



INSIGHTS

by

ML CHAMBERS

SHAREHOLDERS AGREEMENT

How should a shareholder protect his/her interests in the company?

Would every shareholder, notwithstanding his/her proportion of shareholding, be entitled to a seat on the board?

INTRODUCTION

Drafting a well thought through and comprehensive shareholders' agreement is an often neglected but an extremely important step when parties / entities come together to strike deals.

In this article, we explore both the legal underpinnings of such an agreement and some possible practical options available to parties to apportion their rights and liabilities in various circumstances.

Shareholders Agreement V. Company Constitution

A shareholders agreement can feature in the context when individuals come together to invest and co-own a company, in a joint venture between corporate shareholders and even where new investors come on board with the promise of capital injection in exchange for shareholding.

A well drafted shareholders agreement ought to carefully consider and calibrate the interests of the various shareholders but also address issues of board representation, voting mechanisms, deadlock situations, etc.

How would a shareholder protect his/her interests in the company? Would every shareholder, notwithstanding his/her proportion of shareholding, be entitled to a seat on the board? Are there matters / decisions that the shareholders would like the company to reserve to the shareholders only? These questions (and more) have to be addressed in the course of parties navigating the drafting of a shareholders agreement.

Is a shareholders agreement really necessary given that a company would have to in any event prepare a constitution?

The High Court in *BTY v BUA* and other matters [2018] SGHC 213 makes clear the foundational differences between a shareholders agreement and a company's constitution. A shareholders agreement is a private contract. "It derives its contractual force purely from the private law of obligations. The law of contract, which is a branch of the law of obligations, provides that the coincidence of offer, acceptance ...

and consideration gives rise to obligations which are legally binding. At common law, nobody who is not a party to the contract can be bound by its provisions or can claim any rights under its provisions."

On the other hand, a constitution "derives its contractual force from company law, not private law. Section 39(1) of the Companies Act provides that the constitution of a company binds the company and its members as if the constitution had been signed and sealed by each member and contained covenants on the part of each member to observe its provisions. The constitution is therefore a deemed contract which binds immediately by force of statute upon and by virtue of registration. As such, it binds without any need for offer, acceptance or consideration."

Operating on separate planes

As a result of the fundamental different legal character of a shareholders agreement and constitution, it also means that the two contracts "operate on separate planes". "A company's constitution operates on the company law plane A shareholders' agreement operates on the private law plane."

As such, amongst other practical consequences, it is important for shareholders to note the following, including:-

- the provisions of a shareholders' agreement can be modified only with the consent of all of the parties to the agreement. On the other hand, on the company law plane, in general, any provision of a company's constitution may be amended by special resolution. Thus, a shareholder who holds under 25% of a company's shares can find himself bound against his will by a modification of a provision in the company's constitution.

- no person can be bound by a shareholders' agreement unless he accedes to it expressly and separately by contract. On the company law plane, however, an incoming shareholder is, by force of company law, immediately and automatically bound by the company's constitution. No expressed consent is required from the incoming shareholder.
- company law subordinates a private agreement. This has practical consequences for shareholders to a shareholders agreement because "Any obligation which a company or a shareholder undertakes privately in a shareholders' agreement which is contrary to a mandatory provision of company law must yield to company law." Simply, if there are inconsistencies between the terms of a shareholders agreement and the articles of the company's constitution, the articles of the company's constitution would prevail.

Finally, the consequences stemming from the breach of a company's constitution and a shareholders' agreement carry deep differences as well. Where the company has acted in breach of its constitution, shareholders may argue that such act by the company was "ultra vires" and be deemed void and/or may be set aside. Whereas, if a term of a shareholders agreement is breached, that act constituting the breach is not per se ultra vires but merely a breach of a contractual obligation where a shareholder's recourse is for one of civil liability for a breach of contract.

Simply put, a shareholders agreement and one's appreciation of its significance is crucial to the longevity of any deal/transaction between serious commercial parties.

Further Considerations

A shareholders agreement can play an important role in business succession planning when it provides a framework for the transfer of ownership interests to ensure a smooth transition of the business using one or more of the following methods.

Buy-sell provisions

Buy-sell provisions set pre-established rules for transferring the owners' interest in the business in the event of their death, disability, or retirement. These provisions can help ensure that the remaining owners could buy the departing owner's interest at a fair price and prevent the sale of the interest to an outside party who may not be in the best interest of the business.

Transfer restrictions

Transfer restrictions limit the ability of shareholders to transfer their ownership interests to third parties without the consent of the other shareholders. This can help ensure that the remaining owners have control over the ownership of the business and prevent the business from being sold to outside parties without their approval.

To enhance financial protection and reduce risk for the shareholders of a company, here are some strategies that employ the use of insurance as a cost-effective means of financing succession events.

Key person insurance

Key person insurance is a type of life insurance policy that is taken out on a key employee or shareholder of a business. In the event of that person's death, the insurance pay out can be used to fund the purchase of their shares under the terms of a buy-sell agreement.

Cross-purchase plan

A cross-purchase plan is a type of buy-sell agreement where each owner agrees to purchase the other owners' interests in the event of their death or disability. In this type of plan, each owner takes out a life insurance policy on the other owners, with the pay out used to fund the purchase of their shares.

Entity purchase plan

In an entity purchase plan, the business itself agrees to purchase the shares of a deceased or disabled owner. The business takes out a life insurance policy on each owner, with the pay out used to fund the purchase of their shares.

Thus, by incorporating insurance into business succession planning, business owners can ensure that funds will be available to purchase another owner's interest in the event of their death critical illness or disability. This can help provide financial security for the remaining owners and ensure the continuity of the business.

Cross-purchase plan

A cross-purchase plan is a type of buy-sell agreement where each owner agrees to purchase the other owners' interests in the event of their death or disability. In this type of plan, each owner takes out a life insurance policy on the other owners, with the pay out used to fund the purchase of their shares.

Entity purchase plan

In an entity purchase plan, the business itself agrees to purchase the shares of a deceased or disabled owner. The business takes out a life insurance policy on each owner, with the pay out used to fund the purchase of their shares.

Thus, by incorporating insurance into business succession planning, business owners can ensure that funds will be available to purchase another owner's interest in the event of their death critical illness or disability. This can help provide financial security for the remaining owners and ensure the continuity of the business.

For more information on the article, or if you wish to learn more about the topics discussed, please contact:-



Mark LEE
Managing Director
mark.lee@mlclaw.com.sg



Sarah YEO
Director
sarah.yeo@mlclaw.com.sg

ML Chambers Law Corporation is a boutique litigation and arbitration firm specialized in high stakes complex litigation with a particular focus in corporate law, joint ventures, shareholder and boardroom related matters.

The content of this article does not constitute legal advice and should not be relied on as such. Specific advice should be sought about your specific circumstances. Copyright in this publication is owned by ML Chambers Law Corporation. This publication may not be reproduced or transmitted in any form or by any means, in whole or in part, without prior written approval.