

# Responsibilities of Officers and Directors under Texas and Delaware Law

By Byron F. Egan, Dallas, TX\*

I. Introduction .....	5
II. Fiduciary Duties Generally .....	7
A. General Principles .....	7
B. Applicable Law .....	8
C. Fiduciary Duties in Texas Cases .....	12
1. Loyalty .....	13
a. <i>Good Faith</i> .....	13
b. <i>Self-Dealing Transactions</i> .....	13
c. <i>Oversight</i> .....	14
2. Care (including business judgment rule) .....	14
3. Other (obedience) .....	17
D. Fiduciary Duties in Delaware Cases .....	17
1. Loyalty .....	17
a. <i>Conflicts of Interest</i> .....	17
b. <i>Good Faith</i> .....	19
c. <i>Oversight/Caremark</i> .....	21
2. Care .....	32
a. <i>Informed Action; Gross Negligence</i> ...	32
b. <i>Inaction</i> .....	33
c. <i>DGCL § 141(e) Reliance on Reports                 and Records</i> .....	33

---

\* Copyright © 2007 by Byron F. Egan. All rights reserved.

Byron F. Egan is a partner of Jackson Walker L.L.P. in Dallas, Texas. Mr. Egan is a Vice-Chair of the ABA Business Law Section's Negotiated Acquisitions Committee and former Co-Chair of its Asset Acquisition Agreement Task Force, which published the *ABA Model Asset Purchase Agreement with Commentary* (2001). He is also a member of the American Law Institute. Mr. Egan is a former Chairman of the Texas Business Law Foundation and is also former Chairman of the Business Law Section of the State Bar of Texas and of that Section's Corporation Law Committee.

The author wishes to acknowledge the contributions of the following in preparing this paper: Michael L. Kaufman, Michael L. Laussade, Monica L. Pace and Michael E. Taten of Jackson Walker, L.L.P. in Dallas, Texas; Mark A. Morton of Potter, Anderson & Corroon LLP of Wilmington, Delaware; and Val D. Ricks, Professor of Law at South Texas College of Law in Houston, Texas.

	<i>d. DGCL § 102(b)(7) Limitation on         Director Liability</i> .....	33
E.	Fiduciary Duties of Officers .....	36
F.	Derivative Actions.....	38
G.	Effect of Sarbanes-Oxley Act of 2002 on Common Law Fiduciary Duties .....	41
	1. Overview .....	41
	2. Shareholder Causes of Action .....	43
	3. Director Independence.....	43
	<i>a. Power to Independent Directors</i> .....	43
	<i>b. Audit Committee Member             Independence</i> .....	51
	<i>c. Nominating Committee Member             Independence</i> .....	56
	<i>d. Compensation Committee Member             Independence</i> .....	57
	<i>e. State Law</i> .....	58
	4. Compensation .....	65
	<i>a. Prohibition on Loans to Directors or             Officers</i> .....	65
	<i>b. Stock Exchange Requirements</i> .....	68
	<i>c. Fiduciary Duties</i> .....	69
	5. Related Party Transactions.....	69
	<i>a. Stock Exchanges</i> .....	69
	<i>b. Interested Director Transactions —             TBOC § 21.418; TBCA Art. 2.35-1;             and DGCL § 144</i> .....	70
III.	Shifting Duties When Company on Penumbra of Insolvency.....	72
	A. Insolvency Changes Relationships .....	72
	B. When is a Corporation Insolvent or in the Vicinity of Insolvency? .....	76
	C. Director Liabilities to Creditors .....	77
	D. Deepening Insolvency .....	81
	E. Conflicts of Interest .....	87
	F. Fraudulent Transfers .....	88
IV.	Executive Compensation Process .....	88
	A. Fiduciary Duties .....	88
	B. Specific Cases .....	89
	1. Walt Disney .....	89
	<i>a. Facts</i> .....	90
	<i>b. May 28, 2003 Chancery Court                 Opinion</i> .....	90

c.	<i>September 10, 2004 Chancery Court Opinion (Ovitz’s Fiduciary Duties Regarding His Employment Agreement)</i> .....	90
d.	<i>August 9, 2005 Chancery Court Post Trial Opinion</i> .....	91
e.	<i>June 8, 2006 Supreme Court Opinion</i> .....	95
2.	Integrated Health .....	100
3.	Sample v. Morgan .....	104
4.	Ryan v. Gifford .....	107
5.	In re Tyson Foods, Inc. Consolidated Shareholder Litigation .....	109
6.	Desimone v. Barrows .....	113
7.	Teachers’ Retirement System of Louisiana v. Aidinoff .....	116
8.	Valeant Pharmaceuticals v. Jerney .....	116
C.	Non-Profit Corporations .....	119
V.	Standards of Review in M&A Transactions .....	123
A.	Texas Standard of Review .....	123
B.	Delaware Standard of Review .....	125
1.	Business Judgment Rule .....	126
2.	Enhanced Scrutiny .....	127
a.	<i>Defensive Measures</i> .....	128
b.	<i>Sale of Control</i> .....	128
3.	Entire Fairness .....	130
C.	Action Without Bright Lines .....	131
VI.	M&A Transaction Process .....	132
A.	Statutory Framework: Board and Shareholder Action .....	132
B.	Management’s Immediate Response .....	133
C.	The Board’s Consideration .....	134
1.	Matters Considered .....	134
2.	Being Adequately Informed .....	136
a.	<i>Investment Banking Advice</i> .....	136
b.	<i>Value of Independent Directors, Special Committees</i> .....	138
c.	<i>Significant Recent Process Cases</i> .....	149
D.	Value of Thorough Deliberation .....	155
E.	The Decision to Remain Independent .....	157
1.	Judicial Respect for Independence .....	158
2.	Defensive Measures .....	161
F.	The Pursuit of a Sale .....	162
1.	Value to Stockholders .....	162

2.	Ascertaining Value .....	163
3.	Process Changes .....	171
4.	Disparate Treatment of Stockholders ...	179
5.	Protecting the Merger .....	183
a.	<i>No-Shops</i> .....	185
b.	<i>Lock-Ups</i> .....	188
c.	<i>Break-Up Fees</i> .....	189
6.	Specific Cases Where No-Shops, Lock-Ups, and Break-Up Fees Have Been Invalidated .....	191
7.	Specific Cases Where No-Shops, Lock-Ups and Break-Up Fees Have Been Upheld .....	193
G.	Dealing with a Competing Acquiror .....	196
1.	Fiduciary Outs .....	197
a.	<i>Omnicare, Inc. v. NCS Healthcare, Inc.</i> .....	198
b.	<i>Orman v. Cullman</i> .....	203
c.	<i>Energy Partners, Ltd. v. Stone Energy Corp.</i> .....	205
2.	Level Playing Field .....	207
3.	Best Value .....	208
VII.	Responses to Hostile Takeover Attempts .....	210
A.	Certain Defenses .....	210
B.	Rights Plans .....	210
C.	Business Combination Statutes .....	214
1.	DGCL § 203 .....	214
2.	Texas Business Combination Statutes ...	216
VIII.	Going Private Transactions .....	217
A.	In re Pure Resources Shareholders Litigation .....	217
B.	In re Emerging Communications, Inc. Shareholders Litigation .....	222
C.	In re PNB Holding Co. Shareholders Litigation .....	224
D.	In re SS&C Technologies, Inc. Shareholder Litigation .....	228
E.	In re Netsmart Technologies .....	229
F.	In re Topps Company Shareholders Litigation .....	239
In re Lear Corporation Shareholder Litigation .....	247	
IX.	Director Responsibilities and Liabilities .....	249

A. Enforceability of Contracts Violative of Fiduciary Duties .....	249
B. Director Consideration of Long-Term Interests .....	252
C. Liability for Unlawful Distributions .....	252
D. Reliance on Reports and Opinions .....	254
E. Inspection of Records .....	254
F. Right to Resign .....	254
X. Conclusion .....	256

## I. INTRODUCTION

The conduct of directors and officers is subject to particular scrutiny in the context of executive compensation, business combinations, whether friendly or hostile, and when the corporation is charged with illegal conduct. The high profile stories of how much corporations are paying their chief executive officer (“CEO”) and other executives, corporate scandals, bankruptcies and related developments have further focused attention on how directors and officers discharge their duties, and have caused much reexamination of how corporations are governed and how they relate to their shareholders.

The individuals who serve in leadership roles for corporations are fiduciaries in relation to the corporation and its owners. These times make it appropriate to focus upon the fiduciary and other duties of directors and officers, including their duties of care, loyalty and oversight. Increasingly the courts are applying principals articulated in cases involving mergers and acquisitions (“M&A”) to cases involving executive compensation, perhaps because both areas often involve conflicts of interest and self-dealing or because in Delaware, where many of the cases are tried, the same judges are writing significant opinions in both areas. Director and officer fiduciary duties are generally owed to the corporation and its shareholders, but when the corporation is on the penumbra of insolvency, the beneficiaries of those duties may begin to expand to include the creditors.

The failure of Enron Corp. and other corporate debacles resulted in renewed focus on how corporations should be governed and led to the Sarbanes-Oxley Act of 2002 (the “SOX”)<sup>1</sup>, which

---

1. Sarbanes-Oxley Act of 2002, Pub. L. No. 107-204, 116 Stat. 745 (codified in several sections of 15 U.S.C.A.) (“SOX”); see Byron F. Egan, *The Sarbanes-Oxley Act and Its Expanding Reach*, 40 Texas Journal of Busi-

President Bush signed on July 30, 2002. The SOX was intended to protect investors by improving the accuracy and reliability of corporate disclosures made pursuant to the securities laws.<sup>2</sup>

While SOX and related changes to SEC rules and stock exchange listing requirements have mandated changes in corporate governance practices, our focus will be on state corporate statutes and common law.<sup>3</sup> Our focus will be in the context of companies organized under the Delaware General Corporation Law (as amended to date, the “DGCL”) and the applicable Texas statutes.

Prior to January 1, 2006, Texas business corporations were organized under, and many are still governed by, the Texas Business Corporation Act, as amended (the “TBCA”),<sup>4</sup> which was supplemented by the Texas Miscellaneous Corporation Laws Act (the “TMCLA”).<sup>5</sup> However, corporations formed after January 1, 2006 are organized under and governed by the new Texas Business Organization Code (“TBOC”).<sup>6</sup> For entities

---

ness Law 305 (Winter 2005), which can be found at <http://www.jw.com/site/jsp/publicationinfo.jsp?id=505>; Byron F. Egan, *Communicating with Auditors After the Sarbanes-Oxley Act*, 41 Texas Journal of Business Law 131 (Fall 2005); and Byron F. Egan, *Communications with Accountants After the Sarbanes-Oxley Act (including Attorney Letters to Auditors re Loss Contingencies, Attorney Duties under SOX §§ 303 and 307, Options Backdating)* (Oct. 24, 2006), which can be found at <http://www.jw.com/site/jsp/publicationinfo.jsp?id=624>.

2. The SOX is generally applicable to all companies required to file reports, or that have a registration statement on file, with the Securities and Exchange Commission (“SEC”) regardless of size (“public companies”). Although the SOX does have some specific provisions, and generally establishes some important public policy changes, it is implemented in large part through rules adopted by the SEC. Among other things, the SOX amends the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (the “1934 Act”) and the Securities Act of 1933 (the “1933 Act”).
3. See William B. Chandler III and Leo E. Strine Jr., *The New Federalism of the American Corporate Governance System: Preliminary Reflections of Two Residents of One Small State* (February 26, 2002), which can be found at [http://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract\\_id=367720](http://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=367720); cf. Myron T. Steele, *Judicial Scrutiny of Fiduciary Duties in Delaware Limited Partnerships and Limited Liability Companies*, 32 DEL. J. CORP. L. 1 (2007); Leo E. Strine, Jr., *Toward A True Corporate Republic: A Traditionalist Response to Bebchuk’s Solution for Improving Corporate America*, 119 Harvard L. Rev. 1759 (2006).
4. TEX. BUS. CORP. ANN. arts. 1.01 *et. seq.* (Vernon Supp. 2007).
5. TEX. REV. CIV. STAT. ANN. art. 1302 (Vernon Supp. 2007).
6. The TBOC provides that the TBOC provisions applicable to corporations (TBOC Titles 1 and 2) may be officially and collectively known as “Texas Corporation Law” (TBOC § 1.008(b)).

formed before that date, only the ones voluntarily opting into the TBOC will be governed by it until January 1, 2010, at which time all Texas corporations will be governed by the TBOC. However, because until 2010 some Texas for-profit corporations will be governed by the TBCA and others by the TBOC and because the substantive principles under both statutes are generally the same, the term “*Texas Corporate Statutes*” is used herein to refer to the TBOC and the TBCA (as supplemented by the TMCLA) collectively, and the particular differences between the TBCA and the TBOC are referenced as appropriate.<sup>7</sup>

## **II. FIDUCIARY DUTIES GENERALLY**

### **A. General Principles**

The concepts that underlie the fiduciary duties of corporate directors have their origins in English common law of both trusts and agency from over two hundred years ago. The current concepts of those duties in both Texas and Delaware are still largely matters of evolving common law.<sup>8</sup>

Both the Texas Corporate Statutes and the DGCL provide that the business and affairs of a corporation are to be managed under the direction of its board of directors (“*Board*”).<sup>9</sup> While the Texas Corporate Statutes and the DGCL provide statutory guidance as to matters such as the issuance of securities, the payment of dividends, the notice and voting procedures for meetings of directors and shareholders, and the ability of directors to rely on specified persons and information, the nature of a director’s “fiduciary” duty to the corporation and the shareholders has been largely defined by the courts through damage and

- 
7. The term “*charter*” is used herein interchangeably with (i) “*certificate of incorporation*” for Delaware corporations, (ii) “*certificate of formation*” for corporations governed by the TBOC and (iii) “*certificate of incorporation*” for corporations organized under the TBCA, in each case as the document to be filed with the applicable Secretary of State to form a corporation.
  8. The “fiduciary duties of corporate officers and directors . . . are creatures of state common law[.]” *Gearhart Industries, Inc. v. Smith Intern., Inc.*, 741 F.2d 707, 719 (5th Cir. 1984) (citing *Cohen v. Beneficial Industrial Loan Corp.*, 337 U.S. 541, 549 (1949)); *see also Burks v. Lasker*, 441 U.S. 471, 477 (1979). Federal courts generally apply applicable state common law in fiduciary duty cases. *Floyd v. Hefner*, C.A. No. H-03-5693 (S.D. Tex. Sept. 29, 2006).
  9. TBOC § 21.401; TBCA art. 2.31; and DEL. CODE ANN. tit. 8, § 141(a) (title 8 of the Delaware Code Annotated to be hereinafter referred to as the “*DGCL*”).

injunctive actions. In Texas, the fiduciary duty of a director has been characterized as including duties of loyalty (including good faith), care and obedience.<sup>10</sup> In Delaware, the fiduciary duties include those of loyalty (including good faith) and care.<sup>11</sup> Importantly, the duties of due care, good faith and loyalty give rise to a fourth important precept of fiduciary obligation under Delaware law – namely, the so-called “duty of disclosure,” which requires the directors disclose full and accurate information when communicating with stockholders.<sup>12</sup> The term “duty of disclosure,” however, is somewhat of a misnomer because no separate *duty* of disclosure actually exists. Rather, as indicated, the fiduciary obligations of directors in the disclosure context involve a contextually specific application of the duties of care and loyalty.<sup>13</sup>

### **B. Applicable Law**

“The internal affairs doctrine is a conflict of laws principle which recognizes that only one State should have the authority to regulate a corporation’s internal affairs,”<sup>14</sup> and “under the commerce clause a state ‘has no interest in regulating the inter-

- 
10. *Gearhart Industries, Inc. v. Smith International, Inc.*, 741 F.2d 707, 719 (5th Cir. 1984).
  11. While good faith “may be described colloquially as part of a “triad” of fiduciary duties that includes the duties of care and loyalty,” the Delaware Supreme Court recently clarified the relationship of “good faith” to the duties of care and loyalty, noting that “the obligation to act in good faith does not establish an independent fiduciary duty that stands on the same footing as the duties of care and loyalty. Only the latter two duties, where violated, may directly result in liability, whereas a failure to act in good faith may do so, but indirectly. The second doctrinal consequence is that the fiduciary duty of loyalty is not limited to cases involving a financial or other cognizable fiduciary conflict of interest. It also encompasses cases where the fiduciary fails to act in good faith.” *Stone v. Ritter*, 911 A.2d 362, 2006 WL 3169168 (Del. 2006). See Notes 199-220 and related text, *infra*.
  12. “Once [directors] traveled down the road of partial disclosure . . . an obligation to provide the stockholders with an accurate, full, and fair characterization” attaches. *Arnold v. Society for Savings Bancorp, Inc.*, 650 A.2d 1270, 1280 (Del. 1994); see also *In re MONY Group S’holder Litig.*, 852 A.2d 9, 24-25 (Del. Ch. 2004) (“[O]nce [directors] take it upon themselves to disclose information, that information must not be misleading.”).
  13. *Malone v. Brincat*, 722 A.2d 5, 10 (Del 1998) (“[W]hen directors communicate with stockholders, they must recognize their duty of loyalty to do so with honesty and fairness”); see notes 210-214 and related text, *infra*.
  14. *Edgar v. MITE Corp.*, 457 U.S. 624, 645 (1982).



nal affairs of foreign corporations.”<sup>15</sup> “Internal corporate affairs” are “those matters which are peculiar to the relationships among or between the corporation and its current officers, directors, and shareholders.”<sup>16</sup>

The internal affairs doctrine in Texas mandates that courts apply the law of a corporation’s state of incorporation in adjudications regarding director fiduciary duties.<sup>17</sup> Delaware also subscribes to the internal affairs doctrine.<sup>18</sup>

- 
15. *McDermott, Inc. v. Lewis*, 531 A.2d 206, 217 (Del. 1987); Frederick Tung, *Before Competition: Origins of the Internal Affairs Doctrine*, 32 J. CORP. L. 33 (Fall 2006).
  16. *Id.* at 215 (citing *Edgar*, 457 U.S. at 645).
  17. TBOC §§ 1.101-1.105; TBCA art. 8.02; TMCLA art. 1302-1.03; *Hollis v. Hill*, 232 F.3d 460 (5th Cir. 2000); *Gearhart*, 741 F.2d at 719; *A. Copeland Enterprises, Inc. v. Guste*, 706 F. Supp. 1283, 1288 (W.D. Tex. 1989).
  18. *See VantagePoint Venture Partners v. Examen, Inc.*, 871 A.2d 1108 (Del. 2005), in which the Delaware Supreme Court considered whether a class of preferred stock would be entitled to vote as a separate class on the approval of a merger agreement and ruled that Delaware law, rather than California law, governed and did not require the approval of the holders of the preferred stock voting separately as a class for approval of the merger. In reaching that conclusion, the Court held that the DGCL exclusively governs the internal corporate affairs of a Delaware corporation and that Section 2115 of the California Corporations Code, which requires a corporation with significant California contacts (sometimes referred to as a “quasi-California corporation”) to comply with certain provisions of the California Corporations Code even if the corporation is incorporated in another state, such as Delaware, is unconstitutional and, as a result of Delaware rather than California law governing, the approval of the merger did not require the approval of the holders of the preferred stock voting separately as a class.

Section 2115 of the California Corporations Code provides that, irrespective of the state of incorporation, the articles of incorporation of a foreign corporation are deemed amended to conform to California law if (i) more than 50% of its business (as defined) was derived from California during its last fiscal year and (ii) more than 50% of its outstanding voting securities are held by persons with California addresses. Section 1201 of the California Corporations Code requires that the principal terms of a merger be approved by the outstanding shares of each class.

Under Examen’s certificate of incorporation and Delaware law, a proposed merger of Examen with an unrelated corporation required only the affirmative vote of the holders of a majority of the outstanding shares of common stock and preferred stock, voting together as a single class. The holders of Examen’s preferred stock did not have enough votes to block the merger if their shares were voted as a single class with the common stock. Thus they sued in Delaware to block the merger based on the class vote requirements of the California statute.

Under Delaware law, however, holders of preferred stock are not entitled to vote as a class on a merger, even though the merger effects an amendment to the certificate of incorporation that would have to be approved by a class vote if the amendment were effected directly by an amendment to the certificate of incorporation, unless the certificate of incorporation expressly requires a class vote to approve a merger. DGCL § 242(b)(2) provides generally with respect to amendments to certificates of incorporation that the “holders of the outstanding shares of a class shall be entitled to vote as a class upon a proposed amendment, whether or not entitled to vote thereon by the certificate of incorporation, if the amendment would . . . alter or change the powers, preferences, or special rights of the shares of such class so as to affect them adversely.” In *Warner Communications Inc. v. Chris-Craft Indus., Inc.*, 583 A.2d 962 (Del. Ch. 1989), the provision of the Warner certificate of incorporation at issue required a two-thirds class vote of the preferred stock to amend, alter or repeal any provision of the certificate of incorporation if such action adversely affected the preferences, rights, powers or privileges of the preferred stock. Warner merged with a Time subsidiary and was the surviving corporation. In the merger, the Warner preferred stock was converted into Time preferred stock and the Warner certificate of incorporation was amended to delete the terms of the preferred stock. The Chancery Court rejected the argument that holders of the preferred stock were entitled to a class vote on the merger, reasoning that any adverse effect on the preferred stock was caused not by an amendment of the terms of the stock, but solely by the conversion of the stock into a new security in the merger pursuant to DGCL § 251. The Chancery Court also reasoned that the language of the class vote provision at issue was similar to DGCL § 242 and did not expressly apply to mergers. See *Sullivan Money Mgmt., Inc. v. FLS Holdings, Inc.*, Del. Ch., C.A. No. 12731 (Nov. 20, 1992), *aff’d*, 628 A.2d 84 (Del. 1993) (where the certificate of incorporation required a class vote of the preferred stockholders for the corporation to “change, by amendment to the Certificate of incorporation . . . or otherwise,” the terms and provisions of the preferred stock, the Court held that “or otherwise” cannot be interpreted to mean merger in the context of a reverse triangular merger in which the preferred stock was converted into cash but the corporation survived). In contrast, in *Elliott Assocs. v. Avatex Corp.*, 715 A.2d 843 (Del. 1998), the certificate of incorporation provision expressly gave preferred stockholders a class vote on the “amendment, alteration or repeal, whether by merger, consolidation or otherwise” of provisions of the certificate of incorporation so as to adversely affect the rights of the preferred stock, and preferred stock was converted into common stock of the surviving corporation of a merger. The Court in *Elliott*, for purposes of its opinion, assumed that the preferred stock was adversely affected, distinguished *Warner* because the charter contained the “whether by merger, consolidation or otherwise” language, and held that the preferred stock had a right to a class vote on the merger because the adverse effect was caused by the repeal of the charter and the stock conversion. The Court in *Elliott* commented that the “path for future drafters to follow in articulating class vote provisions is clear”: “When a certificate (like the Warner certificate or the Series A provisions here)

grants only the right to vote on an amendment, alteration or repeal, the preferred have no class vote in a merger. When a certificate (like the First Series Preferred certificate here) adds the terms ‘whether by merger, consolidation or otherwise’ and a merger results in an amendment, alteration or repeal that causes an adverse effect on the preferred, there would be a class vote.” *Id.* at 855. See *Benchmark Capital Partners IV, L.P. v. Vague*, 2002 Del. Ch. LEXIS 90, at \*25 (Del. Ch. July 15, 2002) (“[A court’s function in ascertaining the rights of preferred stockholders] is essentially one of contract interpretation.”), *aff’d sub nom. Benchmark Capital Partners IV, L.P. v. Juniper Fin. Corp.*, 822 A.2d 396 (Del. 2003); and *Watchmark Corp. v. Argo Global Capital, LLC, et al.*, C.A. 711-N (Del. Ch. November 4, 2004). (“Duties owed to preferred stockholders are ‘primarily . . . contractual in nature,’ involving the ‘rights and obligations created contractually by the certificate of designation.’ If fiduciary duties are owed to preferred stockholders, it is only in limited circumstances. Whether a given claim asserted by preferred stockholders is governed by contractual or fiduciary duty principles, then, depends on whether the dispute arises from rights and obligations created by contract or from ‘a right or obligation that is not by virtue of a preference but is shared equally with the common.’”)

Under Texas law and unless the charter otherwise provides, approval of a merger or other fundamental business transaction requires the affirmative vote of the holders of two-thirds of (i) all of the corporation’s outstanding shares entitled to vote voting as a single class and (ii) each class entitled to vote as a class or series thereon. TBOC § 21.457; TBCA art. 5.03.F. Separate voting by a class or series of shares of a corporation is required by TBOC § 21.458 and TBCA art. 5.03(E) for approval of a plan of merger only if (a) the charter so provides or (b) the plan of merger contains a provision that if contained in an amendment to the charter would require approval by that class or series under TBOC § 21.364 or TBCA art. 4.03, which generally require class voting on amendments to the charter which change the designations, preferences, limitations or relative rights or a class or series or otherwise affect the class or series in specified respects. Unless a corporation’s charter provides otherwise, the foregoing Texas merger approval requirements (but not the charter amendment requirements) are subject to exceptions for (a) mergers in which the corporation will be the sole survivor and the ownership and voting rights of the shareholders are not substantially impaired (TBOC § 21.459(a); TBCA art. 5.03.G), (b) mergers affected to create a holding company (TBOC §§ 10.005, 21.459(b); TBCA art. 5.03.H – 5.03.K), and (c) short form mergers (TBOC §§ 10.006, 21.459(b); TBCA art. 5.16.A – 5.16.F).

The California courts, however, tend to uphold California statutes against internal affairs doctrine challenges. See *Friese v. Superior Court of San Diego County*, 36 Cal. Rptr. 3d 558 (Cal. Ct. App. 2005), in which a California court allowed insider trading claims to be brought against a director of a California based Delaware corporation and wrote “while we agree that the duties officers and directors owe a corporation are in the first instance defined by the law of the state of incorporation, such duties are not the subject of California’s corporate securities laws in general or [Corporate Securities Law] section 25502.5 in particu-

The Delaware Code subjects directors of Delaware corporations to personal jurisdiction in the Delaware Court of Chancery over claims for violation of a duty in their capacity as directors of a Delaware corporation.<sup>19</sup> Texas does not have a comparable statute.

### C. *Fiduciary Duties in Texas Cases*

The Fifth Circuit stated in *Gearhart* that under Texas law “[t]hree broad duties stem from the fiduciary status of corporate directors; namely the duties of obedience, loyalty, and due care,” and commented that (i) the duty of obedience requires a director to avoid committing *ultra vires* acts, i.e., acts beyond the scope of the authority of the corporation as defined by its articles of incorporation or the laws of the state of incorporation, (ii) the duty of loyalty dictates that a director must act in good faith and must not allow his personal interests to prevail over the interests of the corporation, and (iii) the duty of due care requires that a director must handle his corporate duties with such care as an ordinarily prudent man would use under simi-

---

lar. . . . Because a substantial portion of California’s marketplace includes transactions involving securities issued by foreign corporations, the corporate securities laws have been consistently applied to such transactions.”

19. 10 *Del. C.* § 3114(a) provides (emphasis added):

Every nonresident of this State who after September 1, 1977, accepts election or appointment as a director, trustee or member of the governing body of a corporation organized under the laws of this State or who after June 30, 1978, serves in such capacity, and every resident of this State who so accepts election or appointment or serves in such capacity and thereafter removes residence from this State shall, by such acceptance or by such service, be deemed thereby to have consented to the appointment of the registered agent of such corporation (or, if there is none, the Secretary of State) as an agent upon whom service of process may be made in all civil actions or proceedings brought in this State, by or on behalf of, or against such corporation, in which such director, trustee or member is a necessary or proper party, or in any action or proceeding against such director, trustee or member *for violation of a duty in such capacity*, whether or not the person continues to serve as such director, trustee or member at the time suit is commenced. Such acceptance or service as such director, trustee or member shall be a signification of the consent of such director, trustee or member that any process when so served shall be of the same legal force and validity as if served upon such director, trustee or member within this State and such appointment of the registered agent (or, if there is none, the Secretary of State) shall be irrevocable.

lar circumstances.<sup>20</sup> Good faith under *Gearhart* is an element of the duty of loyalty. *Gearhart* remains the seminal case for defining the fiduciary duties of directors in Texas, although there are subsequent cases that amplify *Gearhart* as they apply it in the context of lawsuits by the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation (“*FDIC*”) and the Resolution Trust Company (“*RTC*”) arising out of failed financial institutions.<sup>21</sup> Many Texas fiduciary duty cases arise in the context of closely held corporations.<sup>22</sup>

## 1. *Loyalty*

### a. *Good Faith*

The duty of loyalty in Texas is a duty that dictates that the director act in good faith and not allow his personal interest to prevail over that of the corporation.<sup>23</sup> The good faith of a director will be determined on whether the director acted with an intent to confer a benefit to the corporation.<sup>24</sup> Whether there exists a personal interest by the director will be a question of fact.<sup>25</sup>

### b. *Self-Dealing Transactions*

In general, a director will not be permitted to derive a personal profit or advantage at the expense of the corporation and must act solely with an eye to the best interest of the corpora-

---

20. *Gearhart*, 741 F.2d at 719-721; *McCollum v. Dollar*, 213 S.W. 259 (Tex. Comm’n App. 1919, holding approved); see *Landon v. S&A Marketing Group, Inc.*, 82 S.W.2d 3rd 666 (Tx. App. Eastland 2002), which quoted and repeated the summary of Texas fiduciary duty principles from *Gearhart*.

21. See, e.g., *FDIC v. Harrington*, 844 F. Supp. 300 (N.D. Tex. 1994).

22. See *Flanary v. Mills*, 150 S.W.3d 785 (Tex. App. – Austin 2004) (uncle and nephew incorporated 50%/50% owned roofing business, but never issued stock certificates or had board or shareholder meetings; uncle used corporation’s banking account as his own, told nephew business doing poorly and sent check to nephew for \$7,500 as his share of proceeds of business for four years; court held uncle liable for breach of fiduciary duties that we would label loyalty and candor.)

23. *Gearhart*, 741 F.2d at 719.

24. *International Bankers Life Insurance Co. v. Holloway*, 368 S.W.2d 567 (Tex. 1967), in which the court indicated that good faith conduct requires a showing that the directors had “an intent to confer a benefit to the corporation.”

25. *Id.* at 578.

tion, unhampered by any pecuniary interest of his own.<sup>26</sup> The court in *Gearhart* summarized Texas law with respect to the question of whether a director is “interested” in the context of self-dealing transactions:

A director is considered “interested” if he or she (1) makes a personal profit from a transaction by dealing with the corporation or usurps a corporate opportunity . . . ; (2) buys or sells assets of the corporation . . . ; (3) transacts business in his director’s capacity with a second corporation of which he is also a director or significantly financially associated . . . ; or (4) transacts business in his director’s capacity with a family member.<sup>27</sup>

### ***c. Oversight***

In Texas an absence of good faith may also be found in situations where there is a severe failure of director oversight. In *FDIC v. Harrington*,<sup>28</sup> a federal district court applying Texas law held that there is an absence of good faith when a board “abdicates [its] responsibilities and fails to exercise any judgment.”

### ***2. Care (including business judgment rule)***

The duty of care in Texas requires the director to handle his duties with such care as an ordinary prudent man would use under similar circumstances. In performing this obligation, the director must be diligent and informed and exercise honest and unbiased business judgment in pursuit of corporate interests.<sup>29</sup>

In general, the duty of care will be satisfied if the director’s actions comport with the standard of the business judgment rule. The Fifth Circuit stated in *Gearhart* that, in spite of the requirement that a corporate director handle his duties with

---

26. *A. Copeland Enterprises*, 706 F. Supp. at 1291; *Milam v. Cooper Co.*, 258 S.W.2d 953 (Tex. Civ. App. — Waco 1953, writ ref’d n.r.e.); see Kendrick, *The Interested Director in Texas*, 21 Sw. L.J. 794 (1967).

27. *Gearhart*, 741 F.2d at 719-20 (citations omitted); see *Landon v. S&A Marketing Group, Inc.*, 82 S.W.2d 3rd 666 (Tx. App. Eastland 2002), which cited and repeated the “independence” test articulated in *Gearhart*. See also.

28. 844 F. Supp. 300 (N.D. Tex. 1994).

29. *Gearhart*, 741 F.2d at 719; *McCollum v. Dollar*, 213 S.W. 259 (Tex. Comm’n App. 1919, holding approved).

such care as an ordinary prudent man would use under similar circumstances, Texas courts will not impose liability upon a *non-interested* corporate director unless the challenged action is *ultra vires* or is tainted by fraud. In a footnote in the *Gearhart* decision, the Fifth Circuit stated:

The business judgment rule is a defense to the duty of care. As such, the Texas business judgment rule precludes judicial interference with the business judgment of directors absent a showing of fraud or an *ultra vires* act. If such a showing is not made, then the good or bad faith of the directors is irrelevant.<sup>30</sup>

In applying the business judgment rule in Texas, the courts in *Gearhart* and other recent cases have quoted from the early Texas decision of *Cates v. Sparkman*,<sup>31</sup> as setting the standard for judicial intervention in cases involving duty of care issues:

[I]f the acts or things are or may be that which the majority of the company have a right to do, or if they have been done irregularly, negligently, or imprudently, or are within the exercise of their discretion and judgment in the development or prosecution of the enterprise in which their interests are involved, these would not constitute such a breach of duty, however unwise or inexpedient such acts might be, as would authorize interference by the courts at the suit of a shareholder.<sup>32</sup>

In *Gearhart* the Court commented that “[e]ven though *Cates* was decided in 1889, and despite the ordinary care standard announced in *McCullum v. Dollar*, *supra*, Texas courts to this day will not impose liability upon a noninterested corporate director unless the challenged action is *ultra vires* or is tainted by fraud.”<sup>33</sup>

Neither *Gearhart* nor the earlier Texas cases on which it relied referenced “gross negligence” as a standard for director liability. If read literally, the business judgment rule articulated in the case would protect even grossly negligent conduct.

---

30. *Gearhart*, 741 F.2d at 723 n.9.

31. 11 S.W. 846 (1889).

32. *Id.* at 849.

33. *Gearhart*, 741 F.2d at 721.

Federal district court decisions in FDIC and RTC initiated cases, however, have declined to interpret Texas law this broadly and have held that the Texas business judgment rule does not protect “any breach of the duty of care that amounts to gross negligence” or “directors who abdicate their responsibilities and fail to exercise any judgment.”<sup>34</sup> These decisions “appear to be the product of the special treatment banks may receive under Texas law” and may not be followed to hold directors “liable for gross negligence under Texas law as it exists now” in other businesses.<sup>35</sup>

Gross negligence in Texas is defined as “that entire want of care which would raise the belief that the act or omission complained of was the result of a conscious indifference to the right or welfare of the person or persons to be affected by it.”<sup>36</sup> In *Harrington*, the Court concluded “that a director’s total abdication of duties falls within this definition of gross negligence.”<sup>37</sup>

The business judgment rule in Texas does not necessarily protect a director with respect to transactions in which he is “interested.” It simply means that the action will have to be challenged on duty of loyalty rather than duty of care grounds.<sup>38</sup>

Directors may “in good faith and with ordinary care, rely on information, opinions, reports or statements, including financial statements and other financial data,” prepared by officers or employees of the corporation, counsel, accountants, investment bankers or “other persons as to matters the director reasonably believes are within the person’s professional or expert competence.”<sup>39</sup>

---

34. *FDIC v. Harrington*, 844 F. Supp. 300, 306 (N.D. Tex. 1994); *see also FDIC v. Schreiner*, 892 F.Supp. 869 (W.D. Tex. 1995); *FDIC v. Benson*, 867 F. Supp. 512 (S.D. Tex. 1994); *RTC v. Acton*, 844 F. Supp. 307, 314 (N.D. Tex. 1994); *RTC v. Norris*, 830 F. Supp. 351, 357-58 (S.D. Tex. 1993); *FDIC v. Brown*, 812 F. Supp. 722, 726 (S.D. Tex. 1992); *cf. RTC v. Miramon*, 22 F.3d 1357 (5th Cir. 1994) (followed *Harrington* analysis of Section 1821(K) of the Financial Institutions Reform, Recovery and Enforcement Act (“FIRREA”) which held that federal common law of director liability did not survive FIRREA and applied Texas’ gross negligence standard for financial institution director liability cases under FIRREA).

35. *Floyd v. Hefner*, C.A. No. H-03-5693 (S.D. Tex. Sept. 29, 2006).

36. *Burk Royalty Co. v. Walls*, 616 S.W.2d 911, 920 (Tex. 1981) (citing *Missouri Pacific Ry. v. Shuford*, 72 Tex. 165, 10 S.W. 408, 411 (1888)).

37. 844 F. Supp. at 306 n.7.

38. *Gearhart*, 741 F.2d at 723, n.9.

39. TBCA art. 2.41D.



### 3. *Other (obedience)*

The duty of obedience in Texas requires a director to avoid committing *ultra vires* acts, i.e., acts beyond the scope of the powers of the corporation as defined by its articles of incorporation and Texas law.<sup>40</sup> An *ultra vires* act may be voidable under Texas law, but the director will not be held personally liable for such act unless the act is in violation of a specific statute or against public policy.

The RTC's complaint in *RTC v. Norris*<sup>41</sup> asserted that the directors of a failed financial institution breached their fiduciary duty of obedience by failing to cause the institution to adequately respond to regulatory warnings: "The defendants committed *ultra vires* acts by ignoring warnings from [regulators], by failing to put into place proper review and lending procedures, and by ratifying loans that did not comply with state and federal regulations and Commonwealth's Bylaws."<sup>42</sup> In rejecting this RTC argument, the court wrote:

The RTC does not cite, and the court has not found, any case in which a disinterested director has been found liable under Texas law for alleged *ultra vires* acts of employees, absent pleadings and proof that the director knew of or took part in the act, even where the act is illegal.

Under the business judgment rule, Texas courts have refused to impose personal liability on corporate directors for illegal or *ultra vires* acts of corporate agents unless the directors either participated in the act or had actual knowledge of the act . . . .<sup>43</sup>

## D. *Fiduciary Duties in Delaware Cases*

### 1. *Loyalty*

#### a. *Conflicts of Interest*

In Delaware, the duty of loyalty mandates "that there shall be no conflict between duty and self-interest."<sup>44</sup> It demands

---

40. *Gearhart*, 741 F.2d at 719.

41. 830 F. Supp. 351 (S.D. Tex. 1993).

42. *Norris*, 830 F. Supp. at 355.

43. *Id.*

44. *Guth v. Loft*, 5 A.2d 503, 510 (Del. 1939).

that the best interests of the corporation and its stockholders take precedence over any personal interest or bias of a director that is not shared by stockholders generally.<sup>45</sup> The Delaware Court of Chancery has summarized the duty of loyalty as follows:

Without intending to necessarily cover every case, it is possible to say broadly that the duty of loyalty is transgressed when a corporate fiduciary, whether director, officer or controlling shareholder, uses his or her corporate office or, in the case of a controlling shareholder, control over corporate machinery, to promote, advance or effectuate a transaction between the corporation and such person (or an entity in which the fiduciary has a substantial economic interest, directly or indirectly) and that transaction is not substantively fair to the corporation. That is, breach of loyalty cases inevitably involve conflicting economic or other interests, even if only in the somewhat diluted form present in every ‘entrenchment’ case.<sup>46</sup>

Importantly, conflicts of interest do not *per se* result in a breach of the duty of loyalty. Rather, it is the manner in which an interested director handles a conflict and the processes invoked to insure fairness to the corporation and its stockholders that will determine the propriety of the director’s conduct and the validity of the particular transaction. Moreover, the Delaware courts have emphasized that only *material* personal interests or influences will imbue a transaction with duty of loyalty implications.

The duty of loyalty may be implicated in connection with numerous types of corporate transactions, including, for example, the following: contracts between the corporation and directors or entities in which directors have a material interest; management buyouts; dealings by a parent corporation with a subsidiary; corporate acquisitions and reorganizations in which the interests of a controlling stockholder and the minority

---

45. *Cede & Co. v. Technicolor, Inc.*, 634 A.2d 345, 361 (Del. 1993) (“*Technicolor I*”). See notes 145-151 and related text, *infra*.

46. *Solash v. Telex Corp.*, 1988 WL 3587 at \*7 (Del. Ch. Jan. 19, 1988). Some of the procedural safeguards typically invoked to assure fairness in transactions involving Board conflicts of interest are discussed in more detail below, in connection with the entire fairness standard of review.

stockholders might diverge; usurpations of corporate opportunities; competition by directors or officers with the corporation; use of corporate office, property or information for purposes unrelated to the best interest of the corporation; insider trading; and actions that have the purpose or practical effect of perpetuating directors in office. In Delaware, a director can be found guilty of a breach of duty of loyalty by approving a transaction in which the director did not personally profit, but did approve a transaction that benefited the majority stockholder to the detriment of the minority stockholders.<sup>47</sup>

### **b. Good Faith**

Good faith is far from a new concept in Delaware fiduciary duty law. Good faith long was viewed by the Delaware courts (and still is viewed by many commentators) as an integral component of the duties of care and loyalty. Indeed, in one of the early, landmark decisions analyzing the contours of the duty of loyalty, the Delaware Supreme Court observed that “no hard and fast rule can be formatted” for determining whether a director has acted in “good faith.”<sup>48</sup> While that observation remains true today, the case law and applicable commentary provide useful guidance regarding some of the touchstone principles underlying the duty of good faith.<sup>49</sup>

The duty of good faith was recognized as a distinct directorial duty in *Cede & Co. v. Technicolor, Inc.*<sup>50</sup> The duty of good faith requires that directors act honestly, in the best interest of the corporation, and in a manner that is not knowingly unlawful or contrary to public policy. While the Court’s review requires it to examine the Board’s subjective motivation, the Court will utilize objective facts to infer such motivation. Like a duty of care analysis, such review likely will focus on the process by which the Board reached the decision under review. Consistent with earlier articulations of the level of conduct necessary to infer bad faith (or irrationality), more recent case law

---

47. *Crescent/Mach I Partners, L.P. v. Twiner*, 846 A.2d 963, n. 50 (Del. Ch. 2000); *Strassburger v. Earley*, 752 A.2d 557, 581 (Del. Ch. 2000).

48. *See Guth*, 5 A.2d at 510.

49. *See Stone v. Ritter*, 911 A.2d 362, 2006 WL 3169168 (Del. 2006); *In re The Walt Disney Co. Derivative Litig.*, 906 A.2d 27 (Del. 2006); John F. Grossbauer and Nancy N. Waterman, *The (No Longer) Overlooked Duty of Good Faith Under Delaware Law*, VIII “Deal Points” No. 2 of 6 (The Newsletter of the ABA Business Law Section Committee on Negotiated Acquisitions, No. 2, Summer 2003).

50. 634 A.2d 345, 361 (Del. 1993) (*Technicolor I*).

suggests that only fairly egregious conduct (such as a knowing and deliberate indifference to a potential risk of harm to the corporation) will rise to the level of “bad faith.”<sup>51</sup>

The impetus for an increased focus on the duty of good faith is the availability of damages as a remedy against directors who are found to have acted in bad faith. DGCL § 102(b)(7) authorizes corporations to include in their certificates of incorporation a provision eliminating or limiting directors’ liability for breaches of the fiduciary duty of care. However, DGCL § 102(b)(7) also expressly provides that directors cannot be protected from liability for either actions not taken in good faith or breaches of the duty of loyalty.<sup>52</sup> A finding of a lack of good faith has profound significance for directors not only because they may not be exculpated from liability for such conduct, but also because a prerequisite to eligibility for indemnification under DGCL § 145 of the DGCL is that the directors who were unsuccessful in their litigation nevertheless must demonstrate that they have acted “in good faith and in a manner the person reasonably believed was in or not opposed to the best interests of the corporation.”<sup>53</sup> Accordingly, a director who has breached the duty of good faith not only is exposed to personal liability, but also may not be able to seek indemnification from the corporation for any judgment obtained against her or for expenses incurred (unsuccessfully) litigating the issue of liability.<sup>54</sup>

---

51. *In re the Walt Disney Company Derivative Litigation*, 906 A.2d 27 (Del. 2006).

52. Specifically, DGCL § 102(b)(7) authorizes the inclusion in a certificate of incorporation of:

A provision eliminating or limiting the personal liability of a director to the corporation or its stockholders for monetary damages for breach of fiduciary duty as a director, provided that such provision shall not eliminate or limit the liability of a director: (i) For any breach of the director’s duty of loyalty to the corporation or its stockholders; (ii) for acts or omissions not in good faith or which involve intentional misconduct or a knowing violation of law; (iii) under §174 of this title [dealing with the unlawful payment of dividends or unlawful stock purchase or redemption]; or (iv) for any transaction from which the director derived an improper personal benefit . . .

53. DGCL §§ 145(a) and (b).

54. In contrast, it is at least theoretically possible that a director who has been found to have breached his or her duty of loyalty could be found to have acted in good faith and, therefore, be eligible for indemnification of expenses (and, in non-derivative cases, amounts paid in judgment or settlement) by the corporation. *See Blasius Industries, Inc. v. Atlas*

Thus, in cases involving decisions made by directors who are disinterested and independent with respect to a transaction (and, therefore, the duty of loyalty is not implicated), the duty of good faith still provides an avenue for asserting claims of personal liability against the directors. Moreover, these claims, if successful, create barriers to indemnification of amounts paid by directors in judgment or settlement.<sup>55</sup>

In *Stone v. Ritter*,<sup>56</sup> the Delaware Supreme Court held that “good faith” is not a separate fiduciary duty like the duties of care and loyalty, but rather is embedded in the duty of loyalty:

[F]ailure to act in good faith results in two additional doctrinal consequences. First, although good faith may be described colloquially as part of a “triad” of fiduciary duties that includes the duties of care and loyalty, the obligation to act in good faith does not establish an independent fiduciary duty that stands on the same footing as the duties of care and loyalty. Only the latter two duties, where violated, may directly result in liability, whereas a failure to act in good faith may do so, but indirectly. The second doctrinal consequence is that the fiduciary duty of loyalty is not limited to cases involving a financial or other cognizable fiduciary conflict of interest.

### *c. Oversight/Caremark*

Directors also may be found to have violated the duty of loyalty when they fail to act in the face of a known duty to act – i.e., they act in bad faith.<sup>57</sup> In an important Delaware Chancery Court decision on this issue, *In re Caremark International, Inc. Derivative Litigation*,<sup>58</sup> the settlement of a derivative action that involved claims that Caremark’s Board breached its fiduci-

---

*Corp.*, 564 A.2d 651 (Del. Ch. 1988) (directors found to have acted in good faith but nevertheless breached their duty of loyalty).

55. The availability of directors and officers liability insurance also may be brought into question by a finding of bad faith. Policies often contain exclusions that could be cited by carriers as a basis for denying coverage.

56. 911 A.2d 362, (Del. 2006).

57. In *Stone v. Ritter*, 911 A.2d 362, (Del. 2006), the Delaware Supreme Court held that “the requirement to act in good faith is a subsidiary element, i.e., a condition, of the fundamental duty of loyalty.”

58. 698 A.2d 959 (Del. Ch. 1996).

ary duty to the company in connection with alleged violations by the company of anti-referral provisions of Federal Medicare and Medicaid statutes was approved. In so doing, the Court discussed the scope of a Board's duty to supervise or monitor corporate performance and stay informed about the business of the corporation as follows:

[I]t would . . . be a mistake to conclude . . . that corporate boards may satisfy their obligations to be reasonably informed concerning the corporation, without assuring themselves that information and reporting systems exist in the organization that are reasonably designed to provide to senior management and to the board itself timely, accurate information sufficient to allow management and the board, each within its scope, to reach informed judgments concerning both the corporation's compliance with law and its business performance.<sup>59</sup>

Stated affirmatively, "a director's obligation includes a duty to attempt in good faith to assure that a corporate information and reporting system, which the board concludes is adequate, exists, and that failure to do so under some circumstances may . . . render a director liable."<sup>60</sup> While *Caremark* recognizes a cause of action for uninformed inaction, the holding is subject to the following:

*First*, the Court held that "only a sustained or systematic failure of the board to exercise oversight — such as an utter failure to attempt to assure a reasonable information and reporting system exists — will establish the lack of good faith that is a necessary condition to liability."<sup>61</sup> It is thus not at all clear that a plaintiff could recover based on a single example of director inaction, or even a series of examples relating to a single subject.

*Second*, *Caremark* noted that "the level of detail that is appropriate for such an information system is a question of business judgment,"<sup>62</sup> which indicates that the presence of an existing information and reporting system will do much to cut

---

59. *Id.* at 970.

60. *Id.*

61. *Id.* at 971.

62. *Id.* at 970.

off any derivative claim, because the adequacy of the system itself will be protected.

*Third*, *Caremark* considered it obvious that “no rationally designed information system . . . will remove the possibility” that losses could occur.<sup>63</sup> As a result, “[a]ny action seeking recovery for losses would logically entail a judicial determination of proximate cause.”<sup>64</sup> This holding indicates that a loss to the corporation is not itself evidence of an inadequate information and reporting system. Instead, the court will focus on the adequacy of the system overall and whether a causal link exists.<sup>65</sup>

The *Caremark* issue of a board’s systematic failure to exercise oversight was revisited by the Seventh Circuit applying Illinois law in *In re Abbott Laboratories Derivative Shareholders Litigation*.<sup>66</sup> *Abbott* involved a shareholders derivative suit against the health care corporation’s directors, alleging breach of fiduciary duty and asserting that the directors were liable under state law for harms resulting from a consent decree between the corporation and the Food and Drug Administration (“FDA”). The consent decree had followed a six-year period during which the FDA had given numerous notices to the corporation of violations of FDA manufacturing regulations and imposed a \$100 million fine, which resulted in a \$168 million charge to earnings. In reversing a district court dismissal of plaintiff’s complaint for failure to adequately plead that demand upon the board of directors would be futile, the Seventh Circuit held that the complaints raised reasonable doubt as to

---

63. *Id.*

64. *Id.* at 970 n. 27.

65. See generally Eisenberg, *Corporate Governance The Board of Directors and Internal Control*, 19 CARDOZO L. REV. 237 (1997); Pitt, et al., *Talking the Talk and Walking the Walk: Director Duties to Uncover and Respond to Management Misconduct*, 1005 PLI/CORP. 301, 304 (1997); Gruner, *Director and Officer Liability for Defective Compliance Systems: Caremark and Beyond*, 995 PLI/CORP. 57, 64-70 (1997); Funk, *Recent Developments in Delaware Corporate Law: In re Caremark International Inc. Derivative Litigation: Director Behavior, Shareholder Protection, and Corporate Legal Compliance*, 22 DEL. J. CORP. L. 311 (1997).

66. 325 F.3d 795 (7th Cir. 2003). The *Abbott* court distinguished *Caremark* on the grounds that in the latter, there was no evidence indicating that the directors “conscientiously permitted a known violation of law by the corporation to occur,” unlike evidence to the contrary in *Abbott*. *Id.* at 806 (quoting *Caremark*, 698 A.2d at 972). However, the *Abbott* court nonetheless relied on *Caremark* language regarding the connection between a board’s systemic failure of oversight and a lack of good faith. *Abbott*, 325 F.3d at 808-809.

whether the directors' actions were the product of a valid exercise of business judgment, thus excusing demand, and were sufficient to overcome the directors' exemption from liability contained in the certificate of incorporation, at least for purposes of defeating the plaintiffs' motion to dismiss. In so holding, the Seventh Circuit noted that the complaint pled that the directors knew or should have known of the FDA noncompliance problems and demonstrated bad faith by ignoring them for six years and not disclosing them in the company's SEC periodic reports during this period. The Court relied upon Delaware case law and wrote:

[T]he facts support a reasonable assumption that there was a 'sustained and systematic failure of the board to exercise oversight,' in this case intentional in that the directors knew of the violations of law, took no steps in an effort to prevent or remedy the situation, and that failure to take any action for such an inordinate amount of time resulted in substantial corporate losses, establishing a lack of good faith. We find that . . . the directors' decision to not act was not made in good faith and was contrary to the best interests of the company.<sup>67</sup>

The Seventh Circuit further held that the provision in the corporation's articles of incorporation limiting director liability<sup>68</sup> would not be sufficient to sustain a motion to dismiss. It stated that in a case such as this "[w]here the complaint sufficiently alleges a breach of fiduciary duties based on a failure of the directors to act in good faith, bad faith actions present a question

---

67. *Abbott*, 325 F.3d at 809.

68. *Abbott's* certificate of incorporation included the following provision limiting director liability:

"A director of the corporation shall not be personally liable to the corporation or its shareholders for monetary damages for breach of fiduciary duty as a director, except for liability (i) for any breach of the director's duty of loyalty to the corporation or its shareholders, (ii) for acts or omissions not in good faith or that involve intentional misconduct or a knowing violation of law, (iii) under Section 8.65 of the Illinois Business Corporation Act, or (iv) for any transaction from which the director derived an improper personal benefit . . . ."

*Id.* at 810.



of fact that cannot be determined at the pleading stage.”<sup>69</sup> The court intimated that had the case involved a simple allegation of breach of the duty of care and not bad faith, the liability limitation clause might have led to a different result.<sup>70</sup>

In *Saito v. McCall*,<sup>71</sup> a derivative suit was brought in the Delaware Chancery Court to recover damages from the directors, senior officers, merger advisors and outside accountants of each of HBO & Company (“HBOC”) (a healthcare software provider), McKesson Corporation (“McKesson”) (a healthcare supply management company) and McKesson HBOC, Inc., the surviving corporation (the “HBOC/McKesson Survivor”) in the 1999 merger of HBOC and McKesson, alleging that: (1) HBOC’s directors and officers presided over a fraudulent accounting scheme; (2) McKesson’s officers, directors and advisors uncovered HBOC’s accounting improprieties during their due diligence, but nonetheless proceeded with the proposed merger; and (3) the Company’s board did not act quickly enough to rectify the accounting fraud following the merger. The Chancery Court dismissed most of the claims on procedural grounds, with the notable exception of the claim against the Company’s directors alleging *Caremark* violations.

In 1998, HBOC’s audit committee met with HBOC’s outside auditor to discuss HBOC’s 1997 audit and was informed that the 1997 audit was “high risk” and explained its concerns. Although a subsequent SEC investigation established that HBOC was misapplying generally accepted accounting principles (“GAAP”) for financial reporting in the U.S., the auditors did not inform the audit committee of this fact, and reported that there were no significant problems or exceptions and that the auditors enjoyed the full cooperation of HBOC management.

During the summer of 1998, HBOC held discussions with McKesson regarding a potential merger. McKesson engaged independent accountants and investment bankers to assist it in evaluating the proposed merger. In a meeting with these advisors, McKesson’s board of directors discussed the proposed merger and the due diligence issues that had surfaced, and first learned of HBOC’s questionable accounting practices, although there was no indication that the McKesson board actually knew of any of HBOC’s material accounting violations.

---

69. *Id.* at 811.

70. *See id.* at 810.

71. C.A. No. 17132-NC, 2004 WL 3029876 (Del. Ch. Dec 20, 2004).

In October 1998, after a brief suspension of merger negotiations, the parties resumed discussions and agreed upon a modified deal structure, but they did not resolve the issues related to HBOC's accounting practices. On October 16, 1998, with awareness of some of HBOC's accounting irregularities, McKesson's board approved the merger and agreed to acquire HBOC for \$14 billion in McKesson stock. Following the effective time of the merger, the HBOC/McKesson Survivor's audit committee met with its advisors to discuss the transaction and certain accounting adjustments to HBOC's financial statements, which the audit committee knew were insufficient to remedy the accounting improprieties that its auditors had previously identified. The HBOC/McKesson Survivor took some remedial action in April 1999, when it announced that it would restate its prior earnings downward and, a few months later, terminated the senior management responsible for the accounting improprieties.

