



Guide to Protection of Minority Shareholders in the Cayman Islands

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Preface	2
Introduction	3
Right to Information	3
Right to Bring Action.....	3
Derivative Actions.....	4
Just and Equitable Winding-up	4

PREFACE

This Appleby Guide outlines the remedies available to minority shareholders in Cayman Islands companies.

Appleby
Grand Cayman, Cayman Islands
October 2010

INTRODUCTION

The company law provisions governing minority shareholder protection in the Cayman Islands are derived from the equivalent provisions in English law, although there are some notable differences. In particular, shareholders in Cayman Islands companies will find it much more difficult to obtain access to company information than their English equivalents. Further, there is no ability for a shareholder of a Cayman Islands company to bring a petition on the basis of “unfair prejudice”. Under statutory provisions which were introduced in 2009, however, the Court hearing a just and equitable winding-up petition now has the discretion to grant alternative remedies, which are the same as the remedies which the English court can grant on an “unfair prejudice” petition.

RIGHT TO INFORMATION

Unless specifically stated in the articles, or agreed by contract (for example in a shareholders agreement), the shareholder of a Cayman Islands company has no right by virtue of his position as shareholder to be provided with information regarding the company, including the company’s accounts. Nor is this information publicly available. The companies registry can be searched, but the only information a search will reveal is the company’s name, number, formation date, type, registered office and status.

On the application of the holders of not less than one-fifth of a company’s shares, the Court may appoint inspectors to examine the company’s affairs and prepare a report thereon to the Court.

The court also has discretion to order pre-action discovery of information by an intended defendant, but only if this is required to facilitate the precise formulation of the claim. If a shareholder has a potential claim against the company’s directors, he may be able to use this rule to obtain information.

RIGHT TO BRING ACTION

A shareholder in a company may be able to bring an action against its directors if he can show that they have breached a duty owed to him personally (rather than to the company). Most actions against directors for breach of their duties, however, are brought to enforce a right belonging to the company rather than to any individual shareholder or shareholders and, as such, have to be brought by the company itself.

A company’s Articles of Association will have to be inspected to see who has the right to initiate litigation in the name of the company. Generally, this right will lie with the Board of Directors. Where the Board contains a majority of errant directors unlikely to initiate litigation against themselves, the shareholders will want to consider whether they can replace the directors with a newly constituted Board, who can then initiate the action against the former directors. The procedure for removal and replacement of directors will be set out in the Articles of Association.

It is also possible for the shareholders by ordinary resolution to bring litigation in the name of the company, at least where the directors are alleged to be a party to the wrongdoing.

Finally, if the criteria set out in the following section are met, an individual shareholder may be able to initiate a claim by way of derivative action.

DERIVATIVE ACTIONS

As stated above, the general principle is that an action seeking to enforce a right belonging to a company has to be brought by the company itself. This is known as the rule in *Foss v Harbottle*.

If the shareholder can bring himself within one of the exceptions to the rule in *Foss v Harbottle*, he may be able to bring a derivative action, whereby he may bring an action in his own name but on behalf of the company. The exceptions are when the act complained of:

- (a) is ultra vires (i.e. beyond the capacity of) the company or illegal;
- (b) constitutes a “fraud on the minority”, and the wrongdoers are themselves in control of the company, so that they will not cause the company to bring an action;
- (c) is an irregularity in the passing of a resolution which requires a special majority; or
- (d) infringes the personal rights of an individual shareholder.

If the company gives notice of intention to defend the proceedings, the shareholder must at that stage apply to court for permission to continue the action. At that stage he must show a prima facie case that the company is entitled to the relief claimed, and that the action falls within one of the exceptions to the rule in *Foss v Harbottle*. This requirement has been described as a “filter” to satisfy the court that the claim is not vexatious or frivolous or has no real prospect of success, or is brought in the shareholder’s own interests (rather than those of the company).¹

JUST AND EQUITABLE WINDING-UP

A last resort for a shareholder who has been unfairly treated is to petition the court to wind up the company on the basis that it is “just and equitable” to do so. If a winding-up order is made, liquidators will be appointed who can then investigate the company’s affairs and pursue claims against the former directors (and any others who have caused loss to the company).

A shareholder bringing a petition on this ground will have to show that he has a “tangible interest” in the winding-up, i.e. that there is likely to be a surplus of assets available for distribution to shareholders. If the company is hopelessly insolvent and there is no prospect of a return to shareholders, a shareholder will not have standing to issue a petition on this ground: if such a petition is issued, it is liable to be struck out.

