International Journal of Law, Justice and Jurisprudence

E-ISSN: 2790-068
P-ISSN: 2790-0673
IJLJJ 2022; 2(2): 104-106
Received: 11-02-2022
Accepted: 16-03-2022

Pratyansha Panigrahi
Advocate and Student LLM, Ajeenkya DY Patil University, Pune, Maharashtra, India

Sangeeta Verma
Assistant Professor, Ajeenkya DY Patil University, Pune, Maharashtra, India

Correspondence
Sangeeta Verma
Assistant Professor, Ajeenkya DY Patil University, Pune, Maharashtra, India

The misuse and abuse of the corporate form

Pratyansha Panigrahi and Sangeeta Verma

Abstract
This paper suggests that there has been little abuse of the corporate form as a proprietary institution. What abuse as there is usually relates to the corporation being used as an unlawful wealth protection device (which should be the preserve of trusts and its perpetuity/accumulation rules) as opposed to one carrying on a business producing goods and services, or perhaps a specific stage in a company's existence where the separate fund is violated and/or the corporate nomenclature misused in a way which benefits one corporate constituent over another. The former is met by the narrow doctrine of veil piercing and the latter by various rules that may reflect the duty to act for proper purposes, as this counteracts an appeal to the company's best interests when this is inappropriate.

Keywords: Corporate law, incorporation, trust deed, corporation law

Introduction
Even though the corporation is sometimes viewed as an unruly horse, it has generated immense riches and other forms of business vehicles have not been used as much because of a variety of factors. Political rent-seeking which favours the employment of the corporate form, may be one factor. However the corporation form must have certain inherent benefits that other vehicles don't challenging to imitate Real estate investment trusts (REITs) in the UK, for instance, have been required to adopt the company form and how Singapore's standard REIT deeds operate make an effort to imitate a company's dual property structure in order to supply artificial.
In the process of founding a type of non-charitable purpose trust, with entity status to the REIT the following expression:
"The Unit holder's rights are outlined in the Trust Deed. Each Unit denotes a complete ownership interest in the (REIT). A unit holder is not entitled to the transfer of any equitable or proprietary interest in the underlying assets of the (REIT) and does not have any such interest. Asset or interest in any asset of the estate (REIT). The privilege of a Unit holder only have the authority to demand proper management of the (REIT) in accordance with the litigation against the Trustee or the Manager is one way to enforce the terms of the Trust Deed."
Therefore, it is essential to have the separate legal standing of a corporation and the ring-fenced fund that it holds, which Commonwealth trusts typically lack. It is necessary to include this feature of separate personality, which safeguards the entity, in any study of abuse.in that its assets are shielded from the contributors' bankruptcy. Positive asset Partitioning is therefore really to limit liability (as opposed to defensive asset partitioning, i.e. facilitate entity lending by allowing creditors to seek priority repayment from the segregated fund. Even if its shareholders had limited liability, that would be of much less consequence traditionally seen to be an advantage of inclusion, but which Hans Mann and Kraak Mann to be something at the beginning of the millennium which can be contracted for and independent of incorporation, came about. The Joint Stock Companies Act of 1844, which was followed by the Limited Liability Act of 1855, made it possible for the latter to exist as of right without the need for a Royal Charter or Private Act. Additionally, we now witness a growth in business. Vehicles that also offer limited liability, though possibly not a completely ring-fenced fund.

Piercing the veil
There is no public policy that mandates tearing through the corporate veil. This was recently confirmed in Antonio Gramsci and Alliance Bank JSC v. Lembergs by Beatson LJ (with whom the other judges concurred). Prior to this, Lord Sumption in the landmark decision in Prest v. If it is not essential to breach the corporate veil, it is not proper to do so, because on

that basis there is no public policy necessity which justifies that approach," Petrodel Resources Ltd. Stated Even if the Justices in Prest did not agree on veil piercing, Lord Sumption (and Lord Neuberger) may have stabilized a body of law in which, in the words of the latter, “the doctrine has not been correctly or successfully used in a single occasion in this jurisdiction”. The case involved a matrimonial dispute. The wife argued that the husband sought to hide some of his assets by vesting them in companies that he controlled, and asked that those underlying properties be transferred to her by way of an order under the Matrimonial Causes Act 1973.

s. 24 (1) (a) as the husband was “entitled … in possession” to them. The Supreme Court allowed the wife’s claim as the properties were held by the companies for the husband on “ordinary resulting trust” principles. However, they dismissed the wife’s appeal in relation to both piercing the veil and the statutory claim. The properties had been transferred to the companies long before the matrimonial dispute and so the husband was not evading any liability when he sought to protect his assets. In dicta, Lord Sumption thought that the real purpose for piercing the corporate veil was “depriving the company or its controller of the advantage that they would otherwise have obtained by the company’s separate legal personality”. There was nothing to pierce if the entity was used simply to conceal the controller’s identity as this could be revealed in other ways. In this regard, it is perhaps relevant that the UK government has proposed a public register reflecting the beneficial ownership (25% and above) of the shares in its unlisted companies and limited liability partnerships.