Thereafter, the plaintiffs brought a duty of oversight claim against the directors of the HBOC/McKesson Survivor alleging, *inter alia*, that the Company directors had failed to (1) correct HBOC's false financial statements, (2) monitor the accounting practices of the Company, (3) implement sufficient internal controls to guard against wrongful accounting practices that were uncovered following the merger, and (4) disclose HBOC's false financial statements. The Court noted that under *Caremark* "a derivative plaintiff must allege facts constituting 'a sustained or systematic failure of the board to exercise oversight – such as an utter failure to attempt to assure a reasonable information reporting system exists.'" To survive a motion to dismiss, the plaintiff was required to show that the HBOC/McKesson Survivor board should have known that the alleged accounting problems had occurred or were occurring and made no good faith effort to rectify the accounting improprieties. Noting that the plaintiff was entitled to the benefit of all reasonable inferences drawn from the applicable facts, the Court found that the plaintiffs had alleged sufficient facts to infer that the boards of each of McKesson and HBOC – members of which comprised the board of the HBOC/McKesson Survivor – knew, or should have known, of HBOC's accounting irregularities, noting that (i) HBOC's audit committee became aware of the accounting problems when it learned that its 1997 audit was "high risk" and that the McKesson board learned of some of the problems during the July 1998 board meeting at which due diligence issues were discussed, and (ii) the HBOC/McKesson Survivor's

audit committee had considered, but failed to act swiftly upon, HBOC's accounting problems. On these facts, the Court concluded that the Company board knew or should have known that HBOC's accounting practices were unlawful and that, despite this knowledge, failed to take any remedial action for several months. While noting that facts later adduced could prove that the Company directors did not violate their duties under *Caremark*, the Court allowed the plaintiffs' claim to survive a motion to dismiss.<sup>72</sup>

In *Stone v. Ritter*<sup>73</sup> the Delaware Supreme Court affirmed *Caremark* as the standard for assessing director oversight responsibility. *Stone v. Ritter* was a "classic *Caremark* claim" arising out of a bank paying \$50 million in fines and penalties to resolve government and regulatory investigations pertaining principally to the failure of bank employees to file Suspicious Activity Reports ("SAR"s) as required by the Bank Secrecy Act ("BSA") and various anti money laundering regulations. The Chancery Court dismissed the plaintiffs' derivative complaint, which alleged that "the defendants had utterly failed to implement any sort of statutorily required monitoring, reporting or information controls that would have enabled them to learn of problems requiring their attention." In affirming the Chancery Court, the Supreme Court commented, "[i]n this appeal, the plaintiffs acknowledge that the directors neither 'knew [n]or should have known that violations of law were occurring,' i.e., that there were no 'red flags' before the directors" and held "[c]onsistent with our opinion in *In re Walt Disney Co. Deriv. Litig.*<sup>74</sup> . . . that *Caremark* articulates the necessary conditions for assessing director oversight liability and . . . that the *Caremark* standard was properly applied to evaluate the derivative complaint in this case."

The Supreme Court explained the doctrinal basis for its holding as follows and, in so doing, held that "good faith" is not a separate fiduciary duty:

As evidenced by the language quoted above, the *Caremark* standard for so-called "oversight" liability

---

72. The HBOC/McKesson Survivor's certificate of incorporation included an exculpatory provision adopted pursuant to DGCL § 102(b)(7). The parties did not raise, and the Court did not address, the impact of that provision.

73. 911 A.2d 362; 2006 WL 3169168 (Del. 2006).

74. 906 A.2d 27 (Del.2006).

draws heavily upon the concept of director failure to act in good faith. That is consistent with the definition(s) of bad faith recently approved by this Court in its recent *Disney* decision, where we held that a failure to act in good faith requires conduct that is qualitatively different from, and more culpable than, the conduct giving rise to a violation of the fiduciary duty of care (i.e., gross negligence). In *Disney*, we identified the following examples of conduct that would establish a failure to act in good faith:

A failure to act in good faith may be shown, for instance, where the fiduciary intentionally acts with a purpose other than that of advancing the best interests of the corporation, where the fiduciary acts with the intent to violate applicable positive law, or where the fiduciary intentionally fails to act in the face of a known duty to act, demonstrating a conscious disregard for his duties. There may be other examples of bad faith yet to be proven or alleged, but these three are the most salient.

The third of these examples describes, and is fully consistent with, the lack of good faith conduct that the *Caremark* court held was a “necessary condition” for director oversight liability, i.e., “a sustained or systematic failure of the board to exercise oversight – such as an utter failure to attempt to assure a reasonable information and reporting system exists. . . .” Indeed, our opinion in *Disney* cited *Caremark* with approval for that proposition. Accordingly, the Court of Chancery applied the correct standard in assessing whether demand was excused in this case where failure to exercise oversight was the basis or theory of the plaintiffs’ claim for relief.

It is important, in this context, to clarify a doctrinal issue that is critical to understanding fiduciary liability under *Caremark* as we construe that case. The phraseology used in *Caremark* and that we employ here – describing the lack of good faith as a “necessary condition to liability” – is deliberate. The purpose of that formulation is to communicate that a failure to act in good faith is not conduct that results, *ipso facto*, in the direct imposition of fiduciary liability. The failure to act in good faith may result in liability because the requirement to act in good faith “is a subsidiary ele-

ment[,]” i.e., a condition, “of the fundamental duty of loyalty.” It follows that because a showing of bad faith conduct, in the sense described in *Disney* and *Caremark*, is essential to establish director oversight liability, the fiduciary duty violated by that conduct is the duty of loyalty.

This view of a failure to act in good faith results in two additional doctrinal consequences. First, although good faith may be described colloquially as part of a “triad” of fiduciary duties that includes the duties of care and loyalty, the obligation to act in good faith does not establish an independent fiduciary duty that stands on the same footing as the duties of care and loyalty. Only the latter two duties, where violated, may directly result in liability, whereas a failure to act in good faith may do so, but indirectly. The second doctrinal consequence is that the fiduciary duty of loyalty is not limited to cases involving a financial or other cognizable fiduciary conflict of interest. It also encompasses cases where the fiduciary fails to act in good faith. As the Court of Chancery aptly put it in *Guttman*, “[a] director cannot act loyally towards the corporation unless she acts in the good faith belief that her actions are in the corporation’s best interest.”

We hold that *Caremark* articulates the necessary conditions predicate for director oversight liability: (a) the directors utterly failed to implement any reporting or information system or controls; or (b) having implemented such a system or controls, consciously failed to monitor or oversee its operations thus disabling themselves from being informed of risks or problems requiring their attention. In either case, imposition of liability requires a showing that the directors knew that they were not discharging their fiduciary obligations. Where directors fail to act in the face of a known duty to act, thereby demonstrating a conscious disregard for their responsibilities, they breach their duty of loyalty by failing to discharge that fiduciary obligation in good faith.

*Stone v. Ritter* was a “demand-excused” case in which the plaintiffs did not demand that the directors commence the derivative action because allegedly the directors breached their oversight duty and, as a result, faced a “substantial likelihood of

liability” as a result of their “utter failure” to act in good faith to put into place policies and procedures to ensure compliance with regulatory obligations. The Court of Chancery found that the plaintiffs did not plead the existence of “red flags” – “facts showing that the board ever was aware that company’s internal controls were inadequate, that these inadequacies would result in illegal activity, and that the board chose to do nothing about problems it allegedly knew existed.” In dismissing the derivative complaint, the Court of Chancery concluded:

This case is not about a board’s failure to carefully consider a material corporate decision that was presented to the board. This is a case where information was not reaching the board because of ineffective internal controls. . . . With the benefit of hindsight, it is beyond question that AmSouth’s internal controls with respect to the Bank Secrecy Act and anti-money laundering regulations compliance were inadequate. Neither party disputes that the lack of internal controls resulted in a huge fine—\$50 million, alleged to be the largest ever of its kind. The fact of those losses, however, is not alone enough for a court to conclude that a majority of the corporation’s board of directors is disqualified from considering demand that AmSouth bring suit against those responsible.

The adequacy of the plaintiffs’ assertion that demand was excused turned on whether the complaint alleged facts sufficient to show that the defendant directors were potentially personally liable for the failure of non-director bank employees to file the required Suspicious Activity Reports. In affirming the Chancery Court, the Supreme Court wrote:

For the plaintiffs’ derivative complaint to withstand a motion to dismiss, “only a sustained or systematic failure of the board to exercise oversight—such as an utter failure to attempt to assure a reasonable information and reporting system exists—will establish the lack of good faith that is a necessary condition to liability.” As the *Caremark* decision noted:

Such a test of liability – lack of good faith as evidenced by sustained or systematic failure of a director to exercise reasonable oversight – is quite high. But, a demanding test of liability in the over-

sight context is probably beneficial to corporate shareholders as a class, as it is in the board decision context, since it makes board service by qualified persons more likely, while continuing to act as a stimulus to *good faith performance of duty* by such directors.

The KPMG Report – which the plaintiffs explicitly incorporated by reference into their derivative complaint – refutes the assertion that the directors “never took the necessary steps . . . to ensure that a reasonable BSA compliance and reporting system existed.” KPMG’s findings reflect that the Board received and approved relevant policies and procedures, delegated to certain employees and departments the responsibility for filing SARs and monitoring compliance, and exercised oversight by relying on periodic reports from them. Although there ultimately may have been failures by employees to report deficiencies to the Board, there is no basis for an oversight claim seeking to hold the directors personally liable for such failures by the employees.

With the benefit of hindsight, the plaintiffs’ complaint seeks to equate a bad outcome with bad faith. The lacuna in the plaintiffs’ argument is a failure to recognize that the directors’ good faith exercise of oversight responsibility may not invariably prevent employees from violating criminal laws, or from causing the corporation to incur significant financial liability, or both, as occurred in *Graham*, *Caremark* and this very case. In the absence of red flags, good faith in the context of oversight must be measured by the directors’ actions “to assure a reasonable information and reporting system exists” and not by second-guessing after the occurrence of employee conduct that results in an unintended adverse outcome. Accordingly, we hold that the Court of Chancery properly applied *Caremark* and dismissed the plaintiffs’ derivative complaint for failure to excuse demand by alleging particularized facts that created reason to doubt whether the directors had acted in good faith in exercising their oversight responsibilities.

## 2. Care

### a. Informed Action; Gross Negligence

Directors have an obligation to inform themselves of all material information reasonably available to them before making a business decision and, having so informed themselves, to act with the requisite care in making such decision.<sup>75</sup> Directors are not required, however, “to read *in haec verba* every contract or legal document,”<sup>76</sup> or to “know all particulars of the legal documents [they] authorize for execution.”<sup>77</sup> Although a director must act diligently and with the level of due care appropriate to the particular situation, the Delaware courts have held that action (or inaction) will constitute a breach of a director’s fiduciary duty of care only if the director’s conduct rises to the level of gross negligence.<sup>78</sup>

Compliance with the duty of care requires active diligence. Accordingly, directors should attend board meetings regularly; they should take time to review, digest, and evaluate all materials and other information provided to them; they should take reasonable steps to assure that all material information bearing on a decision has been considered by the directors or by those upon whom the directors will rely; they should actively participate in board deliberations, ask appropriate questions, and discuss each proposal’s strengths and weaknesses; they should seek out the advice of legal counsel, financial advisors, and other professionals, as needed; they should, where appropriate, reasonably rely upon information, reports, and opinions provided by officers, experts or board committees; and they should take sufficient time (as may be dictated by the circumstances) to reflect on decisions before making them. Action by unanimous written consent ordinarily does not provide any opportunity for, or record of, careful Board deliberations.<sup>79</sup>

---

75. See *Technicolor I*, 634 A.2d at 367; *Van Gorkom*, 488 A.2d at 872.

76. *Smith v. Van Gorkom*, 488 A.2d 858, 883 n.25.

77. *Moran v. Household Int’l, Inc.*, 490 A.2d 1059, 1078 (Del. Ch.), *aff’d*, 500 A.2d 1346 (Del. 1985).

78. See *Van Gorkom*, 488 A.2d at 873.

79. *Official Committee of Unsecured Creditors of Integrated Health Services, Inc. v. Elkins*, 2004 WL 1949290 (Del. Ch. Aug. 24, 2004) (Compensation Committee forgiveness of a loan to the CEO by written consent without any evidence of director deliberation or reliance upon a compensation expert raised a Vice Chancellor’s “concern as to whether it acted with knowing or deliberate indifference.”)



***b. Inaction***

In many cases, of course, the directors' decision may be not to take any action. To the extent that decision is challenged, the focus will be on the process by which the decision not to act was made. Where the failure to oversee or to act is so severe as to evidence a lack of good faith, the failure may be found to be a breach of the duty of loyalty.<sup>80</sup>

***c. DGCL § 141(e) Reliance on Reports and Records***

The DGCL provides two important statutory protections to directors relating to the duty of care. The first statutory protection is DGCL § 141(e), which provides statutory protection to directors who rely in good faith upon corporate records or reports in connection with their efforts to be fully informed, and reads as follows:

A member of the board of directors, or a member of any committee designated by the board of directors, shall, in the performance of such member's duties, be fully protected in relying in good faith upon the records of the corporation and upon such information, opinions, reports or statements presented to the corporation by any of the corporation's officers or employees, or committees of the board of directors, or by any other person as to matters the member reasonably believes are within such other person's professional or expert competence and who has been selected with reasonable care by or on behalf of the corporation.<sup>81</sup>

Significantly, as discussed below, DGCL § 141(e) provides protection to directors only if they acted in good faith.

***d. DGCL § 102(b)(7) Limitation on Director Liability***

The second statutory protection is DGCL § 102(b)(7), which allows a Delaware corporation to provide limitations on (or par-

---

80. In *Stone v. Ritter*, 911 A.2d 362, (Del. 2006), the Delaware Supreme Court held that "the requirement to act in good faith is a subsidiary element, i.e., a condition, of the fundamental duty of loyalty." See Notes 58-73 and related text, *supra*.

81. DGCL § 141(e).

tial elimination of) director liability in relation to the duty of care, and reads as follows:

102 CONTENTS OF CERTIFICATE OF INCORPORATION

\* \* \*

(b) In addition to the matters required to be set forth in the certificate of incorporation by subsection (a) of this section, the certificate of incorporation may also contain any or all of the following matters:

\* \* \*

(7) A provision eliminating or limiting the personal liability of a director to the corporation or its stockholders for monetary damages for breach of fiduciary duty as a director, provided that such provision shall not eliminate or limit the liability of a director: (i) for any breach of the director's duty of loyalty to the corporation or its stockholders; (ii) for acts or omissions not in good faith or which involve intentional misconduct or a knowing violation of law; (iii) under § 174 of this title; or (iv) for any transaction from which the director derived an improper personal benefit. No such provision shall eliminate or limit the liability of a director for any act or omission occurring prior to the date when such provision becomes effective. All references in this paragraph to a director shall also be deemed to refer (x) to a member of the governing body of a corporation which is not authorized to issue capital stock, and (y) to such other person or persons, if any, who, pursuant to a provision of the certificate of incorporation in accordance with § 141(a) of this title, exercise or perform any of the powers or duties otherwise conferred or imposed upon the board of directors by this title.<sup>82</sup>

---

82. The Texas analogue to DGCL § 102(b)(7) is TBOC § 7.001, which provides in relevant part:

- (b) The certificate of formation or similar instrument of an organization to which this section applies [generally, corporations] may provide that a governing person of the organization is not liable, or is liable only to the extent provided by the certificate of formation or similar instrument, to the organization or its owners or members for monetary damages for an act or omission by the person in the person's capacity as a governing person.

DGCL § 102(b)(7) in effect permits a corporation to include a provision in its certificate of incorporation limiting or eliminating a director's personal liability for monetary damages for breaches of the duty of care.<sup>83</sup> The liability of directors may not be so limited or eliminated, however, in connection with breaches of the duty of loyalty, the failure to act in good faith, intentional misconduct, knowing violations of law, obtaining improper personal benefits, or paying dividends or approving stock repurchases in violation of DGCL § 174.<sup>84</sup> Delaware courts have routinely enforced DGCL § 102(b)(7) provisions and held that, pursuant to such provisions, directors cannot be held monetarily liable for damages caused by alleged breaches of the fiduciary duty of care.<sup>85</sup>

- 
- (c) Subsection (b) does not authorize the elimination or limitation of the liability of a governing person to the extent the person is found liable under applicable law for:
- (1) a breach of the person's duty of loyalty, if any, to the organization or its owners or members;
  - (2) an act or omission not in good faith that:
    - (A) constitutes a breach of duty of the person to the organization; or
    - (B) involves intentional misconduct or a knowing violation of law;
  - (3) a transaction from which the person received an improper benefit, regardless of whether the benefit resulted from an action taken within the scope of the person's duties; or
  - (4) an act or omission for which the liability of a governing person is expressly provided by an applicable statute.

TMCLA art. 1302-7.06 provides substantially the same.

83. DGCL § 102(b)(7).

84. DGCL § 102(b)(7); *see also Zirn v. VLI Corp.*, 621 A.2d 773, 783 (Del. 1993) (DGCL § 102(b)(7) provision in corporation's certificate did not shield directors from liability where disclosure claims involving breach of the duty of loyalty were asserted).

85. A DGCL § 102(b)(7) provision does not operate to defeat the validity of a plaintiff's claim on the merits, rather it operates to defeat a plaintiff's ability to recover monetary damages. *Emerald Partners v. Berlin*, 787 A.2d 85, 92 (Del. 2000). In determining when a DGCL § 102(b)(7) provision should be evaluated by the Court of Chancery to determine whether it exculpates defendant directors, the Delaware Supreme Court recently distinguished between cases invoking the business judgment presumption and those invoking entire fairness review (these standards of review are discussed below). *Id.* at 92-3. The Court determined that if a stockholder complaint unambiguously asserts solely a claim for breach of the duty of care, then the complaint may be dismissed by invocation of a DGCL § 102(b)(7) provision. *Id.* at 92. The Court held, however, that "when entire fairness is the applicable standard of judicial

### ***E. Fiduciary Duties of Officers***

Under both Texas and Delaware law, a corporate officer owes fiduciary duties of care, good faith and loyalty to the corporation and may be sued in a corporate derivative action just as a director may be.<sup>86</sup> To be held liable for a breach of fiduciary duty, “it will have to be concluded for each of the alleged breaches that [an officer] had the discretionary authority in a relevant functional area and the ability to cause or prevent a complained-of-action.”<sup>87</sup> Derivative claims against officers for failure to exercise due care in carrying out their responsibilities as assigned by the board of directors are uncommon.

An individual is entitled to seek the best possible employment arrangements for himself before he becomes a fiduciary, but once the individual becomes an officer or director, his ability to pursue his individual self interest becomes restricted. *In re The Walt Disney Co. Derivative Litigation*,<sup>88</sup> which resulted from the failed marriage between Disney and its former President Michael Ovitz, is instructive as to the duties of an officer.<sup>89</sup>

---

review, a determination that the director defendants are exculpated from paying monetary damages can be made only *after the basis* for their liability has been decided.” *Id.* at 94. In such a circumstance, defendant directors can avoid personal liability for paying monetary damages only if they establish that their failure to withstand an entire fairness analysis was exclusively attributable to a violation of the duty of care. *Id.* at 98.

86. *Faour v. Faour*, 789 S.W.2d 620,621 (Tex. App.—Texarkana 1990, writ denied); *Zapata Corp. v. Maldonado*, 430 A.2d 779 (Del. 1981); see *Lifshutz v. Lifshutz*, 199 S.W.3d 9, 18 (Tex. App.—San Antonio 2006) (“Corporate officers owe fiduciary duties to the corporations they serve. [citation omitted]. A corporate fiduciary is under a duty not to usurp corporate opportunities for personal gain, and equity will hold him accountable to the corporation for his profits if he does so.”); *Cotton v. Weatherford Bancshares, Inc.*, 187 S.W.3d 687, 698 (Tex. App.—Fort Worth 2006) (“While corporate officers owe fiduciary duties to the corporation they serve, they do not generally owe fiduciary duties to individual shareholders unless a contract or confidential relationship exists between them in addition to the corporate relationship”).
87. *Pereira v. Cogan*, 294 B.R. 449, 511 (SDNY 2003), *reversed on other grounds and remanded*, *Pereira v. Farace*, 413 F.3d 330 (2nd Cir. 2005); see *Fletcher Cyclopedia of the Law of Private Corporations*, § 846 (2002) (“The Revised Model Business Corporation Act provides that a non-director officer with discretionary authority is governed by the same standards of conduct as a director.”).
88. 906 A.2d 27 (Del. 2006).
89. See the discussion of the *Disney* case in notes 200-205 and related text, *infra*, in respect of director duties when approving executive officer compensation.

Ovitz was elected president of Disney on October 1, 1995 prior to finalizing his employment contract, which was executed on December 12, 1995, and he became a director in January 1996. Ovitz's compensation package was lucrative, including a \$40 million termination payment for a no-fault separation. Ovitz' tenure as an officer was mutually unsatisfying, and a year later he was terminated on a no-fault basis. Derivative litigation ensued against Ovitz and the directors approving his employment and separation arrangements.

The Delaware Supreme Court affirmed the Chancery Court rulings that (i) as to claims based on Ovitz entering into his employment agreement with Disney, officers and directors become fiduciaries only when they are officially installed and receive the formal investiture of authority that accompanies such office or directorship, and before becoming a fiduciary, Ovitz had the right to seek the best employment agreement possible for himself and (ii) as to claims based on actions after he became an officer, (a) an officer may negotiate his or her own employment agreement as long as the process involves negotiations performed in an adversarial and arms-length manner, (b) Ovitz made the decision that a faithful fiduciary would make by abstaining from attendance at a Compensation Committee meeting [of which he was an ex officio member] where a substantial part of his own compensation was to be discussed and decided upon, (c) Ovitz did not breach any fiduciary duties by executing and performing his employment agreement after he became an officer since no material change was made in it from the form negotiated and approved prior to his becoming an officer, and (d) Ovitz did not breach any fiduciary duty in receiving no-fault termination payments because he played no part in the determination that he would be terminated or that his termination would not be for cause.

A corporate officer is an agent of the corporation.<sup>90</sup> If an officer commits a tort while acting for the corporation, under the law of agency, the officer is liable personally for his actions.<sup>91</sup> The corporation may also be liable under *respondeat superior*.

---

90. *Joseph Greenspon's Sons Iron & Steel Co. v. Pecos Valley Gas Co.*, 156 A. 350 (Del. Ch. 1931); *Hollaway v. Skinner*, 898 S.W.2d 793, 795 (Tex. 1995).

91. Dana M. Muir & Cindy A. Schipani, *The Intersection of State Corporation Law and Employee Compensation Programs: Is it Curtains for Veil Piercing?* 1996 U. ILL. L. REV. 1059, 1078-1079 (1996).

### ***F. Derivative Actions***

The fiduciary duties of directors and officers are owed to the corporation they serve. Thus, typically an action against a director or officer for breach of fiduciary duty would be brought by or in the right of the corporation. Since the cause of action belongs to the corporation, a disinterested board of directors would have the power to determine whether to bring a breach of fiduciary duty claim for the corporation.<sup>92</sup>

Both Delaware<sup>93</sup> and Texas<sup>94</sup> law authorize an action brought in the right of the corporation by a shareholder against directors or officers for breach of fiduciary duty.<sup>95</sup> Such an action is called a “derivative action.” In deference to the power of the board of directors, a shareholder would ordinarily be expected to demand that the Board commence the action before commencing a derivative action.<sup>96</sup> An independent and disinterested Board could then decide whether commencing the action would be in the best interest of the corporation or could decide to have the action dismissed.<sup>97</sup>

Delaware recognizes that a Board may not be disinterested and does not require demand when it would be futile. Chancellor Chandler explained when demand will not be required in Delaware in *In re Tyson Foods, Inc. Consolidated Shareholder Litigation*:<sup>98</sup>

The first hurdle facing any derivative complaint is Rule 23.1, which requires that the complaint “allege with particularity the efforts, if any, made by the plaintiff to obtain the action the plaintiff desires from the directors . . . and the reasons for the plaintiff’s failure to obtain the action or for not making the effort.” Rule

---

92. See *Wingate v. Hajdik*, 795 S.W.2d 717, 719 (Tex. 1990) (“Ordinarily, the cause of action for injury to the property of a corporation, or the impairment or destruction of its business, is vested in the corporation, as distinguished from its stockholders . . .”); *Pace v. Jordan*, 999 S.W.2d 615, 622 (Tex. App. – Houston [1st Dist.] 1999, pet. denied) (noting that “[a] corporation’s directors, not its shareholders, have the right to control litigation of corporate causes of action”).

93. Del. Court of Chancery Rule 23.1.

94. TBCA art. 5.14 ; TBOC §§ 21.551-21.563.

95. TBCA art. 5.14 ; TBOC §§ 21.551-21.563.

96. Del. Court of Chancery Rule 23.1; TBCA art. 5.14C; TBOC § 21.553.

97. TBCA art. 5.14F ; TBOC § 21.558; see discussion of *In re Oracle Corp. Derivative Litigation* in note 127, *infra*.

98. 919 A.2d 563 (Del.Ch. 2007).

23.1 stands for the proposition in Delaware corporate law that the business and affairs of a corporation, absent exceptional circumstances, are to be managed by its board of directors. To this end, Rule 23.1 requires that a plaintiff who asserts that demand would be futile must “comply with stringent requirements of factual particularity that differ substantially from the permissive notice pleadings” normally governed by Rule 8(a). Vague or conclusory allegations do not suffice to upset the presumption of a director’s capacity to consider demand. As famously explained in *Aronson v. Lewis*, plaintiffs may establish that demand was futile by showing that there is a reason to doubt either (a) the disinterestedness and independence of a majority of the board upon whom demand would be made, or (b) the possibility that the transaction could have been an exercise of business judgment.

There are two ways that a plaintiff can show that a director is unable to act objectively with respect to a pre-suit demand. Most obviously, a plaintiff can assert facts that demonstrate that a given director is personally interested in the outcome of litigation, in that the director will personally benefit or suffer as a result of the lawsuit in a manner that differs from shareholders generally. A plaintiff may also challenge a director’s independence by alleging facts illustrating that a given director is dominated through a “close personal or familial relationship or through force of will,” or is so beholden to an interested director that his or her “discretion would be sterilized.” Plaintiffs must show that the beholden director receives a benefit “upon which the director is so dependent or is of such subjective material importance that its threatened loss might create a reason to question whether the director is able to consider the corporate merits of the challenged transaction objectively.”

The Chancellor further elaborated on demand futility in *Ryan v. Gifford*,<sup>99</sup> as follows:

Defendants state that plaintiff has failed to make demand or prove demand futility. That is, defendants

---

99. 918 A.2d 341 (Del.Ch. 2007).

contend that the complaint lacks particularized facts that either establish that a majority of directors face a “substantial likelihood” of personal liability for the wrongdoing alleged in the complaint or render a majority of the board incapable of acting in an independent and disinterested fashion regarding demand.

When a shareholder seeks to maintain a derivative action on behalf of a corporation, Delaware law requires that shareholder to first make demand on that corporation’s board of directors, giving the board the opportunity to examine the alleged grievance and related facts and to determine whether pursuing the action is in the best interest of the corporation. This demand requirement works “to curb a myriad of individual shareholders from bringing potentially frivolous lawsuits on behalf of the corporation, which may tie up the corporation’s governors in constant litigation and diminish the board’s authority to govern the affairs of the corporation.”

This Court has recognized, however, that in some cases demand would prove futile. Where the board’s actions cause the shareholders’ complaint, “a question is rightfully raised over whether the board will pursue these claims with 100% allegiance to the corporation, since doing so may require that the board sue *itself* on behalf of the corporation.” Thus, in an effort to balance the interest of preventing “strike suits motivated by the hope of creating settlement leverage through the prospect of expensive and time-consuming litigation discovery [with the interest of encouraging] suits reflecting a reasonable apprehension of actionable director malfeasance that the sitting board cannot be expected to objectively pursue on the corporation’s behalf,” Delaware law recognizes two instances where a plaintiff is excused from making demand. Failure to make demand may be excused if a plaintiff can raise a reason to doubt that: (1) a majority of the board is disinterested or independent or (2) the challenged acts were the product of the board’s valid exercise of business judgment.

The analysis differs, however, where the challenged decision is not a decision of the board in place at the time the complaint is filed. \* \* \* Accordingly, where the challenged transaction was not a decision of the board upon which plaintiff must seek demand, plaintiff must



“create a reasonable doubt that, as of the time the complaint is filed, the board of directors could have properly exercised its independent and disinterested business judgment in responding to a demand.”

\* \* \* Where at least one half or more of the board in place at the time the complaint was filed approved the underlying challenged transactions, which approval may be imputed to the entire board for purposes of proving demand futility, [demand may be excused].

In Delaware a derivative plaintiff must have been a stockholder continuously from the time of the transaction in question through the completion of the lawsuit.<sup>100</sup> Stockholders who obtained their shares in a merger lack derivative standing to challenge pre-merger actions.<sup>101</sup>

## **G. Effect of Sarbanes-Oxley Act of 2002 on Common Law Fiduciary Duties**

### **1. Overview**

Responding to problems in corporate governance, SOX and related changes to SEC rules and stock exchange listing requirements<sup>102</sup> have implemented a series of reforms that re-

---

100. *Id.*; 8 Del. Code § 327.

101. *Cf. Louisiana Municipal Police Employees' Retirement Sys. v. Crawford*, Civil Action No. 2635-N (Del. Ch. February 13, 2007) and *Express Scripts, Inc. v. Crawford*, Civil Action No. 2663-N (Del. Ch. February 13, 2007), in which the Chancellor delayed a stockholders meeting to vote on the proposed Caremark Rx/CVS merger from February 20, 2007 to March 9, 2007 to allow disclosures that (i) Caremark had three times discussed a possible transaction with Express Scripts even though after its agreement with CVS, Caremark was arguing that antitrust concerns even precluded talking to this higher bidder, and (ii) any merger of Caremark could cause other plaintiffs to lose standing to sue Caremark Rx directors for breach of fiduciary duty in respect of alleged options backdating.

102. On November 4, 2003, the SEC issued Release No. 34-48745, titled “Self-Regulatory Organizations; New York Stock Exchange, Inc. and National Association of Securities Dealers, Inc.; Order Approving Proposed Rule Changes [citations omitted],” which can be found at <http://www.sec.gov/rules/sro/34-48745.htm>, pursuant to which the SEC approved the rule changes proposed by the NYSE and NASD to comply with SOX. These rule changes are now effective for all NYSE and NASDAQ listed companies. Any references to the rules in the NYSE Listed Company Manual (the “NYSE Rules”) or the marketplace rules in the NASD Manual (the “NASD Rules”) are references to the rules as approved by the SEC on November 4, 2003.

quire all public companies<sup>103</sup> to implement or refrain from specified actions,<sup>104</sup> some of which are expressly permitted by state corporate laws, subject to general fiduciary principles. Several examples of this interaction of state law with SOX or new SEC or stock exchange requirements are discussed below.

---

103. The SOX is generally applicable to all companies required to file reports with the SEC under the 1934 Act (“*reporting companies*”) or that have a registration statement on file with the SEC under the 1933 Act, in each case regardless of size (collectively, “*public companies*” or “*issuers*”). Some of the SOX provisions apply only to companies listed on a national securities exchange (“*listed companies*”), such as the New York Stock Exchange (“*NYSE*”), the American Stock Exchange (“*AMEX*”) or the NASDAQ Stock Market (“*NASDAQ*”) (the national securities exchanges and NASDAQ are referred to collectively as “*SROs*”), but not to companies traded on the NASD OTC Bulletin Board or quoted in the Pink Sheets or the Yellow Sheets. Small business issuers that file reports on Form 10-QSB and Form 10-KSB are subject to SOX generally in the same ways as larger companies although some specifics vary. SOX and the SEC’s rules thereunder are applicable in many, but not all, respects to (i) investment companies registered under the Investment Company Act of 1940 (the “*1940 Act*”) and (ii) public companies domiciled outside of the U.S. (“*foreign companies*”), although many of the SEC rules promulgated under SOX’s directives provide limited relief from some SOX provisions for the “*foreign private issuer*,” which is defined in 1933 Act Rule 405 and 1934 Act Rule 3b-4(c) as a private corporation or other organization incorporated outside of the U.S., as long as:

- More than 50% of the issuer’s outstanding voting securities are *not* directly or indirectly held of record by U.S. residents;
- The majority of the executive officers or directors are *not* U.S. citizens or residents;
- More than 50% of the issuer’s assets are *not* located in the U.S.; and;
- The issuer’s business is *not* administered principally in the U.S.

104. ; Byron F. Egan, *The Sarbanes-Oxley Act and Its Expanding Reach*, 40 Texas Journal of Business Law 305 (Winter 2005), which can be found at <http://www.jw.com/site/jsp/publicationinfo.jsp?id=505>; Byron F. Egan, *Communicating with Auditors After the Sarbanes-Oxley Act*, 41 Texas Journal of Business Law 131 (Fall 2005); and Byron F. Egan, *Communications with Accountants After the Sarbanes-Oxley Act (including Attorney Letters to Auditors re Loss Contingencies, Attorney Duties under SOX §§ 303 and 307, Options Backdating)* (Oct. 24, 2006), which can be found at <http://www.jw.com/site/jsp/publicationinfo.jsp?id=624>.

## **2. Shareholder Causes of Action**

SOX does not create new causes of action for shareholders, with certain limited exceptions, and leaves enforcement of its proscriptions to the SEC or federal criminal authorities.<sup>105</sup> The corporate plaintiffs' bar, however, can be expected to be creative and aggressive in asserting that the new standards of corporate governance should be carried over into state law fiduciary duties, perhaps by asserting that violations of SOX constitute violations of fiduciary duties of obedience or supervision.<sup>106</sup>

## **3. Director Independence**

### **a. Power to Independent Directors**

(1) *General.* The SEC rules under SOX and related stock exchange listing requirements are shifting the power to govern public companies to outside directors. Collectively, they will generally require that listed companies have:

A board of directors, a majority of whom are independent;<sup>107</sup>

- 
105. "Except in the case of recovery of profits from prohibited sales during a blackout period and suits by whistleblowers, the Sarbanes-Oxley Act does not expressly create new private rights of action for civil liability for violations of the Act. The Sarbanes-Oxley Act, however, potentially affects existing private rights of action under the Exchange Act by: (1) lengthening the general statute of limitations applicable to private securities fraud actions to the earlier of two years after discovery of the facts constituting the violation or five years after the violation; and (2) expanding reporting and disclosure requirements that could potentially expand the range of actions that can be alleged to give rise to private suits under Section 10(b) and Section 18 of the Exchange Act and SEC Rule 10b-5." Patricia A. Vlahakis et al., *Understanding the Sarbanes-Oxley Act of 2002*, CORP. GOVERNANCE REFORM, Sept.-Oct. 2002, at 16.
106. See William B. Chandler III and Leo E. Strine Jr., *The New Federalism of the American Corporate Governance System: Preliminary Reflections of Two Residents of One Small State* (February 26, 2002), which can be found at [http://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract\\_id=367720](http://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=367720), at 43-48.
107. See NYSE Rules 303A.01 ; 303A.02; NASD Rules 4350(c)(1) ; 4200(a)(15).

An audit committee<sup>108</sup> composed entirely of independent directors;<sup>109</sup>

---

108. 1934 Act § 3(a)(58) added by SOX § 2(a)(3) provides:

(58) *Audit Committee*. The term “audit committee” means –

(A) A committee (or equivalent body) established by and amongst the board of directors of an issuer for the purpose of overseeing the accounting and financial reporting processes of the issuer and audits of the financial statements of the issuer; and

(B) If no such committee exists with respect to an issuer, the entire board of directors of the issuer.

109. On April 9, 2003, the SEC issued Release No. 33-8220 (the “SOX §301 Release”) adopting, effective April 25, 2003, 1934 Act Rule 10A-3, titled “Standards Relating to Listed Company Audit Committees” (the “SOX §301 Rule”), which can be found at <http://www.sec.gov/rules/final/33-8220.htm>, to implement SOX §301. Under the SOX §301 Rule, each SRO must adopt rules conditioning the listing of any securities of an issuer upon the issuer being in compliance with the standards specified in SOX §301, which may be summarized as follows:

- *Oversight*. The audit committee must have direct responsibility for the appointment, compensation, and oversight of the work (including the resolution of disagreements between management and the auditors regarding financial reporting) of any registered public accounting firm employed to perform audit services, and the auditors must report directly to the audit committee.
- *Independence*. The audit committee members must be independent directors, which means that each member may not, other than as compensation for service on the board of directors or any of its committees: (i) accept any consulting, advisory or other compensation, directly or indirectly, from the issuer or (ii) be an officer or other affiliate of the issuer.
- *Procedures to Receive Complaints*. The audit committee is responsible for establishing procedures for the receipt, retention and treatment of complaints regarding accounting, internal accounting controls or auditing matters, and the confidential, anonymous submission by employees of the issuer (“whistleblowers”) of concerns regarding questionable accounting or auditing matters.
- *Funding and Authority*. The audit committee must have the authority to hire independent counsel and other advisers to carry out its duties, and the issuer must provide for funding, as the audit committee may determine, for payment of compensation of the issuer’s auditor and of any advisers that the audit committee engages.

SROs may adopt additional listing standards regarding audit committees as long as they are consistent with SOX and the SOX §301 Rule. The NYSE and NASD have adopted such rules, which are discussed below. See NYSE Rules 303A.06 and 303A.07 ; NASD Rule 4350(d).

A nominating/corporate governance committee composed entirely of independent directors;<sup>110</sup> and

A compensation committee composed entirely of independent directors.<sup>111</sup>

These independent directors will be expected to actively participate in the specified activities of the board of directors and the committees on which they serve.

State law authorizes boards of directors to delegate authority to committees of directors. Texas and Delaware law both provide that boards of directors may delegate authority to committees of the board subject to limitations on delegation for fundamental corporate transactions.<sup>112</sup> Among the matters that a

---

110. See NYSE Rule 303A.04; NASD Rule 4350(c)(4).

111. See NYSE Rule 303A.05; NASD Rule 4350(c)(3). The compensation committee typically is composed of independent directors and focuses on executive compensation and administration of stock options and other incentive plans. While the duties of the compensation committee will vary from company to company, the *ALI's Principles of Corporate Governance* § 3A.05 (Supp 2002) recommend that the compensation committee should:

- (1) Review and recommend to the board, or determine, the annual salary, bonus, stock options, and other benefits, direct and indirect, of the senior executives.
- (2) Review new executive compensation programs; review on a periodic basis the operation of the corporation's executive compensation programs to determine whether they are properly coordinated; establish and periodically review policies for the administration of executive compensation programs; and take steps to modify any executive compensation programs that yield payments and benefits that are not reasonably related to executive performance.
- (3) Establish and periodically review policies in the area of management perquisites.

Under SEC Rule 16b-3 under the 1934 Act, the grant and exercise of employee stock options, and the making of stock awards, are generally exempt from the short-swing profit recovery provisions of § 16(b) under the 1934 Act if approved by a committee of independent directors. Further, under Section 162(m) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1980, as amended, corporations required to be registered under the 1934 Act are not able to deduct compensation to specified individuals in excess of \$1,000,000 per year, except in the case of performance based compensation arrangements approved by the shareholders and administered by a compensation committee consisting of two or more "outside directors" as defined. Treas. Reg. § 1.162-27 (2002).

112. TBOC § 21.416; TBCA art. 2.36; DGCL § 141(c). These restrictions only apply to Delaware corporations that incorporated prior to July 1, 1996,

committee of a board of directors will not have the authority to approve are (i) charter amendments, except to the extent such amendments are the result of the issuance of a series of stock permitted to be approved by a board of directors, (ii) a plan of merger or similar transaction, (iii) the sale of all or substantially all of the assets of the corporation outside the ordinary course of its business, (iv) a voluntary dissolution of the corporation and (v) amending bylaws or creating new bylaws of the corporation.<sup>113</sup> In addition, under Texas law, a committee of a board of directors may not fill any vacancy on the board of directors, remove any officer, fix the compensation of a member of the committee or amend or repeal a resolution approved by the whole board to the extent that such resolution by its terms is not so amendable or repealable.<sup>114</sup> Further, under both Texas and Delaware law, no committee of a board of directors has the authority to authorize a distribution (a dividend in the case of Delaware law) or authorize the issuance of stock of a corporation unless that authority is set forth in the charter or bylaws of the corporation.<sup>115</sup> Alternative members may also be appointed to committees under both states' laws.<sup>116</sup>

(2) *NYSE*. NYSE Rule 303A.01 requires the board of directors of each NYSE listed company to consist of a majority of independent directors.

(a) *NYSE Base Line Test*. Pursuant to NYSE Rule 303A.02, no director qualifies as "independent" unless the board affirmatively determines that the director has no material relationship with the company (either directly or as a partner, shareholder or officer of an organization that has a relationship with the company). The company is required to disclose the basis for such determination in its annual proxy statement or, if the company does not file an annual proxy statement, in the company's annual report on Form 10-K filed with the SEC. In complying with this requirement, the company's board is per-

---

and did not elect by board resolution to be governed by DGCL § 141(c)(2). If a Delaware corporation is incorporated after that date or elects to be governed by DGCL § 141(c)(2), then it may authorize a board committee to declare dividends or authorize the issuance of stock of the corporation.

113. TBOC § 21.416; TBCA art. 2.36; DGCL § 141(c).

114. TBOC § 21.416; TBCA art. 2.36B.

115. TBOC § 21.416(d); TBCA art. 2.36C; DGCL § 141(c)(1). In Texas such authorization may alternatively appear in the resolution designating the committee. TBOC § 21.416(d); TBCA art. 2.36C.

116. TBOC § 21.416(a); TBCA art. 2.36A; DGCL § 141(c)(1).

mitted to adopt and disclose standards to assist it in making determinations of independence, disclose those standards, and then make the general statement that the independent directors meet those standards.

(b) *NYSE Per Se Independence Disqualifications.* In addition to the general requirement discussed above, NYSE Rule 303A.02 considers a number of relationships to be an absolute bar on a director being independent as follows:

*First*, a director who is an employee, or whose immediate family member is an executive officer, of the company would not be independent until three years after the end of such employment (employment as an interim Chairman or CEO will not disqualify a director from being considered independent following that employment).

*Second*, a director who has received, or whose immediate family member has received, more than \$100,000 in any twelve-month period within the last three years in direct compensation from the NYSE listed company, except for certain payments, would not be independent.

*Third*, a director who is, or who has an immediate family member who is, a current partner of a firm that is the NYSE listed company's internal or external auditor; a director who is a current employee of such a firm; a director who has an immediate family member who is a current employee of such a firm and who participates in the firm's audit, assurance or tax compliance (but not tax planning) practice; or a director who was, or who has an immediate family member who was, within the last three years (but is no longer) a partner or employee of such a firm and personally worked on the NYSE listed company's audit within that time.

*Fourth*, a director who is employed, or whose immediate family member is employed, as an executive officer of another company where any of the NYSE listed company's present executives served on that company's compensation committee at the same time can not be considered independent until three years after the end of such service or the employment relationship.

*Fifth*, a director who is a current employee, or whose immediate family member is a current executive officer, of a company that has made payments to, or received payments from, the NYSE listed company for

property or services in an amount which, in any of the last three fiscal years, exceeds the greater of \$1 million, or 2% of such other company's consolidated gross revenues. Charitable organizations are not considered "companies" for purposes of the exclusion from independence described in the previous sentence, provided that the NYSE listed company discloses in its annual proxy statement, or if the NYSE listed company does not file an annual proxy statement, in its annual report on Form 10-K filed with the SEC, any charitable contributions made by the NYSE listed company to any charitable organization in which a director serves as an executive officer if, within the preceding three years, such contributions in any single year exceeded the greater of \$1 million or 2% of the organization's consolidated gross revenues.

(3) *NASDAQ*. NASD Rule 4350(c)(1) requires a majority of the directors of a NASDAQ-listed company to be "*independent directors*," as defined in NASD Rule 4200.<sup>117</sup>

(a) *NASDAQ Base Line Test*. NASD Rule 4350(c)(1) requires each NASDAQ listed company to disclose in its annual proxy (or, if the issuer does not file a proxy, in its Form 10-K or 20-F) those directors that the board has determined to be independent as defined in NASD Rule 4200.<sup>118</sup>

(b) *NASDAQ Per Se Independence Disqualifications*. NASD Rule 4200(a)(15) specifies certain relationships that would preclude a board finding of independence as follows:

*First*, a director who is, or at anytime during the past three years was, employed by the NASDAQ listed com-

---

117. NASD Rule 4350, which governs qualitative listing requirements for NASDAQ National Market and NASDAQ SmallCap Market issuers (other than limited partnerships), must be read in tandem with NASD Rule 4200, which provides definitions for the applicable defined terms.

118. If a NASDAQ listed company fails to comply with the requirement that a majority of its board of directors be independent due to one vacancy, or one director ceases to be independent due to circumstances beyond a company's reasonable control, NASD Rule 4350(c)(1) requires the issuer to regain compliance with the requirement by the earlier of its next annual shareholders meeting or one year from the occurrence of the event that caused the compliance failure. Any issuer relying on this provision must provide notice to NASDAQ immediately upon learning of the event or circumstance that caused the non-compliance.



pany or by any parent or subsidiary of the company (the “*NASDAQ Employee Provision*”).

*Second*, a director who accepted or has a family member who accepted any payments from the NASDAQ listed company, or any parent or subsidiary of the company, in excess of \$60,000 during any period of twelve consecutive months within the three years preceding the determination of independence other than certain permitted payments (the “*NASDAQ Payments Provision*”). NASDAQ states in the interpretive material to the NASD Rules (the “*NASDAQ Interpretive Material*”) that this provision is generally intended to capture situations where a payment is made directly to, or for the benefit of, the director or a family member of the director. For example, consulting or personal service contracts with a director or family member of the director or political contributions to the campaign of a director or a family member of the director prohibit independence.

*Third*, a director who is a family member of an individual who is, or at any time during the past three years was, employed by the company or by any parent or subsidiary of the company as an executive officer (the “*NASDAQ Family of Executive Officer Provision*”).

*Fourth*, a director who is, or has a family member who is, a partner in, or a controlling shareholder or an executive officer of, any organization to which the company made, or from which the company received, payments for property or services in the current or any of the past three fiscal years that exceed 5% of the recipient’s consolidated gross revenues for that year, or \$200,000, whichever is more, other than certain permitted payments (the “*NASDAQ Business Relationship Provision*”). The NASDAQ Interpretive Material states that this provision is generally intended to capture payments to an entity with which the director or family member of the director is affiliated by serving as a partner (other than a limited partner), controlling shareholder or executive officer of such entity. Under exceptional circumstances, such as where a director has direct, significant business holdings, the NASDAQ Interpretive Material states that it may be appropriate to apply the NASDAQ Business Relationship Provision in lieu of the NASDAQ Payments Provision described

above, and that issuers should contact NASDAQ if they wish to apply the rule in this manner. The NASDAQ Interpretive Material further notes that the NASDAQ Business Relationship Provision is broader than the rules for audit committee member independence set forth in 1934 Act Rule 10A-3(e)(8).

The NASDAQ Interpretive Material further states that under the NASDAQ Business Relationship Provision, a director who is, or who has a family member who is, an executive officer of a charitable organization may not be considered independent if the company makes payment to the charity in excess of the greater of 5% of the charity's revenues or \$200,000. The NASDAQ Interpretive Material also discusses the treatment of payments from the issuer to a law firm in determining whether a director who is a lawyer may be considered independent. The NASDAQ Interpretive Material notes that any partner in a law firm that receives payments from the issuer is ineligible to serve on that issuer's audit committee.

*Fifth*, a director who is, or has a family member who is, employed as an executive officer of another entity where at any time during the past three years any of the executive officers of the NASDAQ listed company serves on the compensation committee of such other entity ("*NASDAQ Interlocking Directorate Provision*").

*Sixth*, a director who is, or has a family member who is, a current partner of the company's outside auditor, or was a partner or employee of the company's outside auditor, and worked on the company's audit, at any time, during the past three years ("*NASDAQ Auditor Relationship Provision*").

*Seventh*, in the case of an investment company, a director who is an "*interested person*" of the company as defined in section 2(a)(19) of the Investment Company Act, other than in his or her capacity as a member of the board of directors or any board committee.

With respect to the look-back periods referenced in the NASDAQ Employee Provision, the NASDAQ Family of Executive Officer Provision, the NASDAQ Interlocking Directorate Provision, and the NASDAQ Auditor Relationship Provision, "*any time*" during any of the past three years should be considered. The NASDAQ Interpretive Material states that these

three year look-back periods commence on the date the relationship ceases. As an example, the NASDAQ Interpretive Material states that a director employed by the NASDAQ listed company would not be independent until three years after such employment terminates. The NASDAQ Interpretive Material states that the reference to a “*parent or subsidiary*” in the definition of independence is intended to cover entities the issuer controls and consolidates with the issuer’s financial statements as filed with the SEC (but not if the issuer reflects such entity solely as an investment in its financial statements). The NASDAQ Interpretive Material also states that the reference to “*executive officer*” has the same meaning as the definition in Rule 16a-1(f) under the 1934 Act.

### ***b. Audit Committee Member Independence***

(4) *SOX*. To be “*independent*” and thus eligible to serve on an issuer’s audit committee under the SOX §301 Rule, (i) audit committee members may not, directly or indirectly, accept any consulting, advisory or other compensatory fee from the issuer or a subsidiary of the issuer, other than in the member’s capacity as a member of the board of directors and any board committee (this prohibition would preclude payments to a member as an officer or employee, as well as other compensatory payments; indirect acceptance of compensatory payments includes payments to spouses, minor children or stepchildren, or children or stepchildren sharing a home with the member, as well as payments accepted by an entity in which an audit committee member is a general partner, managing member, executive officer or occupies a similar position and which provides accounting, consulting, legal, investment banking, financial or other advisory services or any similar services to the issuer or any subsidiary; receipt of fixed retirement plan or deferred compensation is not prohibited)<sup>119</sup> and (ii) a member of the audit committee of an issuer may not be an “*affiliated person*” of the issuer or any subsidiary of the issuer apart from his or her capacity as a member of the board and any board committee (subject to the safe harbor described below).<sup>120</sup>

---

119. The SOX §301 Rule restricts only current relationships and does not extend to a “look back” period before appointment to the audit committee, although SRO rules may do so.

120. The terms “*affiliate*” and “*affiliated person*” are defined consistent with other definitions of those terms under the securities laws, such as in 1934 Act Rule 12b-2 and 1933 Act Rule 144, with an additional safe

Since it is difficult to determine whether someone controls the issuer, the SOX §301 Rule creates a safe harbor regarding whether someone is an “*affiliated person*” for purposes of meeting the audit committee independence requirement. Under the safe harbor, a person who is not an executive officer, director or 10% shareholder of the issuer would be deemed not to control the issuer. A person who is ineligible to rely on the safe harbor, but believes that he or she does not control an issuer, still could rely on a facts and circumstances analysis. This test is similar to the test used for determining insider status under §16 of the 1934 Act.

The SEC has authority to exempt from the independence requirements particular relationships with respect to audit committee members, if appropriate in light of the circumstances. Because companies coming to market for the first time may face particular difficulty in recruiting members that meet the proposed independence requirements, the SOX §301 Rule provides an exception for non-investment company issuers that requires only one fully independent member at the time of the effectiveness of an issuer’s initial registration statement under the 1933 Act or the 1934 Act, a majority of independent members within 90 days and a fully independent audit committee within one year.

For companies that operate through subsidiaries, the composition of the boards of the parent company and subsidiaries are sometimes similar given the control structure between the parent and the subsidiaries. If an audit committee member of the parent is otherwise independent, merely serving on the board of a controlled subsidiary should not adversely affect the board member’s independence, assuming that the board member also would be considered independent of the subsidiary except for the member’s seat on the parent’s board. Therefore, SOX §301 Rule exempts from the “*affiliated person*” requirement a committee member that sits on the board of directors of both a parent and a direct or indirect subsidiary or other affiliate, if the committee member otherwise meets the independence requirements for both the parent and the subsidiary or

---

harbor. In the SOX §301 Release, the SEC clarified that a director, executive officer, partner, member, principal or designee of an affiliate would not be deemed to be an affiliate. Similarly, a member of the audit committee of an issuer that is an investment company could not be an “*interested person*” of the investment company as defined in 1940 Act §2(a)(19).

affiliate, including the receipt of only ordinary-course compensation for serving as a member of the board of directors, audit committee or any other board committee of the parent, subsidiary or affiliate. Any issuer taking advantage of any of the exceptions described above would have to disclose that fact.

(5) *NYSE*.

(i) *Audit Committee Composition*. NYSE Rules 303A.06 and 303A.07 require each NYSE listed company to have, at a minimum, a three person audit committee composed entirely of directors that meet the independence standards of both NYSE Rule 303A.02 and 1934 Act Rule 10A-3. The Commentary to NYSE Rule 303A.06 states: “The [NYSE] will apply the requirements of SEC Rule 10A-3 in a manner consistent with the guidance provided by the Securities and Exchange Commission in SEC Release No. 34-47654 (April 1, 2003). Without limiting the generality of the foregoing, the [NYSE] will provide companies with the opportunity to cure defects provided in SEC Rule 10A-3(a)(3).”

The Commentary to NYSE Rule 303A.07 requires that each member of the audit committee be financially literate, as such qualification is interpreted by the board in its business judgment, or become financially literate within a reasonable period of time after his or her appointment to the audit committee. In addition, at least one member of the audit committee must have accounting or related financial management expertise, as the NYSE listed company’s board interprets such qualification in its business judgment. While the NYSE does not require an NYSE listed company’s audit committee to include a person who satisfies the definition of audit committee financial expert set forth in Item 401(h) of Regulation S-K, a board may presume that such a person has accounting or related financial management experience.

If an audit committee member simultaneously serves on the audit committee of more than three public companies, and the NYSE listed company does not limit the number of audit committees on which its audit committee members serve to three or less, each board is required to determine that such simultaneous service does not impair the ability of such board member to effectively serve on the NYSE listed company’s audit committee and to disclose such determination.

(ii) *Audit Committee Charter and Responsibilities*. NYSE Rule 303A.07(c) requires the audit committee of each NYSE listed company to have a written audit committee char-

ter that addresses: (i) the committee's purpose; (ii) an annual performance evaluation of the audit committee; and (iii) the duties and responsibilities of the audit committee ("*NYSE Audit Committee Charter Provision*").

The NYSE Audit Committee Charter Provision provides details as to the duties and responsibilities of the audit committee that must be addressed. These include, at a minimum, those set out in 1934 Act Rule 10A-3(b)(2), (3), (4) and (5), as well as the responsibility to at least annually obtain and review a report by the independent auditor; meet to review and discuss the company's annual audited financial statements and quarterly financial statements with management and the independent auditor, including reviewing the NYSE listed company's specific disclosures under MD&A; discuss the company's earnings press releases, as well as financial information and earnings guidance provided to analysts and rating agencies; discuss policies with respect to risk assessment and risk management; meet separately, periodically, with management, with internal auditors (or other personnel responsible for the internal audit function), and with independent auditors; review with the independent auditors any audit problems or difficulties and management's response; set clear hiring policies for employees or former employees of the independent auditors; and report regularly to the board. The commentary to NYSE Rule 303A.07 explicitly states that the audit committee functions specified in NYSE Rule 303A.07 are the sole responsibility of the audit committee and may not be allocated to a different committee.

