

Contractual Subordination of Collaterals

Debt is typically what is subordinated, and senior debts collateral also serves as security for subordinated mezzanine debt. Senior debt will subsequently be repaid before mezzanine debt, according to the intercreditor agreement. The parties may also subordinate debt to collateral as an alternative. The parties may, as an example, substitute second lien financing for subordinated debt The parties may, in theory, agree to subordinate both the obligation and the collateral. Investor inclinations. There are situations when investor demand is increased by the subordination of

collateral. Mezzanine loan instruments are always subordinated in accordance with the intercreditor agreement and, in many instances, even fundamentally subordinated, as was previously stated.

If their investment criteria limit them to exclusively purchasing senior debt securities as opposed to subordinated mezzanine loan instruments, this may provide a challenge for certain fund investors. Collateral subordination may assist in resolving this issue. As an example, the borrower has access to loan facilities A and B. The A facilitys claims are unsubordinated senior. Claims made under the B facility are treated equally to those made under the A facility. As a result, the B facility instruments are considered senior debt. The B facility instruments may nevertheless be considered senior debt even though the security assistance offered for the B facility is subordinate to the security support offered for the A facility. The second lien B facility instruments rank above any structurally subordinated debt such as most high-yield or trash bonds and any unsecured debt, such as trade debt, via the second ranking security [10]–[12].

III. CONCLUSION

Venture capital deals provide early-stage, high-growth businesses essential finance. Successful venture capital investments depend on thorough due diligence, well drafted contracts, and investor safeguards. Venture capital is essential for promoting entrepreneurship, encouraging innovation, and igniting economic development since it supports creative and promising businesses. To sustain a flourishing venture capital ecosystem and maximise the potential of start-up companies, ongoing efforts to improve transparency, investor protections, and supporting legislative frameworks are crucial.

REFERENCES

[1] Q. Liang, C. Gan, and Z. Li, Institutional environment and financing costs: Evidence from venture capital backed transactions, Financ. Res. Lett., 2019, doi: 10.1016/j.frl.2018.11.018.

[2] Y. Drachuk, E. Stalinskay, and N. Trushkin, Trends Of The Global Market For Venture Funding: Comparative Analysis, Balt. J. Econ. Stud., 2016, doi: 10.30525/2256-0742/2016-2-3-59-68.

[3] J. Michael, A. Cohn, and J. R. Butcher, Blockchain Technology Market, The Journal. 2016.

[4] S. N. Kaplan, M. M. Klebanov, and M. Sorensen, American finance association which CEO characteristics and abilities matter?, J. Finance, 2012.

[5] E. Verwaal, H. Bruining, M. Wright, S. Manigart, and A. Lockett, Resources access needs and capabilities as mediators of the relationship between VC firm size and syndication, Small Bus. Econ., 2010, doi: 10.1007/s11187-008-9126-x.

[6] B. Kogut, P. Urso, and G. Walker, Emergent properties of a new financial market: American venture capital syndication, 1960-2005, Manage. Sci., 2007, doi: 10.1287/mnsc.1060.0620.

[7] S. N. Kaplan, M. M. Klebanov, and M. Sorensen, Which CEO Characteristics and Abilities Matter?, SSRN Electron. J., 2011, doi: 10.2139/ssrn.972446.

[8] W. E. Wetzel, The informal venture capital market: Aspects of scale and market efficiency, J. Bus. Ventur., 1987, doi: 10.1016/0883-90268790023-1.

[9] B. T. Hudson, Venture Capital in the Restaurant Industry, Cornell Hotel Restaur. Adm. Q., 1995, doi: 10.1177/001088049503600320.

[10] D. Cumming, Review essay: Global venture capital transactions, Ventur. Cap., 2005, doi: 10.1080/13691060500061289.

[11] S. Kim, Y. Choi, and S. Lee, Emerging Business Opportunities Based-On Venture Capital Investment Data in the Fourth Industrial Revolution, IEEE Access, 2020, doi: 10.1109/ACCESS.2020.3006269.

[12] S. N. Kaplan, M. M. Klebanov, and M. Sorensen, Which CEO Characteristics and Abilities Matter?, J. Finance, 2012, doi: 10.1111/j.1540-6261.2012.01739.x.