Misusing the property characteristic of the company

The misuse of company funds and the corporate brand are the two slightly different topics covered in the next section. However, they are generally restrained by a number of teachings that, according to some, come from the same source. The correct purpose rule, which "is the least talked about," The least widely known of the fiduciary duties that apply to directors. We were recently reminded that the appropriate purpose rule (applied to directors under Companies Act 2006) imposes certain obligations in the case of Eclairs Group Ltd v. JKX Plc Oil and Gas Ltd. on directors in comparison to their responsibility to behave honestly and in the best interests of the organization even though a but for test that offers a defence may exist filmmakers where even if they had done correctly, they would have reached the same end. Mann J rejected the counsel's argument that restricting certain individuals' ability to vote at an AGM stockholders who failed to reply to a notification given (within the authority granted by the UK should disclose their interests in shares under the Companies Act's Section 793 and the company's Articles. Even though the Court of Appeal 23 reversed this judgment by a majority, they did not contest the fact that the two duties were distinct. Sir Robin Jacob and Lord Justice Long more, however, used a different version of the showing how the "victim" of the decision could have easily averted it disproves the causality argument being "not a victim of any unlawful use of a power of the by declaring their interests" directors' board (at [136]). However, they also believed that the specific power being considered here there was no proper procedure to require disclosure or disenfranchise the shareholder purpose analysis but given that there may be circumstances, this illustrates how challenging the idea is when authority is used in a discriminatory manner. Briggs LJ, though, who dissented. The proper purpose rule typically arises in situations where it is difficult to define the directors' obligations in terms of the company's interests and choices that have an impact on the internal organisation of the firm. Conflicting interests within the group must be taken into account while exercising authority in this situation. Constituents with an interest in a decision's result, typically the shareholders who are harmed by a change in the power dynamic, although this might also involve the creditors and staff of the corporation as well, since what purports to be for the company's benefit inexplicably impacts a few of them negatively.

Insolvency

But given that any further losses are only borne by creditors, what about potential abuses in businesses operating while insolvent? Directors have been less concerned while attempting to trade a stock, possibly as a result of her experience with the prior Asian Financial Crisis. Company in Singapore out of bankruptcy. Directors are not required to take any action to prevent the Corporations Act of Australia prohibits unlawful and insolvent trading. Instead, a rather lax clause that allows for the filing of a civil claim is found. 340 (2) against the directors only if there has been a criminal investigation under the test is contained in section 339 (3) and the test is whether there was a “reasonable or probable ground of expectation at the time of the company being able to pay the debt”. However, given developments in England, where insolvency is increasingly seen as a liquidity or cash flow issue, the general concept of insolvency may need to be reconsidered. It was held, in part because of the challenges in accounting for contingent and prospective obligations. It is a weighing process that acknowledges the shareholder/bondholder conflict, as residual claimants have a motive to transfer value from those ranked around them to themselves.

Takeovers

Directors of target companies are likewise expected to perform this balancing act during a takeover. Investor interests seem to take precedence in these circumstances. In the UK-style the principle of Takeover Codes is to defer making the decision of whether to accept or reject the offer.by the provision of proper information and guidance, to the shareholders themselves, and Directors cannot prevent shareholders from voting on the proposal's merits. The situation appeared to be reversed in the US, with the entity's interests only being brought to the fore when there is a potential change in power. Director prioritization. It has been questioned if this is indeed a positive thing in this situation, yet it is beneficial to the interests of those who are not the directors themselves, in particular in relation to poison tablets. After the 2012 Final Report of the Kay Review of UK Equity Markets and Long-Term Decision Making was accepted, it was also anticipated that the English takeover rules would change. The Kay Review's overall ethos appeared to be directed at denying short-term their rights.

Conclusion

There is little chance that the corporate structure will be improperly exploited in general. The doctrine of veil piercing prevents any potential abuse as a going business, but it is increasingly restricted to asset transfers to avoid the controller's existing liabilities. Prest might be viewed as a legal initiative to separate industrial/service enterprises from asset holding organization things, whether they be long-term or momentary in nature.

Capital lock-in that promotes corporate expansion is the corporation's strength. A company that employs people serves as the foundation for everything else, even if some businesses later accrue liabilities that cannot be satisfied from their assets (where insolvency rules apply) intervene. Even in this later scenario, it is not necessary to pierce the curtain, and this is because of old capital maintenance regulations that prohibit the business fund's founding from being violated on the responsibility of directors to use their authority in the right ways.

References

1. John Armour. Avoidance of Transactions as a ‘Fraud on Creditors’ at Common Law” in John Armour and Howard Bennett (eds) Vulnerable Transactions in Corporate Insolvency (Oxford, 2003).
2. Progress Property Company Limited v Moorgarth Group Limited [2010] UKSC 55.
3. Joyce Lee, Making a case for the duty to act for proper purposes [2014] Sing JLS (forthcoming).
4. RP Austin and IM Ramsay, Ford’s Principles of Corporations Law, (14^{th} ed, Australia: LexisNexis Butter worth’s, 2010) at 24.670.
5. Singapore Companies Act (Cap 50, 2006 Rev. Ed. Sing), s 76 (1) (a).
6. William W Bratton, Enron and the Dark Side of Shareholder Value (2002) 76 Tul L Rev 1275 at 1314-1315.
7. [2008] 2 SLR(R) 350 (CA, Singapore), disapproving its earlier decision in Intra co Ltd v Multi-Pak Singapore Pte Ltd [1994] 3 SLR(R) 1064 (CA, Singapore).