Each NYSE listed company must have an internal audit function. The commentary to NYSE Rule 303A.07 states that listed companies must maintain an internal audit function to provide management and the audit committee with ongoing assessments of the NYSE listed company's risk management processes and system of internal control. A NYSE listed company may choose to outsource this function to a third party service provider other than its independent auditor.

(6) NASDAQ.

(i) *Audit Committee Composition*. NASD Rule 4350(d) requires each NASDAQ listed issuer to have an audit committee composed of at least three members. In addition, it requires each audit committee member to: (1) be independent, as defined under NASD Rule 4200(a)(15); (2) meet the criteria for independence set forth in 1934 Act Rule 10A-3 (subject to the exceptions provided in 1934 Act Rule 10A-3(c)); (3) not have participated in

the preparation of the financial statements of the company or any current subsidiary of the company at any time during the past three years; and (4) be able to read and understand fundamental financial statements, including a company's balance sheet, income statement, and cash flow statement ("*NASDAQ Audit Committee Provision*").

One director who is not independent as defined in NASD Rule 4200(a)(15) and meets the criteria set forth in 1934 Act § 10A(m)(3) and the rules thereunder, and is not a current officer or employee of the company or a family member of such person, may be appointed to the audit committee if the board, under exceptional and limited circumstances, determines that membership on the committee by the individual is required by the best interests of the company and its shareholders, and the board discloses, in the next annual proxy statement subsequent to such determination (or, if the issuer does not file a proxy, in its Form 10-K or 20-F), the nature of the relationship and the reasons for that determination. A member appointed under this exception would not be permitted to serve longer than two years and would not be permitted to chair the audit committee. The NASDAQ Interpretive Material recommends that an issuer disclose in its annual proxy (or, if the issuer does not file a proxy, in its Form 10-K or 20-F) if any director is deemed independent but falls outside the safe harbor provisions of SEC Rule 10A-3(e)(1)(ii).

At least one member of the audit committee must have past employment experience in finance or accounting, requisite professional certification in accounting, or any other comparable experience or background which results in the individual's financial sophistication, including being or having been a chief executive officer, chief financial officer or other senior officer with financial oversight responsibilities.

(ii) *Audit Committee Charter and Responsibilities.* NASD Rule 4350(d) requires each NASDAQ listed company to adopt a formal written audit committee charter and to review and reassess the adequacy of the formal written charter on an annual basis. The charter must specify: (1) the scope of the audit committee's responsibilities, and how it carries out those responsibilities, including structure, processes, and membership requirements; (2) the audit committee's responsibility for ensuring its receipt from the outside auditors of a formal written statement delineating all relationships between the auditor and the company, and the audit committee's responsibility for ac-

tively engaging in a dialogue with the auditor with respect to any disclosed relationships or services that may impact the objectivity and independence of the auditor and for taking, or recommending that the full board take, appropriate action to oversee the independence of the outside auditor; (3) the committee's purpose of overseeing the accounting and financial reporting processes of the issuer and the audits of the financial statements of the issuer; and (4) other specific audit committee responsibilities and authority set forth in NASD Rule 4350(d)(3). NASDAQ states in the NASDAQ Interpretive Material to NASD Rule 4350(d) that the written charter sets forth the scope of the audit committee's responsibilities and the means by which the committee carries out those responsibilities; the outside auditor's accountability to the committee; and the committee's responsibility to ensure the independence of the outside auditors.

### ***c. Nominating Committee Member Independence***

(7) *NYSE*. NYSE Rule 303A.04 requires each NYSE listed company to have a nominating/corporate governance committee composed entirely of independent directors. The nominating/corporate governance committee must have a written charter that addresses, among other items, the committee's purpose and responsibilities, and an annual performance evaluation of the nominating/corporate governance committee ("*NYSE Nominating/Corporate Governance Committee Provision*"). The committee is required to identify individuals qualified to become board members, consistent with the criteria approved by the board.

(8) *NASDAQ*. NASD Rule 4350(c)(4)(A) requires director nominees to be selected, or recommended for the board's selection, either by a majority of independent directors, or by a nominations committee comprised solely of independent directors ("*NASDAQ Director Nomination Provision*").

If the nominations committee is comprised of at least three members, one director, who is not independent (as defined in NASD Rule 4200(a)(15)) and is not a current officer or employee or a family member of such person, is permitted to be appointed to the committee if the board, under exceptional and limited circumstances, determines that such individual's membership on the committee is required by the best interests of the company and its shareholders, and the board discloses, in its next annual



meeting proxy statement subsequent to such determination (or, if the issuer does not file a proxy, in its Form 10-K or 20-F), the nature of the relationship and the reasons for the determination. A member appointed under such exception is not permitted to serve longer than two years.

Further, NASD Rule 4350(c)(4)(B) requires each NASDAQ listed company to certify that it has adopted a formal written charter or board resolution, as applicable, addressing the nominations process and such related matters as may be required under the federal securities laws. The NASDAQ Director Nomination Provision does not apply in cases where either the right to nominate a director legally belongs to a third party, or the company is subject to a binding obligation that requires a director nomination structure inconsistent with this provision and such obligation pre-dates the date the provision was approved.

#### ***d. Compensation Committee Member Independence***

(9) *NYSE*. NYSE Rule 303A.05 requires each NYSE listed company to have a compensation committee composed entirely of independent directors. The compensation committee must have a written charter that addresses, among other items, the committee's purpose and responsibilities, and an annual performance evaluation of the compensation committee ("*NYSE Compensation Committee Provision*"). The Compensation Committee is required to produce a compensation committee report on executive compensation, as required by SEC rules, to be included in the company's annual proxy statement or annual report on Form 10-K filed with the SEC. NYSE Rule 303A.05 provides that either as a committee or together with the other independent directors (as directed by the Board), the committee will determine and approve the CEO's compensation level based on the committee's evaluation of the CEO's performance. The commentary to this rule indicates that discussion of CEO compensation with the board generally is not precluded.

(10) *NASDAQ*. NASD Rule 4350(c)(3) requires the compensation of the CEO of a NASDAQ listed company to be determined or recommended to the board for determination either by a majority of the independent directors, or by a compensation committee comprised solely of independent directors ("*NASDAQ Compensation of Executives Provision*"). The CEO may not be present during voting or deliberations. In addition, the compensation of all other officers has to be determined or rec-

ommended to the Board for determination either by a majority of the independent directors, or a compensation committee comprised solely of independent directors.

Under these NASD Rules, if the compensation committee is comprised of at least three members, one director, who is not “*independent*” (as defined in NASD Rule 4200(a)(15)) and is not a current officer or employee or a family member of such person, is permitted to be appointed to the committee if the board, under exceptional and limited circumstances, determines that such individual’s membership on the committee is required by the best interests of the company and its shareholders, and the Board discloses, in the next annual meeting proxy statement subsequent to such determination (or, if the issuer does not file a proxy statement, in its Form 10-K or 20-F), the nature of the relationship and the reasons for the determination. A member appointed under such exception would not be permitted to serve longer than two years.

#### *e. State Law*

Under state law and unlike the SOX rules, director independence is not considered as a general status, but rather is tested in the context of each specific matter on which the director is called upon to take action.

Under Texas common law, a director is generally considered “*interested*” only in respect of matters in which he has a financial interest. The Fifth Circuit in *Gearhart* summarized Texas law with respect to the question of whether a director is “*interested*” as follows:

A director is considered ‘interested’ if he or she (1) makes a personal profit from a transaction by dealing with the corporation or usurps a corporate opportunity . . . ; (2) buys or sells assets of the corporation . . . ; (3) transacts business in his director’s capacity with a second corporation of which he is also a director or significantly financially associated . . . ; or (4) transacts business in his director’s capacity with a family member.<sup>121</sup>

In the context of the dismissal of a derivative action on motion of the corporation, those making the decision on behalf of

---

121. *Gearhart*, 741 F.2d at 719-20 (citations omitted).

the corporation to dismiss the proceeding must lack both any disqualifying financial interest and any relationships that would impair independent decision making. The Texas Corporate Statutes provide that a court shall dismiss a derivative action if the determination to dismiss is made by directors who are both disinterested and independent.<sup>122</sup> For this purpose, a director is considered “*disinterested*”<sup>123</sup> if he lacks any disqualifying financial interest in the matter, and is considered “*inde-*

---

122. TBOC § 21.554, 21.558; TBCA art. 5.14F and 5.14H.

123. TBOC § 1.003 defines “*disinterested*” as follows:

Sec. 1.003. DISINTERESTED PERSON.

- (a) For purposes of this code, a person is disinterested with respect to the approval of a contract, transaction, or other matter or to the consideration of the disposition of a claim or challenge relating to a contract, transaction, or particular conduct, if the person or the person’s associate:
  - (1) is not a party to the contract or transaction or materially involved in the conduct that is the subject of the claim or challenge; and
  - (2) does not have a material financial interest in the outcome of the contract or transaction or the disposition of the claim or challenge.
- (b) For purposes of Subsection (a), a person is not materially involved in a contract or transaction that is the subject of a claim or challenge and does not have a material financial interest in the outcome of a contract or transaction or the disposition of a claim or challenge solely because:
  - (1) the person was nominated or elected as a governing person by a person who is:
    - (A) interested in the contract or transaction; or
    - (B) alleged to have engaged in the conduct that is the subject of the claim or challenge;
  - (2) the person receives normal fees or customary compensation, reimbursement for expenses, or benefits as a governing person of the entity;
  - (3) the person has a direct or indirect equity interest in the entity;
  - (4) the entity has, or its subsidiaries have, an interest in the contract or transaction or was affected by the alleged conduct;
  - (5) the person or an associate of the person receives ordinary and reasonable compensation for reviewing, making recommendations regarding, or deciding on the disposition of the claim or challenge; or
  - (6) in the case of a review by the person of the alleged conduct that is the subject of the claim or challenge:
    - (A) the person is named as a defendant in the derivative proceeding regarding the matter or as a person who engaged in the alleged conduct; or

*pendent*<sup>124</sup> if he is both disinterested and lacks any other specified relationships that could be expected to materially and

---

- (B) the person, acting as a governing person, approved, voted for, or acquiesced in the act being challenged if the act did not result in a material personal or financial benefit to the person and the challenging party fails to allege particular facts that, if true, raise a significant prospect that the governing person would be held liable to the entity or its owners or members as a result of the conduct.

TBCA art. 1.02A(12) provides substantially the same.

124. TBOC § 1.004 defines “*independent*” as follows:

Sec. 1.004. INDEPENDENT PERSON.

- (a) For purposes of this code, a person is independent with respect to considering the disposition of a claim or challenge regarding a contract or transaction, or particular or alleged conduct, if the person:
  - (1) is disinterested;
  - (2) either:
    - (A) is not an associate, or member of the immediate family, of a party to the contract or transaction or of a person who is alleged to have engaged in the conduct that is the subject of the claim or challenge; or
    - (B) is an associate to a party or person described by Paragraph (A) that is an entity if the person is an associate solely because the person is a governing person of the entity or of the entity’s subsidiaries or associates;
  - (3) does not have a business, financial, or familial relationship with a party to the contract or transaction, or with another person who is alleged to have engaged in the conduct, that is the subject of the claim or challenge that could reasonably be expected to materially and adversely affect the judgment of the person in favor of the party or other person with respect to the consideration of the matter; and
  - (4) is not shown, by a preponderance of the evidence, to be under the controlling influence of a party to the contract or transaction that is the subject of the claim or challenge or of a person who is alleged to have engaged in the conduct that is the subject of the claim or challenge.
- (b) For purposes of Subsection (a), a person does not have a relationship that could reasonably be expected to materially and adversely affect the judgment of the person regarding the disposition of a matter that is the subject of a claim or challenge and is not otherwise under the controlling influence of a party to a contract or transaction that is the subject of a claim or challenge or that is alleged to have engaged in the conduct that is the subject of a claim or challenge solely because:

adversely affect his judgment as to the disposition of the matter.

Under Delaware law, an “*independent director*” is one whose decision is based on the corporate merits of the subject before the board rather than extraneous considerations or influence.<sup>125</sup> The Delaware Supreme Court’s teachings on independence can be summarized as follows:

At bottom, the question of independence turns on whether a director is, *for any substantial reason*, incapable of making a decision with only the best interests of the corporation in mind. That is, the Supreme Court cases ultimately focus on impartiality and objectivity.<sup>126</sup>

The Delaware focus includes both financial and other disabling interests. In the words of the Chancery Court:

- 
- (1) the person has been nominated or elected as a governing person by a person who is interested in the contract or transaction or alleged to be engaged in the conduct that is the subject of the claim or challenge;
  - (2) the person receives normal fees or similar customary compensation, reimbursement for expenses, or benefits as a governing person of the entity;
  - (3) the person has a direct or indirect equity interest in the entity;
  - (4) the entity has, or its subsidiaries have, an interest in the contract or transaction or was affected by the alleged conduct;
  - (5) the person or an associate of the person receives ordinary and reasonable compensation for reviewing, making recommendations regarding, or deciding on the disposition of the claim or challenge; or
  - (6) the person, an associate of the person, other than the entity or its associates, or an immediate family member has a continuing business relationship with the entity that is not material to the person, associate, or family member.

TBCA art. 1.02A(15) provides substantially the same.

125. *Aronson v. Lewis*, 473 A.2d 805, 816 (Del. 1984) (overruled as to standard of appellate review); *Odyssey Partners v. Fleming Companies*, 735 A.2d 386 (Del. Ch. 1999).

126. *Parfi Holding AB v. Mirror Image Internet, Inc.*, 794 A.2d 1211, 1232 (Del. Ch. 2001) (footnotes omitted) (emphasis in original), *rev’d in part on other grounds*, 817 A.2d 149 (Del. 2002), *cert. denied*, 123 S. Ct. 2076 (2003).

Delaware law should not be based on a reductionist view of human nature that simplifies human motivations on the lines of the least sophisticated notions of the law and economics movement. *Homo sapiens* is not merely *homo economicus*. We may be thankful that an array of other motivations exist that influence human behavior; not all are any better than greed or avarice, think of envy, to name just one. But also think of motives like love, friendship, and collegiality, think of those among us who direct their behavior as best they can on a guiding creed or set of moral values.<sup>127</sup>

- 
127. *In Re Oracle Corp. Derivative Litigation*, 824 A.2d 917, 2003 WL 21396449 (Del. Ch. 2003). In *Oracle*, the Chancery Court denied a motion by a special litigation committee of Oracle Corporation to dismiss pending derivative actions which accused four Oracle directors and officers of breaching their fiduciary duty of loyalty by misappropriating inside information in selling Oracle stock while in possession of material, nonpublic information that Oracle would not meet its projections. These four directors were Oracle's CEO, its CFO, the Chair of the Executive, Audit and Finance Committees, and the Chair of the Compensation Committee who was also a tenured professor at Stanford University. The other members of Oracle's board were accused of a breach of their *Caremark* duty of oversight through indifference to the deviation between Oracle's earnings guidance and reality.

In response to this derivative action and a variety of other lawsuits in other courts arising out of its surprising the market with a bad earnings report, Oracle created a special litigation committee to investigate the allegations and decide whether Oracle should assume the prosecution of the insider trading claims or have them dismissed. The committee consisted of two new outside directors, both tenured Stanford University professors, one of whom was former SEC Commissioner Joseph Grundfest. The new directors were recruited by the defendant CFO and the defendant Chair of Compensation Committee/Stanford professor after the litigation had commenced and to serve as members of the special litigation committee.

The Chancery Court held that the special committee failed to meet its burden to prove that no material issue of fact existed regarding the special committee's independence due to the connections that both the committee members and three of four defendants had to Stanford. One of the defendants was a Stanford professor who taught special committee member Grundfest when he was a Ph.D. candidate, a second defendant was an involved Stanford alumnus who had contributed millions to Stanford, and the third defendant was Oracle's CEO who had donated millions to Stanford and was considering a \$270 million donation at the time the special committee members were added to the Oracle board. The two Stanford professors were tenured and not involved in fund raising for Stanford, and thus were not dependent on contributions to Stanford for their continued employment.

Delaware draws a distinction between director disinterest and director independence. A director is “*interested*” when he or she stands on both sides of a transaction, or will benefit or experience some detriment that does not flow to the corporation or the stockholders generally. Absent self-dealing, the benefit must be material to the individual director.<sup>128</sup> In contrast, a director is not “*independent*” where the director’s decision is based on “extraneous considerations or influences” and not on the “corporate merits of the subject.”<sup>129</sup> Employment or consulting relationships can impair independence.<sup>130</sup> Family rela-

---

The Court found troubling that the special litigation committee’s report recommending dismissal of the derivative action failed to disclose many of the Stanford ties between the defendants and the special committee. The ties emerged during discovery.

Without questioning the personal integrity of either member of the special committee, the Court found that interrelationships among Stanford University, the special committee members and the defendant Oracle directors and officers necessarily would have colored in some manner the special committee’s deliberations. The Court commented that it is no easy task to decide whether to accuse a fellow director of the serious charge of insider trading and such difficulty was compounded by requiring the committee members to consider accusing a fellow professor and two large benefactors of their university of conduct that is rightly considered a violation of criminal law.

The Chancery Court wrote that the question of independence “turns on whether a director is, for any substantial reason, incapable of making a decision with only the best interests of the corporation in mind.” That is, the independence test ultimately “focus[es] on impartiality and objectivity.” While acknowledging a difficulty in reconciling Delaware precedent, the Court declined to focus narrowly on the economic relationships between the members of the special committee and the defendant officers and directors - *i.e.* “treating the possible effect on one’s personal wealth as the key to an independence inquiry.” Commenting that “*homo sapiens* is not merely *homo economicus*,” the Chancery Court wrote, “Whether the [special committee] members had precise knowledge of all the facts that have emerged is not essential, what is important is that by any measure this was a social atmosphere painted in too much vivid Stanford Cardinal red for the [special committee] members to have reasonably ignored.”

128. *Orman v. Cullman*, 794 A.2d 5 (Del. Ch. 2002).

129. *Orman v. Cullman*, 794 A.2d 5 (Del. Ch. 2002).

130. *See In re Ply Gem Indus., Inc. S’holders Litig.*, C.A. No. 15779-NC, 2001 Del. Ch. LEXIS 84 (Del. Ch. 2001) (holding plaintiffs raised reasonable doubt as to directors’ independence where (i) interested director as Chairman of the Board and CEO was in a position to exercise considerable influence over directors serving as President and COO; (ii) director was serving as Executive Vice President; (iii) a director whose small law firm received substantial fees over a period of years; and (iv) directors receiving substantial consulting fees); *Goodwin v. Live Entertainment*,

tionships can also impair independence.<sup>131</sup> Other business relationships may also prevent independence.<sup>132</sup>

---

*Inc.*, 1999 WL 64265 (Del. Ch. 1999) (stating on motion for summary judgment that evidence produced by plaintiff generated a triable issue of fact regarding whether directors' continuing employment relationship with surviving entity created a material interest in merger not shared by the stockholders); *Orman v. Cullman*, 794 A.2d 5 (Del. Ch. 2002) (questioning the independence of one director who had a consulting contract with the surviving corporation and questioning the disinterestedness of another director whose company would earn a \$3.3 million fee if the deal closed); *In re The Ltd., Inc. S'holders Litig.*, 2002 Del. Ch. LEXIS 28, 2002 WL 537692 (Del. Ch. March 27, 2002) (finding, in context of demand futility analysis, that the plaintiffs cast reasonable doubt on the independence of certain directors in a transaction that benefited the founder, Chairman, CEO and 25% stockholder of the company, where one director received a large salary for his management positions in the company's wholly-owned subsidiary, one director received consulting fees, and another director had procured, from the controlling stockholder, a \$25 million grant to the university where he formerly served as president); *Biondi v. Scrushy*, C.A. No. 19896, 2003 Del. Ch. LEXIS 7 (Del. Ch. Jan. 16, 2003) (questioning the independence of two members of a special committee formed to investigate charges against the CEO because committee members served with the CEO as directors of two sports organizations and because the CEO and one committee member had "long-standing personal ties" that included making large contributions to certain sports programs).

131. See *Chaffin v. GNI Group, Inc.*, C.A. No. 16211, 1999 Del. Ch. LEXIS 182 (Del. Ch. Sept. 3, 1999) (finding that director lacked independence where a transaction benefited son financially); *Harbor Fin. Partners v. Huizenga*, 751 A.2d 879 (Del. Ch. 1999) (holding that director who was brother-in-law of CEO and involved in various businesses with CEO could not impartially consider a demand adverse to CEO's interests); *Mizel v. Connelly*, C.A. No. 16638, 1999 Del. Ch. LEXIS 157 (Del. Ch. July 22, 1999) (holding director could not objectively consider demand adverse to interest of grandfather).
132. See *Kahn v. Tremont Corp.*, 694 A.2d 422 (Del. 1997) (holding members of special committee had significant prior business relationship with majority stockholder such that the committee lacked independence triggering entire fairness); *Heineman v. Datapoint Corp.*, 611 A.2d 950 (Del. 1992) (holding that allegations of "extensive interlocking business relationships" did not sufficiently demonstrate the necessary "nexus" between the conflict of interest and resulting personal benefit necessary to establish directors' lack of independence) (overruled as to standard of appellate review); and see *Citron v. Fairchild Camera & Instr. Corp.*, 569 A.2d 53 (Del. 1989) (holding mere fact that a controlling stockholder elects a director does not render that director non-independent).



A controlled director is not an independent director.<sup>133</sup> Control over individual directors is established by facts demonstrating that “through personal or other relationships the directors are beholden to the controlling person.”<sup>134</sup>

#### 4. Compensation

##### a. Prohibition on Loans to Directors or Officers

SOX §402 generally prohibits, effective July 30, 2002, a corporation from directly or indirectly making or arranging for personal loans to its directors and executive officers.<sup>135</sup> Four

---

133. *In re MAXXAM, Inc.*, 659 A.2d 760, 773 (Del. Ch. 1995) (“To be considered independent, a director must not be dominated or otherwise controlled by an individual or entity interested in the transaction”).

134. *Aronson, supra*, 473 A.2d at 815; compare *In re The Limited, Inc. S’holders Litig.*, 2002 Del. Ch. LEXIS 28, 2002 WL 537692 (Del. Ch. Mar. 27, 2002) (concluding that a university president who had solicited a \$25 million contribution from a corporation’s President, Chairman and CEO was not independent of that corporate official in light of the sense of “owingness” that the university president might harbor with respect to the corporate official), and *Lewis v. Fuqua*, 502 A.2d 962, 966-67 (Del. Ch. 1985) (finding that a special litigation committee member was not independent where the committee member was also the president of a university that received a \$10 million charitable pledge from the corporation’s CEO and the CEO was a trustee of the university), with *In re Walt Disney Co. Derivative Litig.*, 731 A.2d 342, 359 (Del. Ch. 1998) (deciding that the plaintiffs had not created reasonable doubt as to a director’s independence where a corporation’s Chairman and CEO had given over \$1 million in donations to the university at which the director was the university president and from which one of the CEO’s sons had graduated), *aff’d in part, rev’d in part sub nom. Brehm v. Eisner*, 746 A.2d 244 (Del. 2000) and *Bream v. Martha Stewart*, 845 A.2d 1040 (Del. 2004) (“bare social relationships clearly do not create reasonable doubt of independence”; the Supreme Court in distinguishing *Bream* from *Oracle*, wrote “[u]nlike the demand-excusal context [of *Bream*], where the board is presumed to be independent, the SLC [special litigation committee in *Oracle*] has the burden of establishing its own independence by a yardstick that must be ‘like Caesar’s wife’ – ‘above reproach.’ Moreover, unlike the presuit demand context, the SLC analysis contemplates not only a shift in the burden of persuasion but also the availability of discovery into various issues, including independence”).

135. SOX §402(a) provides: “It shall be unlawful for any issuer (as defined in [SOX §2]), directly or indirectly, including through any subsidiary, to extend or maintain credit, to arrange for the extension of credit, or to renew an extension of credit, in the form of a personal loan to or for any director or executive officer (or equivalent thereof) of that issuer. An extension of credit maintained by the issuer on the date of enactment of this subsection shall not be subject to the provisions of this subsection,

categories of personal loans by an issuer to its directors and officers are expressly exempt from SOX §402's prohibition:<sup>136</sup>

(11) any extension of credit existing before the SOX's enactment as long as no material modification or renewal of the extension of credit occurs on or after the date of SOX's enactment (July 30, 2002);

(12) specified home improvement and consumer credit loans if:

- made in the ordinary course of the issuer's consumer credit business,
- of a type generally made available to the public by the issuer, and
- on terms no more favorable than those offered to the public;

(13) loans by a broker-dealer to its employees that:

- fulfill the three conditions of paragraph (2) above,
- are made to buy, trade or carry securities other than the broker-dealer's securities, and
- are permitted by applicable Federal Reserve System regulations; and

(14) loans made or maintained by depository institutions that are insured by the U.S. Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation "if the loans are subject to the insider lending restrictions of section 22(h) of the Federal Reserve Act (12 U.S.C. 375b)."<sup>137</sup>

---

provided that there is no material modification to any term of any such extension of credit or any renewal of any such extension of credit on or after that date of enactment."

136. SEC Release No. 34-48481 (September 11, 2003), which can be found at <http://www.sec.gov/rules/proposed/34-48481.htm>.

137. This last exemption applies only to an "insured depository institution," which is defined by the Federal Deposit Insurance Act ("*FDIA*") as a bank or savings association that has insured its deposits with the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation ("*FDIC*"). Although this SOX §402 provision does not explicitly exclude foreign banks from the exemption, under current U.S. banking regulation a foreign bank cannot be an "insured depository institution" and, therefore, cannot qualify for the bank exemption. Since 1991, following enactment of the Foreign Bank Supervision Enhancement Act ("*FBSEA*"), a foreign bank that seeks to accept and maintain FDIC-insured retail deposits in the United States must establish a U.S. subsidiary, rather than a branch, agency or other entity, for that purpose. These U.S. subsidiaries of foreign banks, and the limited number of grandfathered U.S. branches of foreign banks that

The SEC to date has not provided guidance as to the interpretation of SOX §402, although a number of interpretative issues have surfaced. The prohibitions of SOX §402 apply only to an extension of credit “in the form of a personal loan” which suggests that all extensions of credit to a director or officer are not proscribed. While there is no legislative history or statutory definition to guide, it is reasonable to take the position that the following in the ordinary course of business are not proscribed: travel and similar advances, ancillary personal use of company credit card or company car where reimbursement is required; advances of relocation expenses ultimately to be borne by the issuer; stay and retention bonuses subject to reimbursement if the employee leaves prematurely; advancement of expenses pursuant to typical charter, bylaw or contractual indemnification arrangements; and tax indemnification payments to overseas-based officers.<sup>138</sup>

SOX §402 raises issues with regard to cashless stock option exercises and has led a number of issuers to suspend cashless exercise programs. In a typical cashless exercise program, the optionee delivers the notice of exercise to both the issuer and the broker, and the broker executes the sale of some or all of the underlying stock on that day (T). Then, on or prior to the settlement date (T+3), the broker pays to the issuer the option exercise price and applicable withholding taxes, and the issuer delivers (i.e., issues) the option stock to the broker. The broker transmits the remaining sale proceeds to the optionee. When and how these events occur may determine the level of risk under SOX §402.<sup>139</sup> The real question is whether a broker-administered same-day sale involves “an extension of credit in the

---

had obtained FDIC insurance prior to FBSEA’s enactment, can engage in FDIC-insured, retail deposit activities and, thus, qualify as “insured depository institutions.” But the foreign banks that own the U.S. insured depository subsidiaries or operate the grandfathered insured depository branches are not themselves “insured depository institutions” under the FDIA. The SEC, however, has proposed a rule to address this disadvantageous situation for foreign banks.

138. See outline dated October 15, 2002, authored jointly by a group of 25 law firms and posted at *www.TheCorporateCounsel.net* as “Sarbanes-Oxley Act: Interpretative Issues Under §402 – Prohibition of Certain Insider Loans.”
139. See *Cashless Exercise and Other SOXmania*, The Corporate Counsel (September-October 2002).

form of a personal loan” made or arranged by the issuer. The nature of the arrangement can affect the analysis.<sup>140</sup>

Some practitioners have questioned whether SOX §402 prohibits directors and executive officers of an issuer from taking loans from employee pension benefit plans, which raised the further question of whether employers could restrict director and officer plan loans without violating the U.S. Labor Department’s ant discrimination rules. On April 15, 2003, the Labor Department issued Field Assistance Bulletin 2003-1 providing that plan fiduciaries of public companies could deny participant loans to directors and officers without violating the Labor Department rules.

### ***b. Stock Exchange Requirements***

The stock exchanges require shareholder approval of many equity compensation plans.<sup>141</sup> In contrast, state law generally authorizes such plans and leaves the power to authorize them generally with the power of the board of directors to direct the management of the affairs of the corporation.

- 
140. If the issuer delivers the option stock to the broker before receiving payment, the issuer may be deemed to have loaned the exercise price to the optionee, perhaps making this form of program riskier than others. If the broker advances payment to the issuer prior to T+3, planning to reimburse itself from the sale of proceeds on T+3, that advance may be viewed as an extension of credit by the broker, and the question then becomes whether the issuer “arranged” the credit. The risk of this outcome may be reduced where the issuer does not select the selling broker or set up the cashless exercise program, but instead merely confirms to a broker selected by the optionee that the option is valid and exercisable and that the issuer will deliver the stock upon receipt of the option exercise price and applicable withholding taxes. Even where the insider selects the broker, the broker cannot, under Regulation T, advance the exercise price without first confirming that the issuer will deliver the stock promptly. In that instance, the issuer’s involvement is limited to confirming facts, and therefore is less likely to be viewed as “arranging” the credit.

Where both payment and delivery of the option stock occur on the same day (T+3), there arguably is no extension of credit at all, in which case the exercise should not be deemed to violate SOX §402 whether effected through a designated broker or a broker selected by the insider.

If the insider has sufficient collateral in his or her account (apart from the stock underlying the option being exercised) to permit the broker to make a margin loan equal to the exercise price and applicable withholding taxes, arguably the extension of credit is between the broker and the insider, and does not violate SOX §402 assuming the issuer is not involved in arranging the credit.

141. See NYSE Rule 312; NASD Rule 4350(i).

### ***c. Fiduciary Duties***

In approving executive compensation, directors must act in accordance with their fiduciary duties. The fiduciary duties discussed elsewhere herein, including the duties of care, loyalty and disclosure, are all applicable when directors consider executive compensation matters.<sup>142</sup> As in other contexts, process and disinterested judgment are critical.

## **5. Related Party Transactions**

### ***a. Stock Exchanges***

(15) *General*. Stock exchange listing requirements generally require all related party transactions to be approved by a committee of independent directors.<sup>143</sup>

(16) *NYSE*. The NYSE, in NYSE Rule 307, takes the general position that a publicly-owned company of the size and character appropriate for listing on the NYSE should be able to operate on its own merit and credit standing free from the suspicions that may arise when business transactions are consummated with insiders. The NYSE feels that the company's management is in the best position to evaluate each such relationship intelligently and objectively.

However, there are certain related party transactions that do require shareholder approval under the NYSE Rules. Therefore, a review of NYSE Rule 312 should be done whenever related party transactions are analyzed by a NYSE listed company.

(17) *NASDAQ*. NASD Rule 4350(h) requires each NASDAQ listed company to conduct an appropriate review of all related party transactions for potential conflict of interest situations on an ongoing basis and all such transactions must be approved by the company's audit committee or another independent body of the board of directors. For purposes of this rule, the term "*related party transaction*" shall refer to transactions required to be disclosed pursuant to SEC Regulation S-K, Item 404.

---

142. See notes 197-222 and related text, *infra*.

143. See NYSE Rules 307 and 312; NASD Rule 4350(h).

**b. Interested Director Transactions —TBOC § 21.418; TBCA Art. 2.35-1; and DGCL § 144**

Both Texas and Delaware have embraced the principle that a transaction or contract between a director and the director's corporation is presumed to be valid and will not be voidable solely by reason of the director's interest as long as certain conditions are met.

DGCL § 144 provides that a contract between a director and the director's corporation will not be voidable due to the director's interest if (i) the transaction or contract is approved in good faith by a majority of the disinterested directors after the material facts as to the relationship or interest and as to the transaction or contract are disclosed or known to the directors, (ii) the transaction or contract is approved in good faith by shareholders after the material facts as to the relationship or interest and as to the transaction or contract is disclosed or known to the shareholders, or (iii) the transaction or contract is fair to the corporation as of the time it is authorized, approved, or ratified by the directors or shareholders of the corporation.<sup>144</sup> In *Fliegler v. Lawrence*, however, the Delaware Supreme Court held that where the votes of directors, qua stockholders, were necessary to garner stockholder approval of a transaction in which the directors were interested, the taint of director self-interest was not removed, and the transaction or contract may still be set aside and liability imposed on a director if the transaction is not fair to the corporation.<sup>145</sup> The question remains, however, whether approval by a majority of disinterested stockholders will, pursuant to DGCL § 144(a)(2), cure any invalidity of director actions *and*, by virtue of the stockholder ratification, eliminate any director liability for losses from such actions.<sup>146</sup>

In 1985, Texas followed Delaware's lead in the area of interested director transactions and adopted TBCA article 2.35-1,<sup>147</sup> the predecessor to TBOC § 21.418. In general, these Texas Corporate Statutes provide that a transaction between a corporation and one or more of its directors or officers will not be voidable solely by reason of that relationship if the transaction is approved by shareholders or disinterested directors after dis-

---

144. DGCL § 144(a).

145. *Fliegler v. Lawrence*, 361 A.2d 218, 222 (Del. 1976).

146. *See Michelson v. Duncan*, 407 A.2d 211, 219 (Del. 1979).

147. TBOC § 21.418; TBCA art. 2.35-1.

closure of the interest, or if the transaction is otherwise fair.<sup>148</sup> Because TBCA art. 2.35-1, as initially enacted, was essentially identical to DGCL § 144, some uncertainty on the scope of TBCA art. 2.35-1 arose because of *Fliegler's* interpretation of DGCL § 144. This imposition of a fairness gloss on the Texas statute rendered the effect of the safe harbor provisions in TBCA article 2.35-1 uncertain.

In 1997, TBCA article 2.35-1 was amended to address the ambiguity created by *Fliegler* and to clarify that contracts and transactions between a corporation and its directors and officers or in which a director or officer has a financial interest are valid notwithstanding that interest as long as any one of the following are met: (i) the disinterested directors of the corporation approve the transaction after disclosure of the interest, (ii) the shareholders of the corporation approve the transaction after disclosure of the interest or (iii) the transaction is fair.<sup>149</sup> TBOC § 21.418 mirrors these clarifications. Under the Texas Corporate Statutes, if any one of these conditions is met, the contract will be considered valid notwithstanding the fact that the director or officer has an interest in the transaction.<sup>150</sup> These provisions rely heavily on the statutory definitions of “*disinterested*” contained in TBCA art. 1.02 and TBOC § 1.003. Under these definitions, a director will be considered “*disinterested*” if the director is not a party to the contract or transaction or does not otherwise have a material financial interest in the outcome of the contract.<sup>151</sup>

Article 2.35-1 also changed the general approach of the statute from a mere presumption that a contract is not voidable by reason of the existence of an affiliated relationship if certain conditions are met to an absolute safe harbor that provides that an otherwise valid contract will be valid if the specified conditions are met, a change retained by TBOC § 21.418. Although the difference between the Texas and Delaware constructions is subtle, the distinction is significant and provides more certainty as transactions are structured. However, these Texas Corporate Statutes do not eliminate a director's or officer's fiduciary duty to the corporation.

---

148. *Id.*; TBOC § 21.418; see *v. S&A Marketing Group, Inc.*, 82 S.W.2d 3rd 666 (Tx. App. Eastland 2002).

149. TBCA art. 2.35-1.

150. *Id.* art. 2.35-1(A); TBOC § 21.418(b).

151. *Id.*

### **III. SHIFTING DUTIES WHEN COMPANY ON PENUMBRA OF INSOLVENCY**

#### **A. Insolvency Changes Relationships**

Directors owe fiduciary duties to the corporation and its owners.<sup>152</sup> When the corporation is solvent, the directors owe fiduciary duties to the corporation and the shareholders of the corporation.<sup>153</sup> The creditors relationship to the corporation is contractual in nature. A solvent corporation's directors do not owe any fiduciary duties to the corporation's creditors, whose rights in relation to the corporation are those that they have bargained for and memorialized in their contracts.<sup>154</sup>

In Texas a corporation's directors continue to owe shareholders, not creditors, fiduciary duties "so long as [the corporation] continues to be a going concern, conducting its business in the ordinary way, without some positive act of insolvency, such as the filing of a bill to administer its assets, or the making of a general assignment."<sup>155</sup> When the corporation is both insolvent and has ceased doing business, the corporation's creditors become its owners and the directors owe fiduciary duties to the creditors as the owners of the business in the sense they have a duty to administer the corporation's remaining assets as a trust fund for the benefit of all of the creditors.<sup>156</sup> The duties of direc-

- 
152. Comments of Delaware Vice Chancellor Leo E. Strine in Galveston, Texas on February 22, 2002 at the 24th Annual Conference on Securities Regulation and Business Law Problems sponsored by University of Texas School of Law, et al.
153. *North American Catholic Educational Programming Foundation Inc. v. Gheewalla*, \_\_\_ A2d \_\_\_, 2007 WL 1453705 (Del. May 18, 2007) (slip opinion at 18) ("The directors of Delaware corporations have 'the legal responsibility to manage the business of a corporation for the benefit of its shareholders'", quoting from *Malone v. Brincat*, 722 A.2d 5 (1998))
154. See *Fagan v. La Gloria Oil & Gas Co.*, 494 S.W.2d 624, 628 (Tex. Civ. App.—Houston [14th Dist.] 1973, no writ) ("[O]fficers and directors of a corporation owe to it duties of care and loyalty. . . . Such duties, however, are owed to the corporation and not to creditors of the corporation.")
155. *Conway v. Bonner*, 100 F.2d 786, 787 (5th Cir. 1939); see *Floyd v. Hefner*, 2006 WL 2844245 (S.D. Tex. Sept. 29, 2006); *Askanase v. Fatjo*, No. H-91-3140, 1993 WL 208440 (S.D. Tex. April 22, 1993); but see *Carriero v. Jobs.com*, 393 F.3d 508, 534, n. 24 (5th Cir. 2004) ("[o]fficers and directors that are aware that the corporation is insolvent, or within the 'zone of insolvency' . . . have expanded fiduciary duties to include the creditors of the corporation.")
156. *Floyd v. Hefner*, 2006 WL 2844245 (S.D. Tex. Sept. 29, 2006); *Askanase v. Fatjo*, No. H-91-3140, 1993 WL 208440 (S.D. Tex. April 22, 1993); see



tors of an insolvent corporation to its creditors, however, do not require that the directors must abandon their efforts to direct the affairs of the corporation in a manner intended to benefit the corporation and its shareholders and that they lose the protections of the business judgment rule.<sup>157</sup> However, owing a duty of loyalty means that “a self-interested director cannot orchestrate the sale of a corporation’s assets for his benefit below the price that diligent marketing efforts would have obtained.”<sup>158</sup> The trust fund doctrine in Texas requires the directors and officers of an insolvent corporation to deal fairly with its creditors without preferring one creditor over another or themselves to the injury of other creditors.<sup>159</sup> Even where they are not direct beneficiaries of fiduciary duties, the credi-

---

*also Hixson v. Pride of Texas Distrib. Co.*, 683 S.W.2d 173, 176 (Tex.App.—Fort Worth 1985, no writ); *State v. Nevitt*, 595 S.W.2d 140, 143 (Tex.App.—Dallas 1980, writ ref’d n.r.e.); and *Fagan v. La Gloria Oil & Gas. Co.*, 494 S.W.2d 624, 628 (Tex.App.—Houston [14th Dist.] 1973, no writ).

157. *Floyd v. Hefner*, 2006 WL 2844245 (S.D. Tex. Sept. 29, 2006), in which Judge Melinda Harmon concludes that “Texas law does not impose fiduciary duties in favor of creditors on the directors of an insolvent, but still operating, corporation, [but] it does require those directors to act as fiduciaries of the corporation itself” and that *Gearhart Industries, Inc. v. Smith International, Inc.*, 741 F.2d 707, 719 (5th Cir. 1984), remains the controlling statement of Texas director fiduciary duty law.
158. *Id.*; *cf. In re Performance Nutrition, Inc.*, 237 B.R. 93 (Bankr. N.D. Tex. 1999); *In re General Homes Corp.*, 199 B.R. 148 (S.D. Tex. 1996).
159. *Plas-Tex v. Jones*, 2000 WL 632677 (Tex. App.—Austin 2002; not published in S.W.3d) (“As a general rule, corporate officers and directors owe fiduciary duties only to the corporation and not to the corporation’s creditors, unless there has been prejudice to the creditors. . . . However, when a corporation is insolvent, a fiduciary relationship arises between the officers and directors of the corporation and its creditors, and creditors may challenge a breach of the duty. . . . Officers and directors of an insolvent corporation have a fiduciary duty to deal fairly with the corporation’s creditors, and that duty includes preserving the value of the corporate assets to pay corporate debts without preferring one creditor over another or preferring themselves to the injury of other creditors. . . . However, a creditor may pursue corporate assets and hold directors liable only for ‘that portion of the assets that would have been available to satisfy his debt if they had been distributed pro rata to all creditors.’”); *Geyer v. Ingersoll Pub. Co.*, 621 A. 2d 784, 787 (Del.Ch. 1992) (“[T]he general rule is that directors do not owe creditors duties beyond the relevant contractual terms absent ‘special circumstances’ . . . e.g., fraud, insolvency or a violation of a statute. . . .” [citation omitted]). Furthermore, [no one] seriously disputes that when the insolvency does arise, it creates fiduciary duties for directors for the benefit of creditors. Therefore, the issue. . . is when do directors’ fiduciary duties to creditors arise

tors of an insolvent corporation may benefit from the fiduciary duties, which continue to be owed to the corporation.<sup>160</sup>

In Delaware, the corporation need not have ceased doing business for that trust fund to arise and the directors to owe duties to creditors.<sup>161</sup> However, the Delaware formulation of the trust fund doctrine would not afford relief if the self-dealing was fair:

[C]reditors need protection even if an insolvent corporation is not liquidating, because the fact of insolvency shifts the risk of loss from the stockholders to the creditors. While stockholders no longer risk further loss, creditors become at risk when decisions of the directors affect the corporation's ability to repay debt. This new fiduciary relationship is certainly one of loyalty, trust and confidence, but it does not involve holding the insolvent corporation's assets in trust for distribution to creditors or holding directors strictly liable for actions that deplete corporate assets.<sup>162</sup>

The owing of fiduciary duties to creditors does not preclude the directors from allowing the corporation to take on economic risk for the benefit of the corporation's equity owners.<sup>163</sup> Rather, the shifting merely exonerates the directors who choose

---

via insolvency.”); see Terrell and Short, *Directors Duties in Insolvency: Lessons From Allied Riser*, 14 BNA Bkr. L. Repr. 293 (March 14, 2002).

160. *Floyd v. Hefner*, 2006 WL 2844245 (S.D. Tex. Sept. 29, 2006).

161. *Askanase v. Fatjo*, No. H-91-3140, 1993 WL 208440 (S.D. Tex. April 22, 1993); *Geyer v. Ingersoll Pub. Co.*, 621 A. 2d 784, 787 (Del.Ch. 1992) (“[T]he general rule is that directors do not owe creditors duties beyond the relevant contractual terms absent ‘special circumstances’ . . . e.g., fraud, insolvency or a violation of a statute. . . .” [citation omitted]. Furthermore, [no one] seriously disputes that when the insolvency does arise, it creates fiduciary duties for directors for the benefit of creditors. Therefore, the issue. . . is when do directors’ fiduciary duties to creditors arise via insolvency.”); see Terrell and Short, *Directors Duties in Insolvency: Lessons From Allied Riser*, 14 BNA Bkr. L. Repr. 293 (March 14, 2002).

162. *Decker v. Mitchell (In re JTS Corp)*, 305 B.R. 529, 539 (Bankr. N.D. Cal. 2003).

163. *North American Catholic Educational Programming Foundation Inc. v. Gheewalla*, \_\_\_ A2d \_\_\_, 2007 WL 1453705 (Del. May 18, 2007); *Floyd v. Hefner*, 2006 WL 2844245 (S.D. Tex. Sept. 29, 2006); see Rutheford B. Campbell, Jr. and Christopher W. Frost, *Managers’ Fiduciary Duties in Financially Distressed Corporations: Chaos in Delaware (and Elsewhere)*, 32 J. Corp. L. 492 (Spring 2007). .

to maintain the corporation's long term viability by considering the interests of creditors.<sup>164</sup>

There are degrees of insolvency (e.g., a corporation may be unable to pay its debts as they come due because of troubles with its lenders or its liabilities may exceed the book value of its assets, but the intrinsic value of the entity may significantly exceed its debts). Sometimes it is unclear whether the corporation is insolvent. In circumstances where the corporation is on the penumbra of insolvency, the directors may owe fiduciary duties to the "whole enterprise."<sup>165</sup> Owing fiduciary duties to the

- 
164. *Id.*; see *Equity-Linked Investors, L.P. v. Adams*, 705 A.2d 1040, 1042 n.2 (Del. Ch. 1997) ("[W]here foreseeable financial effects of a board decision may importantly fall upon creditors as well as holders of common stock, as where corporation is in the vicinity of insolvency, an independent board may consider impacts upon all corporate constituencies in exercising its good faith business judgment for benefit of the 'corporation.'").
165. *Geyer v. Ingersoll Pub. Co.*, 621 A. 2d 784, 789 (Del.Ch. 1992) ("The existence of the fiduciary duties at the moment of insolvency may cause directors to choose a course of action that best serves the entire corporate enterprise rather than any single group interested in the corporation at a point in time when the shareholders' wishes should not be the directors only concern"); see *Credit Lyonnais Bank Nederland, N.V. v. Pathe Communications Corp.*, C.A. No. 12150, 1991 Del. Ch. LEXIS 215 at n. 55 (Del. Ch. 1991) in which Chancellor Allen expressed the following in *dicta*:

n. 55 The possibility of insolvency can do curious things to incentives, exposing creditors to risks of opportunistic behavior and creating complexities for directors. Consider, for example, a solvent corporation having a single asset, a judgment for \$51 million against a solvent debtor. The judgment is on appeal and thus subject to modification or reversal. Assume that the only liabilities of the company are to bondholders in the amount of \$12 million. Assume that [based on] the array of probable outcomes of the appeal [25% chance of affirmance, 70% chance of modification and 5% chance of reversal] the best evaluation is that the current value of the equity is \$3.55 million. (\$15.55 million expected value of judgment on appeal \$12 million liability to bondholders). Now assume an offer to settle at \$12.5 million (also consider one at \$17.5 million). By what standard do the directors of the company evaluate the fairness of these offers? The creditors of this solvent company would be in favor of accepting either a \$12.5 million offer or a \$17.5 million offer. In either event they will avoid the 75% risk of insolvency and default. The stockholders, however, will plainly be opposed to acceptance of a \$12.5 million settlement (under which they get practically nothing). More importantly, they very well may be opposed to acceptance of the \$17.5 million offer under which the residual value of the corporation would in-

“whole enterprise” puts the directors in the uncomfortable position of owing duties to multiple constituencies having conflicting interests.<sup>166</sup>

**B. *When is a Corporation Insolvent or in the Vicinity of Insolvency?***

In Delaware it is the fact of insolvency, rather than the commencement of statutory bankruptcy or other insolvency proceedings, that causes the shift in director duties.<sup>167</sup> Delaware courts define insolvency as occurring when the corporation “is unable to pay its debts as they fall due in the usual course of business . . . or it has liabilities in excess of a reasonable market value of assets held.”<sup>168</sup>

Under the “balance sheet” test used for bankruptcy law purposes, insolvency is defined as when an entity’s debts exceed the entity’s property at fair valuation,<sup>169</sup> and the value at which

---

crease from \$3.5 to \$5.5 million. This is so because the litigation alternative, with its 25% probability of a \$39 million outcome to them (\$51 million - \$12 million \$39 million) has an expected value to the residual risk bearer of \$9.75 million (\$39 million x 25% chance of affirmance), substantially greater than the \$5.5 million available to them in the settlement. While in fact the stockholders’ preference would reflect their appetite for risk, it is possible (and with diversified shareholders likely) that the shareholders would prefer rejection of both settlement offers.

But if we consider the community of interests that the corporation represents it seems apparent that one should in this hypothetical accept the best settlement offer available providing it is greater than \$15.55 million, and one below that amount should be rejected. But that result will not be reached by a director who thinks he owes duties directly to shareholders only. It will be reached by directors who are capable of conceiving of the corporation as a legal and economic entity. Such directors will recognize that in managing the business affairs of a solvent corporation in the vicinity of insolvency, circumstances may arise when the right (both the efficient and the fair) course to follow for the corporation may diverge from the choice that the stockholders (or the creditors, or the employees, or any single group interested in the corporation) would make if given the opportunity to act.

166. *See Odyssey Partners, L.P. v. Fleming Companies, Inc.*, 735 A.2d 386 (Del. Ch. 1999).

167. *Geyer v. Ingersoll Pub. Co.*, 621 A. 2d 784, 789 (Del.Ch. 1992).

168. *Id.*

169. 11 U.S.C. § 101(32) (2006). A “balance sheet” test is also used under the fraudulent transfer statutes of Delaware and Texas. *See* DEL. CODE

the assets carried for financial accounting or tax purposes is irrelevant.

Fair value of assets is the amount that would be realized from the sale of assets within a reasonable period of time.<sup>170</sup> Fair valuation is not liquidation or book value, but is the value of the assets considering the age and liquidity of the assets, as well as the conditions of the trade.<sup>171</sup> For liabilities, the fair value assumes that the debts are to be paid according to the present terms of the obligations.

The directors' duties, however, begin the shift even before the moment of insolvency. Where the corporation may not yet be technically insolvent but "is operating in the vicinity of insolvency, a board of directors is not merely the agent of the residue risk bearers, but owes its duty to the corporate enterprise".<sup>172</sup> In cases where the corporation has been found to be in the vicinity of insolvency, the entity was in dire financial straits with a bankruptcy petition likely in the minds of the directors.<sup>173</sup>

### **C. Director Liabilities to Creditors**

The business judgment rule is applicable to actions of directors even while the corporation is insolvent or on the penumbra thereof in circumstances where it would otherwise have been applicable.<sup>174</sup> Where directors are interested, their conduct will

ANN. tit. 6, § 1302 and TEX. BUS. & COM. CODE § 24.003. For general corporate purposes, TBOC § 1.002(39) defines insolvency as the "inability of a person to pay the person's debts as they become due in the usual course of business or affairs." TBCA art. 1.02A(16) provides substantially the same. For transactions covered by the U.C.C., TEX. BUS. & COM. CODE 1.201(23) (2001) defines an entity as "insolvent" who either has ceased to pay its debts in the ordinary course of business or cannot pay its debts as they become due or is insolvent within the meaning of the federal bankruptcy law.

170. *Production Resources Group, L.L.C. v. NCT Group, Inc.*, 863 A.2d 772 (Del. Ch. 2004); *Angelo, Gordon & Co., L.P., et al. v. Allied Riser Communications Corporation, et al.*, 2002 Del. Ch. LEXIS 11.

171. *In re United Finance Corporation*, 104 F.2d 593 (7th Cir. 1939).

172. *Credit Lyonnais Bank Nederland, N.V. v. Pathe Communications Corp.*, C.A. No. 12150 Mem. Op., Del. Ch. LEXIS 215 (Del. Ch. 1991).

173. In the *Credit Lyonnais* case, *supra*, a bankruptcy petition had recently been dismissed, but the corporation continued to labor "in the shadow of that prospect" *Id.* See also *Equity-Linked Investors LP v. Adams*, 705 A.2d 1040, 1041 (Del. Ch. 1997) (corporation found to be on "lip of insolvency" where a bankruptcy petition had been prepared and it had only cash sufficient to cover operations for one more week).

174. *Angelo, Gordon & Co., L.P., et al. v. Allied Riser Communications Corporation, et al.*, 2002 Del. Ch. LEXIS 11.

likewise be judged by the standards that would have otherwise been applicable. A director's stock ownership, however, may call into question a director's independence where the fiduciary duties are owed to the creditors, for the stock ownership would tend to ally the director with the interests of the shareholders rather than the creditors, but relatively insubstantial amounts of stock ownership should not impugn a directors independence.<sup>175</sup>

In *Pereira v. Cogan*<sup>176</sup>, a Chapter 7 trustee bought an adversary proceeding against Marshall Cogan, the former CEO of a closely held Delaware corporation, of which he was the founder and majority stockholder, and the corporation's other officers and directors for their alleged self-dealing or breach of fiduciary duty.<sup>177</sup> The U.S. District Court for the Southern District of New York ("*SDNY*") held *inter alia*, that (1) ratification

---

175. Cf. *Angelo, Gordon & Co., L.P., et al. v. Allied Riser Communications Corporation, et al.*, 2002 Del. Ch. LEXIS 11.

176. 294 B.R. 449 (SDNY 2003).

177. "Once Cogan created the cookie jar—and obtained outside support for it—he could not without impunity take from it.

"The second and more difficult question posed by this lawsuit is what role the officers and directors should play when confronted by, or at least peripherally aware of, the possibility that a controlling shareholder (who also happens to be their boss) is acting in his own best interests instead of those of the corporation. Given the lack of public accountability present in a closely held private corporation, it is arguable that such officers and directors owe a greater duty to the corporation and its shareholders to keep a sharp eye on the controlling shareholder. At the very least, they must uphold the same standard of care as required of officers and directors of public companies or private companies that are not so dominated by a founder/controlling shareholder. They cannot turn a blind eye when the controlling shareholder goes awry, nor can they simply assume that all's right with the corporation without any exercise of diligence to ensure that that is the case.

"As discussed later, it is found as a matter of fact that Trace was insolvent or in the vicinity of insolvency during most of the period from 1995 to 1999, when Trace finally filed for bankruptcy. Trace's insolvency means that Cogan and the other director and officer defendants were no longer just liable to Trace and its shareholders, but also to Trace's creditors. In addition, the insolvency rendered certain transactions illegal, such as a redemption and the declaring of dividends. It may therefore be further concluded that, in determining the breadth of duties in the situation as described above, officers and directors must at the very least be sure that the actions of the controlling shareholder (and their inattention thereto) do not run the privately held corporation into the ground." *Pereira v. Cogan*, 294 B.R. at 463.

by board of directors that was not independent<sup>178</sup> of compensation that the CEO had previously set for himself, without adequate information-gathering, was insufficient to shift from CEO the burden of demonstrating entire fairness of transaction; (2) corporate officers with knowledge of debtor's improper redemption of preferred stock from an unaffiliated stockholder and unapproved loans to the CEO and related persons could be held liable on breach of fiduciary duty theory for failing to take appropriate action; (3) directors, by abstaining from voting on challenged corporate expenditures, could not insulate themselves from liability; (4) directors did not satisfy their burden of demonstrating "entire fairness" of transactions, and were liable for any resulting damages; (5) report prepared by corporation's compensation committee on performance/salary of CEO, which was prepared without advice of outside consultants and consisted of series of conclusory statements concerning the value of services rendered by the CEO in obtaining financing for the corporation was little more than an *ipse dixit*, on which corporate officers could not rely;<sup>179</sup> (6) term "redeem," as used in DGCL

---

178. "Cogan also failed in his burden to demonstrate that the Committee or the Board was "independent" in connection with the purported ratification of his compensation. Sherman, the only member of the Board not on Trace's payroll, was a long-time business associate and personal friend of Cogan, with whom he had other overlapping business interests. Nelson, the only other member of the Committee, was Trace's CFO and was dependent on Cogan both for his employment and the amount of his compensation, as were Farace and Marcus, the other Board members who approved the Committee's ratification of Cogan's compensation. There is no evidence that any member of the Committee or the Board negotiated with Cogan over the amount of his compensation, much less did so at arm's length." *Pereira v. Cogan*, 294 B.R. at 478.