The categories of cases in which a winding-up has been ordered on the just and equitable ground are not closed. However, winding-up on this ground has been ordered where:

- The “substratum” of the company is gone. In 2009, the Grand Court reformulated the test for loss of substratum as follows: if it has become impractical, if not impossible, to carry on the company’s business in accordance with the reasonable expectations of its participating shareholders, it will be just and equitable for the company to be wound up.² In 2010, we successfully petitioned for the winding up of a company which

¹ *Renova Resources Private Equity Limited v Gilbertson and four others* [2009] CILR 268

² *In re Belmont Asset Based Lending Ltd*, Judgment of 19 January 2009 (unreported).

was incorporated in the Cayman Islands for tax purposes: since those purposes could not in the end be achieved due to a ruling of an overseas tax authority, the company was held to have lost its substratum.³

- There is deadlock in management.
- There has been loss of confidence in management, due to a lack of probity in their conduct of the company's affairs.
- There is a need for investigation into the affairs of the company.
- The company is a "quasi-partnership" and the petitioner's legitimate expectations have been breached. A "quasi-partnership" is a company in which features are present which make it appropriate to subject the strict legal rights of the members to equitable considerations. These features include the following:
 - (i) the company is formed on the basis of a personal relationship involving mutual confidence;
 - (ii) there is an agreement that all or some of the members will participate in the company's business;
 - (iii) there is a restriction on the transfer of the members' interest in the company.

Under revisions to the Companies Law which were introduced in 2009, if the court hearing a shareholder's petition for the winding-up of the company on the just and equitable ground is of the opinion that it is just and equitable that the company be wound up, the court also has jurisdiction to make the following orders as an alternative to winding-up:

- an order regulating the conduct of the company's affairs in the future;
- an order requiring the company to refrain from doing an act which the petitioner has complained of, or to do an act which the petitioner has complained that it has omitted to do;
- an order authorizing civil proceedings to be brought in the name and on behalf of the company by the petitioner; or
- an order providing for the purchase of the shares of any member of the company by the company or by other members of the company.

A winding-up petition has to be brought in the Financial Services Division of the Grand Court. Upon filing the Petition, a filing fee of CI\$5,000 (US\$6,097.56) must be paid. At the same time as filing the Petition, the petitioner must issue a summons for directions. There will then be a directions hearing at which the Court will give directions in relation to:

- whether the proceedings are to be treated as proceedings against the company or inter partes proceedings between the shareholders (in the latter case, the company should not bear any of the costs);
- service and advertisement of the petition;

³ In re Freerider Limited, Judgment of 13 May 2010 (unreported).

- service of a defence; and
- service of evidence, discovery and inspection of documents.

For more specific advice on Minority Shareholder Protection in the Cayman Islands, we invite you to contact one of the following:

Jeremy Walton
Partner, Cayman Practice Group Head
+1 345 814 2013
jwalton@applebyglobal.com

Katie Brown
Associate,
+1 345 814 2089
kbrown@applebyglobal.com

Appleby is the leading provider of offshore legal, fiduciary and administration services. With an unparalleled presence in the key offshore jurisdictions of Bermuda, the British Virgin Islands, the Cayman Islands, Guernsey, Isle of Man, Jersey, Mauritius and the Seychelles, the group offers advice on offshore law. We also have offices in the international financial centres of London, Hong Kong, Zurich and Bahrain.

Over 800 lawyers and professional specialists deliver sophisticated, specialised services, primarily in the areas of Corporate and Commercial; Litigation and Insolvency; Private Client and Trusts; and Property. We advise global public and private companies, financial institutions, and high net worth individuals, working with them and their advisers to achieve practical solutions, whether in a single location or across multiple jurisdictions.

This publication is intended only to provide a summary of the subject matter covered. It does not purport to be comprehensive or to provide legal advice. No person should act in reliance on any statement contained in this publication without first obtaining specific professional advice.

If this guide has been sent to you, and you would like to update your details or be removed from our marketing database, please contact the marketing department at Appleby or e-mail info@applebyglobal.com.

Bahrain

Bermuda

British Virgin Islands

Cayman Islands

Guernsey

Hong Kong

Isle of Man

Jersey

London

Mauritius

Seychelles

Zurich