179. "With regard to the ratification of Cogan's compensation from 1988 to 1994, there is no evidence that the Board met to discuss the ratification or that the Board actually knew what level of compensation they were ratifying. While Nelson delivered a report on Cogan's 1991-1994 compensation approximately two years prior to the ratification, on June 24, 1994, there is no evidence that the directors who ratified the compensation remembered that colloquy, nor that they relied on their two-year-old memories of it in deciding the ratify Cogan's compensation. The mere fact that Cogan had successfully spearheaded extremely lucrative deals for Trace in the relevant years and up to the ratification vote is insufficient to justify a blind vote in favor of compensation that may or may not be commensurate with those given to similarly situated executives. Any blind vote is suspect in any case given the fact that Cogan dominated the Board.

"The most that the Board did, or even could do, based on the evidence presented, was to rely on the recommendation of the Compensa-

§ 160, providing that no corporation shall redeem its shares when the capital of the corporation is impaired, was broad enough to include transaction whereby corporation loaned money to another entity to purchase its shares, the other entity used money to purchase shares, and the corporation then accepted shares as collateral for loan; (7) officers and directors could not assert individual-based offsets as defenses to breach of fiduciary duty claims; (8) the exculpatory clause in the corporation's certificate of incorporation which shields directors from liability to the corporation for breach of the duty of care, as authorized by DGCL § 102(b)(7), was inapplicable because the trustee had brought the action for the benefit of the creditors rather than the corporation; and (9) the business judgment rule was not applicable because a majority of the challenged transactions were not the subject of board action. The SDNY concluded that the trustee's fiduciary duty and DGCL claims were in the nature of equitable restitution, rather than legal damages, and denied defendants' request for a jury trial. The CEO was found liable for \$44.4 million and then settled with the trustee. The remaining defendants appealed to the Second Circuit.

On appeal the defendants raised a "sandstorm" of claims and ultimately prevailed. The Second Circuit held in *Pereira v. Farace*<sup>180</sup> that the defendants were entitled to a jury trial because the trustee's claims were principally a legal action for damages, rather than an equitable claim for restitution or unjust enrichment, because the appealing defendants never possessed the funds at issue (the CEO who had received the funds had previously settled with the trustee and was not a party to the appeal). In remanding the case for a jury trial, the Second Circuit also held (i) that the bankruptcy trustee stood in the

---

tion Committee. They have not established reasonable reliance on the advice of the Compensation Committee, then composed of Nelson and Sherman (two of the four non-interested Board members who ratified the compensation). The Compensation Committee had never met. It did not seek the advice of outside consultants. The "report" to the Board consisted of several conclusory statements regarding Cogan's performance, without reference to any attachments listing how much the compensation was or any schedule pitting that level of compensation against that received by executives the Compensation Committee believed to be similarly situated. The "report" was little more than an *ipse dixit* and it should have been treated accordingly by the Board. As a result, the director-defendants cannot elude liability on the basis of reliance on the Compensation Committee's report." *Pereira v. Cogan*, 294 B.R. at 528.

180. 413 F.3d 330 (2nd Cir. 2005).



shoes of the insolvent corporation and as such was bound by the exculpatory provision in the corporation's certificate of incorporation pursuant to DGCL § 102(b)(7) which precluded shareholder claims based on mismanagement (i.e., the duty of care)<sup>181</sup> and (ii) that the SDNY did not properly apply the Delaware definition of insolvency when it used a cash flow test of insolvency which projected into the future whether the corporation's capital will remain adequate over a period of time rather than the Delaware test which looks solely at whether the corporation has been paying its bills on a timely basis and/or whether its assets exceed its liabilities.

When the conduct of the directors is being challenged by the creditors on fiduciary duty of loyalty grounds, the directors do not have the benefit of the statutes limiting director liability in duty of care cases.<sup>182</sup>

#### **D. Deepening Insolvency**

Deepening insolvency as a legal theory can be traced to dicta in a 1983 Seventh Circuit opinion that "the corporate body is ineluctably damaged by the deepening of its insolvency," which results from the "fraudulent prolongation of a corporation's life beyond insolvency."<sup>183</sup> In recent years some federal courts embraced deepening insolvency claims and predicted that Delaware would recognize such a cause of action.<sup>184</sup> In

---

181. Two other cases have held that director exculpation charter provisions adopted under DGCL § 102(b)(7) protect directors from duty of care claims brought by creditors who were accorded standing to pursue fiduciary duty claims against directors because the company was insolvent. *Production Resources Group, L.L.C. v. NCT Group, Inc.*, 863 A.2d 772 (Del. Ch. 2004) ("[T]he fact of insolvency does not change the primary object of the director's duties, which is the firm itself. The firm's insolvency simply makes the creditors the principal constituency injured by any fiduciary breaches that diminish the firm's value and logically gives them standing to pursue these claims to rectify that injury."); *Continuing Creditors' Committee of Star Telecommunications Inc. v. Edgcomb*, 2004 WL 2980736 (D. Del. 2004).

182. *Geyer v. Ingersoll Pub. Co.*, 621 A. 2d 784, 789 (Del.Ch. 1992).

183. *Schacht v. Brown*, 711 F.2d 1343, 1350 (7th Cir 1983); see Sabin Willett, *The Shallows of Deepening Insolvency*, 60 Bus. Law 549 (Feb. 2005).

184. *Official Comm. of Unsecured Creditors v. R.F. Lafferty Co., Inc.*, 267 F.3d 340, 351 (3d Cir. 2001) (applying Pennsylvania law); *In re Exide v. Credit Suisse First Boston*, 299 B.R. 732 (Bankr. D. Del. 2003); *In re Scott Acq. Corp.*, 344 B.R. 283 (Bankr. D. Del.); *Stanziale v. Pepper Hamilton, LLP*, (*In re Student Fin. Corp.*), 355 B.R. 539, 548 (D. Del. 2005).

*Trenwick America Litigation Trust v. Ernst & Young LLP, et al.*,<sup>185</sup> the Delaware Court of Chancery in 2006 for the first time addressed a cause of action for deepening insolvency and, confounding the speculation of the federal courts, held that “put simply, under Delaware law, ‘deepening insolvency’ is no more of a cause of action when a firm is insolvent than a cause of action for ‘shallowing profitability’ would be when a firm is solvent.” This holding arose in the aftermath of two flawed public company acquisitions, which were blamed for the company’s troubles. In granting a motion to dismiss a claim for deepening insolvency, Vice Chancellor Strine explained his reasoning as follows:

In the complaint, the [plaintiff] also has attempted to state a claim against the former subsidiary directors for “deepening insolvency.” \* \* \* Delaware law does not recognize this catchy term as a cause of action, because catchy though the term may be, it does not express a coherent concept. Even when a firm is insolvent, its directors may, in the appropriate exercise of their business judgment, take action that might, if it does not pan out, result in the firm being painted in a deeper hue of red. The fact that the residual claimants of the firm at that time are creditors does not mean that the directors cannot choose to continue the firm’s operations in the hope that they can expand the inadequate pie such that the firm’s creditors get a greater recovery. By doing so, the directors do not become a guarantor of success. Put simply, under Delaware law, “deepening insolvency” is no more of a cause of action when a firm is insolvent than a cause of action for “shallowing profitability” would be when a firm is solvent. Existing equitable causes of action for breach of fiduciary duty, and existing legal causes of action for fraud, fraudulent conveyance, and breach of contract are the appropriate means by which to challenge the actions of boards of insolvent corporations.

Refusal to embrace deepening insolvency as a cause of action is required by settled principles of Delaware law. So, too, is a refusal to extend to creditors a solicitude not given to equity holders. Creditors are better placed than equity holders and other corporate constit-

---

185. 906 A.2d 168 (Del. Ch. 2006).

uencies (think employees) to protect themselves against the risk of firm failure.

The incantation of the word insolvency, or even more amorphously, the words zone of insolvency should not declare open season on corporate fiduciaries. Directors are expected to seek profit for stockholders, even at risk of failure. With the prospect of profit often comes the potential for defeat.

The general rule embraced by Delaware is the sound one. So long as directors are respectful of the corporation's obligation to honor the legal rights of its creditors, they should be free to pursue in good faith profit for the corporation's equity holders. Even when the firm is insolvent, directors are free to pursue value maximizing strategies, while recognizing that the firm's creditors have become its residual claimants and the advancement of their best interests has become the firm's principal objective. [Slip opinion at 5-7]

The strength of the *Trenwick* holding is diluted by the Vice Chancellor's finding that "the complaint fails to plead facts supporting an inference that the subsidiary was insolvent before or immediately after the challenged transactions."

Also elucidating was the Vice Chancellor's statement of the fiduciary duties of the directors of a wholly owned subsidiary:

Likewise, the complaint fails to plead facts suggesting that the subsidiary directors were less than diligent or misunderstood their roles. A wholly-owned subsidiary is to be operated for the benefit of its parent. A subsidiary board is entitled to support a parent's business strategy unless it believes pursuit of that strategy will cause the subsidiary to violate its legal obligations. Nor does a subsidiary board have to replicate the deliberative process of its parent's board when taking action in aid of its parent's acquisition strategies. [Slip opinion at 5]

The plaintiff's complaints against the failed insurance company's accountants, actuaries and lawyers for aiding and abetting a fiduciary duty breach and for malpractice were also summarily dismissed:

At bottom, the complaint simply alleges that big-dog advisors were on the scene when Trenwick acquired Chartwell and LaSalle, that Trenwick ultimately failed, and that in the post-Enron era, big-dog advisors should pay when things go wrong with their clients, even when a plaintiff cannot articulate what it is that the advisors did that was intentionally wrongful or even negligent.

Each of the defendant advisors has moved to dismiss the complaint against it on various grounds. I grant those motions for reasons that will be stated tersely. First, because the complaint fails to state a claim for breach of fiduciary duty against the Trenwick [the parent] or Trenwick America [a wholly owned subsidiary that held principally U.S. based insurance subsidiaries] directors, the claims that the defendant advisors aided and abetted any underlying breach of fiduciary duty fails. As important, a claim for aiding and abetting involves the element that the aider and abettor have “knowingly participated” in the underlying breach of fiduciary duty. The complaint is devoid of facts suggesting that any of the defendant advisors had any reason to believe they were assisting in a breach of fiduciary duty against Trenwick America, a wholly-owned subsidiary of Trenwick, by acting in the capacities they did for Trenwick, in particular in connection with non-self dealing mergers involving Trenwick’s acquisition of other public companies.

Second, for identical reasons, the count in the complaint purporting to state a claim for “conspiracy to breach fiduciary duties” is equally defective.

\* \* \*

Next, the malpractice claims fail to plead facts supporting an inference that the defendant advisors breached the standard of professional care owed by them. For example, as to defendant Milliman, an actuarial firm, the complaint simply states that Milliman’s estimate that Chartwell’s reserves at the time of its acquisition would be sufficient, when supplemented with \$100 million in additional coverage, was wrong. The inflammatory allegations that Milliman must have known they were wrong or manipulated its certification are entirely conclusory and are not accompanied by factual

context giving rise to the odor of purposeful wrongdoing or professional slack. Notably, the Litigation Trust has not pled that Milliman warranted that if its estimates were wrong, it would be strictly liable. Indeed, to the contrary, the public documents the complaint draws upon contain heavy caveats regarding these estimates. In addition, as the Second Circuit recognized, regardless of the actuarial method used, calculations of net worth for casualty risk reinsurers are not as firmly determinable as other financial line items.<sup>186</sup>

The *Trenwick* decision follows the Third Circuit decision *In re CITX Corp. Inc.*,<sup>187</sup> which held that only fraudulent conduct would suffice to support a deepening insolvency claim and declined to allow a claim alleging that negligent conduct caused a deepening insolvency. The Third Circuit also held that deepening insolvency was not a valid theory of damages supporting a professional malpractice claim against an accounting firm.

In *North American Catholic Educational Programming Foundation Inc. v. Gheewalla*,<sup>188</sup> the Delaware Supreme Court held “that the creditors of a Delaware corporation that is either insolvent or in the zone of insolvency have no right, as a matter of law, to assert direct claims for breach of fiduciary duty against the corporation’s directors.” [fn. Slip opinion at 4]. The Supreme Court elaborated on this holding as follows:

It is well established that the directors owe their fiduciary obligations to the corporation and its shareholders. While shareholders rely on directors acting as fiduciaries to protect their interests, creditors are afforded protection through contractual agreements, fraud and fraudulent conveyance law, implied covenants of good faith and fair dealing, bankruptcy law, general commercial law and other sources of creditor rights. Delaware courts have traditionally been reluctant to expand existing fiduciary duties. Accordingly, “the general rule is that directors do not owe creditors duties beyond the relevant contractual terms.”

\* \* \*

---

186. Citing *Delta Holdings, Inc. v. Nat'l Distillers & Chem. Corp.*, 945 F.2d 1226, 1231 (2d Cir. 1991) [Slip opinion at 81-84].

187. 448 F.3d 672 (3d Cir. 2006).

188. \_\_\_ A2d \_\_\_, 2007 WL 1453705 (Del. May 18, 2007).

In this case, the need for providing directors with definitive guidance compels us to hold that no direct claim for breach of fiduciary duties may be asserted by the creditors of a solvent corporation that is operating in the zone of insolvency. When a solvent corporation is navigating in the zone of insolvency, the focus for Delaware directors does not change: directors must continue to discharge their fiduciary duties to the corporation and its shareholders by exercising their business judgment in the best interests of the corporation for the benefit of its shareholder owners. Therefore, we hold the Court of Chancery properly concluded that Count II of the NACEPF Complaint fails to state a claim, as a matter of Delaware law, to the extent that it attempts to assert a direct claim for breach of fiduciary duty to a creditor while Clearwire was operating in the zone of insolvency.

\* \* \*

It is well settled that directors owe fiduciary duties to the corporation. When a corporation is *solvent*, those duties may be enforced by its shareholders, who have standing to bring *derivative* actions on behalf of the corporation because they are the ultimate beneficiaries of the corporation's growth and increased value. When a corporation is *insolvent*, however, its creditors take the place of the shareholders as the residual beneficiaries of any increase in value. Consequently, the creditors of an insolvent corporation have standing to maintain derivative claims against directors on behalf of the corporation for breaches of fiduciary duties. The corporation's insolvency "makes the creditors the principal constituency injured by any fiduciary breaches that diminish the firm's value." Therefore, equitable considerations give creditors standing to pursue derivative claims against the directors of an insolvent corporation. Individual creditors of an insolvent corporation have the same incentive to pursue valid derivative claims on its behalf that shareholders have when the corporation is solvent.

\* \* \*

Recognizing that directors of an insolvent corporation owe direct fiduciary duties to creditors, would create uncertainty for directors who have a fiduciary duty to

exercise their business judgment in the best interest of the insolvent corporation. To recognize a new right for creditors to bring direct fiduciary claims against those directors would create a conflict between those directors' duty to maximize the value of the insolvent corporation for the benefit of all those having an interest in it, and the newly recognized direct fiduciary duty to individual creditors. Directors of insolvent corporations must retain the freedom to engage in vigorous, good faith negotiations with individual creditors for the benefit of the corporation. Accordingly, we hold that individual *creditors* of an *insolvent* corporation have *no right to assert direct* claims for breach of fiduciary duty against corporate directors. Creditors may nonetheless protect their interest by bringing derivative claims on behalf of the insolvent corporation or any *other* direct nonfiduciary claim, as discussed earlier in this opinion, that may be available for individual creditors.

### ***E. Conflicts of Interest***

Conflicts of interest are usually present in closely held corporations where the shareholders are also directors and officers. While the Texas Corporate Statutes allow transactions with interested parties after disclosure and disinterested director or shareholder approval,<sup>189</sup> when insolvency arises, the conflict of interest rules change.

After insolvency, Texas directors begin to owe a fiduciary duty to the creditors and cannot rely on the business judgment rule or disclosure to the disinterested directors as a defense.<sup>190</sup> Instead, the disclosure must include the creditors.<sup>191</sup>

After insolvency, Delaware law dictates a similar result.<sup>192</sup> The Delaware duty of fairness on transactions with interested parties runs to the creditors when the corporation is insolvent.<sup>193</sup>

---

189. See discussion of TBOC § 21.418 and TBCA art. 2.35-1 in notes 145-151 and related text, *supra*.

190. *Weaver v. Kellog*, 216 B.R. 563 (S.D. Tex. 1997).

191. *Id.*

192. *Kahn v. Lynch Communications Systems, Inc.*, 638 A.2d 1110, 1115 (Del. 1994).

193. *Id.*

A developing issue involves the application of the conflict of interest rules to parties that are related to the director or officer. While the courts are not uniform in their definition, the conflict of interest rules usually extend to family members.

### ***F. Fraudulent Transfers***

Both state and federal law prohibit fraudulent transfers<sup>194</sup> and require insolvency at the time of the transaction. The Texas and Delaware fraudulent transfer statutes are identical to the Uniform Fraudulent Transfer Act, except Delaware adds the following provision: “Unless displaced by the provisions of this chapter, the principles of law and equity, including the law merchant and the law relating to principal and agent, estoppel, laches, fraud, misrepresentation, duress, coercion, mistake, insolvency or other validating or invalidating cause, supplement its provisions.”<sup>195</sup>

The applicable statute of limitation varies with the circumstances and the applicable law. Generally, the statute of limitations for state laws may extend to four years, while bankruptcy law dictates a one year limitation starting with the petition filing date.

## ***IV. EXECUTIVE COMPENSATION PROCESS***

### ***A. Fiduciary Duties***

Decisions regarding the compensation of management are among the most important and controversial decisions that a Board can make.<sup>196</sup> The shareholders and management both want management to be compensated sufficiently so they feel amply rewarded for their efforts in making the entity a profitable investment for the shareholders, are motivated to work hard for the success of the entity, and are able to attract and retain other talented executives. Executives are naturally concerned that they be fully rewarded and provided significant incentives. The shareholders, however, are also mindful that amounts paid to management reduce the profits available for the shareholders, want pay to be linked to performance, and

---

194. TEX. BUS. & COM. CODE CHAP. 24; DEL. CODE ANN. tit. 6, § 1301 et seq.; 11 U.S.C. § 548.

195. DEL. CODE ANN. tit. 6, § 1310.

196. See Bruce F. Dravis, *The Role of Independent Directors after Sarbanes-Oxley* 79 (2007).



may challenge compensation that they deem excessive in the media, in elections of directors and in the courts.

As the situation is fraught with potential conflicts, Boards often delegate the power and responsibility for setting executive compensation to a committee of directors (a “*compensation committee*”), typically composed of independent directors.<sup>197</sup> The objective is to follow a process that will resolve the inherent conflicts of interest, comply with the requirements of SOX and other applicable laws,<sup>198</sup> and satisfy the fiduciary duties of all involved.

The fiduciary duties discussed elsewhere herein, including the duties of care, loyalty and disclosure, are all applicable when directors consider executive compensation matters.<sup>199</sup> As in other contexts, process and disinterested judgment are critical.

## **B. Specific Cases**

### **1. Walt Disney**

In respect of directors’ fiduciary duties in approving executive compensation, the Delaware Supreme Court’s opinion dated June 8, 2006, *In re The Walt Disney Co. Derivative Litigation*,<sup>200</sup> which resulted from the failed marriage between Disney and its former President Michael Ovitz, and the Chancery Court decisions which preceded it are instructive. The Supreme Court affirmed the Court of Chancery’s determination after a 37-day trial<sup>201</sup> that Disney’s directors had not breached their fiduciary duties in connection with the hiring or termination of Michael Ovitz as President of The Walt Disney Company. In so ruling, the Supreme Court clarified the parameters of the obligation of corporate fiduciaries to act in good faith and offered helpful guidance about the types of conduct that constitute “bad faith.”

---

197. See Bruce F. Dravis, *The Role of Independent Directors after Sarbanes-Oxley* 79-82 (2007); see also notes 121-133 and related text, *supra*.

198. See notes 111-151 and related text, *supra*, and notes 200-227 and related text, *infra*.

199. See notes 20-91, notes 121-142, and related text, *supra*.

200. 906 A.2d 27 (Del. 2006).

201. 907 A.2d 693 (Del. Ch. 2005).

**a. Facts**

The facts surrounding the *Disney* saga involved a derivative suit against Disney's directors and officers for damages allegedly arising out of the 1995 hiring and the 1996 firing of Michael Ovitz. The termination resulted in a non-fault termination payment to Ovitz under the terms of his employment agreement valued at roughly \$140 million (including the value of stock options). The shareholder plaintiffs alleged that the Disney directors had breached their fiduciary duties both in approving Ovitz's employment agreement and in later allowing the payment of the non-fault termination benefits.

**b. May 28, 2003 Chancery Court Opinion**

In a May 28, 2003 opinion,<sup>202</sup> the Chancery Court denied the defendants' motions to dismiss an amended complaint alleging that Disney directors breached their fiduciary duties when they approved a lucrative pay package, including a \$40 million no-fault termination award and stock options, to Ovitz. "It is rare when a court imposes liability on directors of a corporation for breach of the duty of care," Chancellor Chandler said. However, the allegations in the new complaint "do not implicate merely negligent or grossly negligent decision making by corporate directors. Quite the contrary; plaintiffs' new complaint suggests that the Disney directors failed to exercise any business judgment and failed to make any good faith attempt to fulfill their fiduciary duties to Disney and its stockholders."

**c. September 10, 2004 Chancery Court Opinion  
(Ovitz's Fiduciary Duties Regarding His  
Employment Agreement)**

On September 10, 2004, the Chancery Court ruled on defendant Ovitz' motion for summary judgment<sup>203</sup> as follows: (i) as to claims based on Ovitz entering into his employment agreement with Disney, the Court granted summary judgment for Ovitz confirming that "before becoming a fiduciary, Ovitz had the right to seek the best employment agreement possible for himself and endorsing a bright line rule that officers and directors become fiduciaries only when they are officially installed, and receive the formal investiture of authority that accompanies such office or directorship . . ."; and (ii) as to claims based

---

202. 825 A.2d 275 (Del. Ch. 2003).

203. 2004 WL 2050138 (Del. Ch. 2004).

on actions after he became an officer, (a) “an officer may negotiate his or her own employment agreement as long as the process involves negotiations performed in an adversarial and arms-length manner”; (b) “Ovitz made the decision that a faithful fiduciary would make by abstaining from attendance at a [Compensation Committee] meeting [of which he was an ex officio member] where a substantial part of his own compensation was to be discussed and decided upon”; (c) Ovitz did not breach any fiduciary duties by executing and performing his employment agreement after he became an officer since no material change was made in it from the form negotiated and approved prior to his becoming an officer; (d) in negotiating his no fault termination, his conduct should be measured under DGCL §144 [interested transactions not void if approved by disinterested board or shareholders after full disclosure]; but (e) since his termination involved some negotiation for additional benefits, there was a fact question as to whether he improperly colluded with other side of table in the negotiations and “whether a majority of any disinterested group of independent directors ever authorized the payment of Ovitz severance payments . . . . Absent a demonstration that the transaction was fair to Disney, the transaction may be voidable at the discretion of the company.”

***d. August 9, 2005 Chancery Court Post Trial Opinion***

On August 9, 2005, the Chancery Court rendered an opinion<sup>204</sup> after a 37-day trial on the merits in this Disney case in which he concluded that the defendant directors did not breach their fiduciary duties or commit waste in connection with the hiring and termination of Michael Ovitz. The opinion commented that the Court was charged with the task of determining whether directors have breached their fiduciary duties, and not whether directors have acted in accordance with the best practices of ideal corporate governance, and distinguished between the role of the Court to provide a remedy for breaches of fiduciary duty and the role of the market to provide a remedy for bad business decisions, the Court reasoned as follows:

[T]here are many aspects of defendants’ conduct that fell significantly short of the best practices of ideal cor-

---

204. 907 A.2d 693 (Del. Ch. 2005).

porate governance. Recognizing the protean nature of ideal corporate governance practices, particularly over an era that has included the Enron and WorldCom debacles, and the resulting legislative focus on corporate governance, it is perhaps worth pointing out that the actions (and the failures to act) of the Disney board that gave rise to this lawsuit took place ten years ago, and that applying 21st century notions of best practices in analyzing whether those decisions were actionable would be misplaced.

Unlike ideals of corporate governance, a fiduciary's duties do not change over time. How we understand those duties may evolve and become refined, but the duties themselves have not changed, except to the extent that fulfilling a fiduciary duty requires obedience to other positive law. This Court strongly encourages directors and officers to employ best practices, as those practices are understood at the time a corporate decision is taken. But Delaware law does not—indeed, the common law cannot—hold fiduciaries liable for a failure to comply with the aspirational ideal of best practices, any more than a common-law court deciding a medical malpractice dispute can impose a standard of liability based on ideal—rather than competent or standard—medical treatment practices, lest the average medical practitioner be found inevitably derelict. Fiduciaries are held by the common law to a high standard in fulfilling their stewardship over the assets of others, a standard that (depending on the circumstances) may not be the same as that contemplated by ideal corporate governance. Yet therein lies perhaps the greatest strength of Delaware's corporation law. Fiduciaries who act faithfully and honestly on behalf of those whose interests they represent are indeed granted wide latitude in their efforts to maximize shareholders' investment. Times may change, but fiduciary duties do not. Indeed, other institutions may develop, pronounce and urge adherence to ideals of corporate best practices. But the development of aspirational ideals, however worthy as goals for human behavior, should not work to distort the legal requirements by which human behavior is actually measured. Nor should the common law of fiduciary duties become a prisoner of narrow definitions or formulaic expres-

sions. It is thus both the province and special duty of this Court to measure, in light of all the facts and circumstances of a particular case, whether an individual who has accepted a position of responsibility over the assets of another has been unremittingly faithful to his or her charge.

Because this matter, by its very nature, has become something of a public spectacle—commencing as it did with the spectacular hiring of one of the entertainment industry's best-known personalities to help run one of its iconic businesses, and ending with a spectacular failure of that union, with breathtaking amounts of severance pay the consequence—it is, I think, worth noting what the role of this Court must be in evaluating decision-makers' performance with respect to decisions gone awry, spectacularly or otherwise. It is easy, of course, to fault a decision that ends in a failure, once hindsight makes the result of that decision plain to see. But the essence of business is risk—the application of informed belief to contingencies whose outcomes can sometimes be predicted, but never known. The decision-makers entrusted by shareholders must act out of loyalty to those shareholders. They must in good faith act to make informed decisions on behalf of the shareholders, untainted by self-interest. Where they fail to do so, this Court stands ready to remedy breaches of fiduciary duty.

Even where decision-makers act as faithful servants, however, their ability and the wisdom of their judgments will vary. The redress for failures that arise from faithful management must come from the markets, through the action of shareholders and the free flow of capital, and not from this Court. Should the Court apportion liability based on the ultimate outcome of decisions taken in good faith by faithful directors or officers, those decision-makers would necessarily take decisions that minimize risk, not maximize value. The entire advantage of the risk-taking, innovative, wealth-creating engine that is the Delaware corporation would cease to exist, with disastrous results for shareholders and society alike. That is why, under our corporate law, corporate decision-makers are held strictly to their fiduciary abilities, but within the boundaries of those duties are free to act as their judg-

ment and duties dictate, free of post hoc penalties from a reviewing court using perfect hindsight. Corporate decisions are made, risks are taken, the results become apparent, capital flows accordingly, and shareholder value is increased.

On the issue of good faith, the Court suggested that the concept of good faith is not an independent duty, but a concept inherent in a fiduciary's duties of due care and loyalty:

Decisions from the Delaware Supreme Court and the Court of Chancery are far from clear with respect to whether there is a separate fiduciary duty of good faith. Good faith has been said to require an "honesty of purpose," and a genuine care for the fiduciary's constituents, but, at least in the corporate fiduciary context, it is probably easier to define bad faith rather than good faith. This may be so because Delaware law presumes that directors act in good faith when making business judgments. Bad faith has been defined as authorizing a transaction "for some purpose *other than* a genuine attempt to advance corporate welfare or [when the transaction] is *known to constitute* a violation of applicable positive law." In other words, an action taken with the intent to harm the corporation is a disloyal act in bad faith. \* \* \* It makes no difference the reason why the director intentionally fails to pursue the best interests of the corporation.

\* \* \*

Upon long and careful consideration, I am of the opinion that the concept of *intentional dereliction of duty*, a *conscious disregard for one's responsibilities*, is an appropriate (although not the only) standard for determining whether fiduciaries have acted in good faith. Deliberate indifference and inaction *in the face of a duty to act* is, in my mind, conduct that is clearly disloyal to the corporation. It is the epitome of faithless conduct.

\* \* \*

*e. June 8, 2006 Supreme Court Opinion*

The Delaware Supreme Court affirmed the Court of Chancery's conclusion that the shareholder plaintiffs had failed to prove that the defendants had breached any fiduciary duty.<sup>205</sup> With respect to the hiring of Ovitz and the approval of his employment agreement, the Supreme Court held that the Court of Chancery had a sufficient evidentiary basis from which to conclude, and had properly concluded, that the defendants had not breached their fiduciary duty of care and had not acted in bad faith. As to the ensuing no-fault termination of Ovitz and the resulting termination payment pursuant to his employment agreement, the Supreme Court affirmed the Chancery Court's holdings that the full board did not (and was not required to) approve Ovitz's termination, that Michael Eisner, Disney's CEO, had authorized the termination, and that neither Eisner, nor Sanford Litvack, Disney's General Counsel, had breached his duty of care or acted in bad faith in connection with the termination.

In its opinion, the Supreme Court acknowledged that the contours of the duty of good faith remained "relatively uncharted" and were not well developed. Mindful of the considerable debate that the Court of Chancery's prior opinions in the *Disney* litigation had generated and the increased recognition of the importance of the duty of good faith in the current corporate law environment, the Supreme Court determined that "some conceptual guidance to the corporate community [about the nature of good faith] may be helpful" and provided the following color as to the meaning of "good faith" in Delaware fiduciary duty jurisprudence:

The precise question is whether the Chancellor's articulated standard for bad faith corporate fiduciary conduct—intentional dereliction of duty, a conscious disregard for one's responsibilities—is legally correct. In approaching that question, we note that the Chancellor characterized that definition as "an appropriate (*although not the only*) standard for determining whether fiduciaries have acted in good faith." That observation is accurate and helpful, because as a matter

---

205. 906 A.2d 27 (Del. 2006). The Supreme Court wrote: "We conclude . . . that the Chancellor's factual findings and legal rulings were correct and not erroneous in any respect."

of simple logic, at least three different categories of fiduciary behavior are candidates for the “bad faith” pejorative label.

The first category involves so-called “subjective bad faith,” that is, fiduciary conduct motivated by an actual intent to do harm. That such conduct constitutes classic, quintessential bad faith is a proposition so well accepted in the liturgy of fiduciary law that it borders on axiomatic. We need not dwell further on this category, because no such conduct is claimed to have occurred, or did occur, in this case.

The second category of conduct, which is at the opposite end of the spectrum, involves lack of due care—that is, fiduciary action taken solely by reason of gross negligence and without any malevolent intent. In this case, appellants assert claims of gross negligence to establish breaches not only of director due care but also of the directors’ duty to act in good faith. Although the Chancellor found, and we agree, that the appellants failed to establish gross negligence, to afford guidance we address the issue of whether gross negligence (including a failure to inform one’s self of available material facts), without more, can also constitute bad faith. The answer is clearly no.

From a broad philosophical standpoint, that question is more complex than would appear, if only because (as the Chancellor and others have observed) “issues of good faith are (to a certain degree) inseparably and necessarily intertwined with the duties of care and loyalty. . . .” But, in the pragmatic, conduct-regulating legal realm, which calls for more precise conceptual line drawing, the answer is that grossly negligent conduct, without more, does not and cannot constitute a breach of the fiduciary duty to act in good faith. The conduct that is the subject of due care may overlap with the conduct that comes within the rubric of good faith in a psychological sense, but from a legal standpoint those duties are and must remain quite distinct. Both our legislative history and our common law jurisprudence distinguish sharply between the duties to exercise due care and to act in good faith, and highly significant consequences flow from that distinction.

The Delaware General Assembly has addressed the distinction between bad faith and a failure to exercise



due care (*i.e.*, gross negligence) in two separate contexts. The first is Section 102(b)(7) of the DGCL, which authorizes Delaware corporations, by a provision in the certificate of incorporation, to exculpate their directors from monetary damage liability for a breach of the duty of care. That exculpatory provision affords significant protection to directors of Delaware corporations. The statute carves out several exceptions, however, including most relevantly, “for acts or omissions not in good faith. . . .” Thus, a corporation can exculpate its directors from monetary liability for a breach of the duty of care, but not for conduct that is not in good faith. To adopt a definition of bad faith that would cause a violation of the duty of care automatically to become an act or omission “not in good faith,” would eviscerate the protections accorded to directors by the General Assembly’s adoption of Section 102(b)(7).

A second legislative recognition of the distinction between fiduciary conduct that is grossly negligent and conduct that is not in good faith, is Delaware’s indemnification statute, found at 8 *Del. C.* § 145. To oversimplify, subsections (a) and (b) of that statute permit a corporation to indemnify (*inter alia*) any person who is or was a director, officer, employee or agent of the corporation against expenses (including attorneys’ fees), judgments, fines and amounts paid in settlement of specified actions, suits or proceedings, where (among other things): (i) that person is, was, or is threatened to be made a party to that action, suit or proceeding, and (ii) that person “acted in good faith and in a manner the person reasonably believed to be in or not opposed to the best interests of the corporation. . . .” Thus, under Delaware statutory law a director or officer of a corporation can be indemnified for liability (and litigation expenses) incurred by reason of a violation of the duty of care, but not for a violation of the duty to act in good faith.

Section 145, like Section 102(b)(7), evidences the intent of the Delaware General Assembly to afford significant protections to directors (and, in the case of Section 145, other fiduciaries) of Delaware corporations. To adopt a definition that conflates the duty of care with the duty to act in good faith by making a violation of the former an automatic violation of the latter, would nullify those

legislative protections and defeat the General Assembly's intent. There is no basis in policy, precedent or common sense that would justify dismantling the distinction between gross negligence and bad faith.

That leaves the third category of fiduciary conduct, which falls in between the first two categories of (1) conduct motivated by subjective bad intent and (2) conduct resulting from gross negligence. This third category is what the Chancellor's definition of bad faith—intentional dereliction of duty, a conscious disregard for one's responsibilities—is intended to capture. The question is whether such misconduct is properly treated as a non-exculpable, non-indemnifiable violation of the fiduciary duty to act in good faith. In our view it must be, for at least two reasons.

First, the universe of fiduciary misconduct is not limited to either disloyalty in the classic sense (i.e., preferring the adverse self-interest of the fiduciary or of a related person to the interest of the corporation) or gross negligence. Cases have arisen where corporate directors have no conflicting self-interest in a decision, yet engage in misconduct that is more culpable than simple inattention or failure to be informed of all facts material to the decision. To protect the interests of the corporation and its shareholders, fiduciary conduct of this kind, which does not involve disloyalty (as traditionally defined) but is qualitatively more culpable than gross negligence, should be proscribed. A vehicle is needed to address such violations doctrinally, and that doctrinal vehicle is the duty to act in good faith. The Chancellor implicitly so recognized in his Opinion, where he identified different examples of bad faith as follows:

The good faith required of a corporate fiduciary includes not simply the duties of care and loyalty, in the narrow sense that I have discussed them above, but all actions required by a true faithfulness and devotion to the interests of the corporation and its shareholders. A failure to act in good faith may be shown, for instance, where the fiduciary intentionally acts with a purpose other than that of advancing the best interests of the corporation, where the fiduciary acts with the intent to violate applicable positive law, or where the

fiduciary intentionally fails to act in the face of a known duty to act, demonstrating a conscious disregard for his duties. There may be other examples of bad faith yet to be proven or alleged, but these three are the most salient.

Those articulated examples of bad faith are not new to our jurisprudence. Indeed, they echo pronouncements our courts have made throughout the decades.

Second, the legislature has also recognized this intermediate category of fiduciary misconduct, which ranks between conduct involving subjective bad faith and gross negligence. Section 102(b)(7)(ii) of the DGCL expressly denies money damage exculpation for “acts or omissions not in good faith or which involve intentional misconduct or a knowing violation of law.” By its very terms that provision distinguishes between “intentional misconduct” and a “knowing violation of law” (both examples of subjective bad faith) on the one hand, and “acts. . .not in good faith,” on the other. Because the statute exculpates directors only for conduct amounting to gross negligence, the statutory denial of exculpation for “acts. . .not in good faith” must encompass the intermediate category of misconduct captured by the Chancellor’s definition of bad faith.

For these reasons, we uphold the Court of Chancery’s definition as a legally appropriate, although not the exclusive, definition of fiduciary bad faith. We need go no further.

In addition to the helpful discussion about the contours of the duty of good faith, the Supreme Court’s opinion offers guidance on several other issues. For example, the Supreme Court affirmed the Chancellor’s rulings relating to the power of Michael Eisner, as Disney’s CEO, to terminate Mr. Ovitz as President. The Supreme Court also adopted the same practical view as the Court of Chancery regarding the important statutory protections offered by DGCL § 141(e), which permits corporate directors to rely in good faith on information provided by fellow directors, board committees, officers, and outside consultants.

The Court also found that plaintiffs had “not come close to satisfying the high hurdle required to establish waste” as the Board’s approval of Ovitz’s employment agreement “had a rational business purpose: to induce Ovitz to leave [his prior posi-

tion], at what would otherwise be a considerable cost to him, in order to join Disney.”

## **2. *Integrated Health***

The May 28, 2003 Chancery Court decision on the motion to dismiss in *Disney* influenced the denial of a motion to dismiss many of the allegations that a corporation’s board breached its fiduciary duties in connection with an extensive and multifaceted compensation package benefiting its founder and CEO in *Official Committee of Unsecured Creditors of Integrated Health Services, Inc. v. Elkins*.<sup>206</sup> Integrated Health had been founded by the CEO in the mid-1980s to operate a national chain of nursing homes and to provide care to patients typically following discharge from hospitals, and prospered and grew substantially. Radical changes in Medicare reimbursement in 1997 led to Integrated Health’s decline and commencement of Chapter 11 Bankruptcy Code proceedings in February 2000. After the Bankruptcy Court abstained from adjudicating fiduciary claims against the CEO and directors, plaintiff brought suit in the Delaware Chancery Court, alleging that CEO breached his fiduciary duties of loyalty and good faith to the corporation by improperly obtaining certain compensation arrangements. The plaintiff also alleged that the directors (other than the CEO) breached their duties of loyalty and *good faith* by (1) subordinating the best interests of Integrated Health to their allegiance to the CEO, by failing to exercise independent judgment with respect to certain compensation arrangements, (2) failing to select and rely on an independent compensation consultant to address the CEO’s compensation arrangements, and (3) participating in the CEO’s breaches of fiduciary duty by approving or ratifying his actions. The plaintiff also alleged that each of the defendant directors breached his fiduciary duty of care by (i) approving or ratifying compensation arrangements without adequate information, consideration or deliberation, (ii) failing to exercise reasonable care in selecting and overseeing the compensation expert, and (iii) failing to monitor how the proceeds of loans to the CEO were utilized by him. These actions were alleged to have constituted waste.

In *Integrated Health*, the defendants attempted to defend the breach of loyalty claims by arguing that a Board consisting of a majority of disinterested, independent directors had ap-

---

206. 2004 WL 1949290 (Del. Ch. Aug. 24, 2004).

proved all compensation arrangements. Addressing first the question of whether a majority of the members of the Board were “interested” in the challenged transactions or were “beholden” to one who was interested in the challenged transactions, the Chancery Court noted the distinction between “interest,” which requires that a person receive a personal financial benefit from a transaction that is not equally shared by stockholders, and “independence,” which requires the pleading of facts that raise sufficient doubt that a director’s decision was based on extraneous considerations or influences rather than on the corporate merits of the transaction. The Chancery Court wrote that this inquiry was fact specific (requiring the application of a subjective “actual person” standard, rather than an objective “reasonable director” standard) and that it would not deem a director to lack independence unless the plaintiff alleged, in addition to someone’s control over a company, facts that would demonstrate that through personal or other relationships the directors were beholden to the controlling person. The Chancery Court concluded that under Delaware law (i) personal friendships, without more, (ii) outside business relationships, without more, and (iii) approving or acquiescing in a challenged transaction, in each case without more, were insufficient to raise a reasonable doubt of a directors’ ability to exercise independent business judgment. The court stated that while domination and control are not tested merely by economics, the plaintiff must allege some facts showing a director is “beholden” to an interested director in order to show a lack of independence. The critical issue was whether the director was conflicted in his loyalties with respect to the challenged board action. The Chancery Court found that the directors were not interested in the CEO’s compensation transactions and found that most of the directors were not beholden to the CEO. Focusing specifically on a lawyer who was a founding partner of a law firm that provided legal services to the corporation, the court said such facts, without more, were not enough to establish that the lawyer was beholden to the CEO. One director who had been an officer of a subsidiary during part of the time period involved was assumed to have lacked independence from the CEO, but there were enough other directors who were found not to be interested and found to be independent so that all the transactions were approved by a board consisting of a majority of independent, disinterested directors.

The defendants responded to the plaintiff's duty of care claims with three separate arguments: (i) to the extent the defendants relied on the compensation expert's opinions in approving the challenged transaction, they were insulated from liability by DGCL § 141(e), which permits good faith reliance on experts; (ii) to the extent DGCL § 141(e) did not insulate the defendants from liability, Integrated Health's DGCL § 102(b)(7) exculpation provision did so; and (iii) regardless of the DGCL § 141(e) and DGCL § 102(b)(7) defenses, plaintiff had failed to plead facts that showed gross negligence, which the defendants said was a necessary minimum foundation for a due care claim.

The Chancery Court declined to dismiss the *bad faith* and breach of loyalty claims against the CEO himself, adopting the May 28, 2003 *Disney* standard that once an employee becomes a fiduciary of an entity, he had a duty to negotiate further compensation arrangements "honestly and in good faith so as not to advantage himself at the expense of the [entity's] shareholders," but that such requirement did not prevent fiduciaries from negotiating their own employment agreements so long as such negotiations were "performed in an adversarial and arms-length manner."

As to whether any of the challenged transactions was authorized with the kind of intentional or conscious disregard that avoided the DGCL § 102(b)(7) exculpatory provision defense, the court wrote that in the May 28, 2003 *Disney* decision the Chancellor determined that the compliant adequately alleged that the defendants consciously and intentionally disregarded their responsibilities, and wrote that while there may be instances in which a board may act with deference to corporate officers' judgments, executive compensation was not one of those instances: "The board must exercise its own business judgment in approving an executive compensation transaction."<sup>207</sup> Since the case involved a motion to dismiss based on the DGCL § 102(b)(7) provision in the corporation's certificate of incorporation, the plaintiff must plead facts that, if true, would show that the board consciously and intentionally disregarded its responsibilities (as contrasted with being only grossly negligent). Examining each of the specific compensation pieces attacked in the pleadings, the court found that the following alleged facts met such conscious and intentional standard: (i) loans from the corporation to the CEO that were initiated by

---

207. *Id.* at \*12.

the CEO were approved by the compensation committee and the board only after the loans had been made; (ii) the compensation committee gave approval to loans even though it was given no explanation as to why the loans were made; (iii) the Board, without additional investigation deliberation, consultation with an expert or determination as to what the compensation committee's decision process was, ratified loans (loan proceeds were received prior to approval of loans by the compensation committee); (iv) loan forgiveness provisions were extended by unanimous written consent without any deliberation or advice from any expert; (v) loans were extended without deliberation as to whether the corporation received any consideration for the loans; and (vi) there were no identified corporate authorizations or analysis of the costs to the corporation or the corporate reason therefor performed either by the compensation committee or other members of the Board with respect to the provisions in CEO's employment contract that gave him large compensation if he departed from the company.

Distinguishing between the alleged total lack of deliberation discussed in the May 28, 2003 *Disney* opinion and the alleged inadequate deliberation in *Integrated Health*, the Chancery Court wrote:

Thus a change in characterization from a *total* lack of deliberation (and for that matter a difference between the meaning of discussion and deliberation, if there is one), to even a short conversation may change the outcome of a *Disney* analysis. Allegations of non-deliberation are different from allegations of not enough deliberation.<sup>208</sup>

Later in the opinion, in granting a motion to dismiss with respect to some of the compensation claims, the Chancery Court suggested that arguments as to what would be a reasonable length of time for board discussion or what would be an unreasonable length of time for the Board to consider certain decisions were not particularly helpful in evaluation a fiduciary duty claim:

As long as the Board engaged in action that can lead the Court to conclude it did not act in knowing and deliberate indifference to its fiduciary duties, the inquiry

---

208. *Id.* at \*13 fn. 58.

of this nature ends. The Court does not look at the *reasonableness* of a Board's actions in this context, as long as the Board exercised *some* business judgment.<sup>209</sup>

In the end, the Chancery Court upheld claims alleging that no deliberation occurred concerning certain elements of compensation to Elkins, but dismissed claims alleging that some (but inadequate) deliberation occurred. Further, the decision upheld claims alleging a failure to consult with a compensation expert as to some elements of compensation, but dismissed claims alleging that the directors consulted for too short a period of time with the compensation expert who had been chosen by the CEO and whose work had been reviewed by the CEO in at least some instances prior to being presented to directors. Thus, it appears that directors who give some attention to an issue, as opposed to none, will have a better argument that they did not consciously and intentionally disregard their responsibilities.

### 3. *Sample v. Morgan*

In *Sample v. Morgan*,<sup>210</sup> the plaintiff alleged a variety of breaches of director fiduciary duties, including the duties of disclosure and loyalty, in connection with the board of directors' action in seeking approval from the company's stockholders for a certificate of incorporation amendment (the "*Charter Amendment*") and a Management Stock Incentive Plan (the "*Incentive Plan*") that reduced the par value of the company stock from a dollar per share to a tenth of a cent each and authorized a 200,000 share (46%) increase in the number of shares for the purpose of "attracting and retaining" key employees. The same day as the stockholder vote, the board formed a Compensation Committee to consider how to implement the Incentive Plan. At its very first meeting, which lasted only 25 minutes, the two member Compensation Committee considered a proposal by the company's outside counsel to grant all the newly authorized shares to just three employees of the company – the CEO, the CFO, and the Vice President of Manufacturing – all of whom were directors of the company and who collectively comprised the majority of the company's five member board of directors (the "*Insider Majority*"). Within ten days, the board approved a

---

209. *Id.* at \*14. Vice Chancellor Noble wrote: "The Compensation Committee's signing of unanimous written consents in this case raises a concern as to whether it acted with knowing and deliberate indifference."

210. 914 A.2d 647 (Del. Ch. 2007).



version of that proposal at a 20 minute meeting. Although the Compensation Committee adopted a vesting schedule for the grants that extended for some years and required the Insider Majority members to remain with the company, all of the newly authorized shares could be voted by the Insider Majority immediately and would receive dividends immediately. The Committee only required the Insider Majority to pay a tenth of a penny per share. Soon thereafter, the Compensation Committee authorized the company to borrow approximately \$700,000 to cover the taxes owed by the Insider Majority on the shares they received, although the company's net sales were less than \$10 million and it lost over \$1.7 million before taxes. In determining the Insider Majority's tax liability, the Compensation Committee estimated the value of the shares granted to be \$5.60 apiece, although the Insider Majority only paid a tenth of a penny per share to get them. Throughout the process, the only advisor to the Compensation Committee was the company's outside counsel, who had structured the transactions for the Insider Majority.

When the use of the Incentive Plan shares was disclosed, plaintiff filed suit in the Delaware Chancery Court, alleging that the grant of the new shares was a wasteful entrenchment scheme designed to ensure that the Insider Majority would retain control of the company and that the stockholders' approval of the Charter Amendment and the Incentive Plan were procured through materially misleading disclosures. The complaint noted that the directors failed to disclose that the Charter Amendment and Incentive Plan had resulted from planning between the company's outside counsel – the same one who eventually served as the sole advisor to the Compensation Committee that decided to award all of the new shares to the Insider Majority at the cheapest possible price and with immediate voting and dividend rights – and the company's CEO. In memoranda to the CEO, the company's outside counsel articulated that the Incentive Plan was inspired by the Insider Majority's desire to own “a significant equity stake in the company as incentive for them to grow the company and increase stockholder value, as well as to provide them with protection against a third party . . . gaining significant voting control over the company.” Those memoranda also contained other material information, including the fact that the company counsel had advised the CEO that a plan constituting 46% of the then-out-

standing equity was well above the range of typical corporate equity plans.

Also not disclosed to the stockholders was the fact that the company had entered into a contract with the buyer of the company's largest existing bloc of shares simultaneously with the board's approval of the Charter Amendment and the Incentive Plan which provided that for five years thereafter the company would not issue any shares in excess of the new shares that were to be issued if the Charter Amendment and Incentive Plan were approved. Thus, the stockholders were not told that they were authorizing the issuance to management of the only equity the company could issue for five years, nor were they told that the board knew this when it approved the contract, the Charter Amendment, and the Incentive Plan all at the same meeting.

In denying defendants' motion to dismiss, Vice Chancellor Strine wrote:

The complaint plainly states a cause of action. Stockholders voting to authorize the issuance of 200,000 shares comprising nearly a third of the company's voting power in order to "attract and retain key employees" would certainly find it material to know that the CEO and company counsel who conjured up the Incentive Plan envisioned that the entire bloc of shares would go to the CEO and two other members of top management who were on the board. A rational stockholder in a small company would also want to know that by voting yes on the Charter Amendment and Incentive Plan, he was authorizing management to receive the only shares that the company could issue during the next five years due to a contract that the board had simultaneously signed with the buyer of another large bloc of shares.

In view of those non-disclosures, it rather obviously follows that the brief meetings at which the Compensation Committee, relying only the advice of the company counsel who had helped the Insider Majority develop a strategy to secure a large bloc that would deter takeover bids, bestowed upon the Insider Majority all 200,000 shares do not, as a matter of law, suffice to require dismissal of the claim that those acts resulted from a purposeful scheme of entrenchment and were wasteful. The complaint raises serious questions about what the two putatively independent directors who

comprised the Compensation Committee knew about the motivation for the issuance, whether they were complicitous with the Insider Majority and company counsel's entrenchment plans, and whether they were adequately informed about the implications of their actions in light of their reliance on company counsel as their sole source of advice.

As important, the directors do not explain how subsequent action of the board in issuing shares to the Insider Majority could cure the attainment of stockholder approval through disclosures that were materially misleading. To that point, the directors also fail to realize that the contractual limitation they placed on their ability to raise other equity capital bears on the issue of whether the complaint states a claim for relief. Requiring the Insider Majority to relinquish their equity in order to give the company breathing room to issue other equity capital without violating the contract is a plausible remedy that might be ordered at a later stage.

Finally, although the test for waste is stringent, it would be error to determine that the board could not, as a matter of law, have committed waste by causing the company to go into debt in order to give a tax-free grant of nearly a third of the company's voting power and dividend stream to existing managers with entrenchment motives and who comprise a majority of the board in exchange for a tenth of a penny per share. If giving away nearly a third of the voting and cash flow rights of a public company for \$200 in order to retain managers who ardently desired to become firmly entrenched just where they were does not raise a pleading-stage inference of waste, it is difficult to imagine what would.

#### **4. *Ryan v. Gifford***

*Ryan v. Gifford*<sup>211</sup> was a derivative action involving options backdating, a practice that involves the granting of options under a stock option plan approved by the issuer's stockholders which requires that the option exercise price not be less than

---

211. 2007 WL 416162 (Del. Ch. February 6, 2007).

the market price of the underlying stock on the date of grant and increasing the management compensation by fixing the grant date on an earlier date when the stock was trading for less than the market price on the date of the corporate action required to effect the grant. Plaintiff alleged that defendants breached their fiduciary duties of due care and loyalty by approving or accepting backdated options that violated the clear terms of the stockholder approved option plans. Chancellor William B. Chandler III denied defendants' motion to discuss the derivative action because plaintiff failed to first demand that the issuer commence the proceedings, ruling that because "one half of the current board members approved each challenged transaction," asking for board approval was not required. The Chancellor also denied defendants' motion to transfer the case to California where other backdating cases involving Maxim are pending, or stay the Delaware proceedings pending resolution of the California cases, basing his decision on the absence of Delaware precedent on options backdating and the importance of there being Delaware guidance on the issues.

Turning to the substance of the case, the Chancellor held "that the intentional violation of a shareholder approved stock option plan, coupled with fraudulent disclosures regarding the directors' purported compliance with that plan, constitute conduct that is disloyal to the corporation and is therefore an act in bad faith."<sup>212</sup> The Chancellor further commented:

A director who approves the backdating of options faces at the very *least* a substantial likelihood of liability, if only because it is difficult to conceive of a context in which a director may simultaneously lie to his shareholders (regarding his violations of a shareholder-approved plan, no less) and yet satisfy his duty of loyalty. Backdating options qualifies as one of those "rare cases [in which] a transaction may be so egregious on its face that board approval cannot meet the test of business judgment, and a substantial likelihood of director liability therefore exists." Plaintiff alleges that three members of a board *approved* backdated options, and another board member accepted them. These are sufficient allegations to raise a reason to

---

212. 2007 WL 416162 (Del. Ch. February 6, 2007) at 11.

doubt the disinterestedness of the current board and to suggest that they are incapable of impartially considering demand.

\* \* \*

I am unable to fathom a situation where the deliberate violation of a shareholder approved stock option plan and false disclosures, obviously intended to mislead shareholders into thinking that the directors complied honestly with the shareholder-approved option plan, is anything but an act of bad faith. It certainly cannot be said to amount to faithful and devoted conduct of a loyal fiduciary. Well-pleaded allegations of such conduct are sufficient, in my opinion, to rebut the business judgment rule and to survive a motion to dismiss.<sup>213</sup>

The Chancellor dismissed claims concerning transactions that occurred before the plaintiff owned shares.

### **5. *In re Tyson Foods, Inc. Consolidated Shareholder Litigation***

A 1997 settlement arising out of transactions between minority shareholders of Tyson Foods, Inc. and the family of its largest stockholder, Don Tyson, and a 2004 SEC consent order arising out of SEC allegations that Tyson Foods' proxy statements from 1997 to 2003 mislabeled payments as travel and entertainment expenses underlay the plaintiffs' fiduciary duty claims in *In re Tyson Foods, Inc. Consolidated Shareholder Litigation*.<sup>214</sup> Plaintiffs' complaint alleged three particular types of

---

213. *Id.* at 9 and 11. The Chancellor's focus on the inability of directors consistently with their fiduciary duties to grant options that deviate from the provisions of a stockholder is consistent with the statement that "Delaware law requires that the terms and conditions of stock options be governed by a written, board approved plan" in *First Marblehead Corp. v. House*, 473 F.3d 1, 6 (1st Cir. 2006), a case arising out of a former employee attempting to exercise a stock option more than three months after his resignation. In *First Marblehead* the option plan provided that no option could be exercisable more than three months after the optionee ceased to be an employee, but the former employee was never given a copy of the option plan nor told of this provision. The Court held that the employee's breach of contract claim was barred by Delaware law because it conflicted with the plan, but that under the laws of Massachusetts the issuer's failure to disclose this term constituted negligent misrepresentation.

214. 2007 WL 416132 (Del.Ch. Feb. 6, 2007).

Board malfeasance: (1) approval of consulting contracts that provided lucrative and undisclosed benefits to corporate insiders; (2) grants of “spring-loaded” stock options to insiders; and (3) acceptance of related-party transactions that favored insiders at the expense of shareholders.

In regard to the allegations that the directors breached their fiduciary duties in approving compensation, Chancellor Chandler wrote:

Plaintiffs’ complaint as to the approval of the compensation amounts to a claim for excessive compensation. To maintain such a claim, plaintiffs must show either that the board or committee that approved the compensation lacked independence (in which case the burden shifts to the defendant director to show that the compensation was objectively reasonable), or to plead facts sufficient to show that the board or committee lacked good faith in making the award. Assuming that this standard is met, plaintiffs need only allege some specific facts suggesting unfairness in the transaction in order to shift the burden of proof to defendants to show that the transaction was entirely fair.

\* \* \*

The report of the Compensation Committee in the same proxy, however, discusses salaries, bonuses, options and stock, but remains conspicuously silent about other annual compensation.

It is thus reasonable to infer at this stage that the Compensation Committee did not approve or review the other annual compensation. Plaintiffs easily meet their further burden to allege some fact suggesting that the transactions were unfair to shareholders: the transactions and their related lack of disclosure undeniably exposed the company to SEC sanctions.

With respect to the option spring-loading issues, the Chancellor wrote:

Whether a board of directors may in good faith grant spring-loaded options is a somewhat more difficult question than that posed by options backdating, a practice that has attracted much journalistic, prosecutorial, and judicial thinking of late. At their heart, all backdated options involve a fundamental, incontrovertible lie: directors who approve an option dissemble as

to the date on which the grant was actually made. Allegations of spring-loading implicate a much more subtle deception.

Granting spring-loaded options, without explicit authorization from shareholders, clearly involves an indirect deception. A director's duty of loyalty includes the duty to deal fairly and honestly with the shareholders for whom he is a fiduciary. It is inconsistent with such a duty for a board of directors to ask for shareholder approval of an incentive stock option plan and then later to distribute shares to managers in such a way as to undermine the very objectives approved by shareholders. This remains true even if the board complies with the strict letter of a shareholder-approved plan as it relates to strike prices or issue dates.

The question before the Court is not, as plaintiffs suggest, whether spring-loading constitutes a form of insider trading as it would be understood under federal securities law. The relevant issue is whether a director acts in bad faith by authorizing options with a market-value strike price, as he is required to do by a shareholder-approved incentive option plan, at a time when he knows those shares are actually worth more than the exercise price. A director who intentionally uses inside knowledge not available to shareholders in order to enrich employees while avoiding shareholder-imposed requirements cannot, in my opinion, be said to be acting loyally and in good faith as a fiduciary.

This conclusion, however, rests upon at least two premises, each of which should be (and, in this case, has been) alleged by a plaintiff in order to show that a spring-loaded option issued by a disinterested and independent board is nevertheless beyond the bounds of business judgment. First, a plaintiff must allege that options were issued according to a shareholder-approved employee compensation plan. Second, a plaintiff must allege that the directors that approved spring-loaded (or bullet-dodging) options (a) possessed material non-public information soon to be released that would impact the company's share price, and (b) issued those options with the intent to circumvent otherwise valid shareholder-approved restrictions upon the exercise price of the options. Such allegations would satisfy a plaintiff's requirement to show adequately at the

pleading stage that a director acted disloyally and in bad faith and is therefore unable to claim the protection of the business judgment rule. Of course, it is conceivable that a director might show that shareholders have expressly empowered the board of directors (or relevant committee) to use backdating, spring-loading, or bullet-dodging as part of employee compensation, and that such actions would not otherwise violate applicable law. But defendants make no such assertion here.

Plaintiffs' have alleged adequately that the Compensation Committee violated a fiduciary duty by acting disloyally and in bad faith with regard to the grant of options. I therefore deny defendants' motion to dismiss Count III as to the seven members of the committee who are implicated in such conduct.

With the several related party transactions, the plaintiffs did not challenge the disinterestedness or independence of the special committee and thus the Chancellor focused on whether the plaintiffs alleged sufficient facts to show that "the board knew that material decisions were being made without adequate deliberation in a manner that suggests they did not care that shareholders would suffer a loss." Elaborating on this scienter-based test, the Chancellor wrote:

There is an important distinction between an allegation of non-deliberation and one of inadequate deliberation. It is easy to conclude that a director who fails to consider an issue at all has violated at the very least a duty of due care. In alleging inadequate deliberation, however, a successful complaint will need to make detailed allegations with regard to the process by which a committee conducted its deliberations: the amount of time a committee took in considering a specific motion, for instance, or the experts relied upon in making a decision.

In declining to dismiss disclosure violation claims based on the DGCL § 102(b)(7) exculpatory clause in the certificate of incorporation of Tyson Foods, the Chancellor commented:

Disclosure violations may, but do not always, involve violations of the duty of loyalty. A decision violates



only the duty of care when the misstatement or omission was made as a result of a director's erroneous judgment with regard to the proper scope and content of disclosure, but was nevertheless made in good faith. Conversely, where there is reason to believe that the board lacked good faith in approving a disclosure, the violation implicates the duty of loyalty. It is too early for me to conclude that the alleged failures to disclose do not implicate the duty of loyalty.

### **6. *Desimone v. Barrows***

Following the Delaware Chancery Court decisions in *Ryan v. Gifford*<sup>215</sup> and *In re Tyson Foods, Inc. Consolidated Shareholder Litigation*<sup>216</sup> in which derivative claims involving backdated and spring-loaded options survived motions to dismiss, the Delaware Chancery court decision in *Desimone v. Barrows*<sup>217</sup> demonstrates that cases involving such options issues can be very fact specific and may not result in director liability, even where there have been internal, SEC and Department of Justice investigations finding option granting irregularities. In *Desimone v. Barrows*, the issuer (Sycamore Networks, Inc.) essentially admitted in its SEC filings that many of its option grants were backdated and this truth was not disclosed until after an internal investigation. Based on allegations in an internal memorandum that options granted to six rank and file employees were backdated and the issuer's restatement of earnings after an internal investigation following that memorandum was revealed to the Board, plaintiff brought a derivative action against recipients of allegedly improper grants. The action involved a plan that permitted grants of options below market, which distinguished it from the plan in *Ryan v. Gifford* that required that options be granted at fair market value. Plaintiff endeavored to stigmatize three distinct classes of grants: (1) grants to rank and file employees that may have been effected by officers without Board or Compensation Committee approval, (2) grants to officers which involved Compensation Committee approval, although no particular facts were alleged that the Compensation Committee knew of the backdating, and (3) grants to outside directors that were awarded annually after

---

215. See notes 206-209 and related text, *supra*.

216. See notes 210-211 and related text, *supra*.

217. Del. Ch. CA No. 2210-VCS June 7, 2007.

the annual meeting of stockholders pursuant to specific stockholder approval of both the amount and the timing of the grants but that allegedly had fortuitous timing. . The Court dismissed plaintiff's complaint on the basis that the complaint did not plead particularized facts establishing demand excusals as to the grants to rank and file employees and to officers because there were no specific facts plead that a majority of the Board was unable to independently decide whether to pursue the claims.<sup>218</sup> Because a majority of the directors received the director options and, thus, likely would be unable to act independently of their interest therein, demand was excused with respect to the director option claims, but the complaint did not survive the motion to dismiss because there were no particular allegations that the regular director option grants did not conform to non-discriminatory arrangement approved by the stockholders. In explaining, in a section captioned "Proceed With Care: The Legal Complexities Raised By Various Options Practices," how the allegations in the *Desimone v. Barrows* complaint differed from those in *Ryan* and *Tyson*, Vice Chancellor Strine wrote:

As in *Ryan* and *Tyson*, issues of backdating and spring loading are presented here. But there are some very important differences between the allegations made here about the Employee, Officer, and Outside Director Grants, and those that were made in *Ryan* and *Tyson*. The first is that the Incentive Plan, the stockholder-approved option plan under which all of the Employee and Officer Grants were made, did not by its terms require that all options be priced at fair market value on the date of the grant. Rather, the Incentive Plan gave Sycamore's directors discretion to set the exercise price of the options and expressly permitted below-market-value options to be granted. This case thus presents a different question than those involved in *Ryan* and *Tyson*, which is whether corporate officials breach their fiduciary duties when they, despite having express permission under a stockholder-approved option plan to grant below-market options, represent to shareholders, markets, and regulatory authorities that they are granting fair-market-value options when in fact they

---

218. See notes 95 and 96, *supra*, regarding demand excusal standard under Delaware Rule 23.1.

are secretly manipulating the exercise price of the option.

As to that question, there is also the subsidiary question of whether the means matters. For example, do backdating and spring loading always have the same implications? In this respect, the contraventions of stockholder-approved option plans that allegedly occurred in *Ryan* and *Tyson* are not the only cause for concern. The tax and accounting fraud that flows from acts of concealed options backdating involve clear violations of positive law. But even in such cases, there are important nuances about *who* bears responsibility when the corporation violates the law, nuances that turn importantly on the state of mind of those accused of involvement.

That point highlights the second important difference between this case and *Ryan* and *Tyson*. In contrast to the plaintiff in *Ryan*, plaintiff Desimone has pled no facts to suggest even the hint of a culpable state of mind on the part of any director. Likewise, Desimone has not, as was done in *Tyson*, pled any facts to suggest that any director was incapable of acting independently of the recipients of any of the Employee or Officer Grants. The absence of pled facts of these kinds underscores the utility of a cautious, non-generic approach to addressing the various options practices now under challenge in many lawsuits. The various practices have jurisprudential implications that are also diverse, not identical, and the policy purposes of different bodies of related law (corporate, securities, and tax) could be lost if courts do not proceed with prudence. Indeed, within the corporate law alone, there are subtle issues raised by options practices.<sup>219</sup>

---

219. Slip Opinion pp. 34-36; see *In re CNET Networks Inc. Derivative Litigation*, No. C-06-3817 WHA, 2007 WL 1089690 (N.D. Cal. Apr. 11, 2007), an options-backdating derivative action in which plaintiffs' complaint was dismissed for failure to plead with particularity that demand on the board was excused as futile under FRCP 23.1, which also recognized that, even in the options-backdating context, in order to allege breach of fiduciary duty with the necessary particularity, derivative plaintiffs must allege more than that improper backdating occurred and that the defendant directors had such involvement that they breached their fiduciary duties.

### **7. *Teachers' Retirement System of Louisiana v. Aidinoff***

In *Teachers' Retirement System of Louisiana v. Aidinoff*,<sup>220</sup> the plaintiff brought suit on behalf of American International Group ("AIG") against Maurice R. Greenberg (AIG's former CEO) and others, relating to an alleged compensation scheme, pursuant to which senior AIG executives became stockholders of a separate company which collected substantial commissions and other payments from AIG, effectively for no separate services rendered. In upholding the complaint as against defendants' motions to dismiss, the Delaware Court of Chancery rejected as determinative the defense that the relevant arrangements were approved annually by the Board and focused upon the complaint's allegations that the Board relied "blindly" on Greenberg, an interested defendant, to approve the relationship "after hearing a short song-and-dance from him annually." The Court also noted that the outside directors "did not employ any integrity-enhancing device, such as a special committee, to review the . . . relationship and to ensure that the relationship was not tainted by the self-interest of AIG executives who owned large stakes" in the second company. While stressing that the "informed approval of a conflict transaction by an independent Board majority remains an important cleansing device under our law and can insulate the resulting decision from fairness review under the appropriate circumstances," the Court also made clear that to avail itself of that cleansing device, "the conflicted insider gets no credit for bending a curve ball past a group of uncurious Georges who fail to take the time to understand the nature" of the transactions at issue.

### **8. *Valeant Pharmaceuticals v. Jerney***

In *Valeant Pharmaceuticals International v. Jerney*,<sup>221</sup> the Delaware Court of Chancery in a post-trial opinion found that compensation received by a former director and president of ICN Pharmaceuticals, Inc. (now known as Valeant Pharmaceuticals International), Adam Jerney, was not entirely fair, held him liable to disgorge a \$3 million transaction bonus paid to him, and also held Jerney liable for (i) his 1/12 share (as one of 12 directors) of the costs of the special litigation committee investigation that led to the litigation and (ii) his 1/12 share

---

220. 900 A.2d 654 (Del. Ch. 2006).

221. 2007 WL 704935 (Del. Ch. March 1, 2007).

of the bonuses paid by the Board to non-director employees. The Court further ordered him to repay half of the \$3.75 million in defense costs that ICN paid to Jerney and the primary defendant, ICN Chairman and CEO Milan Panic. Pre-judgment interest at the legal rate, compounded monthly, was granted on all amounts.

The *Valeant* case illustrates how compensation decisions by a Board can be challenged after a change in control by a subsequent Board. The litigation was initiated by dissident stockholders as a stockholder derivative action but, following a change in control of the Board, a special litigation committee of the Board chose to realign the corporation as a plaintiff. As a result, with the approval of the Court, ICN took over control of the litigation. During the course of discovery, ICN reached settlement agreements with all of the non-management directors, leaving Panic and Jerney as the only remaining defendants at the trial. After trial, ICN reached a settlement agreement with Panic, leaving only Jerney.

The transaction on which the bonus was paid was a reorganization of ICN into three companies; a U.S. unit, an international unit and a unit holding the rights to its antiviral medication, shares of which would be sold to the public in a registered public offering (“*IPO*”). After the *IPO* but before the reorganization was completed, control of the Board changed as a result of the election of additional dissident directors.

The ensuing litigation illustrates the risks to all involved when the compensation committee is not independent and disinterested. Executive compensation is like any other transaction between a corporation and its management – it is voidable unless the statutory requirements for validation of interested director transactions are satisfied.<sup>222</sup> In Delaware a contract between a director and the director’s corporation is voidable due to the director’s interest unless (i) the transaction or contract is approved in good faith by a majority of the disinterested directors after the material facts as to the relationship or interest and as to the transaction or contract are disclosed or known to the directors, (ii) the transaction or contract is approved in good faith by shareholders after the material facts as to the relationship or interest and as to the transaction or contract is disclosed or known to the shareholders, or (iii) the transaction or contract is fair to the corporation as of the time it is authorized, ap-

---

222. See notes 144-151 and related text, *supra*.

proved or ratified by the directors or shareholders of the corporation.<sup>223</sup> Neither the ICN compensation committee nor the ICN Board was disinterested because all of the directors were receiving some of the questioned bonuses.<sup>224</sup> Since the compensation had not been approved by the stockholders, the court applied the “entire fairness” standard in reviewing the compensation arrangements, which placed the burden on the defendant director and officer of establishing both components of entire fairness: fair dealing and fair price. “Fair dealing” addresses the “questions of when the transaction was timed, how it was initiated, structured, negotiated, disclosed to the directors, and how the approvals of the directors and the stockholders were obtained.”<sup>225</sup> “Fair price” requires that the transaction be substantively fair by examining “the economic and financial considerations.”<sup>226</sup>

The fair dealing prong of the entire fairness led the Court to scrutinize processes of the compensation committee. The compensation committee had obtained a report supporting the bonuses from Towers Perrin, a well-regarded compensation consultant, and claimed that it was protected in relying on the report of this expert. However, the compensation consultant who prepared the compensation report on which the compensation committee was relying was initially selected by management, was hired to justify a plan developed by management, had initially criticized the amounts of the bonuses and then only supported them after further meetings with management, and opined in favor of the plan despite being unable to find any comparable transactions. As a result, the Court held that reliance on the compensation report did not provide Jerney with a defense under DGCL § 141(e), which provides that a director will

---

223. *Id.*

224. The Court noted that each of the three directors on the compensation committee received a \$330,500 cash bonus and “were clearly and substantially interested in the transaction they were asked to consider.” Further, the Court commented “that at least two of the committee members were acting in circumstances which raise questions as to their independence from Panic. Tomich and Moses had been close personal friends with Panic for decades. Both were in the process of negotiating with Panic about lucrative consulting deals to follow the completion of their board service. Additionally, Moses, who played a key role in the committee assignment to consider the grant of 5 million options to Panic, had on many separate occasions directly requested stock options for himself from Panic.”

225. *Weinberger v. UOP, Inc.*, 457 A.2d 701, 711 (Del. 1983).

226. *Id.*

be “fully protected” in relying on experts chosen with reasonable care.<sup>227</sup> The Court explained: “To hold otherwise would replace this court’s role in determining entire fairness under 8 Del. C. sec. 144 with that of various experts hired to give advice. . . .” The Court also separately examined the consultant’s work and concluded that it did not meet the standard for DGCL § 141(e) reliance.

The Court rejected an argument that the Company’s senior officers merited bonuses comparable to those paid by outside restructuring experts: “Overseeing the IPO and spin-off were clearly part of the job of the executives at the company. This is in clear contrast to an outside restructuring expert. . . .”

The Court held that doctrines of common law and statutory contribution would not apply to a disgorgement remedy for a transaction that was voidable under DGCL § 144. Hence Jerney was required to disgorge the entirety of his bonus without any ability to seek contribution from other defendants or a reduction in the amount of the remedy because of the settlements executed by the other defendants.

The ICN opinion shows the significant risks that directors face when entire fairness is the standard of review. The opinion also shows the dangers of transactions that confer material benefits on outside directors, thereby resulting in the loss of business judgment rule protection. Although compensation decisions made by independent boards are subject to great deference, that deference disappears when there is not an independent board and entire fairness is the standard. The Court in *Valeant* explained: “Where the self-compensation involves directors or officers paying themselves bonuses, the court is particularly cognizant to the need for careful scrutiny.”

### **C. Non-Profit Corporations**

The compensation of directors and officers of non-profit corporations can raise conflict of interest issues<sup>228</sup> comparable to

---

227. See notes 584-586 and related text, *infra*.

228. TBOC § 22.230 parallels Article 2.30 of the Texas Non-Profit Corporation Act and provides as follows:

Sec. 22.230. CONTRACTS OR TRANSACTIONS INVOLVING INTERESTED DIRECTORS, OFFICERS, AND MEMBERS.

(a) This section applies only to a contract or transaction between a corporation and:

(1) one or more of the corporation’s directors, officers, or members; or

those discussed above in respect of the compensation of directors and officers of for-profit corporations.<sup>229</sup> Further, since non-profit corporations often seek to qualify for exemption from federal income taxation under § 501(c)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, as amended (the “IRC”), as organizations organized and operated exclusively for charitable, religious, literary or scientific purposes and whose earnings do not inure to the benefit of any private shareholders or individuals, the compensation of directors and officers of non-profit corporations can be subject to scrutiny by the Internal Revenue Service

---

- (2) an entity or other organization in which one or more of the corporation’s directors, officers, or members:
  - (A) is a managerial official or a member; or
  - (B) has a financial interest.
- (b) An otherwise valid contract or transaction is valid notwithstanding that a director, officer, or member of the corporation is present at or participates in the meeting of the board of directors, of a committee of the board, or of the members that authorizes the contract or transaction, or votes to authorize the contract or transaction, if:
  - (1) the material facts as to the relationship or interest and as to the contract or transaction are disclosed to or known by:
    - (A) the corporation’s board of directors, a committee of the board of directors, or the members, and the board, the committee, or the members in good faith and with ordinary care authorize the contract or transaction by the affirmative vote of the majority of the disinterested directors, committee members or members, regardless of whether the disinterested directors, committee members or members constitute a quorum; or
    - (B) the members entitled to vote on the authorization of the contract or transaction, and the contract or transaction is specifically approved in good faith and with ordinary care by a vote of the members; or
  - (2) the contract or transaction is fair to the corporation when the contract or transaction is authorized, approved, or ratified by the board of directors, a committee of the board of directors, or the members.
- (c) Common or interested directors or members of a corporation may be included in determining the presence of a quorum at a meeting of the board, a committee of the board, or members that authorizes the contract or transaction.

229. See American Law Institute, *Principals of the Law of Nonprofit Organizations* § 330 (Tentative Draft No. 1 March 19, 2007); ABA Guidebook for Directors of Nonprofit Corporations (1933).



(“*IRS*”).<sup>230</sup> Excessive compensation can be deemed the sort of private inurement that could cause the organization to lose its status as an exempt organization under the IRC and subject the recipient to penalties and other sanctions under the IRC.<sup>231</sup>

The fiduciary duties of directors applicable to compensation process are comparable to those of a for-profit corporation dis-

---

230. See IRS Report on Exempt Organizations Executive Compensation Compliance Project—Parts I and II (March 2007), which can be found at [http://www.irs.gov/pub/irs-tege/exec\\_comp\\_final.pdf](http://www.irs.gov/pub/irs-tege/exec_comp_final.pdf).

231. *Id.* On February 2, 2007, the IRS issued voluntary guidelines for exempt corporations entitled Good Governance Practices for 501(c)(3) Organizations, which can be found at <http://www.irs.gov/charities/charitable/article/0,,id=167626,00.html> and which are intended to help organizations comply with the requirements for maintaining their tax exempt status under the IRC. In addition to having a Board composed of informed individuals who are active in the oversight of the organization’s operations and finances, the guidelines suggest the following nine specific practices that, taken together, the IRS believes every exempt organization should adopt in order to avoid potential compliance problems:

- Adopt a clearly articulated mission statement that makes manifest its goals and activities.
- Adopt a code of ethics setting ethical standards for legal compliance and integrity.
- The directors exercise that degree of due diligence that allows them to ensure that each such organization’s charitable purpose is being realized in the most efficient manner possible.
- Adopt a conflicts of interest policy and require the filing of a conflicts of interest disclosure form annually by all of its directors.
- Post on its website or otherwise make available to the public all of its tax forms and financial statements.
- Ensure that its fund-raising activities comply fully with all federal and state laws and that the costs of such fund-raising are reasonable.
- Operate in accordance with an annual budget, and, if the organization has substantial assets or revenues, an annual audit should be conducted. Further, the Board should establish an independent audit committee to work with and oversee any outside auditor hired by the organization.
- Pay no more than reasonable compensation for services rendered and generally either not compensate persons for serving on the board of directors or do so only when an appropriate committee composed of persons not compensated by the organization determines to do so.
- Adopt a policy establishing standards for document integrity, retention, and destruction, including guidelines for handling electronic files.

cussed elsewhere herein.<sup>232</sup> Like directors of for-profit corporations, directors of non-profit corporations are increasingly subject to scrutiny under fiduciary duty principles with respect to how they handle the compensation of management.

In *People ex rel Spitzer v. Grasso*,<sup>233</sup> the New York Attorney General challenged the compensation paid or payable to Richard Grasso, the former CEO of the New York Stock Exchange (which at the relevant times was organized under the New York Not-for-Profit Law) as unreasonable, unlawful and ultra vires.<sup>234</sup> The litigation ensued after disclosures by the NYSE of a new employment contract with Grasso providing for an immediate lump sum payment of \$139.5 million, which led to the Chairman of the SEC writing to the NYSE that Grasso's pay package "raises serious questions regarding the effectiveness of the NYSE's current governance structure." The resulting furor led the NYSE's Board to request Grasso's resignation, which he tendered.<sup>235</sup> An internal investigation led by special independent counsel was highly critical of Grasso's level of compensa-

---

232. TBOC § 22.221 parallels Article 2.26 of the Texas Non-Profit Corporation Act and provides as follows with respect to the duties of directors of a non-profit corporation organized under the TBOC:

Sec. 22.221. GENERAL STANDARDS FOR DIRECTORS.

- (a) A director shall discharge the director's duties, including duties as a committee member, in good faith, with ordinary care, and in a manner the director reasonably believes to be in the best interest of the corporation.
- (b) A director is not liable to the corporation, a member, or another person for an action taken or not taken as a director if the director acted in compliance with this section. A person seeking to establish liability of a director must prove that the director did not act:
  - (1) in good faith;
  - (2) with ordinary care; and
  - (3) in a manner the director reasonably believed to be in the best interest of the corporation.

233. 13 Misc. 3rd 1227A, 2006 WL 3016952 (N.Y. Sup. Oct. 18, 2006).

234. The Texas Attorney General has also been active in respect of compensation paid to officers and directors of Texas non-profit corporations. See John W. Vinson, *The Charity Oversight Authority of the Texas Attorney General*, 35 St. Mary's L.J. 243 (2004).

235. Grasso tendered his resignation without giving the written notice required under his employment agreement for a termination by the NYSE without cause or by Grasso for good reason, which would have entitled him to additional severance payments. The Court held that Grasso's failure to give this written notice was fatal to his claim for these additional severance payments under both his contract and New York law.

tion and suggested he had played an improper role in setting his own compensation by selecting the Board members who set his compensation. The Court denied cross motions for summary judgment as to the reasonableness of Grasso's compensation generally, but found that the acceleration of certain deferred compensation arrangements was not in strict conformity with the plans<sup>236</sup> and, thus, resulted in illegal loans which Grasso was obligated to repay. The Court found that Grasso had breached his fiduciary duties of care and loyalty in failing to fully inform the Board as to the amount of his accumulated benefits as it was considering granting him additional benefits.

On appeal, the New York Appellate Division,<sup>237</sup> in a 4-to-1 decision, held the New York Attorney General did not have authority to assert four of the six causes of action in which the trial court had allowed recovery from Grasso on a showing that compensation was excessive. The other two causes of action, which were not subject to the appeal, required a showing of fault: (1) the payments were unlawful (i.e. not reasonable) and Grasso knew of their unlawfulness; and (2) violation of fiduciary duty by influencing and accepting excessive compensation.

## V. STANDARDS OF REVIEW IN M&A TRANSACTIONS

### A. Texas Standard of Review

Possibly because the Texas business judgment rule, as articulated in *Gearhart*, protects so much director action, the parties and the courts in the two leading cases in the takeover context have concentrated on the duty of loyalty in analyzing the propriety of the director conduct. This focus should be contrasted with the approach of the Delaware courts which often concentrates on the duty of care.

To prove a breach of the duty of loyalty, it must be shown that the director was "interested" in a particular transaction.<sup>238</sup> In *Copeland*, the court interpreted *Gearhart* as indicating that "[a]nother means of showing interest, when a threat of takeover

---

236. The plans could have been amended by the Board directly, but the parties had attempted to effect the changes by separate agreements with Grasso, which the Court found not to be in conformity with the plans. The Court's holding seems harsh and teaches that formalities can be important when dealing with compensation issues.

237. *People ex rel Spitzer v. Grasso*, 2007 NY Slip Op 03990 (Supreme Court, Appellate Division, May 8, 2007).

238. *Gearhart*, 741 F.2d. at 719; *Copeland*, 706 F. Supp. at 1290.

is pending, is to demonstrate that actions were taken with the goal of director entrenchment.”<sup>239</sup>

Both the *Gearhart* and *Copeland* courts assumed that the defendant directors were interested, thus shifting the burden to the directors to prove the fairness of their actions to the corporation.<sup>240</sup> Once it is shown that a transaction involves an interested director, the transaction is “subject to strict judicial scrutiny but [is] not voidable unless [it is] shown to be unfair to the corporation.”<sup>241</sup> “[T]he burden of proof is on the interested director to show that the action under fire is fair to the corporation.”<sup>242</sup>

In analyzing the fairness of the transaction at issue, the Fifth Circuit in *Gearhart* relied on the following criteria set forth by Justice Douglas in *Pepper v. Litton*, 308 U.S. 295, 306-07 (1939):

A director is a fiduciary. So is a dominant or controlling stockholder or group of stockholders. Their powers are powers in trust. Their dealings with the corporation are subjected to rigorous scrutiny and where any of their contracts or engagements with the corporation is challenged the burden is on the director or stockholder not only to prove the good faith of the transaction but also to show its inherent fairness from the viewpoint of the corporation and those interested therein. The essence of the test is whether or not under all the circumstances the transaction carries the earmarks of an arm’s length bargain. If it does not, equity will set it aside.<sup>243</sup>

In *Gearhart*, the court also stated that a “challenged transaction found to be unfair to the corporate enterprise may nonetheless be upheld if ratified by a majority of disinterested directors or the majority of stockholders.”<sup>244</sup>

In setting forth the test for fairness, the *Copeland* court also referred to the criteria discussed in *Pepper v. Litton* and

---

239. *Copeland*, 706 F. Supp. at 1290-91.

240. *Gearhart*, 741 F.2d at 722; *Copeland*, 706 F. Supp. at 1291-92.

241. *Gearhart*, 741 F.2d at 720; see also *Copeland*, 706 F. Supp. at 1291.

242. *Gearhart*, 741 F.2d at 720; see also *Copeland*, 706 F. Supp. at 1291.

243. *Gearhart*, 741 F.2d at 723 (citations omitted).

244. *Id.* at 720 (citation omitted).

cited *Gearhart* as controlling precedent.<sup>245</sup> In analyzing the shareholder rights plan (also known as a “*poison pill*”) at issue, however, the court specifically cited Delaware cases in its after-the-fact analysis of the fairness of the directors’ action.<sup>246</sup> Whether a Texas court following *Gearhart* would follow Delaware case law in its fairness analysis remains to be seen, especially in light of the Fifth Circuit’s complaint in *Gearhart* that the lawyers focused on Delaware cases and failed to deal with Texas law:

We are both surprised and inconvenienced by the circumstance that, despite their multitudinous and voluminous briefs and exhibits, neither plaintiffs nor defendants seriously attempt to analyze officers’ and directors’ fiduciary duties or the business judgment rule under Texas law. This is particularly so in view of the authorities cited in their discussions of the business judgment rule: Smith and Gearhart argue back and forth over the applicability of the plethora of out-of-state cases they cite, yet they ignore the fact that we are obligated to decide these aspects of this case under Texas law. We note that two cases cited to us as purported Texas authority were both decided under Delaware law. . . .<sup>247</sup>

Given the extent of Delaware case law dealing with director fiduciary duties, it is certain, however, that Delaware cases will be cited and argued by corporate lawyers negotiating transactions and handling any subsequent litigation. The following analysis, therefore, focuses on the pertinent Delaware cases.

### ***B. Delaware Standard of Review***

An examination only of the actual substantive fiduciary duties of corporate directors provides a somewhat incomplete picture. Compliance with those duties in any particular circumstance will be informed by the standard of review that a court would apply when evaluating a board decision that has been challenged.

Under Delaware law, there are generally three standards against which the courts will measure director conduct. As ar-

---

245. *Copeland*, 706 F. Supp. at 1290-91.

246. *Id.* at 1291-93.

247. *Gearhart*, 741 F.2d. at 719 n.4.

articulated by the Delaware courts, these standards provide important guidelines for directors and their counsel as to the process to be followed for director action to be sustained. In the context of considering a business combination transaction, these standards are:

1. *business judgment rule*—for a decision to remain independent or to approve a transaction not involving a sale of control;
2. *enhanced scrutiny*—for a decision to adopt or employ defensive measures<sup>248</sup> or to approve a transaction involving a sale of control; and
3. *entire fairness*—for a decision to approve a transaction involving management or a principal shareholder or for any transaction in which a plaintiff successfully rebuts the presumptions of the business judgment rule.

### **1. Business Judgment Rule**

The Delaware business judgment rule “is a presumption that in making a business decision the directors of a corporation acted on an informed basis, in good faith and in the honest belief that the action taken was in the best interests of the company.”<sup>249</sup> “A hallmark of the business judgment rule is that a court will not substitute its judgment for that of the board if the latter’s decision can be ‘attributed to any rational business purpose’.”<sup>250</sup>

---

248. In *Williams v. Geier*, 671 A.2d 1368 (Del. 1996), the Delaware Supreme Court held that an antitakeover defensive measure will not be reviewed under the enhanced scrutiny standard when the defensive measure is approved by stockholders. The court stated that this standard “should be used only when a board unilaterally (i.e. without stockholder approval) adopts defensive measures in reaction to a perceived threat.” *Id.* at 1377.

249. *Aronson v. Lewis*, 473 A.2d 805, 812 (Del. 1984) (citation omitted); see also *Brazen v. Bell Atl. Corp.*, 695 A.2d 43, 49 (Del. 1997); cf. David Rosenberg, *Galactic Stupidity and the Business Judgment Rule*, 32 J. of Corp. Law 301 (Winter 2007).

250. *Unocal Corp. v. Mesa Petroleum Co.*, 493 A.2d 946, 954 (quoting *Sinclair Oil Corp. v. Levien*, 280 A.2d 717, 720 (Del. 1971)); see Stephen M. Bainbridge, *Unocal at 20: Director Primacy in Corporate Takeovers*, 31 DEL. J. CORP. L. 769 (2006); Andrew G.T. Moore II, *The Birth of Unocal—A Brief History*, 31 DEL. J. CORP. L. 865 (2006); A. Gilchrist Sparks III, *A Comment upon “Unocal at 20”*, 31 DEL. J. CORP. L. 887 (2006).

The availability of the business judgment rule does not mean, however, that directors can act on an uninformed basis. Directors must satisfy their duty of care even when they act in the good faith belief that they are acting only in the interests of the corporation and its stockholders. Their decision must be an informed one. “The determination of whether a business judgment is an informed one turns on whether the directors have informed themselves ‘prior to making a business decision, of all material information reasonably available to them.’”<sup>251</sup> In *Van Gorkom*, notwithstanding a transaction price substantially above the current market, directors were held to have been grossly negligent in, among other things, acting in haste without adequately informing themselves as to the value of the corporation.<sup>252</sup>

## 2. *Enhanced Scrutiny*

When applicable, enhanced scrutiny places on the directors the burden of proving that they have acted reasonably. The key features of enhanced scrutiny are:

- (1) a judicial determination regarding the adequacy of the decision-making process employed by the directors, including the information on which the directors based their decision; and
- (4) a judicial examination of the reasonableness of the directors’ action in light of the circumstances then existing.

The directors have the burden of proving that they were adequately informed and acted reasonably.<sup>253</sup>

The reasonableness required under enhanced scrutiny falls within a range of acceptable alternatives, which echoes the deference found under the business judgment rule.

[A] court applying enhanced judicial scrutiny should be deciding whether the directors made a reasonable decision, not a perfect decision. If a board selected one of several reasonable

---

251. *Smith v. Van Gorkom*, 488 A.2d 858, 872 (Del. 1985); see Bernard S. Sharfman, *Being Informed Does Matter: Fine Tuning Gross Negligence Twenty Plus Years after Van Gorkom*, 62 Bus. Law. 135 (Nov. 2006).

252. *Id.* at 874.

253. *Paramount Communications Inc. v. QVC Network Inc.*, 637 A.2d 34, 45 (Del. 1994); see also *Quickturn Design Sys., Inc. v. Shapiro*, 721 A.2d 1281, 1290 (Del. 1998).

alternatives, a court should not second-guess that choice even though it might have decided otherwise or subsequent events may have cast doubt on the board's determination. Thus, courts will not substitute their business judgment for that of the directors, but will determine if the directors' decision was, on balance, within a range of reasonableness.<sup>254</sup>

### **a. Defensive Measures**

In *Unocal Corp. v. Mesa Petroleum Co.*,<sup>255</sup> the Delaware Supreme Court held that when directors authorize takeover defensive measures, there arises "the omnipresent specter that a board may be acting primarily in its own interests, rather than those of the corporation and its shareholders."<sup>256</sup> The court reviewed such actions with enhanced scrutiny even though a traditional conflict of interest was absent. In refusing to enjoin a selective exchange offer adopted by the board to respond to a hostile takeover attempt, the *Unocal* court held that the directors must prove that (i) they had reasonable grounds for believing there was a danger to corporate policy and effectiveness (satisfied by showing good faith and reasonable investigation)<sup>257</sup> and (ii) the responsive action taken was reasonable in relation to the threat posed (established by showing that the response to the threat was not "coercive" or "preclusive" and then by demonstrating that the response was within a "range of reasonable responses" to the threat perceived).<sup>258</sup>

### **b. Sale of Control**

In *Revlon, Inc. v. MacAndrews & Forbes Holdings, Inc.*,<sup>259</sup> the Delaware Supreme Court imposed an affirmative duty on the Board to seek the highest value reasonably obtainable to the stockholders when a sale of the company becomes inevitable. Then in *Paramount Communications Inc. v. QVC Network Inc.*,<sup>260</sup> when the issues were whether a poison pill could be used selectively to favor one of two competing bidders (effectively precluding shareholders from accepting a tender offer) and whether provisions of the merger agreement (a "no-shop"

---

254. *QVC*, 637 A.2d at 45.

255. 493 A.2d 946 (Del. 1985).

256. *Unocal*, 493 A.2d at 954.

257. *Id.* at 954-55.

258. *Unitrin, Inc. v. Am. Gen. Corp.*, 651 A.2d 1361, 1387-88 (Del. 1995).

259. 506 A.2d 173 (Del. 1985).

260. 637 A.2d 34 (Del. 1994).



clause, a “lock-up” stock option, and a break-up fee) were appropriate measures in the face of competing bids for the corporation, the Delaware Supreme Court sweepingly explained the possible extent of enhanced scrutiny:

The consequences of a sale of control impose special obligations on the directors of a corporation. In particular, they have the obligation of acting reasonably to seek the transaction offering the best value reasonably available to the stockholders. The courts will apply enhanced scrutiny to ensure that the directors have acted reasonably.<sup>261</sup>

The rule announced in *QVC* places a burden on the directors to obtain the *best value reasonably available* once the board determines to sell the corporation in a change of control transaction. This burden entails more than obtaining a fair price for the shareholders, one within the range of fairness that is commonly opined upon by investment banking firms. In *Cede & Co. v. Technicolor, Inc.*,<sup>262</sup> the Delaware Supreme Court found a breach of duty even though the transaction price exceeded the value of the corporation determined under the Delaware appraisal statute: “[I]n the review of a transaction involving a sale of a company, the directors have the burden of establishing that the price offered was the highest value reasonably available under the circumstances.”<sup>263</sup>

Although *QVC* mandates enhanced scrutiny of board action involving a sale of control, certain stock transactions are considered not to involve a change in control for such purpose. In *Arnold v. Soc’y for Sav. Bancorp*, the Delaware Supreme Court considered a merger between Bancorp and Bank of Boston in which Bancorp stock was exchanged for Bank of Boston stock.<sup>264</sup> The shareholder plaintiff argued, among other things, that the board’s actions should be reviewed with enhanced scrutiny because (i) Bancorp was seeking to sell itself and (ii) the merger constituted a change in control because the Bancorp shareholders were converted to minority status in Bank of Boston, losing the opportunity to enjoy a control premium.<sup>265</sup> The

---

261. *QVC*, 637 A.2d at 43 (footnote omitted).

262. 634 A.2d 345 (Del. 1993).

263. *Id.* at 361.

264. 650 A.2d 1270, 1273 (Del. 1994).

265. *Id.* at 1289.

Court held that the corporation was not for sale because no active bidding process was initiated and the merger was not a change in control and, therefore, that enhanced scrutiny of the board's approval of the merger was not appropriate.<sup>266</sup> Citing *QVC*, the Court stated that "there is no 'sale or change in control' when '[c]ontrol of both [corporations] remain[s] in a large, fluid, changeable and changing market.'"<sup>267</sup> As continuing shareholders in Bank of Boston, the former Bancorp shareholders retained the opportunity to receive a control premium.<sup>268</sup> The Court noted that in *QVC* a single person would have control of the resulting corporation, effectively eliminating the opportunity for shareholders to realize a control premium.<sup>269</sup>

### 3. *Entire Fairness*

Both the business judgment rule and the enhanced scrutiny standard should be contrasted with the "*entire fairness*" standard applied in transactions with affiliates.<sup>270</sup> In reviewing board action in transactions involving management, board members or a principal shareholder, the Delaware Supreme Court has imposed an "*entire fairness*" standard.<sup>271</sup> Under this standard the burden is on directors to show both (i) fair dealing and (ii) a fair price:

The former embraces questions of when the transaction was timed, how it was initiated, structured, negotiated, disclosed to the directors, and how the approvals of the directors and the stockholders were obtained. The latter aspect of fairness relates to the economic and financial considerations of the proposed merger, including all relevant factors: assets, market value, earnings, future prospects, and any other ele-

---

266. *Id.* at 1289-90.

267. *Id.* at 1290.

268. *Id.*

269. *Id.*; see also *Paramount Communications, Inc. v. Time, Inc.*, 571 A.2d 1140 (Del. 1989).

270. Directors also will have the burden to prove the entire fairness of the transaction to the corporation and its stockholders if a stockholder plaintiff successfully rebuts the presumption of valid business judgment. *Aronson v. Lewis*, 473 A.2d at 811-12.

271. See *Weinberger v. UOP, Inc.*, 457 A.2d 701, 710-11 (Del. 1983); *Mills Acquisition Co. v. Macmillan, Inc.*, 559 A.2d 1261 (Del. 1988).

ments that affect the intrinsic or inherent value of a company's stock.<sup>272</sup>

The burden shifts to the challenger to show the transaction was unfair where (i) the transaction is approved by the majority of the minority shareholders, though the burden remains on the directors to show that they completely disclosed all material facts relevant to the transaction,<sup>273</sup> or (ii) the transaction is negotiated by a special committee of independent directors that is truly independent, not coerced and has real bargaining power.<sup>274</sup>

### ***C. Action Without Bright Lines***

Whether the burden will be on the party challenging board action, under the business judgment rule, or on the directors, under enhanced scrutiny, clearly the care with which the directors acted in a change of control transaction will be subjected to close review. For this review there will be no “bright line” tests, and it may be assumed that the board may be called upon to show care commensurate with the importance of the decisions made, whatever they may have been in the circumstances. Thus directors, and counsel advising them, should heed the Delaware Supreme Court in *Barkan v. Amsted Indus., Inc.*:<sup>275</sup> “[T]here is no single blueprint that a board must follow to fulfill its duties. A stereotypical approach to the sale and acquisition of corporate control is not to be expected in the face of the evolving techniques and financing devices employed in today’s corporate environment.” In the absence of bright lines and blueprints that fit all cases, the process to be followed by the directors will be paramount. The elements of the process should be clearly understood at the beginning, and the process should be guided and well documented by counsel throughout.

---

272. *Weinberger*, 457 A.2d at 711.

273. *Id.* at 703.

274. *See Kahn v. Lynch Communications Sys., Inc.*, 638 A.2d 1110, 1117 (Del. 1994).

275. 567 A.2d 1279, 1286 (Del. 1989).

## VI. M&A TRANSACTION PROCESS

### A. *Statutory Framework: Board and Shareholder Action*

Both Texas and Delaware law permit corporations to merge with other corporations by adopting a plan of merger and obtaining the requisite shareholder approval.<sup>276</sup> Under Texas law, approval of a merger will generally require approval of the holders of at least two-thirds of the outstanding shares entitled to vote on the merger, while Delaware law provides that mergers may be approved by a vote of the holders of a majority of the outstanding shares.<sup>277</sup> As with other transactions, the Texas Corporate Statutes permit a corporation's certificate of formation to reduce the required vote to an affirmative vote of the holders of a majority of the outstanding shares.<sup>278</sup>

Both Texas and Delaware permit a merger to be effected without shareholder approval if the corporation is the sole surviving corporation, the shares of stock of the corporation are not changed as a result of the merger and the total number of shares of stock issued pursuant to the merger does not exceed 20% of the shares of the corporation outstanding immediately prior to the merger.<sup>279</sup>

Board action on a plan of merger is required under both Texas and Delaware law. However, Texas law does not require that the board of directors approve the plan of merger, but rather it need only adopt a resolution directing the submission of the plan of merger to the corporation's shareholders.<sup>280</sup> Such a resolution must either recommend that the plan of merger be approved or communicate the basis for the board's determination that the plan be submitted to shareholders without any recommendation.<sup>281</sup> The Texas Corporate Statutes' allowance of directors to submit a plan of merger to shareholders without recommendation is intended to address those few circumstances in which a board may consider it appropriate for shareholders to be given the right to vote on a plan of merger but for fiduciary or other reasons the board has concluded that it would not be

---

276. See TBOC §§ 10.001, 21.452; TBCA art. 5.01; DGCL §§ 251-58; see generally Curtis W. Huff, *The New Texas Business Corporation Act Merger Provisions*, 21 ST. MARY'S L.J. 109 (1989).

277. TBOC §§ 21.452, 21.457; TBCA art. 5.03E; DGCL § 251(c).

278. TBOC § 21.365(a); TBCA art. 2.28.

279. TBOC § 21.459; TBCA art. 5.03G; DGCL § 251(f).

280. TBOC § 21.452(b); TBCA art. 5.03B(1).

281. TBOC § 21.452(d); TBCA art. 5.03B(1).

appropriate for the board to make a recommendation.<sup>282</sup> Delaware law has no similar provision and requires that the board approve the agreement of merger and declare its advisability, and then submit the merger agreement to the stockholders for the purpose of their adopting the agreement.<sup>283</sup> Delaware and Texas permit a merger agreement to contain a provision requiring that the agreement be submitted to the stockholders whether or not the board of directors determines at any time subsequent to declaring its advisability that the agreement is no longer advisable and recommends that the stockholders reject it.<sup>284</sup>

### **B. Management's Immediate Response**

Serious proposals for a business combination require serious consideration. The CEO and management will usually be called upon to make an initial judgment as to seriousness. A written, well developed proposal from a credible prospective acquiror should be studied. In contrast, an oral proposal, or a written one that is incomplete in material respects, should not require management efforts to develop the proposal further. In no event need management's response indicate any willingness to be acquired. In *Citron v. Fairchild Camera and Instrument Corp.*,<sup>285</sup> for example, the Delaware Supreme Court sanctioned behavior that included the CEO's informing an interested party that the corporation was not for sale, but that a written proposal, if made, would be submitted to the board for review. Additionally, in *Matador Capital Management Corp. v. BRC Holdings, Inc.*,<sup>286</sup> the Delaware Chancery Court found unpersuasive the plaintiff's claims that the board failed to consider a potential bidder because the board's decision to terminate discussion was "justified by the embryonic state of [the potential bidder's] proposal."<sup>287</sup> In particular, the court stated that the potential bidder did not provide evidence of any real financing capability and conditioned its offer of its ability to arrange the

---

282. Egan and Huff, *Choice of State of Incorporation – Texas versus Delaware: Is It Now Time To Rethink Traditional Notions?*, 54 SMU L. Rev. 249, 282 (Winter 2001).

283. See DGCL § 251(b), (c).

284. DGCL § 146; TBOC §§ 21.452(f), (g); TBCA art. 5.01C(3).

285. 569 A.2d 53 (Del. 1989).

286. 729 A.2d 280 (Del. Ch. 1998).

287. *Id.* at 292.

participation of certain members of the target company's management in the transaction.<sup>288</sup>

### C. *The Board's Consideration*

“When a board addresses a pending takeover bid it has an obligation to determine whether the offer is in the best interests of the corporation and its shareholders.”<sup>289</sup> Just as all proposals are not alike, board responses to proposals may differ. A proposal that is incomplete in material respects should not require serious board consideration. On the other hand, because more developed proposals may present more of an opportunity for shareholders, they ought to require more consideration by the board.<sup>290</sup>

#### 1. *Matters Considered*

Where an offer is perceived as serious and substantial, an appropriate place for the board to begin its consideration may be an informed understanding of the corporation's value. This may be advisable whether the board's ultimate response is to “say no,” to refuse to remove pre-existing defensive measures, to adopt new or different defensive measures or to pursue another strategic course to maximize shareholder value. Such a point of departure is consistent with *Van Gorkom* and *Unocal*. In *Van Gorkom*, the board was found grossly negligent, among other things, for not having an understanding of the intrinsic value of the corporation. In *Unocal*, the inadequacy of price was recog-

---

288. *Id.*

289. *Unocal*, 493 A.2d at 954.

290. *See Desert Partners, L.P. v. USG Corp.*, 686 F. Supp. 1289, 1300 (N.D. Ill. 1988) (applying Delaware law) (“The Board did not breach its fiduciary duty by refusing to negotiate with Desert Partners to remove the coercive and inadequate aspects of the offer. USG decided not to bargain over the terms of the offer because doing so would convey the image to the market place ‘that (1) USG was for sale – when, in fact, it was not; and (2) \$42/share was an ‘in the ballpark’ price - when, in fact, it was not.’”); and *Citron*, 569 A.2d at 63, 66-67 (validating a board's action in approving one bid over another that, although higher on its face, lacked in specifics of its proposed back-end which made the bid impossible to value). *Compare Golden Cycle, LLC v. Allan*, 1998 WL 892631, at \*15-16 (Del. Ch. December 10, 1998) (board not required to contact competing bidder for a higher bid before executing a merger agreement where bidder had taken itself out of the board process, refused to sign a confidentiality agreement and appealed directly to the stockholders with a consent solicitation).

nized as a threat for which a proportionate response is permitted.<sup>291</sup>

That is not to say, however, that a board must “price” the corporation whenever a suitor appears. Moreover, it may be ill advised even to document a range of values for the corporation before the conclusion of negotiations. However, should the decision be made to sell or should a defensive reaction be challenged, the board will be well served to have been adequately informed of intrinsic value during its deliberations from the beginning.<sup>292</sup> In doing so, the board may also establish, should it need to do so under enhanced scrutiny, that it acted at all times to maintain or seek “the best value reasonably available to the stockholders.”<sup>293</sup> This may also be advisable even if that value derives from remaining independent.

There are, of course, factors other than value to be considered by the board in evaluating an offer. The Delaware judicial guidance here comes from the sale context and the evaluation of competing bids, but may be instructive:

In assessing the bid and the bidder’s responsibility, a board may consider, among various proper factors, the adequacy and terms of the offer; its fairness and feasibility; the proposed or actual financing for the offer, and the consequences of that financing; questions of illegality; the impact of both the bid and the potential acquisition on other constituencies, provided that it bears some reasonable relationship to general shareholder interests; the risk of nonconsummation; the basic stockholder interests at stake; the bidder’s identity, prior background and other business venture experiences; and the bidder’s business plans for the corporation and their effects on stockholder interests.<sup>294</sup>

---

291. *Unocal*, 493 A.2d at 955; see also *Unitrin Inc. v. American Gen. Corp.*, 651 A.2d 1361, 1384 (Del. 1995), noting as a threat “substantive coercion . . . the risk that shareholders will mistakenly accept an underpriced offer because they disbelieve management’s representations of intrinsic value.”

292. See *Technicolor*, 634 A.2d at 368.

293. *QVC*, 637 A.2d at 45.

294. *Macmillan*, 559 A.2d at 1282 n.29 (citations omitted).

## 2. *Being Adequately Informed*

Although there is no one blueprint for being adequately informed,<sup>295</sup> the Delaware courts do value expert advice, the judgment of directors who are independent and sophisticated, and an active and orderly deliberation.

### a. *Investment Banking Advice*

Addressing the value of a corporation generally entails obtaining investment banking advice.<sup>296</sup> The analysis of value requires the “techniques or methods which are generally considered acceptable in the financial community. . . .”<sup>297</sup> Clearly, in *Van Gorkom*, the absence of expert advice prior to the first Board consideration of a merger proposal contributed to the determination that the Board “lacked valuation information adequate to reach an informed business judgment as to the fairness [of the price]” and the finding that the directors were grossly negligent.<sup>298</sup> Although the Delaware Supreme Court noted that “fairness opinions by independent investment bankers are [not] required as a matter of law,”<sup>299</sup> in practice, investment banking advice is typically obtained for a decision to sell and often for a decision not to sell. In the non-sale context, such advice is particularly helpful where there may be subsequent pressure to sell or disclosure concerning the board’s decision not to sell is likely. In either case, however, the fact that the board of directors relies on expert advice to reach a decision provides strong support that the Board acted reasonably.<sup>300</sup>

The advice of investment bankers is not, however, a substitute for the judgment of the directors.<sup>301</sup> As the court pointed

---

295. See *Goodwin v. Live Entertainment, Inc.*, 1999 WL 64265, at \*21 (Del. Ch. 1999) (citing *Barkan*, 567 A.2d at 1286).

296. See, e.g., *In re Talley Indus., Inc. Shareholders Litig.*, 1998 WL 191939, at \*11-12 (Del. Ch. 1998).

297. *Weinberger*, 457 A.2d at 713.

298. *Van Gorkom*, 488 A.2d at 878.

299. *Id.* at 876.

300. See *Goodwin*, 1999 WL 64265, at \*22 (“The fact that the Board relied on expert advice in reaching its decision not to look for other purchasers also supports the reasonableness of its efforts.”); *In re Vitalink Communications Corp. Shareholders Litig.*, 1991 WL 238816, at \*12 (Del. Ch. 1991) (citations omitted) (board’s reliance on the advice of investment bankers supported a finding that the board had a “reasonable basis” to conclude that it obtained the best offer).

301. See *In re IXC Communications, Inc. Shareholders Litigation*, 1999 WL 1009174 (Del. Ch. 1999), in which Vice Chancellor Steele stated that



out in *Citron*, “in change of control situations, sole reliance on hired experts and management can ‘taint the design and execution of the transaction’.”<sup>302</sup> In addition, the timing, scope and diligence of the investment bankers may affect the outcome of subsequent judicial scrutiny. The following cases, each of which involves a decision to sell, nevertheless may be instructive for board deliberations concerning a transaction that does not result in a sale decision:

(18) In *Weinberger*,<sup>303</sup> the Delaware Supreme Court held that the board’s approval of an interested merger transaction did not meet the test of fairness.<sup>304</sup> The fairness analysis prepared by the investment bankers was criticized as “hurried” where due diligence was conducted over a weekend and the price was slipped into the opinion by the banking partner (who was also a director of the corporation) after a quick review of the assembled diligence on a plane flight.<sup>305</sup>

(19) In *Macmillan*,<sup>306</sup> the court enjoined defensive measures adopted by the board, including a lock-up and no-shop granted to an acquiror, to hinder competing bids from Mills. The court questioned an investment bank’s conclusion that an \$80 per share cash offer was inadequate when it had earlier opined that the value of the company was between \$72 and \$80 per share and faulted the investment bankers, who were retained by and consulted with financially interested management, for lack of independence.<sup>307</sup>

(20) In *Technicolor*,<sup>308</sup> the court faulted the valuation package prepared by the investment bankers because they were given limited access to senior officers and directors of Technicolor.

Often all or part of the investment banker’s fee is payable only in the event of success in the transaction. If there is a contingent component in the banker’s fee, the Board should recog-

---

“[n]o board is obligated to heed the counsel of any of its advisors and with good reason. Finding otherwise would establish a procedure by which this Court simply substitutes advise from Morgan Stanley or Merrill Lynch for the business judgment of the board charged with ultimate responsibility for deciding the best interests of shareholders.”

302. *Citron*, 569 A.2d at 66 (citation omitted).

303. *Weinberger*, 457 A.2d 701.

304. *Id.* at 715.

305. *Id.* at 712.

306. *Macmillan*, 559 A.2d 1261 (Del. 1988).

307. *Id.* at 1271.

308. *Technicolor*, 634 A.2d 345.

nize the possible effect of that incentive and, if a transaction is ultimately submitted for shareholder vote, include information about the contingent element among the disclosures to shareholders.<sup>309</sup>

**b. Value of Independent Directors, Special Committees**

One of the first tasks of counsel in a takeover context is to assess the independence of the Board.<sup>310</sup> In a sale of control transaction, “the role of outside, independent directors becomes particularly important because of the magnitude of a sale of control transaction and the possibility, in certain cases, that management may not necessarily be impartial.”<sup>311</sup> As pointed out by the Delaware Supreme Court in *Unocal*, when enhanced scrutiny is applied by the court, “proof is materially enhanced . . . by the approval of a board comprised of a majority of outside independent directors who have acted [in good faith and after a reasonable investigation].”<sup>312</sup>

(21) *Characteristics of an Independent Director.* An independent director has been defined as a non-employee and non-management director.<sup>313</sup> To be effective, outside directors cannot be dominated by financially interested members of management or a controlling stockholder.<sup>314</sup> Care should also be taken to restrict the influence of other interested directors, which may

---

309. In *Louisiana Municipal Police Employees’ Retirement System v. Crawford*, 2007 WL 582510 (Del. Ch. Feb. 23, 2007) and *Express Scripts, Inc. v. Crawford*, 2007 WL 707550 (Del. Ch. Feb. 23, 2007), the Court of Chancery held that a postponement of the stockholder vote was necessary to provide the target stockholders with additional disclosure that the major part of the financial advisors’ fee was contingent upon the consummation of a transaction by target with its merger partner or a third party. The target’s proxy statement disclosure was found misleading because it did not clearly state that its financial advisors were entitled to the fee only if the initial merger was approved. The Court concluded that disclosure of these financial incentives to the financial advisors was material to the stockholder deliberations on the merger.

310. See, e.g., *Kahn v. MSB Bancorp, Inc.*, 1998 WL 409355, at \*3 (Del. Ch. 1998), *aff’d* 734 A.2d 158 (Del. 1999) (“[T]he fact that nine of the ten directors are not employed by MSB, but are outside directors, strengthens the presumption of good faith.”)

311. *QVC*, 637 A.2d at 44; see also *Macmillan*, 559 A.2d 1261.

312. *Unocal*, 493 A.2d at 955.

313. *Unitrin*, 651 A.2d at 1375; see notes 121-134 and related text, *supra*.

314. See *Macmillan*, 559 A.2d at 1266.

include recusal of interested directors from participation in certain board deliberations.<sup>315</sup>

(22) *Need for Active Participation.* Active participation of the independent members of the board is important in demonstrating that the Board did not simply follow management. In *Time*,<sup>316</sup> the Delaware Supreme Court considered Time's actions in recasting its previously negotiated merger with Warner into an outright cash and securities acquisition of Warner financed with significant debt to ward off Paramount's surprise all-cash offer to acquire Time. Beginning immediately after Paramount announced its bid, the Time board met repeatedly to discuss the bid, determined the merger with Warner to be a better course of action, and declined to open negotiations with Paramount. The outside directors met independently, and the Board sought advice from corporate counsel and financial advisors. Through this process the Board reached its decision to restructure the combination with Warner. The Court viewed favorably the participation of certain of the Board's 12 independent directors in the analysis of Paramount's bid. The Time Board's process contrasts with *Van Gorkom*, where although one-half of Trans Union's Board was independent, an absence of any inquiry by those directors as to the basis of management's analysis and no review of the transaction documents contributed to the court's finding that the board was grossly negligent in its decision to approve a merger.<sup>317</sup>

(23) *Use of Special Committee.* When directors or shareholders with fiduciary obligations have a conflict of interest with respect to a proposed transaction, the use of a special committee is recommended. A special committee is also recom-

---

315. See *Technicolor*, 634 A.2d at 366 n.35. See also *Brehm v. Eisner*, 746 A.2d 244, 256 (Del. 2000) (in evaluating charge that directors breached fiduciary duties in approving employment and subsequent severance of a corporation's president, the Delaware Supreme Court held that the "issues of disinterestedness and independence" turn on whether the directors were "incapable, due to personal interest or domination and control, of objectively evaluating" an action).

316. 571 A.2d 1140 (Del. 1989).

317. See also *Kahn v. Tremont Corp.*, 694 A.2d 422, 429 (Del. 1997), where the Delaware Supreme Court found that the three member special committee of outside directors was not fully informed, not active, and did not appropriately simulate an arm's-length transaction, given that two of the three members permitted the other member to perform the committee's essential functions and one of the committee members did not attend a single meeting of the committee.

mended where there is the potential for a conflict to develop.<sup>318</sup> Accordingly, use of a special committee should be considered in connection with any going-private transaction (i.e., management buy-outs or squeeze-out mergers), asset sales or acquisitions involving entities controlled by or affiliated with directors or controlling shareholders, or any other transactions with majority or controlling shareholders.<sup>319</sup> If a majority of the Board is disinterested and independent with respect to a proposed transaction (other than a freeze out merger proposal by a controlling stockholder), a special committee may not be necessary, since the Board's decision will be accorded deference under the business judgment rule (assuming, of course, that the disinterested directors are not dominated or otherwise controlled by the interested party(ies)). In that circumstance, the disinterested directors may act on behalf of the company and the interested

- 
318. *See In re Western National Corp. Shareholders Litig.*, 2000 WL 710192 at \*26 (Del. Ch. May 22, 2000)(use of special committee where the transaction involved a 46% stockholder; court ultimately held that because the 46% stockholder was not a controlling stockholder, the business judgment rule would apply: “[w]ith the aid of its expert advisors, the Committee apprised itself of all reasonably available information, negotiated . . . at arm’s length and, ultimately, determined that the merger transaction was in the interests of the Company and its public shareholders”).
319. *See In re Digex, Inc. Shareholders Litig.*, 789 A.2d 1176 (Del. Ch. 2000) (special committee of a company with a controlling corporate shareholder formed to consider potential acquisition offers); *Kohls v. Duthie*, 765 A.2d 1274, 1285 (Del. Ch. 2000)(special committee formed in connection with a management buyout transaction); *T. Rowe Price Recovery Fund, L.P. v. Rubin*, Del. Ch., 770 A.2d 536 (2000) (special committee used to consider shared service agreements among corporation and its chief competitor, both of which were controlled by the same entity); *In re MAXXAM, Inc. / Federated Development Shareholders Litig.*, 1997 Del. Ch. LEXIS 51 (Del. Ch. Apr. 4, 1997) (special committee formed to consider a purchase of assets from the controlling stockholder); *Citron v. E.I. Du Pont de Nemours & Co.*, 584 A.2d 490 (Del. Ch. 1990) (majority shareholder purchase of minority shares); *Lynch I* (involving controlling shareholder’s offer to purchase publicly held shares); *In re Resorts International Shareholders Litig.*, 570 A.2d 259 (Del. 1990) (special committee used to evaluate controlling shareholder’s tender offer and competing tender offer); *Kahn v. Sullivan*, 594 A.2d 48, 53 (Del. 1991) (special committee formed to evaluate corporation’s charitable gift to entity affiliated with the company’s chairman and CEO); *Kahn v. Dairy Mart Convenience Stores, Inc.*, 1996 Del. Ch. LEXIS 38, at \*18-19 (Del. Ch. March 29, 1996) (special committee formed to consider management LBO); *Kahn v. Roberts*, 679 A.2d 460, 465 (Del. 1996) (special committee formed to evaluate stock repurchase from 33% shareholder).

directors should abstain from deliberating and voting on the proposed transaction.<sup>320</sup>

Although there is no legal requirement under Delaware law that an interested Board make use of a special committee, the Delaware courts have indicated that the absence of such a committee in connection with an affiliate or conflict transaction may evidence the transaction's unfairness (or other procedural safeguards, such as a majority of minority vote requirement).<sup>321</sup>

**(i) Formation of the Committee**

Where a majority of the Board is disinterested, a special committee may be useful if there are reasons to isolate the deliberations of the noninterested directors.<sup>322</sup> Where a majority of the directors have some real or perceived conflict, however, and in the absence of any other procedural safeguards, the formation of a special committee is critical. Ideally, the special committee should be formed prior to the first series of negotiations of a proposed transaction, or immediately upon receipt of an unsolicited merger or acquisition proposal. Formation at a

- 
- 320. See DGCL § 144 (providing that interested director transactions will not be void or voidable solely due to the existence of the conflict if certain safeguards are utilized, including approval by a majority of the disinterested directors, assuming full disclosure).
  - 321. See *Seagraves v. Urstady Property Co.*, 1996 Del. Ch. LEXIS 36, at \*16 (Del. Ch. Apr. 1, 1996) (failure to use a special committee or other procedural safeguards “evidences the absence of fair dealing”); *Jedwab v. MGM Grand Hotels, Inc.*, 509 A.2d 584, 599 (Del. Ch. 1986) (lack of independent committee is pertinent factor in assessing whether fairness was accorded to the minority); *Boyer v. Wilmington Materials, Inc.*, 1997 Del. Ch. LEXIS 97, at \*20 (Del. Ch. June 27, 1997) (lack of special committee is an important factor in a court’s “overall assessment of whether a transaction was fair”).
  - 322. See *Spiegel v. Buntrock*, 571 A.2d 767, 776 n.18 (Del. 1990) (“Even when a majority of a board of directors is independent, one advantage of establishing a special negotiating committee is to isolate the interested directors from material information during either the investigative or decisional process”); *Moore Business Forms, Inc. v. Cordant Holdings Corp.*, 1996 Del. Ch. LEXIS 56, at \*18-19 (Del. Ch. June 4, 1996) (recommending use of a special committee to prevent shareholder’s board designee’s access to privileged information regarding possible repurchase of shareholder’s preferred stock; “the special committee would have been free to retain separate legal counsel, and its communications with that counsel would have been properly protected from disclosure to [the shareholder] and its director designee”); *Kohls v. Duthie*, 765 A.2d at 1285 (forming a special committee to isolate the negotiations of the non-interested directors from one director that would participate in a management buyout).

later stage is acceptable, however, if the special committee is still capable of influencing and ultimately rejecting the proposed transaction.<sup>323</sup> As a general rule, however, the special committee should be formed whenever the conflicts of fellow directors become apparent in light of a proposed or contemplated transaction. To the extent possible, however, the controlling stockholder or the CEO, if interested, should not select, or influence the selection of, the members of the special committee or its chairperson.<sup>324</sup>

### **(ii) Independence and Disinterestedness**

In selecting the members of a special committee, care should be taken to ensure not only that the members have no financial interest in the transaction, but that they have no financial ties, or are otherwise beholden, to any person or entity involved in the transaction.<sup>325</sup> In other words, all committee

---

323. *See In re SS&C Technologies, Inc. Shareholder Litigation*, 911 A.2d 816 (Del. Ch. 2006), a case in which the settlement of litigation challenging a management led cash-out merger was disapproved in part because the Court was concerned that the buyer's proposal was solicited by the CEO without prior Board approval as part of informal "test the waters" process to find a buyer who would pay a meaningful premium while allowing the CEO to make significant investment in the acquisition vehicle and continue managing the target. After being satisfied with the buyer's proposal but before all details had been negotiated, the CEO advised the Board about the deal. The Board then formed special committee that hired independent legal and financial advisers and embarked on a program to solicit other buyers, but the Court was concerned that this process was perhaps too late to affect outcome. The Court expressed concern whether the CEO had misused confidential information and resources of corporation in talking to his selected buyer and engaging an investment banker before Board approval and whether the CEO's precommitment to a deal with the buyer and his conflicts (i.e., receiving cash plus an interest in the acquisition vehicle and continuing management role) prevented the Board from considering whether a sale should take place and, if so, to negotiating the best terms reasonably available.

324. *See Macmillan*, 559 A.2d at 1267 (in case where special committee had no burden-shifting effect, court noted that the interested CEO "hand picked" the members of the committee); *In re Fort Howard Corp. Shareholders Litig.*, 1988 WL 83147 (Del. Ch. 1988) ("It cannot . . . be the best practice to have the interested CEO in effect handpick the members of the Special Committee as was, I am satisfied, done here.").

325. *See Katell v. Morgan Stanley Group, Inc.*, 1995 Del. Ch. LEXIS 76, at \*21, Fed. Sec. L. Rep. (CCH) 98861 (Del. Ch. June 15, 1995) ("[w]hen a special committee's members have no personal interest in the disputed transactions, this Court scrutinizes the members' relationship with the

members should be independent and disinterested. To be disinterested, the member cannot derive any personal (primarily financial) benefit from the transaction not shared by the stockholders.<sup>326</sup> To be independent, the member's decisions must be "based on the corporate merits of the subject before the [committee] rather than extraneous considerations or influences."<sup>327</sup> To establish non-independence, a plaintiff has to show that the committee members were "beholden" to the conflicted party or "so under [the conflicted party's] influence that their discretion would be sterilized."<sup>328</sup> In a recent case in which committee members appeared to abdicate their responsibilities to another member "whose independence was most suspect," the Delaware Supreme Court reemphasized that:

"[i]t is the care, attention and sense of individual responsibility to the performance of one's duties. . .that generally touches on independence."<sup>329</sup>

If a committee member votes to approve a transaction to appease the interested director/shareholder, to stay in the interested party's good graces, or because he/she is beholden to the interested party for the continued receipt of consulting fees or other payments, such committee member will not be viewed as independent.<sup>330</sup>

---

interested directors"); E. Norman Veasey, *Duty of Loyalty: The Criticality of the Counselor's Role*, 45 Bus. Law. 2065, 2079 ("the members of the committee should not have unusually close personal or business relations with the conflicted directors").

326. *Pogostin v. Rice*, 480 A.2d 619, 624, 627 (Del. 1984) (overruled as to standard of appellate review).
327. *Aronson*, 473 A.2d at 816; *In re MAXXAM, Inc. / Federated Development Shareholders Litig.*, 659 A.2d 760, 773 (Del. Ch. 1995) ("To be considered independent, a director must not be 'dominated or controlled by an individual or entity interested in the transaction.'" (citing *Grobow v. Perot*, 539 A.2d 180, 189 (Del. 1988) (overruled as to standard of appellate review)). See also *Grimes v. Donald*, 673 A.2d 1207, 1219 n.25 (Del. 1996) (parenthetically describing *Lynch I* as a case in which the "'independent committee' of the board did not act independently when it succumbed to threat of controlling stockholder") (overruled as to standard of appellate review).
328. *MAXXAM*, 659 A.2d at 773 (quoting *Rales v. Blasband*, 634 A.2d 927, 936 (Del. 1993)).
329. *Kahn v. Tremont Corp.*, 694 A.2d 422, 430 (Del. 1997) (citing *Aronson*, 473 A.2d at 816).
330. *Rales*, 634 A.2d at 936-37; *MAXXAM, Inc. / Federated Development Shareholders Litig.*, 1997 Del. Ch. LEXIS 51, at \*66-71 (Del. Ch. Apr. 4,

**(iii) Selection of Legal and Financial Advisors**

Although there is no legal requirement that a special committee retain legal and financial advisors, it is highly advisable that the committee retain advisors to help them carry out their duties.<sup>331</sup> The selection of advisors, however, may influence a court's determinations of the independence of the committee and the effectiveness of the process.<sup>332</sup>

Selection of advisors should be made by the committee after its formation. Although the special committee may rely on the company's professional advisors, perception of the special committee's independence is enhanced by the separate retention of advisors who have no prior affiliation with the company or interested parties.<sup>333</sup> Accordingly, the special committee should

---

1997) (special committee members would not be considered independent due to their receipt of consulting fees or other compensation from entities controlled by the shareholder who controlled the company); *Kahn v. Tremont Corp.*, 694 A.2d at 429-30 (holding that special committee "did not function independently" because the members had "previous affiliations with [an indirect controlling shareholder, Simmons,] or companies which he controlled and, as a result, received significant financial compensation or influential positions on the boards of Simmons' controlled companies."); *Kahn v. Dairy Mart Convenience Stores, Inc.*, 1996 Del. Ch. LEXIS 38, at \*18-19 (noting that the special committee member was also a paid consultant for the corporation, raising concerns that he was beholden to the controlling shareholder).

331. *See, e.g., Strassburger v. Earley*, 752 A.2d 557, 567 (Del. Ch. 2000) (court criticizing a one-man special committee and finding it ineffective in part because it had not been "advised by independent legal counsel or even an experienced investment banking firm").

332. *See Kahn v. Dairy Mart Convenience Stores, Inc.*, 1996 Del. Ch. LEXIS 38, at \*22 n.6 (a "critical factor in assessing the reliability and independence of the process employed by a special committee, is the committee's financial and legal advisors and how they were selected"); *In re Fort Howard Corp. Shareholders Litig.*, 1988 WL 83147 (Del. Ch. 1988) ("no role is more critical with respect to protection of shareholder interests in these matters than that of the expert lawyers who guide sometimes inexperienced [committee members] through the process"). *See* note 355 and related text, *infra*.

333. *See, e.g., Citron v. E.I. Du Pont de Nemours & Co.*, 584 A.2d at 494 (noting that to insure a completely independent review of a majority stockholder's proposal the independent committee retained its own independent counsel rather than allowing management of the company to retain counsel on its behalf); *cf. In re Fort Howard*, 1988 WL 83147 (Del. Ch. 1988) (noting that the interested CEO had selected the committee's legal counsel; "[a] suspicious mind is made uneasy contemplating the possibilities when the interested CEO is so active in choosing his



take time to ensure that its professional advisors have no prior or current, direct or indirect, material affiliations with interested parties.

Retention of legal and financial advisors by the special committee also enhances its ability to be fully informed. Because of the short time-frame of many of today's transactions, professional advisors allow the committee to assimilate large amounts of information more quickly and effectively than the committee could without advisors. Having advisors that can efficiently process and condense information is important where the committee is asked to evaluate proposals or competing proposals within days of their making.<sup>334</sup> Finally, a court will give some deference to the committee's selection of advisors where there is no indication that they were retained for an "improper purpose."<sup>335</sup>

**(iv) *The Special Committee's Charge: "Real Bargaining Power"***

From a litigation standpoint, one of the most important documents when defending a transaction that has utilized a special committee is the board resolution authorizing the special committee and describing the scope of its authority.<sup>336</sup> Obviously, if the board has materially limited the special committee's authority, the work of the special committee will not be given great deference in litigation since the conflicted board will be viewed as having retained ultimate control over

---

adversary"); *Macmillan*, 559 A.2d at 1267-68 (noting that conflicted management, in connection with an MBO transaction, had "intensive contact" with a financial advisor that subsequently was selected by management to advise the special committee).

334. See, e.g., *In re KDI Corp. Shareholders Litig.*, 1990 Del. Ch. LEXIS 201, at \*10, Fed. Sec. L. Rep. (CCH) 95727 (Del. Ch. Dec. 13, 1990) (noting that special committee's financial advisor contacted approximately 100 potential purchasers in addition to evaluating fairness of management's proposal).

335. See *Clements v. Rogers*, 790 A.2d 1222 (Del. Ch. 2001) (court brushing aside criticism of choice of local banker where there was valid business reasons for the selection).

336. See, e.g., *In re Digex, Inc. Shareholders Litig.*, 789 A.2d 1176 (Del. Ch. 2000) (quoting board resolution which described the special committee's role); *Strassburger*, 752 A.2d at 567 (quoting the board resolution authorizing the special committee); *Kahn v. Sullivan*, 594 A.2d at 53 (quoting in full the board resolutions creating the special committee and describing its authority).

the process.<sup>337</sup> Where, however, the special committee is given broad authority and permitted to negotiate the best possible transaction, the special committee's work and business decisions will be accorded substantial deference.<sup>338</sup>

The requisite power of a special committee was addressed initially in *Rabkin v. Olin Corp.*<sup>339</sup> In *Rabkin*, the court noted that the "mere existence of an independent special committee" does not itself shift the burden of proof with respect to the entire fairness standard of review. Rather, the court stated that at least two factors are required:

First, the majority shareholder must not dictate the terms of the merger. Second, the special committee must have real bargaining power that it can exercise with the majority shareholder on an arms length basis. The Hunt special committee was given the narrow mandate of determining the monetary fairness of a non-negotiable offer. [The majority shareholder] dictated the terms of the merger and there were no arm's length negotiations. Unanimous approval by the apparently independent Hunt board suffers from the same infirmities as the special committee. The ultimate burden of showing by a preponderance of the evidence that the merger was entirely fair thus remains with the defendants.<sup>340</sup>

---

337. See, e.g., *Strassburger*, 752 A.2d at 571 (court noting that the "narrow scope" of the committee's assignment was "highly significant" to its finding that the committee was ineffective and would not shift the burden of proof).

338. Compare *Kohls v. Duthie*, 765 A.2d at 1285 (noting the bargaining power, active negotiations and frequent meetings of the special committee and concluding that the special committee process was effective and that defendants would likely prevail at a final hearing) with *International Telecharge, Inc. v. Bomarko, Inc.*, 766 A.2d 437 (Del. 2000) (affirming the trial court's application of the entire fairness standard where the special committee was misinformed and did not engage in meaningful negotiations).

339. 1990 Del. Ch. LEXIS 50, at \*18, Fed. Sec. L. Rep. (CCH) 95255 (Del. Ch. Apr. 17, 1990), reprinted in 16 Del. J. Corp. L. 851 (1991), *aff'd*, 586 A.2d 1202 (Del. 1990) ("*Rabkin*").

340. *Rabkin*, 1990 Del. Ch. LEXIS 50, at \*18-19 (citations omitted); see also *Kahn v. Lynch Comm. Systems, Inc.*, 669 A.2d 79, 82-83 (Del. 1995) ("*Lynch II*") (noting the Supreme Court's approval of the *Rabkin* two-part test).

Even when a committee is active, aggressive and informed, its approval of a transaction will not shift the entire fairness burden of persuasion unless the committee is free to reject the proposed transaction.<sup>341</sup> As the court emphasized in *Lynch I*:

The power to say no is a significant power. It is the duty of directors serving on [an independent] committee to approve only a transaction that is in the best interests of the public shareholders, to say no to any transaction that is not fair to those shareholders and is not the best transaction available. It is not sufficient for such directors to achieve the best price that a fiduciary will pay if that price is not a fair price.<sup>342</sup>

Accordingly, unless the interested party can demonstrate it has “replicated a process ‘as though each of the contending parties had in fact exerted its bargaining power at arm’s length,’ the burden of proving entire fairness will not shift.”<sup>343</sup>

Importantly, if there is any change in the responsibilities of the committee due to, for example, changed circumstances, the authorizing resolution should be amended or otherwise supplemented to reflect the new charge.<sup>344</sup>

- 
341. *Kahn v. Lynch Comm. Systems, Inc.*, 638 A.2d at 1120-21 (“*Lynch I*”) (“[p]articular consideration must be given to evidence of whether the special committee was truly independent, fully informed, and had the freedom to negotiate at arm’s length”); see also *In re First Boston, Inc. Shareholders Litig.*, 1990 Del. Ch. LEXIS 74, at \*20, Fed. Sec. L. Rep. (CCH) 95322 (Del. Ch. June 7, 1990) (holding that although special committee’s options were limited, it retained “the critical power: the power to say no”).
342. *Lynch I*, 638 A.2d at 1119 (quoting *In re First Boston, Inc. Shareholders Litig.*, 1990 Del. Ch. LEXIS 74, at \*20-21, Fed. Sec. L. Rep. (CCH) 95322 (Del. Ch. June 7, 1990)).
343. *Lynch I*, 638 A.2d at 1121 (quoting *Weinberger*, 457 A.2d at 709-710 n.7). See also *In re Digex, Inc. Shareholders Litig.*, 789 A.2d 1176 (Del. Ch. 2000) (inability of special committee to exercise real bargaining power concerning Section 203 issues is fatal to the process).
344. See, e.g., *In re Resorts International Shareholders Litig.*, 570 A.2d 259 (Del. 1990) (where special committee initially considered controlling shareholder’s tender offer and subsequently a competing tender offer and proposed settlements of litigation resulting from offers); *Lynch I*, 638 A.2d at 1113 (noting that the board “revised the mandate of the Independent Committee” in light of tender offer by controlling stockholder).

**(v) *Informed and Active***

A committee with real bargaining power will not cause the burden of persuasion to shift unless the committee exercises that power in an informed and active manner.<sup>345</sup> The concepts of being active and being informed are interrelated. An informed committee will almost necessarily be active and vice versa.<sup>346</sup>

To be informed, the committee necessarily must be knowledgeable with respect to the company's business and advised of, or involved in, ongoing negotiations. To be active, the committee members should be involved in the negotiations or at least communicating frequently with the designated negotiator. In addition, the members should meet frequently with their independent advisors so that they can acquire "critical knowledge of essential aspects of the [transaction]."<sup>347</sup>

Committee members need to rely upon, interact with, and challenge their financial and legal advisors. While reliance is often important and necessary, the committee should not allow an advisor to assume the role of ultimate decision-maker. For example, in *In re Trans World Airlines, Inc. Shareholders Litig.*, the court determined, in connection with a preliminary injunction application, that substantial questions were raised as to the effectiveness of a special committee where the committee misunderstood its role and "relied almost completely upon the efforts of [its financial advisor], both with respect to the evalua-

---

345. See, e.g., *Kahn v. Dairy Mart Convenience Stores, Inc.*, 1996 Del. Ch. LEXIS 38, at \*7 (Del. Ch. March 29, 1996) (despite being advised that its duty was "to seek the best result for the shareholders, the committee never negotiated for a price higher than \$15"); *Strassburger*, 752 A.2d at 567 (finding a special committee ineffective where it did not engage in negotiations and "did not consider all information highly relevant to [the] assignment"); *Clements v. Rogers*, 790 A.2d 1222 (Del. Ch. 2001) (court criticizing a special committee for failing to fully understand the scope of the committee's assignment).

346. *Kahn v. Tremont Corp.*, 694 A.2d at 430.

347. *Id.* at 429-430 (committee member's "absence from all meetings with advisors or fellow committee members, rendered him ill-suited as a defender of the interests of minority shareholders in the dynamics of fast moving negotiations"). See also *Macmillan*, 559 A.2d at 1268 n.9 (in case where special committee had no burden-shifting effect, court noted that one committee member "failed to attend a single meeting of the Committee"); *Strassburger*, 752 A.2d at 557 (finding an ineffective committee where its sole member did not engage in negotiations and had less than complete information).

tion of the fairness of the price offered and with respect to such negotiations as occurred.”<sup>348</sup>

Similarly, in *Mills Acquisition Co. v. MacMillan, Inc.*,<sup>349</sup> the court criticized the independent directors for failing to diligently oversee an auction process conducted by the company’s investment advisor that indirectly involved members of management. In this regard, the court stated:

Without board planning and oversight to insulate the self-interested management from improper access to the bidding process, and to ensure the proper conduct of the auction by truly independent advisors selected by, and answerable only to, the independent directors, the legal complications which a challenged transaction faces under [enhanced judicial scrutiny] are unnecessarily intensified.<sup>350</sup>

### ***c. Significant Recent Process Cases***

(24) *In re Tele-Communications, Inc. Shareholders Litig.*,<sup>351</sup> the Chancery Court denied defendants motion for summary judgment on several claims arising out of the 1999 merger of Tele-Communications, Inc. (“TCI”) with AT&T Corp in large part because the defendants failed to adequately show that a special committee of the TCI board of directors formed to consider the merger proposal was truly independent, fully informed and had the freedom to negotiate at arm’s length in a manner sufficient to shift the burden of proving entire fairness of a transaction providing a premium to a class or series of high-vote stock over a class or series of low-vote stock. Citing *FLS Holdings*<sup>352</sup> and *Reader’s Digest*,<sup>353</sup> the Chancery Court in *Tele-Communications* found that entire fairness should apply because “a clear and significant benefit . . . accrued primarily . . . to directors controlling a large vote of the corporation, at the expense of

---

348. 1988 Del. Ch. LEXIS 139, at \*12, \*22 (Del. Ch. Oct. 21, 1988) *reprinted in* 14 Del. J. Corp. L. 870 (1989).

349. 559 A.2d at 1281.

350. *Id.* at 1282.

351. C.A. No. 16470, Chandler, C. (Del. Ch. Dec. 21, 2005, revised January 10, 2006).

352. *In re FLS Holdings, Inc. S’holders Litig.*, 1993 WL 104562 (Del. Ch. Apr. 21, 1993).

353. *Leuco Alternative Fund Ltd. v. Reader’s Digest Ass’n, Inc.*, 803 A.2d 428 (Del. 2002).

another class of shareholders to whom was owed a fiduciary duty.”<sup>354</sup> Alternatively, the Court concluded that a majority of the TCI directors were interested in the transaction because they each received a material benefit from the premium accorded to the high vote shares.

In reaching the decision that the defendants failed to demonstrate fair dealing and fair price, the Chancery Court found, based on a review of the evidence in a light most favorable to the plaintiffs, the following special committee process flaws:

- *The Choice of Special Committee Directors.* The special committee consisted of two directors, one of whom held high vote shares and gained an additional \$1.4 million as result of the premium paid on those shares, to serve on the special committee. This flaw appears to be of particular importance to the Court’s decision and contributed to the other flaws in the committee process.
- *The Lack of a Clear Mandate.* One committee member believed the special committee’s job was to represent the interests of the holders of the low vote shares, while the other member believed the special committee’s job was to protect the interests of all of the stockholders.

---

354. C.A. No. 16470, Chandler, C. (Del. Ch. Dec. 21, 2005, revised January 10, 2006); *In re LNR Property Corp. Shareholder Litigation* (Del. Ch., Consolidated C.A. No. 674-N, November 4, 2005), in which the Chancery Court held that minority shareholders who were cashed out in a merger negotiated by the controlling shareholder – who also ended up with a 20 percent stake in the purchaser – stated allegations sufficient to warrant application of the entire-fairness standard of review and wrote: “When a controlling shareholder stands on both sides of a transaction, he or she is required to demonstrate his or her utmost good faith and most scrupulous inherent fairness of the bargain.” The shareholders further alleged that LNR’s board of directors breached its fiduciary duties by allowing the controlling stockholder and the CEO, who had “obvious and disabling conflicts of interest,” to negotiate the deal. Although the board formed a special independent committee to consider the deal, plaintiffs alleged, the committee was a “sham” because it was “dominated and controlled” by the controlling stockholder and the CEO, and was not permitted to negotiate with the buyer or seek other deals. Additionally, the shareholders claimed that the committee failed to get an independent evaluation of the deal, but relied on a financial advisor that worked with the controlling stockholder and the CEO to negotiate the deal, and that stood to gain an \$11 million commission when the transaction was completed.

- *The Choice of Advisors.* The special committee did not retain separate legal and financial advisors, and chose to use the TCI advisors. Moreover, the Court criticized the contingent nature of the fee paid to the financial advisors, which amounted to approximately \$40 million, finding that such a fee created “a serious issue of material fact, as to whether [the financial advisors] could provide independent advice to the Special Committee.” While it agreed with TCI’s assertion that TCI had no interest in paying advisor fees absent a deal, the Court wrote:

A special committee does have an interest in bearing the upfront cost of an independent and objective financial advisor. A contingently paid and possibly interested financial advisor might be more convenient and cheaper absent a deal, but its potentially misguided recommendations could result in even higher costs to the special committee’s shareholder constituency in the event a deal was consummated.

Since the advisors were hired to advise TCI in connection with the transaction, a question arises as to whether the Court’s concerns about the contingent nature of the fee would have been mitigated if a special committee comprised of clearly disinterested and independent directors hired independent advisors and agreed to a contingent fee that created appropriate incentives.

- *Diligence of Research and Fairness Opinion.* The special committee lacked complete information about the premium at which the high vote shares historically traded and precedent transactions involving high vote stocks. The Court noted that the plaintiffs had presented evidence that showed that the high vote shares had traded at a 10% premium or more only for “a single five-trading day interval.” The Court did not find it persuasive that the financial advisor supported the payment of the premium by reference to a call option agreement between the TCI CEO and TCI that allowed TCI to purchase the TCI CEO’s high vote shares for a 10% premium, expressing concern about the arm’s length nature of

that transaction. The Court stated that the special committee should have asked the financial advisor for more information about the precedent transactions, including information concerning the prevalence of the payment of a premium to high-vote stock over low-vote stock. By contrast, the Court noted that the plaintiffs had presented evidence suggesting that a significantly higher number of precedent transactions provided no premium for high-vote stock, and neither the special committee nor its financial advisors considered the fairness of the 10% premium paid on the high vote shares:

In the present transaction, the Special Committee failed to examine, and [its financial advisors] failed to opine upon, the fairness of the [high vote] premium to the [low vote] holders. [The financial advisors] provided only separate analyses of the fairness of the respective exchange ratios to each corresponding class. The [*Reader's Digest*] Court mandated more than separate analyses that blindly ignore the preferences another class might be receiving, and with good intuitive reason: such a doctrine of separate analyses would have allowed a fairness opinion in our case even if the [high vote] holders enjoyed a 110% premium over the [low vote] holders, as long as the [low vote] holders enjoyed a thirty-seven percent premium over the market price. Entire fairness requires an examination of the fairness of such exorbitant premiums to the prices received by the [low vote] holders. This is not to say that the premium received by the [low vote] holders is irrelevant—obviously, it must be balanced with the fairness and magnitude of the 10% [high vote] premium.

- *Result is Lack of Arm's Length Bargaining.* All of the above factors led to a flawed special committee process that created an “inhospitable” environment for arm's length bargaining. The Court found that the unclear mandate, the unspecified compensation plan and the special committee's lack of information regarding historical trading prices of the high



vote shares and the precedent merger transactions were relevant to concluding that the process did not result in arm's length bargaining.

(25) In *Gesoff v. IIC Indus. Inc.*,<sup>355</sup> the Court of Chancery made clear that in evaluating whether a going private transaction is entirely fair (or whether the burden of proving entire fairness should be shifted to the plaintiff), it will examine the composition of, and the process undertaken by, an independent committee closely for indicators of fairness. In *Gesoff*, the board of CP Holdings Limited (“CP”), an English holding company owning approximately 80% of IIC Industries Inc. (“IIC”), determined IIC should be taken private by way of a tender offer followed by a short-form merger. The IIC board appointed a special committee consisting of one member, and formally authorized him to present a recommendation to the IIC board as to the CP tender offer. After some review, the one-person committee approved the tender offer transaction, but the tender offer ultimately failed to provide CP with 90% of the outstanding stock, and CP thereafter instituted a long-form merger. Although no new fairness opinion was sought for the long-form merger, the special committee member supported the transaction. Following the consummation of the transaction, minority stockholders sued, claiming the transaction was not entirely fair and also seeking appraisal.

The Chancery Court evaluated the formation and actions of the special committee to determine whether the process taken with regard to the tender offer and merger was entirely fair. The Chancery Court stated that members of such a committee must be independent and willing to perform their job throughout the entire negotiation, and further indicated that committees should typically be composed of more than one director.

The Chancery Court also reiterated the importance of a committee's mandate, stating that a committee should have a clear understanding of its duties and powers, and should be given the power not only to fully evaluate the transaction, but also to say “no” to the transaction. Although the language of the resolution granting the committee member power in this case was fairly broad (he was given the authority to appoint outside auditors and counsel, and was further authorized to spend up to \$100,000 for a fairness opinion), the Chancery

---

355. C.A. Nos. 19473, 19600 (Del. Ch. May 18, 2006)

Court stated that the evidence indicated that his authority was closely circumscribed and that he was deeply confused regarding the structure of the transaction.

The Chancery Court was also critical of the committee's choice of financial and legal advisors, as these advisors were essentially handpicked by CP and the conflicted IIC board. The committee member accepted the appointment of a lawyer recommended by CP management who also served as IIC's outside counsel, was beholden for his job to a board dominated by CP, and had been advising CP on the tender offer. The Chancery Court stated that no reasonable observer would have believed that this attorney was appropriate independent counsel.

Evidence at trial showed that the investment bank retained by the independent committee pitched itself to the committee member prior to his receipt of authority to hire advisors, and that a member of CP's management (who had a prior relationship with the banker) emailed the banker saying he was close to having the bank "signed up" as an advisor to the committee. The committee member, relying on advice of his conflicted legal counsel, then appointed the banker without speaking to any other candidates for the position. Moreover, throughout negotiations, the banker kept CP informed of all of the committee's private valuations, essentially giving the company the upper hand in negotiations. The Chancery Court was also particularly troubled by an email between the committee's lawyer and banker and CP's management describing an orchestrated negotiation process that foreshadowed the negotiation structure that eventually occurred, and found this to be clear evidence that the negotiations were constructed by CP and were thus not at arm's-length.

Having found the process unfair, the Chancery Court then determined that the price paid was also unfair, but found that the committee member was protected by the limitation of liability provision found in IIC's charter (as permitted by DGCL § 102(b)(7)).

(26) The importance of procedural safeguards was again emphasized in *Oliver v. Boston University*,<sup>356</sup> and in particular, the Court of Chancery focused on the lack of a representative for the minority stockholders in merger negotiations. Boston University ("BU") was the controlling stockholder of Seragen, Inc. ("Seragen"), a financially troubled biotechnology company.

---

356. C.A. No. 16570 (Del. Ch. Apr. 14, 2006)

After going public in 1992, Seragen entered into a number of transactions in order to address its desperate need for capital, and eventually agreed to a merger with Ligand Pharmaceuticals, Inc. (“*Ligand*”). A group of minority stockholders brought a series of claims challenging the transactions preceding the merger and the process by which the merger proceeds were allocated to the respective classes.

The Chancery Court discussed whether the potential derivative claims arising from various transactions preceding the merger were properly valued by the defendants in merger negotiations. Noting that Seragen’s board effectively ignored these claims and that the negotiations and approval of these transactions were procedurally flawed because no safeguards were employed to protect the minority, the Court nonetheless found that these potential claims had no actual value.

The Chancery Court then turned to whether the allocation of merger proceeds was entirely fair, focusing on the company’s failure to take steps to protect the minority, and stated:

The Director Defendants treated the merger allocation negotiations with a surprising degree of informality, and, as with many of Seragen’s transactions reviewed here, no steps were taken to ensure fairness to the minority common shareholders. More disturbing is that, although representatives of all of the priority stakeholders were involved to some degree in the negotiations, no representative negotiated on behalf of the minority common shareholders. . . . Clearly the process implementing these negotiations was severely flawed and no person acted to protect the interests of the minority common shareholders.

Although the derivative claims had been found to have no value, the Chancery Court held that the allocation of merger proceeds was unfair due to both the lack of procedures to ensure its fairness and because the price was also found to be unfair. After so holding, the Chancery Court went on to dispose of the plaintiffs’ disclosure, voting power dilution, and aiding and abetting claims.

#### ***D. Value of Thorough Deliberation***

The Delaware cases repeatedly emphasize the importance of the process followed by directors in addressing a takeover

proposal. The Delaware courts have frowned upon board decision-making that is done hastily or without prior preparation. Counsel should be careful to formulate and document a decision-making process that will withstand judicial review from this perspective.

Early in the process the board should be advised by counsel as to the applicable legal standards and the concerns expressed by the courts that are presented in similar circumstances. Distribution of a memorandum from counsel can be particularly helpful in this regard. Management should provide the latest financial and strategic information available concerning the corporation and its prospects. If a sale is contemplated or the corporation may be put "in play," investment bankers should be retained to advise concerning comparable transactions and market conditions, provide an evaluation of the proposal in accordance with current industry standards, and, if requested, render a fairness opinion concerning the transaction before it is finally approved by the board. The board should meet several times, preferably in person, to review reports from management and outside advisors, learn the progress of the transaction and provide guidance. Directors should receive reports and briefing information sufficiently before meetings so that they can be studied and evaluated. Directors should be active in questioning and analyzing the information and advice received from management and outside advisors. A summary of the material provisions of the merger agreement should be prepared for the directors and explained by counsel.<sup>357</sup>

(27) In *Van Gorkom*,<sup>358</sup> the Trans Union board approved the proposed merger at a meeting without receiving notice of the purpose of the meeting, no investment banker was invited to advise the board, and the proposed agreement was not available before the meeting and was not reviewed by directors. This action contributed to the court's conclusion that the board was grossly negligent.

(28) In *Technicolor*,<sup>359</sup> notice of a special board meeting to discuss and approve an acquisition proposal involving interested management was given to members of the board only one day prior to the meeting, and it did not disclose the purpose of

---

357. See, e.g., *Moore Corp. Ltd. v. Wallace Computer Services, Inc.*, 907 F. Supp. 1545 (D. Del. 1995) for an in depth description of a decision-making process that withstood review under enhanced scrutiny.

358. 488 A.2d 858.

359. 634 A.2d 345.

the meeting. Board members were not informed of the potential sale of the corporation prior to the meeting, and it was questioned whether the documents were available for the directors' review at the meeting.

(29) In contrast is *Time*,<sup>360</sup> where the board met often to discuss the adequacy of Paramount's offer and the outside directors met frequently without management, officers or directors.<sup>361</sup>

### ***E. The Decision to Remain Independent***

A board may determine to reject an unsolicited proposal. It is not required to exchange the benefits of its long-term corporate strategy for short-term gain. However, like other decisions in the takeover context, the decisions to "say no" must be adequately informed. The information to be gathered and the process to be followed in reaching a decision to remain independent will vary with the facts and circumstances, but in the final analysis the board should seek to develop reasonable support for its decision.

A common ground for rejection is that the proposal is inadequate. Moreover, the proposal may not reflect the value of recent or anticipated corporate strategy. Another ground is that continued independence is thought to maximize shareholder value. Each of these reasons seems founded on information about the value of the corporation and points to the gathering of information concerning value.

A decision based on the inadequacy of the proposal or the desirability of continuing a pre-existing business strategy is subject to the business judgment rule, in the absence of the contemporaneous adoption of defensive measures or another re-

---

360. 571 A.2d 1140.

361. *See also Moran v. Household International, Inc.*, 500 A.2d 1346 (Del. 1985), where (i) before considering a rights plan as a preventative mechanism to ward off future advance, the board received material on the potential takeover problem and the proposed plan, (ii) independent investment bankers and counsel attended the board meeting to advise the directors, and (iii) ten of the board's sixteen members were outside directors; and *MSB Bancorp*, 1998 WL 409355, where during the period in question, the board met weekly, considered the offers, consulted with its legal and financial advisors, and then made its conclusion as to which offer to pursue. For a summary of guidelines for counsel to develop a suitable process for the board's deliberations, *see* Frankle, *Counseling the Board of Directors in Exploring Alternatives*, 1101 PLI/Corp. 261 (1998).

sponse that proposes an alternative means to realize shareholder value.<sup>362</sup> Defensive measures are subject to enhanced scrutiny, with its burden on the directors to demonstrate reasonableness. An alternative transaction can raise an issue as to whether the action should be reviewed as essentially a defensive measure. Moreover, the decision not to waive the operation of a poison pill or the protection of a state business combination statute such as DGCL § 203 can be viewed as defensive.<sup>363</sup> A merger agreement that requires the merger to be submitted to shareholders, even if the board has withdrawn its recommendation of the merger, as permitted by DGCL § 146, may also be analyzed as defensive. In any case, and especially where it is likely that the suitor or a shareholder will turn unfriendly, the authorized response should be based on a developed record that demonstrates its reasonableness.

### ***1. Judicial Respect for Independence***

Delaware cases have acknowledged that directors may reject an offer that is inadequate or reach an informed decision to remain independent. In a number of prominent cases, the Delaware courts have endorsed the board's decision to remain independent:

a. In *Time*,<sup>364</sup> the Delaware Supreme Court validated the actions of Time's board in the face of an all-shares cash offer

---

362. Whether the standards of review for a decision to remain independent are the same in the face of a cash bid that potentially involves "Revlon duties" or a stock transaction that does not is unsettled. Compare, e.g., Wachtell, Lipton, Rosen & Katz, *Takeover Law and Practice*, 1212 PLI/Corp. 801, 888, citing no authority: "If the proposal calls for a transaction that does not involve a change in control within the meaning of QVC, it would appear that the traditional business judgment rule would apply to the directors' decision. If the acquisition proposal calls for a transaction that would involve a change within the meaning of QVC, the enhanced-scrutiny *Unocal* test would apply." Such a conclusion would subject all director decisions to a reasonableness standard merely because of what transaction has been proposed. In *Time*, 571 A.2d 1140, however, the Delaware Supreme Court suggested that a well-informed, fully independent board ought to be accorded more deference than this where it has not initiated a sale, even though the consideration for the sale presents advantages that are reasonable. On the other hand, in practice, it may be difficult to avoid the defensive responses to a proposal, which would involve a reasonableness review, where the bidder is persistent.

363. See e.g., *Moore*, 907 F. Supp. at 1556 (failure to redeem poison pill defensive).

364. 571 A.2d 1140.

from Paramount. The board had concluded that the corporation's purchase of Warner "offered a greater long-term value for the stockholders and, unlike Paramount's offer, did not pose a threat to Time's survival and its 'culture'."<sup>365</sup> In approving these actions, the court determined that the board, which "was adequately informed of the potential benefits of a transaction with Paramount," did not have to abandon its plans for corporate development in order to provide the shareholders with the option to realize an immediate control premium.<sup>366</sup> "Time's board was under no obligation to negotiate with Paramount."<sup>367</sup> According to the court, this conclusion was consistent with long-standing Delaware law: "We have repeatedly stated that the refusal to entertain an offer may comport with a valid exercise of a board's business judgment."<sup>368</sup>

b. In *Unitrin*,<sup>369</sup> the Delaware Supreme Court considered defensive actions taken by Unitrin's board in response to American General's overtures. The board rejected the offer as financially inadequate and presenting antitrust complications, but did not adopt defensive measures to protect against a hostile bid until American General issued a press release announcing the offer.<sup>370</sup> Unitrin's board viewed the resulting increase in Unitrin's stock price as a suggestion that speculative traders or arbitrageurs were buying up Unitrin stock and concluded that the announcement constituted a "hostile act designed to coerce the sale of Unitrin at an inadequate price."<sup>371</sup> In response, the board adopted a poison pill and an advance notice bylaw provision for shareholder proposals.<sup>372</sup> The directors then adopted a repurchase program for Unitrin's stock.<sup>373</sup> The directors owned 23% of the stock and did not participate in the repurchase program.<sup>374</sup> This increased their percentage ownership and made approval of a business combination with a shareholder without director participation more difficult.<sup>375</sup> The Delaware Court of

---

365. *Id.* at 1149.

366. *Id.* at 1154.

367. *Id.*

368. *Id.* at 1152 (citing *Macmillan*, 559 A.2d at 1285 n.35; *Van Gorkom*, 448 A.2d at 881; and *Pogostin v. Rice*, 480 A.2d 619, 627 (Del. 1984).

369. 651 A.2d 1361.

370. *Id.* at 1370.

371. *Id.*

372. *Id.*

373. *Id.* at 1370-71.

374. *Id.* at 1370.

375. *Id.* at 1371-72.

Chancery ruled that the poison pill was a proportionate defensive response to American General's offer, but that the repurchase plan exceeded what was necessary to protect shareholders from a low bid. The poison pill was not directly at issue when the Delaware Supreme Court reviewed the case. The Supreme Court determined that the Court of Chancery used an incorrect legal standard and substituted its own business judgment for that of the board.<sup>376</sup> The Supreme Court remanded to the Court of Chancery to reconsider the repurchase plan and determine whether it, along with the other defensive measures, was preclusive or coercive and, if not, "within the range of reasonable defensive measures available to the Board."<sup>377</sup>

c. In *Revlon*,<sup>378</sup> the Delaware Supreme Court looked favorably on the board's initial rejection of Pantry Pride's offer and its adoption of a rights plan in the face of a hostile takeover at a price it deemed inadequate.<sup>379</sup> The court did not suggest that Revlon's board had a duty to negotiate or shop the company before it "became apparent to all that the break-up of the company was inevitable" and the board authorized negotiation of a deal, thus recognizing that the company was for sale.<sup>380</sup>

d. In *Desert Partners*,<sup>381</sup> the court approved the USG board's refusal to redeem a poison pill to hinder an inadequate hostile offer and noted that the board had no duty to negotiate where it had neither put the company up for sale nor entertained a bidding contest.<sup>382</sup> "Once a Board decides to maintain a company's independence, Delaware law does not require a board of directors to put their company on the auction block or assist a potential acquiror to formulate an adequate takeover bid."<sup>383</sup>

e. In *MSB Bancorp*,<sup>384</sup> the Delaware Chancery Court upheld the Board's decision to purchase branches of another bank in furtherance of its long-held business strategy rather than to negotiate an unsolicited merger offer that would result in short-

---

376. *Id.* at 1389.

377. *Id.* at 1390.

378. 506 A.2d 173.

379. *Id.* at 180-81.

380. *Id.* at 182.

381. 686 F. Supp. 1289 (applying Delaware law).

382. *Id.* at 1300.

383. *Id.* at 1300.

384. 1998 WL 409355.



term gain to the shareholders.<sup>385</sup> In reaching its conclusion, the Chancery Court applied the business judgment rule because it determined that there was no defensive action taken by the Board in merely voting not to negotiate the unsolicited merger offer which did not fit within its established long-term business plan.<sup>386</sup>

## 2. *Defensive Measures*

When a Board makes a decision to reject an offer considered inadequate, the Board may adopt defensive measures in case the suitor becomes unfriendly. Such a response will be subjected to the proportionality test of *Unocal*, that the responsive action taken is reasonable in relation to the threat posed.<sup>387</sup> This test was further refined in *Unitrin* to make clear that defensive techniques that are “coercive” or “preclusive” will not be considered to satisfy the proportionality test:

An examination of the cases applying *Unocal* reveals a direct correlation between findings of proportionality or disproportionality and the judicial determination of whether a defensive response was draconian because it was either coercive or preclusive in character. In *Time*, for example, [the Delaware Supreme Court] concluded that the Time board’s defensive response was reasonable and proportionate since it was not aimed at ‘cramming down’ on its shareholders a management-sponsored alternative, i.e., was not coercive, and because it did not preclude Paramount from making an offer for the combined Time-Warner Company, i.e., was not preclusive.<sup>388</sup>

In *Moran*,<sup>389</sup> the Delaware Supreme Court considered a shareholder rights plan adopted by Household International not during a takeover contest, “but as a preventive mechanism to ward off future advances.”<sup>390</sup> The court upheld the pre-planned poison pill but noted that the approval was not absolute.<sup>391</sup> When the board “is faced with a tender offer and a request to redeem the [rights plan], they will not be able to arbitrarily reject the offer. They will be held to the same fiduciary standards

---

385. *Id.* at \*4.

386. *Id.* at \*3.

387. *See, e.g., Quickturn*, 721 A.2d at 1290.

388. *Unitrin*, 651 A.2d at 1387 (citations omitted).

389. 500 A.2d 1346.

390. *Id.* at 1349.

391. *Id.* at 1354.

any other board of directors would be held to in deciding to adopt a defensive mechanism.”<sup>392</sup>

## ***F. The Pursuit of a Sale***

When a board decides to pursue a sale of the corporation (involving a sale of control within the meaning of *QVC*), whether on its own initiative or in response to a friendly suitor, it must “seek the best value reasonably available to the stockholders.”<sup>393</sup> As the Delaware Supreme Court stated in *Technicolor*: “[I]n the review of a transaction involving a sale of a company, the directors have the burden of establishing that the price offered was the highest value reasonably available under the circumstances.”<sup>394</sup>

### ***1. Value to Stockholders***

In *Revlon*, the Delaware Supreme Court imposed an affirmative duty on the board to seek the highest value reasonably available to the shareholders when a sale became inevitable.<sup>395</sup> The duty established in *Revlon* has been considered by the Delaware courts on numerous occasions, and was restated in *QVC*. According to the Delaware Supreme Court in *QVC*, the duty to seek the highest value reasonably available is imposed on a board in the following situations:

Under Delaware law there are, generally speaking and without excluding other possibilities, two circumstances which may implicate *Revlon* duties. The first, and clearer one, is when a corporation initiates an active bidding process seeking to sell itself or to effect a business reorganization involving a clear break-up of the company. However, *Revlon* duties may also be triggered where, in response to a bidder’s offer, a target abandons its long-term strategy and seeks an alterna-

---

392. *Id.* See also *Moore*, 907 F. Supp. 1545; *Desert Partners*, 686 F. Supp. 1289; *Unitrin*, 651 A.2d 1361; *Ivanhoe Partners v. Newmont Mining Corp.*, 535 A.2d 1334 (Del. 1987); and *Revlon*, 506 A.2d 173, where the court considered favorably a board’s defensive measures to protect its decision to remain independent.

393. *QVC*, 637 A.2d at 48; see also *Matador*, 729 A.2d at 290.

394. *Technicolor*, 634 A.2d at 361.

395. See *Revlon*, 506 A.2d 173.

tive transaction involving the break-up of the company.<sup>396</sup>

[W]hen a corporation undertakes a transaction which will cause: (a) a change in corporate control; or (b) a break-up of the corporate entity, the directors' obligation is to seek the best value reasonably available to the stockholders.<sup>397</sup>

The principles of *Revlon* are applicable to corporations which are not public companies.<sup>398</sup> Directors' *Revlon* duties to secure the highest value reasonably attainable apply not only in the context of break-up, but also in a change in control.<sup>399</sup>

## 2. *Ascertaining Value*

When the *Revlon* decision was first announced by the Delaware Supreme Court, many practitioners read the decision to mandate an auction by a target company in order to satisfy the board's fiduciary duties (the so-called "*Revlon duties*").<sup>400</sup> After interpreting *Revlon* in *Barkan*, *Macmillan*, *Time*, *Technicolor*, and *QVC*, however, the Delaware Supreme Court has clearly indicated that an auction is not the only way to satisfy the board's fiduciary duties. As the court in *Barkan* stated:

*Revlon* does not demand that every change in the control of a Delaware corporation be preceded by a heated bidding contest. *Revlon* is merely one of an unbroken line of cases that seek to prevent the conflicts of interest that arise in the field of mergers and acquisitions by demanding that directors act with scrupulous concern for fairness to shareholders.<sup>401</sup>

---

396. *QVC*, 637 A.2d at 47 (citation omitted).

397. *Id.* at 48.

398. *See Cirrus Holding v. Cirrus Ind.*, 794 A.2d 1191 (Del Ch. 2001).

399. *Cirrus Holding v. Cirrus Ind.*, 794 A.2d 1191 (Del Ch. 2001); *McMillan v. Intercago Corp.*, 768 A.2d 492, 502 (Del. Ch. 2000); *see also Krim v. ProNet, Inc.*, 744 A.2d 523 (Del. 1999) (Delaware law requires that once a change of control of a company is inevitable the board must assume the role of an auctioneer in order to maximize shareholder value).

400. *See McBride, Revisiting Delaware Law and Mergers and Acquisitions: The Impact of QVC v. Paramount*, 2 PLI Course Handbook, 26th Ann. Inst. on Sec. Reg. 86 (1994).

401. *Barkan*, 567 A.2d at 1286.

One court has noted that when the board is negotiating with a single suitor and has no reliable grounds upon which to judge the fairness of the offer, a canvas of the market is necessary to determine if the board can elicit higher bids.<sup>402</sup> However, the Delaware Supreme Court held in *Barkan* that when the directors “possess a body of reliable evidence with which to evaluate the fairness of a transaction, they may approve that transaction without conducting an active survey of the market.”<sup>403</sup>

The following cases indicate situations in which a board was not required to engage in an active survey of the market. Most involve one-on-one friendly negotiations without other bidders, although in some the target had earlier discussions with other potential bidders.

a. In *Barkan*,<sup>404</sup> the corporation had been put “in play” by the actions of an earlier bidder.<sup>405</sup> Instead of taking an earlier offer, the corporation instituted a management buyout (the “MBO”) through an employee stock ownership program.<sup>406</sup> In holding that the board did not have to engage in a market survey to meet its burden of informed decision-making in good faith, the court listed the following factors: (i) potential suitors had ten months to make some sort of offer (due to early announcements), (ii) the MBO offered unique tax advantages to the corporation that led the board to believe that no outside offer would be as advantageous to the shareholders, (iii) the board had the benefit of the advice of investment bankers, and (iv) the trouble the corporation had financing the MBO, indicating that the corporation would be unattractive to potential suitors.<sup>407</sup> In holding that an active market check was not necessary, however, the court sounded a note of caution:

The evidence that will support a finding of good faith in the absence of some sort of market test is by nature circumstantial; therefore, its evaluation by a court must be open-textured. However, the crucial element supporting a finding of good faith is knowledge. It

---

402. *In re Fort Howard Corp. Shareholders Litig.*, 1988 WL 83147 (Del. Ch. 1988).

403. *Barkan*, 567 A.2d at 1287.

404. 567 A.2d 1279 (Del. 1989).

405. *Id.* at 1287.

406. *Id.* at 1282-83.

407. *Id.* at 1287-88.

must be clear that the board had sufficient knowledge of relevant markets to form the basis for its belief that it acted in the best interests of the shareholders. *The situations in which a completely passive approach to acquiring such knowledge is appropriate are limited.*<sup>408</sup>

b. In *In re Vitalink*,<sup>409</sup> Vitalink entered a merger agreement with Network Systems Corporation.<sup>410</sup> While Vitalink had also conducted earlier discussions with two other companies, the court found that Vitalink had not discussed valuation with those two companies, and thus did not effectively canvas the market.<sup>411</sup> In holding that the Vitalink board nevertheless met its burden of showing that it acted in an informed manner in good faith, the court looked at the following factors: (i) no bidder came forward in the 45 days that passed between the public announcement of the merger and its closing; (ii) the parties negotiated for a number of months; (iii) the board had the benefit of a fairness opinion from its investment banker; and (iv) the investment banker's fee was structured to provide it an incentive to find a buyer who would pay a higher price.<sup>412</sup>

As the Delaware Supreme Court noted in *Van Gorkom*, failure to take appropriate action to be adequately informed as to a transaction violates the board's duty of due care.(footnote) Without a firm blueprint to build adequate information, however, the passive market check entails a risk of being judged as "doing nothing" to check the market or assess value.<sup>413</sup>

c. *In re MONY Group Inc. Shareholder Litigation*<sup>414</sup> involved stockholders seeking a preliminary injunction against a stockholder vote on the merger of MONY with AXA. The stockholders of MONY alleged that the defendant board, having decided to put MONY up for sale, did not fulfill its *Revlon* duty to seek the best transaction reasonably available to the stockholders, by forgoing a pre-agreement auction in favor of a process involving a single-bidder negotiation followed by a post-agreement market check. The stockholders challenged (i) the board's

---

408. *Id.* at 1288 (emphasis added).

409. 1991 WL 238816.

410. *Id.* at \*3-4.

411. *Id.* at \*7.

412. *Id.* at \*11-12.

413. *See Barkan*, 567 A.2d at 1287 (there is no single method that a board must employ to become informed).

414. *In re MONY Group Inc. S'holder Litig.*, 852 A.2d 9 (Del. Ch. 2004).

decision that the resulting negotiated merger proposal was the best proposal reasonably available, (ii) the adequacy of the market check utilized and (iii) the adequacy of disclosures made in a proxy statement sent to the stockholders seeking their approval of the merger. The court granted a limited injunction relating solely to proxy statement disclosures concerning payments under certain change-in-control agreements, but denied the request for a preliminary injunction on the allegations as to the failure to get the best transaction.

The MONY board recognized that MONY had a number of problems and had received a report from its investment banker listing a number of companies, including AXA, that might acquire MONY. The board considered and rejected the idea of publicly auctioning MONY out of concern that a failed auction would expose MONY's weaknesses and provide competitors with information they could use to raid MONY's insurance agents. Accordingly, the board instructed the CEO to quietly explore merger opportunities. After hearing the MONY CEO's report of his meeting with the AXA CEO and of prior discussions with other potential partners, the MONY board authorized solicitations of interest from AXA, but not from any other potential bidder.

AXA initially proposed a price of \$26 to \$26.50 per MONY share, which led to negotiations over several months that involved allowing AXA access to confidential information under a confidentiality agreement. During these negotiations, the MONY CEO advised AXA the MONY change in control agreements would cost the survivor about \$120 million. After a period of negotiation, AXA proposed to acquire MONY for \$28.50 per share, an aggregate of about \$1.368 billion, but later AXA determined that the change in control agreements would actually cost about \$163 million, not \$120 million, and it lowered its offer to \$26.50 per share or \$1.272 billion. At the end of these negotiations, the MONY board rejected a stock-for-stock merger with AXA that purported to reflect the \$26.50 per share price by a fixed share exchange ratio that was collared between \$17 and \$37 per MONY share. The board also concluded that the change in control agreements were too rich and that AXA's offer price would have been higher if it had not been for the change in control agreements.

Shortly after the AXA offer was rejected, the MONY board engaged a compensation consultant to analyze the change in control agreements and received a report that change in control

agreements costs typically range from 1% to 3% of a proposed transaction price (and sometimes up to 5%), but that MONY's change in control agreements represented 15% of the previously proposed AXA merger price. Ultimately, the board informed senior management that it would not renew the change in control agreements when they expired, and offered management new change in control agreements that lowered the payout provisions to between 5% and 7% of the AXA transaction's value, which the management parties accepted.

Two months later, the AXA CEO contracted the MONY CEO to ask if MONY would be interested in an all-cash transaction, but the board would not permit the MONY CEO to engage in sale negotiations until the change in control agreements had been amended, thus postponing the talks. When the AXA CEO then made an offer of \$29.50 cash per MONY share, the MONY CEO informed him that the change in control agreements had been modified and that the offer should be \$1.50 higher to reflect the change. At the end of this round of negotiations, a merger agreement was signed, providing for the payment of \$31 cash for each MONY share and a negotiated provision allowing MONY to pay a dividend of \$0.25 per share before the merger was consummated. The merger consideration reflected a 7.3% premium to MONY's then-current trading price, as well as valuing MONY's equity at \$1.5 billion and the total transaction (including liabilities assumed) at \$2.1 billion.

MONY accepted a broad "window shop" provision and a fiduciary-out termination clause which required MONY to pay AXA a termination fee equal to 3.3% of the equity value and 2.4% of the transaction value. In the several months following the announcement of the merger agreement, no one made a competing proposal, although there was one expression of interest if the AXA deal failed.

The plaintiff stockholders claimed that the MONY board breached its fiduciary duties under *Revlon* by failing to procure the best possible price for MONY, presumably through a public auction. Citing *Revlon* and *QVC*, the court found that the consequences of a sale of control imposed special obligations on the directors, particularly the obligation of acting reasonably to seek the transaction offering the best value reasonably available for stockholders (i.e., getting the best short-term price for stockholders), but that these requirements did not demand that every change of control be preceded by a heated bidding contest, noting that a board could fulfill its duty to obtain the best trans-

action reasonably available by entering into a merger agreement with a single bidder, establishing a “floor” for the transaction, and then testing the transaction with a post-agreement market check. The court wrote that the traditional inquiry was whether the board was adequately informed and acted in good faith. Furthermore, in the sale of control context this inquiry was heightened such that the directors had the burden of proving that they were adequately informed and acted reasonably, with the court scrutinizing the adequacy of the decision-making process, including the information on which the directors based their decision and the reasonableness of the directors’ action in light of the circumstances then existing. The question was whether the directors made a reasonable decision, not a perfect decision. If a board selected one of several reasonable alternatives, the court should not second-guess that choice even though it might have decided otherwise or subsequent events might have cast doubt on the board’s determination.

The plaintiffs argued that the board relied too much upon the MONY CEO to determine and explore alternatives, and in doing so that it had breached its fiduciary duties, since the CEO and other members of MONY senior management stood to gain excessive payments under the change in control agreements if MONY was sold. With respect to the plaintiff stockholders argument that the board should have established a special committee to continue negotiations with AXA, the court held that a board could rely on the CEO to conduct negotiations and that the involvement of an investment bank in the negotiations was not required, particularly since the board actively supervised the CEO’s negotiations and the CEO had acted diligently in securing improvements for MONY. The court further noted that the board had repeatedly demonstrated its independence and control, first in rejecting the stock for stock transaction and second in reducing the insiders’ change in control agreements benefits.

In addressing the contention that there should have been a public auction, the court concluded that a single-bidder approach offered the benefits of protecting against the risk that an auction would fail and avoiding a premature disclosure to the detriment of MONY’s then-ongoing business, and noted that the board had taken into consideration a number of company and industry specific factors in deciding not to pursue a public auction or active solicitation process and not to make out-going calls to potentially interested parties after receiving AXA’s cash



proposal. The court noted that the board members were financially sophisticated, knowledgeable about the insurance and financial services industry, and knew the industry and the potential strategic partners available to MONY. The board had been regularly briefed on MONY's strategic alternatives and industry developments over recent years. The board was also advised as to alternatives to the merger. The court wrote that this "financially sophisticated Board engaged CSFB for advice in maximizing stockholder value [and] . . . obtained a fairness opinion from CSFB, itself incentivized to obtain the best available price due to a fee that was set at 1% of transaction value. . . .," noting that CSFB was not aware of any other entity that had an interest in acquiring MONY at a higher price. One witness testified that CSFB did not participate directly in the negotiations due to a reasonable concern that CSFB's involvement could cause AXA to get its own investment banker, which MONY believed would increase the risk of leaks and might result in a more extensive due diligence process, to its detriment. The court found that using these resources and the considerable body of information available to it, the board had determined that, because MONY and AXA shared a similar business model, AXA was a strategic fit for MONY and thus presented an offer that was the best price reasonably available to stockholders.

Under the market check provisions, which the court found reasonable and adequate, MONY could not actively solicit offers after announcement of the transaction and before the stockholder vote, but could, subject to a reasonable termination fee, pursue inquiries that could be reasonably expected to lead to a business combination more favorable to stockholders. The court found the five-month period while the transaction pended after it was announced (for SEC filing clearance and vote solicitation) was an adequate time for a competing bidder to emerge and complete its due diligence.

The court concluded that the termination fee (3.3% of MONY's total equity value and 2.4% of the total transaction value) was within the range of reasonableness. Moreover, the court said that the change in control agreements were "bidder neutral" in that they would affect any potential bidder in the same fashion as they affected AXA. Thus, the court found the five-month market check more than adequate to determine if the price offered by AXA was the best price reasonably available, which supported a conclusion that the board acted reasonably and had satisfied its *Revlon* duties.

The plaintiffs alleged that the proxy statement was misleading because it failed to disclose the percentage of transaction value of aggregate payments to be made under the amended change in control agreements as compared to payments in similar transactions. The MONY board's expert showed that the mean change-in-control payment (as a percentage of deals for selected financial services industry transactions) was 3.37%, with the 25th and 75th percentile for such transactions being .94% and 4.92% respectively. The base case under the original change in control agreements for MONY would have been over 15% of the original offer and the amended change in control agreements lowered that to 6%, which was still well above the 75th percentile. The court noted the history of AXA's bidding as showing that there was essentially a 1:1 ratio between the value of the change in control agreements and the amount per share offered. Because the change in control agreements' value was above the amount paid in change in control agreements in more than 75% of comparable transactions, the court was persuaded that the proxy statement needed to include disclosure of information available to the board about the size of the change in control agreements payments as compared to comparable transactions, noting that the materiality of such disclosure was heightened by the board's rejection of the original offer, at least in part because of the original outsized change in control agreements' payment obligations. The court concluded the shareholders were entitled to know that the change in control agreements remained unusually large when deciding whether to vote to approve the \$31 per share merger price or vote "no" or demand appraisal under statutory merger appraisal procedures. Moreover, the court said that more disclosure about comparative information was made necessary to the extensive disclosure that was in the proxy statement about steps the board had taken to lower the payments under the change in control agreements since that disclosure had created the strong impression that the amended change in control agreements were in line with those in comparable transactions. The court said that the proxy statement had misleadingly implied that the payments under the change in control agreements were consistent with current market practice when they were in fact considerably more lucrative than was normal. The court ordered the additional disclosure about the change in control agreements.

After the initial decision in the *MONY Group* case, the board of MONY reset and pushed back the record date for the vote on the merger by several months. The same court held in another decision that the directors did not breach their duties to existing stockholders in so doing even though the extended record date included additional stockholders (arbitrageurs) who had recently purchased shares and who were likely to vote in favor of the merger.<sup>415</sup>

### 3. *Process Changes*

In *re Toys “R” Us, Inc. Shareholder Litigation*<sup>416</sup> involved a motion to enjoin a vote of the stockholders of Toys “R” Us, Inc. to consider approving a merger with an acquisition vehicle formed by a group led by Kohlberg Kravis Roberts & Co. (“KKR”) that resulted from a lengthy, publicly-announced search for strategic alternatives and presented merger consideration constituting a 123% premium over the per share price when the strategic process began 18 months previously. During the strategic process, the Toys “R” Us board of directors, nine of whose ten members were independent, had frequent meetings to explore the company’s strategic options with an open mind and with the advice of expert advisors.

Eventually, the board settled on the sale of the company’s most valuable asset, its toy retailing business, and the retention of the company’s baby products retailing business, as its preferred option after considering a wide array of options, including a sale of the whole company. The company sought bids from a large number of the most logical buyers for the toy business, and it eventually elicited attractive expressions of interest from four competing bidders who emerged from the market canvass. When due diligence was completed, the board put the bidders through two rounds of supposedly “final bids” for the toys business. In this process, one of the bidders expressed a serious interest in buying the whole company. The board was presented with a bid that was attractive compared with its chosen strategy, in light of the valuation evidence that its financial advisors had presented, and in light of the failure of any strategic or financial buyer to make any serious expression of interest in buying the whole company despite the board’s openly expressed

---

415. *In re MONY Group Inc. Shareholders Litigation*, 853 A.2d 661 (Del. Ch. 2004).

416. 877 A.2d 975 (Del. Ch. 2005).

examination of its strategic alternatives. Recognizing that the attractive bids it had received for the toys business could be lost if it extended the process much longer, the Executive Committee of the board, acting in conformity with direction given to it by the whole board, approved the solicitation of bids for the entire company from the final bidders for the toys business, after a short period of due diligence.

When those whole company bids came in, the winning bid of \$26.75 per share from KKR topped the next most favorable bid by \$1.50 per share. After a thorough examination of its alternatives and a final reexamination of the value of the company, the board decided that the best way to maximize stockholder value was to accept the \$26.75 bid.

In its proposed merger agreement containing the \$26.75 offer, KKR asked for a termination fee of 4% of the implied equity value of the transaction to be paid if the company terminated to accept another deal, as opposed to the 3% offered by the company in its proposed draft of merger agreement. Knowing that the only other bid for the company was \$1.50 per share or \$350 million less, the company's negotiators nonetheless bargained the termination fee down to 3.75% the next day, and bargained down the amount of expenses KKR sought in the event of a naked no vote.

The plaintiffs faulted the board for failing to fulfill its duty to act reasonably in pursuit of the highest attainable value for the company's stockholders, complaining that the board's decision to conduct a brief auction for the full company from the final bidders for the toy business was unreasonable and that the board should have taken the time to conduct a new, full-blown search for buyers and that the board unreasonably locked up the deal by agreeing to draconian deal termination measures that precluded any topping bid. The Chancery Court rejected those arguments, finding that the board made reasonable choices in confronting the real world circumstances it faced, was supple in reacting to new circumstances, and was adroit in responding to a new development that promised greater value to the stockholders.

Likewise, the Chancery Court found the choice of the board's negotiators not to press too strongly for a reduction of KKR's desired 4% termination fee all the way to 3% initially proposed by the company was reasonable, given that KKR had topped the next best bid by such a big margin and the board's negotiators did negotiate to reduce the termination fee from 4%

to 3.75%. Furthermore, the size of the termination fee and the presence in the merger agreement of a provision entitling KKR to match any competing bid received did not act as a serious barrier to any bidder willing to pay materially more than KKR's price.

In rejecting the plaintiffs' *Revlon* arguments and finding the Board's decision to negotiate with four bidders who had previously submitted bids to buy part of the company, rather than conduct a wide auction, was reasonable and *Revlon*-compliant, the Chancery Court wrote:

The plaintiffs, of course, argue that the Toys "R" Us board made a hurried decision to sell the whole Company, after feckless deliberations, rushing headlong into the arms of the KKR Group when a universe of worthier, but shy, suitors were waiting to be asked to dance. The M & A market, as they view it, is comprised of buyers of exceedingly modest and retiring personality, too genteel to make even the politest of uninvited overtures: a cotillion of the reticent.

For that reason, the Company's nearly year long, publicly announced search for strategic alternatives was of no use in testing the market. Because that announced process did not specifically invite offers for the entire Company from buyers, the demure M & A community of potential Cyranos, albeit ones afraid to even speak through front men, could not be expected to risk the emotional blow of rejection by Toys "R" Us. Given its failure to appreciate the psychological barriers that impeded possible buyers from overcoming the emotional paralysis that afflicts them in the absence of a warm, outreached hand, the Company's board wrongly seized upon the KKR Group's bid, without reasonable basis (other than, of course, its \$350 million superiority to the Cerberus bid and its attractiveness when compared to the multiple valuations that the board reviewed).

The plaintiffs supplement this dubious big-picture with a swarm of nits about several of the myriad of choices directors and their advisors must make in conducting a thorough strategic review. Rather than applaud the board's supple willingness to change direction when that was in the stockholders' best interest, the plaintiffs instead trumpet their arguable view that the directors and their advisors did not set out on the correct

course in the first instance. Even the reasonable refusal of the Company to confirm or deny rumors in the *Wall Street Journal* is flown in to somehow demonstrate the board's failure to market the Company adequately.

It is not hyperbole to say that one could spend hundreds of pages swatting these nits out of the air. In the fewer, but still too numerous, pages that follow, I will attempt to explain in a reader-friendly fashion why the board's process for maximizing value cannot reasonably be characterized as unreasonable.

I begin by noting my disagreement with the plaintiffs about the nature of players in the American M & A markets. They are not like some of us were in high school. They have no problem with rejection. The great takeover cases of the last quarter century — like *Unocal*, *QVC*, and — oh, yeah — *Revlon* — all involved bidders who were prepared, for financial advantage, to make hostile, unsolicited bids. Over the years, that willingness has not gone away.

Given that bidders are willing to make unsolicited offers for companies with an announced strategy of remaining independent, boards like Toys “R” Us know that one way to signal to buyers that they are open to considering a wide array of alternatives is to announce the board's intention to look thoroughly at strategic alternatives. By doing that, a company can create an atmosphere conducive to offers of a non-public and public kind, while not putting itself in a posture that signals financial distress.

In that regard, the defendants plausibly argue that if the Company's board had put a “for sale” sign on Toys “R” Us when its stock price was at \$12.00 per share, the ultimate price per share it would have received would likely have begun with a “1” rather than a “2” and not have been anywhere close to \$26.75 per share. The board avoided that risk by creating an environment in which it simultaneously recognized the need to unlock value and signaled its openness to a variety of means to accomplish that desirous goal, while at the same time notifying buyers that no emergency required a sale.

By this method, I have no doubt that Toys “R” Us caught the attention of every retail industry player

that might have had an interest in a strategic deal with it. That is, in fact, what triggered calls from PET-smART, Home Depot, Office Depot, Staples, and Best Buy, all of whom potentially wanted to buy some of the Company's real estate.

In a marketplace where strategic buyers have not felt shy about "jumping" friendly deals crafted between their industry rivals, the board's open search for strategic alternatives presented an obvious opportunity for retailers, of any size or stripe, who thought a combination with all or part of the Company made sense for them, to come forward with a proposal. That they did not do so, early or late in the process, is most likely attributable to their inability to formulate a coherent strategy that would combine the Company's toy and baby store chains into another retail operation. The plaintiffs' failure to identify, or cite to any industry analyst touting the existence of, likely synergistic combinations is telling.

The approach that the board took not only signaled openness to possible buyers, it enabled the board to develop a rich body of knowledge regarding the value not only of the Company's operations, but of its real estate assets. That body of knowledge provided the board with a firm foundation to analyze potential strategic options and constituted useful information to convince buyers to pay top dollar.

The Chancery Court further found no fault in the Board's willingness to allow two of the bidders to present a joint bid:

Likewise, the decision to accede to KKR and Vornado/Bain's request to present a joint bid cannot be deemed unreasonable. The Cerberus consortium had done that earlier, as to the Global Toys business only. Had First Boston told KKR and Vornado/Bain "no," they might not have presented any whole Company bid at all. Their rationale for joining together, to spread the risk that would be incurred by undertaking what the plaintiffs have said is the largest retail acquisition by financial buyers ever, was logical and is consistent with an emerging practice among financial buyers. By banding together, these buyers are able to make bids that would be imprudent, if pursued in isolation. The plaintiffs'

continued description of the KKR Group's bid as "collusive," is not only linguistically imprecise, it is a naked attempt to use inflammatory words to mask a weak argument. The "cooperative" bid that First Boston permitted the KKR Group to make gave the Company a powerful bidding competitor to the Cerberus consortium, which included, among others, Goldman Sachs.

In rejecting plaintiffs' other major argument that the Board acted unreasonably because the merger agreement with KKR included deal protection measures that, in the plaintiffs' view, precluded other bidders from making a topping offer, the Chancery Court wrote:

It is no innovation for me to state that this court looks closely at the deal protection measures in merger agreements. In doing so, we undertake a nuanced, fact-intensive inquiry [that] does not presume that all business circumstances are identical or that there is any naturally occurring rate of deal protection, the deficit or excess of which will be less than economically optimal. Instead, that inquiry examines whether the board granting the deal protections had a reasonable basis to accede to the other side's demand for them in negotiations. In that inquiry, the court must attempt, as far as possible, to view the question from the perspective of the directors themselves, taking into account the real world risks and prospects confronting them when they agreed to the deal protections. As *QVC* clearly states, what matters is whether the board acted reasonably based on the circumstances then facing it.

\* \* \*

As the plaintiffs must admit, neither a termination fee nor a matching right is per se invalid. Each is a common contractual feature that, when assented to by a board fulfilling its fundamental duties of loyalty and care for the proper purpose of securing a high value bid for the stockholders, has legal legitimacy.

\* \* \*

Contributing to this negotiating dynamic, no doubt, were prior judicial precedents, which suggested that it would not be unreasonable for the board to grant a sub-



stantial termination fee and matching rights to the KKR Group if that was necessary to successfully wring out a high-value bid. Given the Company's lengthy search for alternatives, the obvious opportunity that unsolicited bidders had been afforded to come forward over the past year, and the large gap between the Cerberus and the KKR Group bids, the board could legitimately give more weight to getting the highest value bid out of the KKR Group, and less weight to the fear that an unlikely higher-value bid would emerge later. After all, anyone interested had had multiple chances to present, however politely, a serious expression of interest — none had done so.

Nor was the level of deal protection sought by the KKR Group unprecedented in magnitude. In this regard, the plaintiffs ignore that many deals that were jumped in the late 1990s involved not only termination fees and matching rights but also stock option grants that destroyed pooling treatment, an additional effect that enhanced the effectiveness of the barrier to prevent a later-emerging bidder.

\* \* \*

In view of this jurisprudential reality, the board was not in a position to tell the KKR Group that they could not have any deal protection. The plaintiffs admit this and therefore second-guess the board's decision not to insist on a smaller termination fee, more like 2.5% or 3%, and the abandonment of the matching right. But that, in my view, is precisely the sort of quibble that does not suffice to prove a *Revlon* claim.

\* \* \*

It would be hubris in these circumstances for the court to conclude that the board acted unreasonably by assenting to a compromise 3.75% termination fee in order to guarantee \$26.75 per share to its stockholders, and to avoid the substantial risk that the KKR Group might somehow glean the comparatively large margin by which it had outbid Cerberus.

\* \* \*

The central purpose of *Revlon* is to ensure the fidelity of fiduciaries. It is not a license for the judiciary to set arbitrary limits on the contract terms that fiduciaries

acting loyally and carefully can shape in the pursuit of their stockholders' interest.

\* \* \*

This is not to say that this court is, or has been, willing to turn a blind eye to the adoption of excessive termination fees, such as the 6.3% termination fee in *Phelps Dodge* that Chancellor Chandler condemned, that present a more than reasonably explicable barrier to a second bidder, or even that fees lower than 3% are always reasonable. But it is to say that *Revlon's* purpose is not to set the judiciary loose to enjoin contractual provisions that, upon a hard look, were reasonable in view of the benefits the board obtained in the other portions of an integrated contract.

In finding that the board's process passed muster and after noting the scrupulous way in which management refused to even discuss future employment prospects with any bidder (or even meet with a bidder in the absence of its financial adviser), the Chancery Court noted that the financial adviser had introduced an unnecessary issue by agreeing (after the merger agreement was signed and with the permission of the board) to provide buy-side financing for KKR:

First Boston did create for itself, and therefore its clients, an unnecessary issue. In autumn 2004, First Boston raised the possibility of providing buy-side financing to bidders for Global Toys. First Boston had done deals in the past with many of the late-round financial buyers, most notably with KKR. The board promptly nixed that idea. At the board's insistence, First Boston had, therefore, refused to discuss financing with the KKR Group, or any bidder, before the merger was finalized. But, when the dust settled, and the merger agreement was signed, the board yielded to a letter request by First Boston to provide financing on the buy-side for the KKR Group.

That decision was unfortunate, in that it tends to raise eyebrows by creating the appearance of impropriety, playing into already heightened suspicions about the ethics of investment banking firms. Far better, from the standpoint of instilling confidence, if First Boston had never asked for permission, and had taken the po-

sition that its credibility as a sell-side advisor was too important in this case, and in general, for it to simultaneously play on the buy-side in a deal when it was the seller's financial advisor. In that respect, it might have been better, in view of First Boston's refusal to refrain, for the board of the Company to have declined the request, even though the request came on May 12, 2005, almost two months after the board had signed the merger agreement.

My job, however, is not to police the appearances of conflict that, upon close scrutiny, do not have a causal influence on a board's process. Here, there is simply no basis to conclude that First Boston's questionable desire to provide buy-side financing ever influenced it to advise the board to sell the whole Company rather than pursue a sale of Global Toys, or to discourage bidders other than KKR, or to assent to overly onerous deal protection measures during the merger agreement negotiations.

#### ***4. Disparate Treatment of Stockholders***

In a merger there are often situations where it is desired to treat shareholders within the same class differently. For example, a buyer may not want to expose itself to the costs and delays that may be associated with issuing securities to shareholders of the target who are not "*accredited investors*" within the meaning of Rule 501(a) of Regulation D under the Securities Act of 1933. In such a situation, the buyer may seek to issue shares only to accredited investors and pay equivalent value on a per share basis in cash to unaccredited investors.

DGCL § 251(b) provides, in relevant part, that "[an] agreement of merger shall state: . . . (5) the manner, if any, of converting the shares of each of the constituent corporations into shares or other securities of the corporation surviving or resulting from the merger or consolidation, or of cancelling some or all of such shares, and, if any shares of any of the constituent corporations are not to remain outstanding, to be converted solely into shares or other securities of the surviving or resulting corporation, or to be cancelled, the cash, property, rights or securities of any other corporation or entity which the holders of such shares are to receive in exchange for, or upon conversion of such shares and the surrender of any certificates evidencing them,

which cash, property, rights or securities of any other corporation or entity may be in addition to or in lieu of shares or other securities of the surviving or resulting corporation.”<sup>417</sup> Similarly, TBOC § 10.002 provides that “[a] plan of merger must include . . . the manner and basis of converting any of the ownership or membership interests of each organization that is a party to the merger into: (A) ownership interests, membership interests, obligations, rights to purchase securities, or other securities of one or more of the surviving or new organizations; (B) cash; (C) other property, including ownership interests, membership interests, obligations, rights to purchase securities, or other securities of any other person or entity; or (D) any combination of the items described by Paragraphs (A)-(C).”<sup>418</sup> Further, “[i]f the plan of merger provides for a manner and basis of converting an ownership or membership interest that may be converted in a manner or basis different than any other ownership or membership interest of the same class or series of the ownership or membership interest, the manner and basis of conversion must be included in the plan of merger in the same manner as provided by Subsection (a)(5).”<sup>419</sup>

DGCL § 251(b)(5) and the Texas Corporate Statutes do not by their literal terms require that all shares of the same class of a constituent corporation in a merger be treated identically in a merger effected in accordance therewith.<sup>420</sup> Certain Delaware court decisions provide guidance. In *Jedwab v. MGM Grand Hotels, Inc.*,<sup>421</sup> a preferred stockholder of MGM Grand Hotels, Inc. (“MGM”) sought to enjoin the merger of MGM with a subsidiary of Bally Manufacturing Corporation whereby all stockholders of MGM would receive cash. The plaintiff challenged the apportionment of the merger consideration among the common and preferred stockholders of MGM. The controlling stockholder of MGM apparently agreed, as a facet of the merger agreement, to accept less per share for his shares of common stock than the other holders of common stock would receive on a

---

417. 8 Del. C. § 251(b).

418. TBOC § 10.002(a)(5); see also TBCA art. 5.01B.

419. TBOC § 10.002(c); see also TBCA art. 5.01B.

420. Compare *Beaumont v. American Can Co.*, Index No. 28742/87 (N.Y. Sup. Ct. May 8, 1991) (determining that unequal treatment of stockholders violates the literal provisions of N.Y. Bus. Corp. Law § 501(C), which requires that “each share shall be equal to every other share of the same class”); see David A. Drexler et al., *Delaware Corporation Law and Practice* § 35.04[1], at 35-11 (1997).

421. 509 A.2d 584 (Del. Ch. 1986).

per share basis in respect of the merger. While the primary focus of the opinion in *Jedwab* was the allocation of the merger consideration between the holders of common stock and preferred stock, the Court also addressed the need to allocate merger consideration equally among the holders of the same class of stock. In this respect, the Court stated that “should a controlling shareholder for whatever reason (to avoid entanglement in litigation as plaintiff suggests is here the case or for other personal reasons) elect to sacrifice some part of the value of his stock holdings, the law will not direct him as to how what amount is to be distributed and to whom.” According to the Court in *Jedwab*, therefore, there is no *per se* statutory prohibition against a merger providing for some holders of a class of stock to receive less than other holders of the same class if the holders receiving less agree to receive such lesser amount.<sup>422</sup>

In *Jackson v. Turnbull*,<sup>423</sup> plaintiffs brought an action pursuant to DGCL § 225 to determine the rightful directors and officers of L’Nard Restorative Concepts, Inc. (“L’Nard”) and claimed, among other things, that a merger between Restorative Care of America, Inc. (“Restorative”) and L’Nard was invalid. The merger agreement at issue provided that the L’Nard common stock held by certain L’Nard stockholders would be converted into common stock of the corporation surviving the merger and that the common stock of L’Nard held by certain other L’Nard stockholders would be converted into the right to receive a cash payment. The plaintiffs argued that the merger violated DGCL § 251(b)(5) by, *inter alia*, forcing stockholders holding the same class of stock to accept different forms of consideration in a single merger. The Court in *Jackson* ultimately found the merger to be void upon a number of grounds, includ-

---

422. See *Emerson Radio Corp. v. International Jensen Inc.*, C.A. No. 15130, slip op. at 33-34 (Del. Ch. Apr. 30, 1996); R. Franklin Balotti & Jesse A. Finkelstein, *The Delaware Law of Corporations and Business Organizations* § 9.10 (2d ed. 1997); David A. Drexler et al., *Delaware Corporation Law and Practice* § 35.04[1] (1997); see also *In re Reading Co.*, 711 F.2d 509, 517 (3d Cir. 1983) (applying Delaware law, the Court held that stockholders may be treated less favorably with respect to dividends when they consent to such treatment); *Schrage v. Bridgeport Oil Co., Inc.*, 71 A.2d 882, 883 (Del. Ch. 1950) (in enjoining the implementation of a plan of dissolution, holding that the plan could have provided for the payment of cash to certain stockholders apparently by means of a cafeteria-type plan in lieu of an in-kind distribution of the corporation’s assets).

423. C.A. No. 13042 (Del. Ch. Feb. 8, 1994), *aff’d*, 653 A.2d 306 (Del. Dec. 7, 1994).

ing what it found to be an impermissible delegation of the L'Nard directors' responsibility to determine the consideration payable in the merger. In respect of the plaintiffs' claims that the merger was void under DGCL § 251, the Chancery Court rejected such a claim as not presenting a statutory issue. The clear implication of the Court's decision in *Jackson* is the decision to treat holders of shares of the same class of stock in a merger differently is a fiduciary, not a statutory, issue.

Even though a merger agreement providing for different treatment of stockholders within the same class appears to be authorized by both DGCL and the Texas Corporate Statutes, the merger agreement may still be challenged on grounds that the directors violated their fiduciary duties of care, good faith and loyalty in approving the merger. In *In re Times Mirror Co. Shareholders Litigation*,<sup>424</sup> the Court approved a proposed settlement in connection with claims pertaining to a series of transactions which culminated with the merger of The Times Mirror Company ("*Times Mirror*") and Cox Communications, Inc. The transaction at issue provided for: (i) certain stockholders of Times Mirror related to the Chandler family to exchange (prior to the merger) outstanding shares of Times Mirror Series A and Series C common stock for a like number of shares of Series A and Series C common stock, respectively, of a newly formed subsidiary, New TMC Inc. ("*New TMC*"), as well as the right to receive a series of preferred stock of New TMC; and (ii) the subsequent merger whereby the remaining Times Mirror stockholders (i.e., the public holders of Times Mirror Series A and Series C common stock) would receive a like number of shares of Series A and Series C common stock, respectively, of New TMC and shares of capital stock in the corporation surviving the merger. Although holders of the same class of stock were technically not being disparately treated in respect of a merger since the Chandler family was to engage in the exchange of their stock immediately prior to the merger (and therefore *Times Mirror* did not present as a technical issue a statutory claim under DGCL § 251(b)(5)), the Court recognized the somewhat differing treatment in the transaction taken as a whole. As the Court inquired, "[i]s it permissible to treat one set of shareholders holding a similar security differently than another subset of that same class?" The Court in *Times Mirror* was not required to finally address the issue of disparate treat-

---

424. C.A. No. 13550 (Del. Ch. Nov. 30, 1994) (Bench Ruling).

ment of stockholders since the proceeding was a settlement proceeding. Therefore, the Court was merely required to assess the strengths and weaknesses of the claims being settled. The Court nonetheless noted that “[f]or a long time I think that it might have been said that [the discriminatory treatment of stockholders] was not permissible,” but then opined that “I am inclined to think that [such differing treatment] is permissible.” In addition to noting that *Unocal v. Mesa Petroleum Co.*,<sup>425</sup>—which permitted a discriminatory stock repurchase as a response to a hostile takeover bid—would be relevant in deciding such issue, the Court noted that an outright prohibition of discriminatory treatment among holders of the same class of stock would be inconsistent with policy concerns. In this respect, the Court noted “that a controlling shareholder, so long as the shareholder is not interfering with the corporation’s operation of the transaction, is itself free to reject any transaction that is presented to it if it is not in its best interests as a shareholder.” Therefore, if discriminatory treatment among holders of the same class of stock were not permitted in certain circumstances:

[T]hen you might encounter situations in which no transaction could be done at all. And it is not in the social interest – that is, the interest of the economy generally – to have a rule that prevents efficient transactions from occurring.

What is necessary, and I suppose what the law is, is that such a discrimination can be made but it is necessary in all events that both sets of shareholders be treated entirely fairly.<sup>426</sup>

### **5. *Protecting the Merger***

During the course of acquisition negotiations, it may be neither practicable nor possible to auction or actively shop the corporation. Moreover, even when there has been active bidding by two or more suitors, it may be difficult to determine whether the bidding is complete. In addition, there can remain the possibility that new bidders may emerge that have not been foreseen. In these circumstances, it is generally wise for the board to make some provision for further bidders in the merger agreement. Such a provision can also provide the board with

---

425. 493 A.2d 946 (Del. 1985).

426. C.A. No. 13550 (Del. Ch. Nov. 30, 1994) (Bench Ruling).

additional support for its decision to sell to a particular bidder if the agreement does not forestall competing bidders, permits the fact gathering and discussion sufficient to make an informed decision and provides meaningful flexibility to respond to them. In this sense, the agreement is an extension of, and has implications for, the process of becoming adequately informed.

In considering a change of control transaction, a board should consider:

[W]hether the circumstances afford a disinterested and well motivated director a basis reasonably to conclude that if the transactions contemplated by the merger agreement close, they will represent the best available alternative for the corporation and its shareholders. This inquiry involves consideration *inter alia* of the nature of any provisions in the merger agreement tending to impede other offers, the extent of the board's information about market alternatives, the content of announcements accompanying the execution of the merger agreement, the extent of the company's contractual freedom to supply necessary information to competing bidders, and the time made available for better offers to emerge.<sup>427</sup>

Management will, however, have to balance the requirements of the buyer against these interests in negotiating the merger agreement. The buyer will seek assurance of the benefit of its bargain through the agreement, especially the agreed upon price, and the corporation may run the risk of losing the transaction if it does not accede to the buyer's requirements in this regard. The relevant cases provide the corporation and its directors with the ability, and the concomitant obligation in certain circumstances, to resist.

The assurances a buyer seeks often take the form of a "no-shop" clause, a "lock-up" agreement for stock or assets, a break-up fee, or a combination thereof. In many cases, a court will consider the effect of these provisions together. Whether or not the provisions are upheld may depend, in large measure, on whether a court finds that the board has adequate information about the market and alternatives to the offer being considered. The classic examples of no-shops, lock-ups and break-up fees oc-

---

427. *Roberts v. General Instrument Corp.*, 1990 WL 118356, at \*8 (Del. Ch. 1990).



cur, however, not in friendly situations, where a court is likely to find that such arrangements provide the benefit of keeping the suitor at the bargaining table, but rather in a bidding war between two suitors, where the court may find that such provisions in favor of one suitor prematurely stop an auction and thus do not allow the board to obtain the highest value reasonably attainable.

The fact that a buyer has provided consideration for the assurances requested in a merger agreement does not end the analysis. In *QVC*, the Delaware Supreme Court took the position that provisions of agreements that would force a board to violate its fiduciary duty of care are unenforceable. As the court stated:

Such provisions, whether or not they are presumptively valid in the abstract, may not validly define or limit the directors' fiduciary duties under Delaware law or prevent the . . . directors from carrying out their fiduciary duties under Delaware law. To the extent such provisions are inconsistent with those duties, they are invalid and unenforceable.<sup>428</sup>

Although this language provides a basis for directors to resist unduly restrictive provisions, it may be of little comfort to a board that is trying to abide by negotiated restrictive provisions in an agreement and their obligations under Delaware law, especially where the interplay of the two may not be entirely clear.

#### ***a. No-Shops***

The term “*no-shop*” is used generically to describe both provisions that limit a corporation's ability to actively canvas the market (the “*no shop*” aspect) or to respond to overtures from the market (more accurately, a “*no talk*” provision). No-shop clauses can take different forms. A strict no-shop allows no solicitation and also prohibits a target from facilitating other offers, all without exception. Because of the limitation that a strict no-shop imposes on the board's ability to become informed, such a provision is of questionable validity.<sup>429</sup> A cus-

---

428. *QVC*, 637 A.2d at 48.

429. See *Phelps Dodge Corp. v. Cypress Amax Minerals Co.*, 1999 WL 1054255, (Del. Ch. 1999); *Ace Ltd. v. Capital Re Corp.*, 747 A.2d 95 (Del. Ch. 1999) (expressing view that certain no-talk provisions are “particu-

tomary, and limited, no-shop clause contains some type of “fiduciary out,” which allows a board to take certain actions to the extent necessary for the board to comply with its fiduciary duties to shareholders.<sup>430</sup> Board actions permitted can range from supplying confidential information about the corporation to unsolicited suitors, to negotiating with unsolicited suitors and terminating the existing merger agreement upon payment of a break-up fee, to actively soliciting other offers.<sup>431</sup> Each action is tied to a determination by the board, after advice of counsel, that it is required in the exercise of the board’s fiduciary duties. Such “fiduciary outs,” even when restrictively drafted, will likely be interpreted by the courts to permit the board to become informed about an unsolicited competing bid. “[E]ven the decision not to negotiate . . . must be an informed one. A target can refuse to negotiate [in a transaction not involving a sale of control] but it should be informed when making such refusal.”<sup>432</sup>

See *Ace Ltd. v. Capital Re Corp.*<sup>433</sup> for a discussion of restrictive “no shop” provisions. In *Ace*, which did not involve a change in control merger, the court interpreted a “no-talk” provision of a “no-shop” to permit the board to engage in continued discussions with a continuing bidder, notwithstanding the signing of a merger agreement, when not to do so was tantamount to precluding the stockholders from accepting a higher offer. The court wrote:

*QVC* does not say that directors have no fiduciary duties when they are not in “Revlon-land.” . . . Put somewhat differently, *QVC* does not say that a board can, in

---

larly suspect”); but see *In re IXC Communications, Inc. Shareholders Litigation*, 1999 WL 1009174 (Del. Ch. 1999) (no talk provisions “are common in merger agreements and do not imply some automatic breach of fiduciary duty”). For a thorough discussion of these cases, see the article by Mark Morton, Michael Pittenger and Mathew Fischer entitled “Recent Delaware Law Developments Concerning No-Talk Provisions: From “Just Say No” to “Can’t Say Yes,” which was published in *V Deal Points* No. 1 (The News-Letter of the ABA Bus. L. S. Committee on Negotiated Acquisitions).

430. See, e.g., *Matador*, 729 A.2d at 288-89; and Allen, “Understanding Fiduciary Outs: The What and Why of an Anomalous Concept,” 55 *Bus. Law.* 653 (2000).

431. See *Id.*

432. *Phelps Dodge Corp. v. Cypress Amax Minerals Co.*, 1999 WL 1054255, (Del. Ch. 1999).

433. 747 A.2d. 95 (Del. Ch. 1999).

all circumstances, continue to support a merger agreement not involving a change of control when: (1) the board negotiated a merger agreement that was tied to voting agreements ensuring consummation if the board does not terminate the agreement; (2) the board no longer believes that the merger is a good transaction for the stockholders; and (3) the board believes that another available transaction is more favorable to the stockholders. The fact that the board has no *Revlon* duties does not mean that it can contractually bind itself to set idly by and allow an unfavorable and preclusive transaction to occur that its own actions have brought about. The logic of *QVC* itself casts doubts on the validity of such a contract.<sup>434</sup>

See also *Cirrus Holding v. Cirrus Ind.*,<sup>435</sup> in which the court wrote in denying the petition by a purchaser who had contracted to buy from a closely held issuer 61% of its equity for a preliminary injunction barring the issuer from terminating the purchase agreement and accepting a better deal that did not involve a change in control:

As part of this duty [to secure the best value reasonably available to the stockholders], directors cannot be precluded by the terms of an overly restrictive “no-shop” provision from all consideration of possible better transactions. Similarly, directors cannot willfully blind themselves to opportunities that are presented to them, thus limiting the reach of “no talk” provisions. The fiduciary out provisions also must not be so restrictive that, as a practical matter, it would be impossible to satisfy their conditions. Finally, the fiduciary duty did not end when the Cirrus Board voted to approve the SPA. The directors were required to consider all available alternatives in an informed manner until such time as the SPA was submitted to the stockholders for approval.

Although determinations concerning fiduciary outs are usually made when a serious competing suitor emerges, it may be difficult for a board or its counsel to determine just how

---

434. *Id.* at 107-108.

435. 794 A.2d 1191 (Del. Ch. 2001).

much of the potentially permitted response is required by the board's fiduciary duties.<sup>436</sup> As a consequence, the board may find it advisable to state the "fiduciary out" in terms that do not only address fiduciary duties, but also permit action when an offer, which the board reasonably believes to be "superior," is made.

As the cases that follow indicate, while in some more well-known situations no-shops have been invalidated, the Delaware courts have on numerous occasions upheld different no-shop clauses as not impeding a board's ability to make an informed decision that a particular agreement provided the highest value reasonably obtainable for the shareholders.

### **b. Lock-Ups**

Lock-ups can take the form of an option to buy additional shares of the corporation to be acquired, which benefits the suitor if the price for the corporation increases after another bidder emerges and discourages another bidder by making the corporation more expensive or by giving the buyer a head start in obtaining the votes necessary to approve the transaction.<sup>437</sup>

---

436. See Johnston, *Recent Amendments to the Merger Sections of the DGCL Will Eliminate Some - But Not All - Fiduciary Out Negotiation and Drafting Issues*, 1 BNA Mergers & Acquisitions L. Rep. 777 (1998):

[I]n freedom-of-contract jurisdictions like Delaware, the target board will be held to its bargain (and the bidder will have the benefit of its bargain) only if the initial agreement to limit the target board's discretion can withstand scrutiny under applicable fiduciary duty principles. The exercise of fiduciary duties is scrutinized up front — at the negotiation stage. If that exercise withstands scrutiny, fiduciary duties will be irrelevant in determining what the target board's obligations are when a better offer, in fact, emerges; at that point its obligations will be determined solely by the contract.

*Id.* at 779.

437. Such an option is issued by the corporation, generally to purchase newly issued shares for up to 19.9% of the corporation's outstanding shares at the deal price. The amount is intended to give the bidder maximum benefit without crossing limits established by the New York Stock Exchange (see Rule 312.03, NYSE Listed Company Manual) or NASD (see Rule 4310(c)(25)(H)(i), NASD Manual — The NASDAQ Stock Market) that require shareholder approval for certain large stock issuances. Such an option should be distinguished from options granted by significant shareholders or others in support of the deal. Shareholders may generally grant such options as their self-interest requires. See *Mendel v. Carroll*, 651 A.2d 297, 306 (Del. Ch. 1994). However, an option involving 15% or more of the outstanding shares generally will trigger

Lock-ups can also take the form of an option to acquire important assets (a company's "crown jewels") at a price that may or may not be a bargain for the suitor, which may so change the attractiveness of the corporation as to discourage or preclude other suitors. "[L]ock-ups and related agreements are permitted under Delaware law where their adoption is untainted by director interest or other breaches of fiduciary duty."<sup>438</sup> The Delaware Supreme Court has tended to look askance at lock-up provisions when such provisions, however, impede other bidders or do not result in enhanced bids. As the Delaware Supreme Court stated in *Revlon*,

Such [lock-up] options can entice other bidders to enter a contest for control of the corporation, creating an auction for the company and maximizing shareholder profit. . . . However, while those lock-ups which draw bidders into the battle benefit shareholders, similar measures which end an active auction and foreclose further bidding operate to the shareholders detriment.<sup>439</sup>

As the cases that follow indicate, the Delaware courts have used several different types of analyses in reviewing lock-ups. In active bidding situations, the courts have examined whether the lock-up resulted in an enhanced bid (in addition to the fact that the lock-up ended an active auction).<sup>440</sup> In situations not involving an auction, the courts have examined whether the lock-up impeded other potential suitors, and if an active or passive market check took place prior to the grant of the lock-up.<sup>441</sup>

### **c. Break-Up Fees**

Break-up fees generally require the corporation to pay consideration to its merger partner should the corporation be ac-

---

DGCL § 203, which section restricts certain transactions with shareholders who acquire such amount of shares without board approval. Any decision to exempt such an option from the operation of DGCL § 203 involves the board's fiduciary duties.

438. *Revlon*, 506 A.2d at 176.

439. *Revlon*, 506 A.2d at 183.

440. *See Revlon*, 506 A.2d 173; *Macmillan*, 559 A.2d 1261.

441. *See Matador*, 729 A.2d at 291; *Rand*, 1994 WL 89006; *Roberts*, 1990 WL 118356. For a further discussion of the analytical approaches taken by the Delaware courts, *see* Fraidin and Hanson, *Toward Unlocking Lock-ups*, 103 Yale L. J. 1739, 1748-66 (1994).

quired by a competing bidder who emerges after the merger agreement is signed. As with no-shops and lock-ups, break-up fees are not invalid unless they are preclusive or an impediment to the bidding process.<sup>442</sup> As the cases that follow indicate, however, break-up fees are not as disliked by the Delaware courts, and such fees that bear a reasonable relation to the value of a transaction so as not to be preclusive have been upheld.<sup>443</sup> In practice, counsel are generally comfortable with break-up fees that range up to 4% of the equity value of the transaction and a fee of up to 5% may be justified in connection with certain smaller transactions. A court, when considering the validity of a fee, will consider the aggregate effect of that fee and all other deal protections.<sup>444</sup> As a result, a 5% fee may be reasonable in one case and a 2.5% fee may be unreasonable in another case. However, the Delaware jurisprudence was not yet resolved whether the appropriate basis for calculating a termination fee is equity or enterprise value.<sup>445</sup> For this purpose,

---

442. Alternatively, if parties to a merger agreement expressly state that the termination fee will constitute liquidated damages, Delaware courts will evaluate the termination fee under the standard for analyzing liquidated damages. For example, in *Brazen v. Bell Atlantic Corp.*, 695 A.2d 43 (Del. 1997), Bell Atlantic and NYNEX entered into a merger agreement which included a two-tiered termination fee of \$550 million, which represented about 2% of Bell Atlantic's market capitalization and would serve as a reasonable measure for the opportunity cost and other losses associated with the termination of the merger. *Id.* at 45. The merger agreement stated that the termination fee would "constitute liquidated damages and not a penalty." *Id.* at 46. Consequently, the court found "no compelling justification for treating the termination fee in this agreement as anything but a liquidated damages provision, in light of the express intent of the parties to have it so treated." *Id.* at 48. Rather than apply the business judgment rule, the court followed "the two-prong test for analyzing the validity of the amount of liquidated damages: 'Where the damages are uncertain and the amount agreed upon is reasonable, such an agreement will not be disturbed.'" *Id.* at 48 (citation omitted). Ultimately, the court upheld the liquidated damages provision. *Id.* at 50. The court reasoned in part that the provision was within the range of reasonableness "given the undisputed record showing the size of the transaction, the analysis of the parties concerning lost opportunity costs, other expenses, and the arms-length negotiations." *Id.* at 49.

443. See *Goodwin*, 1999 WL 64265, at \* 23; *Matador*, 729 A.2d at 291 n.15 (discussing authorities).

444. *QVC*, 637 A.2d 34.

445. See *In re Pennaco Energy, Inc. Shareholders Litig.*, 787 A.2d 691, 702 n.16 (Del. Ch. 2001) (noting that "Delaware cases have tended to use equity value as a benchmark for measuring the termination fee" but ad-

the value of any lock-up given by the corporation to the bidder should be included.

**6. *Specific Cases Where No-Shops, Lock-Ups, and Break-Up Fees Have Been Invalidated***

a. In *Revlon*,<sup>446</sup> the court held that the no-shop along with a lock-up agreement and a break-up fee effectively stopped an active bidding process and thus was invalid.<sup>447</sup> The court noted that the no-shop is impermissible under the *Unocal* if it prematurely ends an active bidding process because the “board’s primary duty [has become] that of an auctioneer responsible for selling the company to the highest bidder.”<sup>448</sup> *Revlon* had also granted to Forstmann a “crown jewel” asset lock-up representing approximately 24% of the deal value (and apparently the crown jewel was undervalued), and a break-up fee worth approximately 1.2% of the deal. The court invalidated the lock-up and the break-up fee, noting that Forstmann “had already been drawn into the contest on a preferred basis, so the result of the lock-up was not to foster bidding, but to destroy it.”<sup>449</sup>

b. In *Macmillan*,<sup>450</sup> the directors of the corporation granted one of the bidders a lock-up agreement for one of its “crown jewel” assets.<sup>451</sup> As in *Revlon*, the court held that the lock-up had the effect of ending the auction, and held that the lock-up was invalid. The court also noted that if the intended effect is to end an auction, “at the very least the independent members of the board must attempt to negotiate alternative bids before granting such a significant concession.”<sup>452</sup>

In this case, a lock-up agreement was not necessary to draw any of the bidders into the contest. *Macmillan* cannot seriously contend that they received a final bid from KKR that materially enhanced general stockholder interests. . . . When one compares what KKR received for the lock-up, in contrast to its inconsider-

---

ding that “no case has squarely addressed which benchmark is appropriate).”

446. *Revlon*, 506 A.2d 173.

447. *Id.* at 182.

448. *Id.* at 184.

449. *Id.* at 183.

450. *Macmillan*, 559 A.2d 1261.

451. *Id.* at 1286.

452. *Id.*

able offer, the invalidity of the [lock-up] becomes patent.<sup>453</sup>

The court was particularly critical of the “crown jewel” lock-up. “Even if the lock-up is permissible, when it involves ‘crown jewel’ assets careful board scrutiny attends the decision. . . . Thus, when directors in a *Revlon* bidding contest grant a crown jewel lock-up, serious questions are raised, particularly where, as here, there is little or no improvement in the final bid.”<sup>454</sup>

c. In *QVC*,<sup>455</sup> which like *Revlon* involved an active auction, the no-shop provision provided that Paramount would not:

[S]olicit, encourage, discuss, negotiate, or endorse any competing transaction unless: (a) a third party “makes an unsolicited written, bona fide proposal, which is not subject to any material contingencies relating to financing”; and (b) the Paramount board determines that discussions or negotiations with the third party are necessary for the Paramount Board to comply with its fiduciary duties.<sup>456</sup>

The break-up fee arrangement provided that Viacom would receive \$100 million (between 1% and 2% of the front-end consideration) if (i) Paramount terminated the merger agreement because of a competing transaction, (ii) Paramount’s stockholders did not approve the merger, or (iii) Paramount’s board recommended a competing transaction.<sup>457</sup> In examining the lock-up agreement between Paramount and Viacom (for 19.9% of the stock of Paramount), the court emphasized two provisions of the lock-up as being both “unusual and highly beneficial” to Viacom: “(a) Viacom was permitted to pay for the shares with a senior subordinated note of questionable marketability instead of cash, thereby avoiding the need to raise the \$1.6 billion purchase price” and “(b) Viacom could elect to require Paramount to pay Viacom in cash a sum equal to the difference between the purchase price and the market price of Paramount’s stock.”<sup>458</sup> The court held that the lock-up, no-shop and break-

---

453. *Id.* at 1286.

454. *Id.*

455. *QVC*, 637 A.2d 34.

456. *Id.* at 39 (citations omitted).

457. *Id.*

458. *Id.*



up fee were “impeding the realization of the best value reasonably available to the Paramount shareholders.”<sup>459</sup>

d. In *Holly Farms*,<sup>460</sup> the board of Holly Farms entered into an agreement to sell the corporation to ConAgra which included a lock-up option on Holly Farms’ prime poultry operations and a \$15 million break-up fee plus expense reimbursement.<sup>461</sup> Tyson Foods was at the same time also negotiating to purchase Holly Farms. In invalidating the lock-up and the break-up fee, the court noted that “[w]hile the granting of a lock up may be rational where it is reasonably necessary to encourage a prospective bidder to submit an offer, lock-ups ‘which end an active auction and foreclose further bidding operate to the shareholders’ detriment’ are extremely suspect.”<sup>462</sup> The court further stated that “the lock up was nothing but a ‘show stopper’ that effectively precluded the opening act.”<sup>463</sup> The court also invalidated the break-up fee, holding that it appeared likely “to have been part of the effort to preclude a genuine auction.”<sup>464</sup>

### **7. Specific Cases Where No-Shops, Lock-Ups and Break-Up Fees Have Been Upheld**

a. In *Goodwin*,<sup>465</sup> the plaintiff shareholder argued that the board of Live Entertainment violated its fiduciary duties by entering into a merger agreement with Pioneer Electronics.<sup>466</sup> The merger agreement contained a 3.125% break-up fee.<sup>467</sup> While the plaintiff did not seek to enjoin the transaction on the basis of the fee and did not attack any other aspect of the merger agreement as being unreasonable, the court noted “this type of fee is commonplace and within the range of reasonableness approved by this court in similar contexts.”<sup>468</sup> Ultimately, the Chancery Court upheld the merger agreement.

b. In *Matador*,<sup>469</sup> Business Records Corporation entered into a merger agreement with Affiliated Computer Services

---

459. *Id.* at 50.

460. *In re Holly Farms Corp. Shareholders Litig.*, 564 A.2d 342 (Del. Ch. 1988).

461. *Id.* at \*2.

462. *Id.* at \*6 (citations omitted).

463. *Id.*

464. *Id.*

465. *Goodwin*, 1999 WL 64265.

466. *Id.* at \*21.

467. *Id.* at \*23.

468. *Id.*

469. *Matador*, 729 A.2d 280.

which contained four “defensive” provisions, including a no-shop provision with a fiduciary out and a termination fee.<sup>470</sup> Three BRC shareholders also entered into lock-up agreements with ACS to tender their shares to ACS within five days of the tender offer of ACS.<sup>471</sup> The Chancery Court upheld these provisions reasoning that “these measures do not foreclose other offers, but operate merely to afford some protection to prevent disruption of the Agreement by proposals from third parties that are neither bona fide nor likely to result in a higher transaction.”<sup>472</sup> The court also noted that because the termination fee is not “invoked by the board’s receipt of another offer, nor is it invoked solely because the board decides to provide information, or even negotiates with another bidder,” it can hardly be said that it prevents the corporation from negotiating with other bidders.<sup>473</sup>

c. In *Rand*,<sup>474</sup> Western had been considering opportunities for fundamental changes in its business structure since late 1985.<sup>475</sup> In the spring of 1986, Western had discussions with both American and Delta, as well as other airlines.<sup>476</sup> When Western entered into a merger agreement with Delta in September 1986, the agreement contained a no-shop clause providing that Western could not “initiate contact with, solicit, encourage or participate in any way in discussions or negotiations with, or provide an information or assistance to, or provide any information or assistance to, any third party . . . concerning any acquisition of . . . [Western].”<sup>477</sup> Western also granted Delta a lock-up agreement for approximately 30% of Western’s stock. The court stated that the market had been canvassed by the time the merger agreement was signed, and that by having a lock-up and a no-shop clause Western “gained a substantial benefit for its stockholders by keeping the only party expressing any interest at the table while achieving its own assurances that the transaction would be consummated.”<sup>478</sup>

---

470. *Id.* at 289.

471. *Id.*

472. *Id.* at 291.

473. *Id.* at 291 n.15.

474. *Rand*, 1994 WL 89006.

475. *Id.* at \*1.

476. *Id.*

477. *Id.* at \*2.

478. *Id.* at \*7.

d. In *Vitalink*,<sup>479</sup> the court held that the break-up fee, which represented approximately 1.9% of the transaction, did not prevent a canvass of the market.<sup>480</sup> The merger agreement in *Vitalink* also contained a no-shop which prohibited the target from soliciting offers, and a lock-up for NSC to purchase 19.9% of the shares of *Vitalink*.<sup>481</sup> In upholding the no-shop clause, the court noted that the no-shop clause “was subject to a fiduciary out clause whereby the Board could shop the company so as to comply with, among other things, their *Revlon* duties (i.e., duty to get the highest price reasonably attainable for shareholders).”<sup>482</sup> The court also held that the lock-up at issue did not constitute a “real impediment to an offer by a third party.”<sup>483</sup>

e. In *Roberts*,<sup>484</sup> General Instrument entered into a merger agreement with a subsidiary of Forstmann Little & Co.<sup>485</sup> The merger agreement contained a no-shop clause providing that the corporation would not “solicit alternative buyers and that its directors and officers will not participate in discussions with or provide any information to alternative buyers except to the extent required by the exercise of fiduciary duties.”<sup>486</sup> General Instrument could terminate the merger agreement if it determined that a third party’s offer was more advantageous to the shareholders than Forstmann’s offer.<sup>487</sup> Forstmann also agreed to keep the tender offer open for 30 business days, longer than required by law, to allow time for alternative bidders to make proposals. General Instrument was contacted by two other potential acquirors, and provided them with confidential information pursuant to confidentiality agreements.<sup>488</sup> Neither made offers. The court held that the no-shop did not impede any offers, noting that the merger agreement contained a sufficient fiduciary out.<sup>489</sup> The transaction in *Roberts* also included a \$33 million break-up fee in the event that the General Instrument board chose an unsolicited bid over that of the bidder in the ex-

---

479. *In re Vitalink*, 1991 WL 238816.

480. *Id.* at \*7.

481. *Id.* at \*3.

482. *Id.* at \*7.

483. *Id.*

484. *Roberts*, 1990 WL 118356.

485. *Id.* at \*6.

486. *Id.*

487. *Id.*

488. *Id.*

489. *Id.* at \*9.

ercise of the board's fiduciary duties.<sup>490</sup> The court held that the break-up fee was "limited", approximately 2% of the value of the deal, and would not prevent the board from concluding that it had effected the best available transaction.<sup>491</sup>

f. In *Fort Howard*,<sup>492</sup> the board decided to enter into a merger agreement with a subsidiary of the Morgan Stanley Group. The agreement contained a no-shop clause that allowed Fort Howard to respond to unsolicited bids and provide potential bidders with information. Fort Howard received inquiries from eight potential bidders, all of whom were provided with information.<sup>493</sup> None of the eight made a bid.<sup>494</sup> The agreement also contained a break-up fee of approximately 1% of the consideration. The court believed that Fort Howard conducted an active market check, noting that the:

[A]lternative "market check" that was achieved was not so hobbled by lock-ups, termination fees or topping fees, so constrained in time or so administered (with respect to access to pertinent information or manner of announcing "window shopping" rights) as to permit the inference that this alternative was a sham designed from the outset to be ineffective or minimally effective.<sup>495</sup>

The court noted that it was "particularly impressed with the [window shopping] announcement in the financial press and with the rapid and full-hearted response to the eight inquiries received."<sup>496</sup>

### **G. Dealing with a Competing Acquiror**

Even in the friendly acquisition, a board's obligations do not cease with the execution of the merger agreement.<sup>497</sup> If a competing acquiror emerges with a serious proposal offering greater value to shareholders (usually a higher price), the board

---

490. *Id.* at \*6.

491. *Id.* at \*9.

492. *In re Fort Howard*, 1988 WL 83147.

493. *Id.* at \*8.

494. *Id.* at \*8-9.

495. *Id.* at \*13.

496. *Id.*

497. *See e.g., Emerson Radio Corp. v. Int'l Jensen Inc.*, 1996 WL 483086 (Del. Ch. 1996) (bidding and negotiations continued more than six months after merger agreement signed).

should give it due consideration.<sup>498</sup> Generally the same principles that guided consideration of an initial proposal (being adequately informed and undertaking an active and orderly deliberation) will also guide consideration of the competing proposal.<sup>499</sup>

### **1. *Fiduciary Outs***

A board should seek to maximize its flexibility in responding to a competing bidder in the no-shop provision of the merger agreement. It will generally be advisable for the agreement to contain provisions permitting the corporation not only to provide information to a bidder with a superior proposal, but also to negotiate with the bidder, enter into a definitive agreement with the bidder, and terminate the existing merger agreement upon the payment of a break-up fee. Without the ability to terminate the agreement, the board may find, at least under the language of the agreement, that its response will be more limited.<sup>500</sup> In such circumstances, there may be some doubt as to its ability to negotiate with the bidder or otherwise pursue the bid. This may in turn force the competing bidder to take its bid directly to the shareholders through a tender offer, with a concomitant loss of board control over the process.

Bidders may seek to reduce the board's flexibility by negotiating for an obligation in the merger agreement to submit the merger agreement to stockholders (also known as a "force the vote" provision) even if the board subsequently withdraws its recommendation to the stockholders. Such an obligation is now permitted by DGCL Section 146. The decision to undertake such submission, however, implicates the board's fiduciary duties. Because of the possibility of future competing bidders, this may be a difficult decision.<sup>501</sup>

---

498. See *Phelps Dodge*, 1999 WL 1054255 and *Ace*, 747 A.2d at 107-108.

499. See *Macmillan*, 559 A.2d at 1282 n.29.

500. See *Van Gorkom*, 488 A.2d at 888 ("Clearly the . . . Board was not 'free' to withdraw from its agreement . . . by simply relying on its self-induced failure to have [negotiated a suitable] original agreement. . . .") *But see also QVC*, 637 A.2d at 51 (a board cannot "contract away" its fiduciary duties) and *Ace*, 747 A.2d at 107-108.

501. See John F. Johnston, *Recent Amendments to the Merger Sections of the DGCL Will Eliminate Some - But Not All - Fiduciary Out Negotiation and Drafting Issues*, 1 BNA Mergers & Acquisitions L. Rep. 777 (1998).

**a. *Omnicare, Inc. v. NCS Healthcare, Inc.***

The Delaware Supreme Court's April 4, 2003 decision in *Omnicare, Inc. v. NCS Healthcare, Inc.*<sup>502</sup> deals with the inter-relationship between a "force the vote" provision in the merger agreement, a voting agreement which essentially obligated a majority of the voting power of the target company's shares to vote in favor of a merger, and the absence of a "fiduciary termination right" in the merger agreement that would have enabled the board of directors to back out of the deal before the merger vote if a better deal comes along.

The decision in *Omnicare* considered a challenge to a pending merger agreement between NCS Healthcare, Inc. and Genesis Health Ventures, Inc. Prior to entering into the Genesis merger agreement, the NCS directors were aware that Omnicare was interested in acquiring NCS. In fact, Omnicare had previously submitted proposals to acquire NCS in a pre-packaged bankruptcy transaction. NCS, however, entered into an exclusivity agreement with Genesis in early July 2002. When Omnicare learned from other sources that NCS was negotiating with Genesis and that the parties were close to a deal, it submitted an offer that would have paid NCS stockholders \$3.00 cash per share, which was more than three times the value of the \$0.90 per share, all stock, proposal NCS was then negotiating with Genesis. Omnicare's proposal was conditioned upon negotiation of a definitive merger agreement, obtaining required third party consents, and completing its due diligence. The exclusivity agreement with Genesis, however, prevented NCS from discussing the proposal with Omnicare.

When NCS disclosed the Omnicare offer to Genesis, Genesis responded by enhancing its offer. The enhanced terms included an increase in the exchange ratio so that each NCS share would be exchanged for Genesis stock then valued at \$1.60 per share. But Genesis also insisted that NCS approve and sign the merger agreement as well as approve and secure the voting agreements by midnight the next day, before the exclusivity agreement with Genesis was scheduled to expire. On July 28, 2002, the NCS directors approved the Genesis merger agreement prior to the expiration of Genesis's deadline.

The merger agreement contained a "force-the-vote" provision authorized by the Delaware General Corporation Law, which required the agreement to be submitted to a vote of

---

502. 818 A.2d 914 (Del. 2003).

NCS's stockholders, even if its board of directors later withdrew its recommendation of the merger (which the NCS board later did). In addition, two NCS director-stockholders who collectively held a majority of the voting power, but approximately 20% of the equity of NCS, agreed unconditionally and at the insistence of Genesis to vote all of their shares in favor of the Genesis merger. The NCS board authorized NCS to become a party to the voting agreements and granted approval under Section 203 of the Delaware General Corporation Law, in order to permit Genesis to become an interested stockholder for purposes of that statute. The "force-the-vote" provision and the voting agreements, which together operated to ensure consummation of the Genesis merger, were not subject to fiduciary outs.

*The Court of Chancery's Decision in Omnicare.* The Court of Chancery declined to enjoin the NCS/Genesis merger. In its decision, the Court emphasized that NCS was a financially troubled company that had been operating on the edge of insolvency for some time. The Court also determined that the NCS board was disinterested, independent, and fully informed. The Vice Chancellor further emphasized his view that the NCS board had determined in good faith that it would be better for NCS and its stockholders to accept the fully-negotiated deal with Genesis, notwithstanding the lock up provisions, rather than risk losing the Genesis offer and also risk that negotiations with Omnicare over the terms of a definitive merger agreement could fail.

*The Supreme Court Majority Opinion in Omnicare.* On appeal, the Supreme Court of Delaware accepted the Court of Chancery's finding that the NCS directors were disinterested and independent and assumed "arguendo" that they exercised due care in approving the Genesis merger. Nonetheless, the majority held that the "force-the-vote" provision in the merger agreement and the voting agreements operated in tandem to irrevocably "lock up" the merger and to preclude the NCS board from exercising its ongoing obligation to consider and accept higher bids. Because the merger agreement did not contain a fiduciary out, the Supreme Court held that the Genesis merger agreement was both preclusive and coercive and, therefore, invalid under *Unocal Corp. v. Mesa Petroleum Co.*:<sup>503</sup>

---

503. 493 A.2d 946 (Del. 1985).

The record reflects that the defensive devices employed by the NCS board are preclusive and coercive in the sense that they accomplished a *fait accompli*. In this case, despite the fact that the NCS board has withdrawn its recommendation for the Genesis transaction and recommended its rejection by the stockholders, the deal protection devices approved by the NCS board operated in concert to have a preclusive and coercive effect. Those tripartite defensive measures – the Section 251(c) provision, the voting agreements, and the absence of an effective fiduciary out clause – made it “mathematically impossible” and “realistically unattainable” for the Omnicare transaction or any other proposal to succeed, no matter how superior the proposal.

As an alternative basis for its conclusion, the majority held that under the circumstances the NCS board did not have authority under Delaware law to completely “lock up” the transaction because the defensive measures “completely prevented the board from discharging its fiduciary responsibilities to the minority stockholders when Omnicare presented its superior transaction.” In so holding, the Court relied upon its decision in *Paramount Communications Inc. v. QVC Networks Inc.*,<sup>504</sup> in which the Court held that “[t]o the extent that a [merger] contract, or a provision thereof, purports to require a board to act or not act in such a fashion as to limit the exercise of fiduciary duties, it is invalid and unenforceable.”

*The Dissents in Omnicare.* Chief Justice Veasey and Justice Steele wrote separate dissents. Both believed that the NCS board was disinterested and independent and acted with due care and in good faith – observations with which the majority did not necessarily disagree. The dissenters articulated their view that it was “unwise” to have a bright-line rule prohibiting absolute lock ups because in some circumstances an absolute lock up might be the only way to secure a transaction that is in the best interests of the stockholders. The dissenters would have affirmed on the basis that the NCS board’s decision was protected by the business judgment rule. Both Chief Justice Veasey and Justice Steele expressed a hope that the majority’s

---

504. 637 A.2d 34, 51 (Del. 1994).



decision “will be interpreted narrowly and will be seen as *sui generis*.”

*Impact of the Omnicare Decision.* The *Omnicare* decision has several important ramifications with regard to the approval of deal protection measures in the merger context.

*First*, the decision can be read to suggest a bright-line rule that a “force-the-vote” provision cannot be utilized in connection with voting agreements locking up over 50% of the stockholder vote unless the board of directors of the target corporation retains for itself a fiduciary out that would enable it to terminate the merger agreement in favor of a superior proposal. It is worth noting that the decision does not preclude – but rather seems to confirm the validity of – combining a “force-the-vote” provision with a voting agreement locking up a majority of the stock so long as the board of directors retains an effective fiduciary out. More uncertain is the extent to which the rule announced in *Omnicare* might apply to circumstances in which a merger agreement includes a “force-the-vote” provision along with a fiduciary termination out and contemplates either an option for the buyer to purchase a majority block of stock or a contractual right of the buyer to receive some or all of the upside received by a majority block if a superior proposal is accepted. While neither structure would disable the board from continuing to exercise its fiduciary obligations to consider alternative bids, arguments could be made that such a structure is coercive or preclusive, depending upon the particular circumstances.

The *Omnicare* decision also does not expressly preclude coupling a “force-the-vote” provision with a voting agreement locking up less than a majority block of stock, even if the board does not retain a fiduciary termination out. Caution would be warranted, however, if a buyer were to request a “force-the-vote” provision without a fiduciary termination out and seek to couple such a provision with a voting agreement affecting a substantial block of stock, as that form of deal protection could potentially implicate the same concerns expressed by the majority in *Omnicare*. Moreover, existing case law and commentary make clear that a board must retain its ability to make full disclosure to stockholders if a merger agreement contains a “force-the-vote” provision and does not provide the board with a fiduciary termination right.

The extent to which the bright-line rule announced in *Omnicare* may be applicable to other factual circumstances remains to be seen. Powerful arguments can be made, for exam-

ple, that a similar prohibition should not apply to circumstances in which the majority stockholder vote is obtained by written consents executed after the merger agreement is approved and signed. Likewise, it is doubtful that a similar prohibition should apply to a merger with a majority stockholder who has expressed an intention to veto any transaction in which it is not the buyer.

*Second*, the majority's decision confirms that *Unocal's* enhanced judicial scrutiny is applicable to a Delaware court's evaluation of deal protection measures designed to protect a merger agreement. Where board-implemented defensive measures require judicial review under *Unocal*, the initial burden is on the defendant directors to demonstrate that they had reasonable grounds for believing that a threat to corporate policy and effectiveness existed and that they took action in response to the threat that was neither coercive nor preclusive and that was within a range of reasonable responses to the threat perceived. Prior to *Omnicare*, there appeared to be a split of authority in the Court of Chancery as to whether deal protection measures in the merger context should be evaluated under *Unocal*. Although the dissenters questioned whether *Unocal* should be the appropriate standard of review, the majority decision confirms that *Unocal* applies to judicial review of deal protection measures.

*Third*, although the majority assumed "arguendo" that the *Revlon* doctrine was not applicable to the NCS board's decision to approve the Genesis merger, the majority seems to question the basis for the Court of Chancery's determination that *Revlon* was not applicable. When the doctrine announced in *Revlon, Inc. v. MacAndrews & Forbes Holdings, Inc.*<sup>505</sup> is applicable to a sale or merger of a corporation, the board of directors is charged with obtaining the best price reasonably available to the stockholders under the circumstances, and the board's decision making is subject to enhanced scrutiny judicial review and not automatically protected by the business judgment rule. Prior decisional law has established that *Revlon* is applicable where, among other circumstances, the board has initiated an active bidding process seeking to sell the company or has approved a business combination resulting in a break up or sale of the company or a change of control.

---

505. 506 A.2d 173, 182 (Del. 1986).

The Court of Chancery determined that *Revlon* was not applicable because the NCS board did not initiate an active bidding contest seeking to sell NCS, and even if it had, it effectively abandoned that process when it agreed to negotiate a stock-for-stock merger with Genesis in which control of the combined company would remain in a large, fluid and changing market and not in the hands of a controlling stockholder. The NCS board, however, had evaluated the fairness of the Genesis merger based on the market price of Genesis' stock and not as a strategic transaction. Accordingly, the Court of Chancery's suggestion that *Revlon* no longer applies if a board approves any form of stock-for-stock merger at the end of an active bidding process could signal that *Revlon* applies in fewer circumstances than many practitioners previously believed. On appeal, the Supreme Court majority explained that whether *Revlon* applied to the NCS board's decision to approve the Genesis merger was not outcome determinative. For purposes of its analysis, the majority assumed "arguendo" that the business judgment rule applied to the NCS board's decision to merge with Genesis. This could be read to signal that the majority disagreed with the trial court's *Revlon* analysis. Thus, whether or not *Revlon* could potentially be applicable to non-strategic stock-for-stock mergers entered into at the end of an auction process remains an open question.

### ***b. Orman v. Cullman***

A year after *Omnicare*, the Chancery Court in *Orman v. Cullman (General Cigar)*,<sup>506</sup> upheld a merger agreement in which majority stockholders with high vote stock agreed to vote their shares pro rata in accordance with public stockholders and the majority stockholders also agreed not to vote in favor of another transaction for 18 months following termination. The Chancery Court found that such a transaction was not coercive because there was no penalty to public stockholders for voting against the transaction.

In *Orman*, the court focused on whether the combined effect of the provisions was coercive and upheld the deal protection devices as not being coercive. In this case, the acquiror obtained a voting agreement from stockholders owning a majority of the voting stock of the target entity. The target had two classes of stock (class A and class B), and the approval of the

---

506. C.A. No. 18039, 2004 Del. Ch. LEXIS 150 (Del. Ch. Oct. 20, 2004).

class A stockholders voting as a separate class was required. The voting agreement required the subject stockholders to vote in favor of the transaction, to not sell their shares and to vote their class B shares against any alternative acquisition for a period of up to eighteen months following the termination of the merger agreement. However, the voting agreement also contained a “mirrored voting” provision that required the stockholders subject to voting agreements to vote their shares of class A common stock in accordance with the vote of the other class A stockholders in connection with the vote to approve the transaction. Despite the “mirrored voting” concession with respect to a vote on the proposed transaction, there was an absolute obligation on the parties to the voting agreement to vote against a competing transaction. The terms of the merger agreement allowed the board of directors of the target to consider alternative proposals if the special committee of the board determined the proposal was bona fide and more favorable than the existing transaction. The board was also permitted to withdraw its recommendation of the transaction if the board concluded it was required to do so in order to fulfill its fiduciary duties. However, the merger agreement did contain a “force the vote” provision requiring the target to convene a special meeting of stockholders to consider the transaction even if the board withdrew its recommendation.

In upholding the deal protection provisions, the *Orman* court, using reasoning similar to the dissent in *Omnicare*, concluded that the voting agreement and the eighteen month tail provision following the termination of the merger agreement did not undermine the effect that the class A stockholders had the right to vote on a deal on the merits. Thus, unlike in *Omnicare*, the deal protection measures did not result in “*a fait accompli*” where the result was predetermined regardless of the public shareholders’ actions. The combination of the shareholders’ ability to reject the transaction and the ability of the board to alter the recommendation resulted in the Chancellor concluding that “as a matter of law [that] the deal protection mechanisms present here were not impermissibly coercive.” The plaintiff did not argue that the arrangement was “preclusive.”

*Omnicare* and *Orman* emphasize the risk of having deal protection measures that do not contain an effective “fiduciary out” or which would combine a “force the vote” provision with voting agreements that irrevocably lock up a substantial percentage of the stockholder vote. Although under *Omnicare*, vot-

ing agreements locking up sufficient voting power to approve a merger are problematic, locking up less than 50% of the voting power could also be an issue in particular circumstances.<sup>507</sup>

**c. *Energy Partners, Ltd. v. Stone Energy Corp.***

Whether a buyer may enter into a merger agreement which limits its own right to explore third party proposal for its acquisition if its being acquired could lead to a termination of the merger agreement (i.e., whether a buyer as well as a seller may need a fiduciary out) was presented in *Energy Partners, LTD. v. Stone Energy Corp.*,<sup>508</sup> in which a declaratory judgment was sought as to the meaning and validity of Section 6.2(e) of the merger agreement between Energy Partners, Ltd. (“*Energy Partners*” or “*Parent*”) (the acquiror) and Stone Energy Corporation (“*Stone*”) (the target) that provided as follows:

[N]either Parent nor any of its Subsidiaries. . . shall (e) knowingly take, or agree to commit to take, any action that would or would reasonably be expected to result in the failure of a condition [set forth in the merger agreement], . . . or that would reasonably be expected to materially impair the ability of Target, Parent, Merger Sub, or the holders of Target Common Shares to consummate the Merger in accordance with the terms hereof or materially delay such consummation. . . .

Although Stone’s Board had originally approved a merger agreement pursuant to which Stone would merge into a wholly owned subsidiary of Plains Exploration and Production Company (“*Plains*”), after its later receipt of a proposal from Energy Partners, Stone’s Board determined that the Energy Partners

---

507. Compare *Ace Ltd. v. Capital Re Corp.*, 747 A.2d 95 (Del. Ch. 1999) (noting that acquiror’s ownership of 12.3% of target’s stock and voting agreements with respect to another 33.5%, gave acquiror, as a “virtual certainty,” the votes to consummate the merger even if a materially more valuable transaction became available) with *In re IXC Communications, Inc. S’holders Litig.*, C.A. Nos. 17324 & 17334, 1999 Del. Ch. LEXIS 210, \*24 (Del. Ch. Oct. 27, 1999) (stating, in reference to a transaction where an independent majority of the target’s stockholders owning nearly 60% of the target’s shares could freely vote for or against the merger, “[a]lmost locked up’ does not mean ‘locked up,’ and ‘scant power’ may mean less power, but it decidedly does not mean ‘no power,’” and finding that the voting agreement did not have the purpose or effect of disenfranchising the remaining majority of stockholders).

508. C.A. Nos. 2374-N, 2402-N (Del. Ch. Oct. 11, 2006).

proposal satisfied the fiduciary out provision in the Plains merger agreement and initiated negotiations with Energy Partners. The Energy Partners merger agreement (the “*Energy Partners Merger Agreement*”) was approved by Stone’s Board and Energy Partners agreed to pay a termination fee to Plains pursuant to the Plains merger agreement.

The Energy Partners Merger Agreement negotiated between Energy Partners and Stone contained the provision noted above, as well as an express no-shop provision restricting Stone (the target) from soliciting or entertaining competing offers. The Energy Partners Merger Agreement did not, however, have a parallel no-shop provision restricting Energy Partners (the buyer). After the Energy Partners Merger Agreement was signed, ATS, Inc. (“ATS”) made a hostile tender offer for Energy Partners conditioned on the Energy Partners stockholders voting down the Energy Partners Merger Agreement. In light of this development, Stone and Energy Partners expressed differing interpretations of Section 6.2(e), and ATS and Energy Partners sued, seeking a declaratory judgment on the matter. ATS argued that Section 6.2(e) was invalid to the extent that it prevented Energy Partners directors from fulfilling their fiduciary duties; Energy Partners argued that the section was neither intended to nor could be construed as a no-shop clause; and Stone argued that the section did not restrict Energy Partners so long as any negotiations, etc., did not materially delay or impair the Stone/Energy Partners merger.

After determining that the issue of whether Energy Partners could explore the ATS tender offer was justiciable, the Chancery Court then outlined the applicable contract interpretation precedents, and ultimately held that the plain language of the Energy Partners Merger Agreement permitted Energy Partners to pursue third party acquisition proposals. In so holding, the Chancery Court stated that when read as a whole, the Energy Partners Merger Agreement acknowledged that Energy Partners could be subject to third party proposals including proposals conditioned on the termination of the Energy Partners Merger Agreement, citing specifically the sections of the Energy Partners Merger Agreement that: (1) allowed Energy Partners or Stone to terminate the Energy Partners Merger Agreement if Stone accepted a superior proposal; (2) provided that Energy Partners could change its recommendation of the merger if necessary to comply with its fiduciary duties; and (3) explicitly recognized that Energy Partners might

withdraw or modify its recommendation in reference to a proposal conditioned upon the termination of the merger agreement and abandonment of the merger. The Chancery Court concluded that although it could be argued that a change in recommendation would violate Section 6.2(e) by “materially impair[ing] the ability of [the parties] to consummate the merger,” the other provisions of the Energy Partners Merger Agreement made clear that Stone’s remedy for an Energy Partners change of recommendation would be to terminate the agreement and receive a termination fee.

The Chancery Court further noted that even if there was ambiguity in the contract (which there was not), extrinsic evidence would resolve that ambiguity against Stone because the parties did not discuss Section 6.2(e) in their negotiations and also because Energy Partners repeatedly refused to agree to be bound by a no-shop provision. Finally, the Chancery Court found that Delaware law supported a construction of Section 6.2(e) that permitted Energy Partners to pursue third party acquisition proposals, stating that a complete ban on Energy Partners’ ability to speak to ATS or shop the transaction would “likely be incompatible with the directors’ fiduciary duties, and therefore, void.” The Chancery Court further stated that “[t]he structure of the no-shop provision applicable to Stone and the clauses in the nature of fiduciary outs in the Stone Merger Agreement demonstrate that Stone and Energy Partners recognized this reality.” Thus, the Chancery Court found that Energy Partners and ATS were entitled to a declaratory judgment that the Energy Partners Merger Agreement did not limit the ability of Energy Partners to explore third party acquisition proposals, including the ATS tender offer, in good faith.

## **2. *Level Playing Field***

If a bidding contest ensues, a board cannot treat bidders differently unless such treatment enhances shareholder interests. As the court in *Barkan* stated, “[w]hen multiple bidders are competing for control, this concern for fairness [to shareholders] forbids directors from using defensive mechanisms to thwart an auction or to favor one bidder over another.”<sup>509</sup> In *Macmillan*, however, the court stated that the purpose of enhancing shareholder interests “does not preclude differing treatment of bidders when necessary to advance those interests.

---

509. *Barkan*, 567 A.2d at 1286-87; see also *QVC*, 637 A.2d at 45.

Variables may occur which necessitate such treatment.”<sup>510</sup> The *Macmillan* court cited a coercive two-tiered bust-up tender offer as one example of a situation that could justify disparate treatment of bidders.<sup>511</sup>

In all-cash transactions disparate treatment is unlikely to be permitted. In the context of keeping bidders on a level playing field, the court in *Revlon* stated that:

Favoritism for a white knight to the total exclusion of a hostile bidder might be justifiable when the latter’s offer adversely affects shareholder interests, but when bidders make relatively similar offers, or dissolution of the company becomes inevitable, the directors cannot fulfill their enhanced Unocal duties by playing favorites with the contending factions.<sup>512</sup>

The court in *QVC* restated this concept and applied the *Unocal* test in stating that in the event a corporation treats bidders differently, “the trial court must first examine whether the directors properly perceived that shareholder interests were enhanced. In any event the board’s action must be reasonable in relation to the advantage sought to be achieved, or conversely, to the threat which a particular bid allegedly poses to stockholder interests.”<sup>513</sup>

### 3. *Best Value*

In seeking to obtain the “best value” reasonably available, the Delaware Supreme Court has stated that the “best value” does not necessarily mean the highest price.

In *Citron*,<sup>514</sup> Fairchild was the subject of a bidding contest between two competing bidders, Schlumberger and Gould.<sup>515</sup> The Fairchild board had an all cash offer of \$66 per share from Schlumberger, and a two-tier offer of \$70 per share from Gould, with the terms of the valuation of the back-end of Gould’s offer left undefined.<sup>516</sup> The board was also informed by its experts that a transaction with Schlumberger raised substantially less

---

510. *Macmillan*, 559 A.2d at 1286-87.

511. *Id.* at 1287 n.38.

512. *Revlon*, 506 A.2d at 184.

513. *QVC*, 637 A.2d at 45 (quoting *Macmillan*, 559 A.2d at 1288).

514. 569 A.2d 53.

515. *Id.* at 54.

516. *Id.*



antitrust concern than a transaction with Gould. The board accepted Schlumberger's offer. In upholding the agreement between Fairchild and Schlumberger, the court stated that Gould's failure to present a firm unconditional offer precluded an auction.<sup>517</sup> The court also stated that Fairchild had a duty to consider "a host of factors," including "the nature and timing of the offer," and "its legality, feasibility and effect on the corporation and its stockholders," in deciding whether to accept or reject Gould's claim.<sup>518</sup> Nevertheless, the *Citron* court specifically found that Fairchild "studiously endeavored to avoid 'playing favorites'" between the two bidders.<sup>519</sup>

A decision not to pursue a higher price, however, necessarily involves uncertainty, the resolution of which depends on a court's view of the facts and circumstances specific to the case. In *In re Lukens Inc. Shareholders Litig.*,<sup>520</sup> the court sustained a board decision to sell to one bidder, notwithstanding the known possibility that a "carve up" of the business between the two bidders could result in incremental stockholder value. The court placed great weight on the approval of the transaction by the stockholders after disclosure of the carve-up possibility.<sup>521</sup>

In the final analysis, in many cases, the board may not know that it has obtained the best value reasonably available until after the merger agreement is signed and competing bids are no longer proposed. In several cases, the Delaware courts have found as evidence that the directors obtained the best value reasonably available the fact that no other bidders came forward with a competing offer once the transaction was public knowledge.<sup>522</sup>

---

517. *Id.* at 68-69.

518. *Id.* at 68.

519. *Id.*

520. 757 A.2d 720 (Del. Ch. 1999).

521. *Lukens*, 757 A.2d at 738.

522. *See, e.g., Barkan*, 567 A.2d at 1287 ("when it is widely known that some change of control is in the offing and no rival bids are forthcoming over an extended period of time, that fact is supportive of the board's decision to proceed"); *Goodwin*, 1999 WL 64265, at \*23 ("Given that no draconian defenses were in place and that the merger was consummated three months after its public announcement, the fact that no bidders came forward is important evidence supporting the reasonableness of the Board's decision."); *Matador*, 729 A.2d at 293 (failure of any other bidder to make a bid within one month after the transaction was announced "is evidence that the directors, in fact, obtained the highest and best transaction reasonably available").

## **VII. RESPONSES TO HOSTILE TAKEOVER ATTEMPTS**

### **A. Certain Defenses**

Shareholder rights plans and state anti-takeover laws, which developed in response to abusive takeover tactics and inadequate bids, have become a central feature of most major corporations' takeover preparedness. For example, over 2,300 companies have adopted rights plans.

Rights plans and state anti-takeover laws do not interfere with negotiated transactions, nor do they preclude unsolicited takeovers. They are intended to cause bidders to deal with the target's board of directors and ultimately extract a higher acquisition premium than would otherwise have been the case. If a bidder takes action that triggers the rights or the anti-takeover laws, however, dramatic changes in the rights of the bidder can result.

In a negotiated transaction the board can let down the defensive screen afforded by a rights plan or state anti-takeover law to allow the transaction to proceed. Doing so, however, requires strict compliance with the terms of the rights plan and applicable statutes, as well as compliance with the directors fiduciary duties.

### **B. Rights Plans**

**The Basic Design.** The key features of a rights plan are the "flip-in" and "flip-over" provisions of the rights, the effect of which, in specified circumstances, is to impose unacceptable levels of dilution on the acquirer. The risk of dilution, combined with the authority of a board of directors to redeem the rights prior to a triggering event (generally an acquisition of 15% or 20% of the corporation's stock), gives a potential acquirer a powerful incentive to negotiate with the board of directors rather than proceeding unilaterally.

*Basic Case Law Regarding Rights Plans.* It is a settled principle of Delaware law that a poison pill/shareholder rights plan, if drafted correctly, is valid as a matter of Delaware law. See *Leonard Loventhal Account v. Hilton Hotels Corp.*,<sup>523</sup> in which the Chancery Court, citing *Moran*,<sup>524</sup> wrote:

---

523. C.A. No. 17803, 2000 WL 1528909 (Del. Ch. Oct. 10, 2000).

524. 500 A.2d at 1346.

The Delaware courts first examined and upheld the right of a board of directors to adopt a poison pill rights plan fifteen years ago in *Moran v. Household International, Inc.* Since that decision, others have followed which affirmed the validity of a board of directors' decision to adopt a poison pill rights plan. Today, rights plans have not only become commonplace in Delaware, but there is not a single state that does not permit their adoption.

Federal courts applying Texas law have upheld the concept of rights plans.<sup>525</sup>

The litigation concerning rights plans now focuses on whether or not a board of directors should be required to redeem the rights in response to a particular bid. In this respect, courts applying Delaware law have upheld, or refused to enjoin, determinations by boards of directors not to redeem rights in response to two-tier offers<sup>526</sup> or inadequate 100% cash offers<sup>527</sup> as well as to protect an auction or permit a target to explore alternatives.<sup>528</sup> On the other hand, some decisions have held that the rights may not interfere with shareholder choice at the conclusion of an auction<sup>529</sup> or at the "end stage" of a target's attempt to develop alternatives.<sup>530</sup> *Pillsbury* involved circumstances in which the board of directors, rather than "just saying no," had pursued a restructuring that was comparable to the pending all-cash tender offer.<sup>531</sup>

---

525. See *Gearhart Industries v. Smith International*, 741 F.2d 707 (5th Cir. 1984); and *A. Copeland Enterprises, Inc. v. Guste*, 706 F. Supp. 1283 (W.D. Tex. 1989).

526. *Desert Partners, L.P. v. USG Corp.*, 686 F. Supp. 1289 (N.D. Ill. 1988).

527. *BNS Inc. v. Koppers Co.*, 683 F. Supp. 458, 474-75 (D. Del. 1988); *Moore Corp. v. Wallace Computer Services, Inc.*, 907 F. Supp. 1545 (D. Del. 1995); *MAI Basic Four, Inc. v. Prime Computer, Inc.*, [1988-89 Transfer Binder] Fed. Sec. L. Rep. (CCH) ¶ 94,179 (Del. Ch. 1988).

528. *CRTF Corp. v. Federated Dept. Stores, Inc.*, 683 F. Supp. 422, 438-42 (S.D.N.Y. 1988) (refusing to enjoin discriminatory application of poison pill during auction); *In re Holly Farms Corp. Shareholders Litigation*, 564 A.2d 342 (Del. Ch. 1988).

529. *Mills Acquisition Co. v. Macmillan, Inc.*, 1988 WL 108332 [1988-89 Transfer Binder] Fed. Sec. L. Rep. (CCH) ¶ 94,071 (Del. Ch. 1988), *rev'd on other grounds*, 559 A.2d 1261 (Del. 1989).

530. *Grand Metropolitan Public, Ltd. v. Pillsbury Co.*, 558 A.2d 1049 (Del. Ch. 1988); *TW Services v. SWT Acquisition Corp.*, C.A. No. 10427, 1989 Del. Ch. LEXIS 19, at 24-25 (Mar. 2, 1989).

531. See *Paramount Communications Inc. v. Time Inc.*, 1988 WL 79880 at \*28 (Del. Ch. 1988) [1989 Transfer Binder] Fed. Sec. L. Rep. (CCH) ¶

Many rights plans adopted shortly after creation of these protective measures in 1984 were scheduled to expire and have generally been renewed. Renewal of a rights plan involves essentially the same issues as the initial adoption of a plan.

*“Dead Hand” Pills.* In the face of a “Just Say No” defense, the takeover tactic of choice has become a combined tender offer and solicitation of proxies or consents to replace target’s board with directors committed to redeeming the poison pill to permit the tender offer to proceed. Under DGCL § 228, a raider can act by written consent of a majority of the shareholders without a meeting of stockholders, unless such action is prohibited in the certificate of incorporation (under the Texas Corporate Statutes, unanimous consent is required for shareholder action by written consent unless the certificate of formation otherwise provides).<sup>532</sup> Under DGCL § 211(d) a raider can call a special meeting between annual meetings only if permitted under the target’s bylaws, whereas under the Texas Corporate Statutes any holder of at least 10% of the outstanding shares can call a special meeting unless the certificate of formation specifies a higher percentage (not to exceed 50%).<sup>533</sup> If the target has a staggered board, a raider can generally only replace a majority of the target’s board by waging a proxy fight at two consecutive annual meetings.

A target without a staggered Board cannot rely on an ordinary poison pill to give much protection in the face of a combined tender offer/proxy fight. The predicament faced by such targets has spawned variants of the so-called “continuing director” or “dead hand” pill.

“Pure” dead hand pills permit only directors who were in place prior to a proxy fight or consent solicitation (or new directors recommended or approved by them) to redeem the rights plan. Once these “continuing directors” are removed, no other director can redeem the pill.

Modified dead hand provisions come in a variety of forms. So called “nonredemption” or “no hand” provisions typically provide that no director can redeem the rights plan once the contin-

---

94,514, at 93,283 (Del. Ch. 1988) (in *Pillsbury* and *Interco*, management sought to “cram down” a transaction that was the functional equivalent of the very leveraged ‘bust up’ transaction that management was claiming presented a threat to the corporation”), *aff’d*, 571 A.2d 1140 (Del. 1989).

532. TBOC § 6.201; TBCA art. 9.10A.

533. TBOC § 21.352(a)(2); TBCA art. 2.24C.

uing directors no longer constitute a majority of the board. This limitation on redemption may last for a limited period or for the remaining life of the pill. The rights plan at issue in the *Quickturn* case discussed below included such a provision.

Another variant is the “limited duration,” or “delayed redemption,” dead hand pill. This feature can be attached to either the pure dead hand or no hand rights plan. As the name indicates, these pills limit a dead hand or no hand restriction’s effectiveness to a set period of time, typically starting after the continuing directors no longer constitute a majority of the board. These rights plans delay, but do not preclude, redemption by a newly elected board.

The validity of dead hand provisions depends in large part upon the state law that applies. Delaware recently has made clear that dead hand provisions – even of limited duration – are invalid.<sup>534</sup>

The Delaware Supreme Court held that the dead hand feature of the rights plan ran afoul of DGCL § 141(a), which empowers the board of directors to manage the corporation. Relying on the requirement in § 141(a) that any limitation on the board’s power must be stated in the certificate of incorporation, the court found that a dead hand provision would prevent a newly elected board “from completely discharging its fundamental management duties to the corporation and its stockholders for six months” by restricting the board’s power to negotiate a sale of the corporation. The reasoning behind the *Quickturn* holding leaves little room for dead hand provisions of any type in Delaware.<sup>535</sup>

Not all states have come down against dead hand rights plans.<sup>536</sup> The rights plan upheld in *Copeland*<sup>537</sup> involved dead

---

534. See *Quickturn Design Systems, Inc. v. Shapiro*, 721 A.2d 1281 (Del. 1998), which involved a “no hand” pill provision of limited duration that the target’s board had adopted in the face of a combined proxy fight and tender offer by raider. The pill provision barred a newly elected board from redeeming the rights plan for six months after taking office if the purpose or effect would be to facilitate a transaction with a party that supported the new board’s election.

535. See also *Carmody v. Toll Brothers, Inc.*, 723 A.2d 1180 (Del. Ch. 1988).

536. See *Invacare Corporation v. Healthyne Technologies, Inc.*, 968 F. Supp. 1578 (N.D. Ga. 1997) (court rejected the offeror’s contention that a dead hand pill impermissibly restricts the power of future boards of directors – including a board elected as part of a takeover bid – to redeem a rights plan, relying upon the “plain language” of a Georgia statute that ex-

hand features, although the opinion did not focus on the validity of the dead hand feature.

### **C. Business Combination Statutes**

Both Delaware and Texas provide protections to shareholders of public companies against interested shareholder transactions that occur after a shareholder has acquired a 15% to 20% ownership interest. The Delaware limitations are found in Section 203 of the DGCL and the Texas limitations are found in Part Thirteen of the TBCA and Chapter 21, Subchapter M of the TBOC (the “*Texas Business Combination Statutes*”).

#### **1. DGCL § 203**

DGCL § 203 imposes restrictions on transactions between public corporations and certain stockholders defined as “*interested stockholders*” unless specific conditions have been met. In general, § 203(a) provides that a publicly held Delaware corporation may not engage in a business combination with any interested stockholder for a period of three years following the date the stockholder first became an interested stockholder unless (i) prior to that date the board of directors of the corporation approved the business combination or the transaction that resulted in the stockholder becoming an interested stockholder, (ii) the interested stockholder became an interested stockholder as a result of acquiring at least 85% of the voting stock of the corporation, excluding shares held by directors and officers and employee benefit plans in which participants do not have the right to determine confidentially whether their shares will be tendered in a tender or exchange offer, or (iii) the transaction is approved by the board of directors and by the affirmative vote of at least two-thirds of the outstanding shares excluding the shares held by the interested stockholder. In the context of a corporation with more than one class of voting stock where one class has more votes per share than another class, “85% of the voting stock” refers to the percentage of the votes of such voting stock and not to the percentage of the number of shares.<sup>538</sup>

An interested stockholder is generally defined under DGCL § 203(c)(5) as any person that directly or indirectly owns or con-

---

pressly grants a corporation’s board the “sole discretion” to determine the terms contained in a rights plan).

537. *Copeland*, 706 F.Supp. at 1283.

538. See DGCL § 203(c)(8).

trols or has beneficial ownership or control of at least 15% of the outstanding shares of the corporation.<sup>539</sup> A business combination is defined under DGCL § 203(c)(3) to include (i) mergers, (ii) consolidations, (iii) direct or indirect sales, leases, exchanges, mortgages, transfers and other dispositions of assets to the interested stockholder having an aggregate market value greater than 10% of the total aggregate market value of the assets of the corporation, (iv) various issuances of stock and securities to the interested stockholder that are not issued to other stockholders on a similar basis and (v) various other transactions in which the interested stockholder receives a benefit, directly or indirectly, from the corporation that is not proportionally received by other stockholders.

The provisions of DGCL § 203 apply only to public corporations (i.e., corporations the stock of which is listed on a national securities exchange, authorized for quotation on interdealer quotation system of a registered national securities association

---

539. DGCL § 203(c)(9) defines “owner” broadly as follows:

- (9) “Owner,” including the terms “own” and “owned,” when used with respect to any stock, means a person that individually or with or through any of its affiliates or associates:
  - (i) Beneficially owns such stock, directly or indirectly; or
  - (ii) Has (A) the right to acquire such stock (whether such right is exercisable immediately or only after the passage of time) pursuant to any agreement, arrangement or understanding, or upon the exercise of conversion rights, exchange rights, warrants or options, or otherwise; provided, however, that a person shall not be deemed the owner of stock tendered pursuant to a tender or exchange offer made by such person or any of such person’s affiliates or associates until such tendered stock is accepted for purchase or exchange; or (B) the right to vote such stock pursuant to any agreement, arrangement or understanding; provided, however, that a person shall not be deemed the owner of any stock because of such person’s right to vote such stock if the agreement, arrangement or understanding to vote such stock arises solely from a revocable proxy or consent given in response to a proxy or consent solicitation made to 10 or more persons; or
  - (iii) Has any agreement, arrangement or understanding for the purpose of acquiring, holding, voting (except voting pursuant to a revocable proxy or consent as described in item (B) of subparagraph (ii) of this paragraph), or disposing of such stock with any other person that beneficially owns, or whose affiliates or associates beneficially own, directly or indirectly, such stock.

or held of record by more than 2,000 stockholders).<sup>540</sup> The provisions of DGCL § 203 also will not apply to certain stockholders who held their shares prior to the adoption of DGCL § 203. In addition, DGCL § 203 will not apply if the certificate of incorporation of the corporation or the bylaws approved by stockholders provides that the statute will not apply; provided that if the corporation is subject to DGCL § 203 at the time of adoption of an amendment eliminating the application of DGCL § 203, the amendment will not become effective for 12 months after adoption and the section will continue to apply to any person who was an interested stockholder prior to the adoption of the amendment.<sup>541</sup>

A vote to so waive the protection of DGCL § 203 is sometimes referred to as a “*Section 203 waiver*” and requires that the directors act consistently with their fiduciary duties of care and loyalty.<sup>542</sup> Significantly, in transactions involving a controlling stockholder, the board’s decision to grant a DGCL § 203 waiver to a buyer may present conflict issues for a board dominated by representatives of the controlling stockholders.<sup>543</sup>

## **2. Texas Business Combination Statutes**

The Texas Business Combination Statutes, like DGCL § 203, impose a special voting requirement for the approval of certain business combinations and related party transactions between public corporations and affiliated shareholders unless the transaction or the acquisition of shares by the affiliated shareholder is approved by the board of directors prior to the affiliated shareholder becoming an affiliated shareholder.<sup>544</sup>

In general, the Texas Business Combination Statutes prohibit certain mergers, sales of assets, reclassifications and other transactions (defined as business combinations) between shareholders beneficially owning 20% or more of the outstanding stock of a Texas public corporation (such shareholders being defined as affiliated shareholders) for a period of three years following the shareholder acquiring shares representing 20% or more of the corporation’s voting power unless two-thirds of the unaffiliated shareholders approve the transaction at a meeting held no earlier than six months after the shareholder acquires

---

540. DGCL § 203(b).

541. *Id.*

542. *See In re Digex, Inc. Shareholders Litig.*, 789 A.2d 1176 (Del. Ch. 2000).

543. *Id.*

544. *See* TBOC § 21.606; TBCA arts. 13.01-13.08.



that ownership. The provisions requiring the special vote of shareholders will not apply to any transaction with an affiliated shareholder if the transaction or the purchase of shares by the affiliated shareholder is approved by the board of directors before the affiliated shareholder acquires beneficial ownership of 20% of the shares or if the affiliated shareholder was an affiliated shareholder prior to December 31, 1996, and continued as such through the date of the transaction.<sup>545</sup> The Texas Business Combination Statutes do not contain the Delaware 85% unaffiliated share tender offer exception, which was considered by the drafters to be a major loophole in the Delaware statute, and attempts to clarify various uncertainties and ambiguities contained in the Delaware statute.

The Texas Business Combination Statutes apply only to an “issuing public corporation,” which is defined to be a corporation organized under the laws of Texas that has: (i) 100 or more shareholders, (ii) any class or series of its voting shares registered under the 1934 Act, as amended, (not in statute), or (iii) any class or series of its voting shares qualified for trading in a national market system.<sup>546</sup> For the purposes of this definition, a shareholder is a shareholder of record as shown by the share transfer records of the corporation.<sup>547</sup> The Texas Business Combination Statutes also contains an opt-out provision that allows a corporation to elect out of the statute by adopting a by-law or charter amendment prior to December 31, 1997.<sup>548</sup>

## VIII. GOING PRIVATE TRANSACTIONS

### A. *In re Pure Resources Shareholders Litigation*

*In re Pure Resources Shareholders Litigation*<sup>549</sup> was another Delaware Chancery Court opinion involving an 800-pound gorilla with an urgent hunger for the rest of the bananas (i.e., a majority shareholder who desires to acquire the rest of the shares). In this case, the Court of Chancery enjoined Unocal Corp.’s proposed \$409 million unsolicited tender offer for the 35% of Midland, Texas-based Pure Resources Inc. that it did not own (the “Offer”). The opinion, *inter alia*, (i) explains the kinds of authority that a Board may (should) delegate to a Special

---

545. TBOC §§ 21.606, 21.607(3); TBCA art. 13.03, 13.04.

546. TBOC § 21.601(1); TBCA art. 13.02.A(6).

547. *Id.*

548. TBOC § 21.607(1)(B); TBCA art. 1304A(1)(b).

549. 808 A.2d 421 (Del. Ch. 2002).

Committee in dealing with a buy-out proposal of a controlling shareholder (the full authority of the Board vs. the power to negotiate the price), and (ii) discusses how the standard of review may differ depending on whether the controlling shareholder proposes to acquire the minority via merger or tender offer (entire fairness vs. business judgment).

A Special Committee of Pure's Board voted not to recommend the Offer. The Special Committee requested, but was not "delegated the full authority of the board under Delaware law to respond to the Offer." With such authority, the Special Committee could have searched for alternative transactions, speeded up consummation of a proposed royalty trust, evaluated the feasibility of a self-tender, and put in place a shareholder rights plan (*a.k.a.*, poison pill) to block the Offer. The Special Committee never pressed the issue of its authority to a board vote, the Pure directors never seriously debated the issue at the board table itself, and the Court noted that the "record does not illuminate exactly why the Special Committee did not make this their Alamo." The Special Committee may have believed some of the broader options technically open to them under their preferred resolution (e.g., finding another buyer) were not practicable, but "[a]s to their failure to insist on the power to deploy a poison pill - the by-now *de rigeur* tool of a board responding to a third-party tender offer - the record is obscure."

The Court commented that its "ability to have confidence in these justifications [for not pressing for more authority] has been compromised by the Special Committee's odd decision to invoke the attorney-client privilege as to its discussion of these issues" and in a footnote stated "in general it seems unwise for a special committee to hide behind the privilege, except when the disclosure of attorney-client discussions would reveal litigation-specific advice or compromise the special committee's bargaining power."

Much of the Court's opinion focuses on whether a tender offer by a controlling shareholder is "governed by the *entire fairness* standard of review," which puts the burden on the controlling shareholder to prove both "*substantive fairness*" (fair price and structure) and "*procedural fairness*" (fair process in approving the transaction). Plaintiffs argued that "entire fairness" should be the applicable standard because "the *structural power* of Unocal over Pure and its board, as well as Unocal's involvement in determining the scope of the Special Committee's au-

thority, make the Offer other than a *voluntary, non-coercive transaction*” and that “the Offer poses the same threat of . . . ‘*inherent coercion*’ that motivated the Supreme Court in *Kahn v. Lynch*.”

In response, Unocal asserted that “[b]ecause Unocal has proceeded by way of an exchange offer and not a negotiated merger, the rule of Lynch is inapplicable,” and under the *Solomon v. Pathe Communications Corp.*<sup>550</sup> line of cases Unocal “is free to make a tender offer at whatever price it chooses so long as it does not: i) ‘*structurally coerce*’ the Pure minority by suggesting explicitly or implicitly that injurious events will occur to those stockholders who fail to tender; or ii) mislead the Pure minority into tendering by concealing or misstating the material facts.” Further, “[b]ecause Unocal has conditioned its Offer on a *majority of the minority* provision and intends to consummate a short-form merger at the same price, the Offer poses no threat of structural coercion and that the Pure minority can make a voluntary decision.” Thus, “[b]ecause the Pure minority has a negative recommendation from the Pure Special Committee and because there has been full disclosure (including of any material information Unocal received from Pure in formulating its bid), Unocal submits that the Pure minority will be able to make an informed decision whether to tender.”

The Court wrote that “[t]his case therefore involves an aspect of Delaware law fraught with doctrinal tension: what equitable standard of fiduciary conduct applies when a controlling shareholder seeks to acquire the rest of the company’s shares? \* \* \* The key inquiry is not what statutory procedures must be adhered to when a controlling stockholder attempts to acquire the rest of the company’s shares, [for] [c]ontrolling stockholders counseled by experienced lawyers rarely trip over the legal hurdles imposed by legislation.”<sup>551</sup>

In analyzing cases involving negotiated mergers, Vice Chancellor Strine focused on *Kahn v. Lynch Communications*

---

550. 672 A.2d 35 (Del. 1996).

551. The Court further commented that “the doctrine of *independent legal significance*” was not of relevance as that “doctrine stands only for the proposition that the mere fact that a transaction cannot be accomplished under one statutory provision does not invalidate it if a different statutory method of consummation exists. Nothing about that doctrine alters the fundamental rule that inequitable actions in technical conformity with statutory law can be restrained by equity.”

*Systems, Inc.*,<sup>552</sup> in which “the Delaware Supreme Court addressed the standard of review that applies when a controlling stockholder attempts to acquire the rest of the corporation’s shares in a negotiated merger [and] held that the stringent *entire fairness* form of review governed regardless of whether: i) the target board was comprised of a majority of independent directors; ii) a special committee of the target’s independent directors was empowered to negotiate and veto the merger; and iii) the merger was made subject to approval by a majority of the disinterested target stockholders.” This is the case because “even a gauntlet of protective barriers like those would be insufficient protection because of the ‘inherent coercion’ that exists when a controlling stockholder announced its desire to buy the minority’s shares. In colloquial terms, the Supreme Court saw the controlling stockholder as the *800-pound gorilla whose urgent hunger for the rest of the bananas is likely to frighten less powerful primates* like putatively independent directors who might well have been hand-picked by the gorilla (and who at the very least owed their seats on the board to his support) [and] expressed concern that minority stockholders would fear retribution from the gorilla if they defeated the merger . . .” and could not make a genuinely free choice. In two recent cases [*Aquila* and *Siliconix*]<sup>553</sup>, the Chancery Court “followed *Solomon’s* articulation of the standards applicable to a tender offer, and held that the ‘Delaware law does not impose a duty of entire fairness on controlling stockholders making a non-coercive tender or exchange offer to acquire shares directly from the minority holders.’”

The differences between the approach of the *Solomon v. Pathe* line of cases and that of *Lynch* were, to the Court, stark: “To begin with, the controlling stockholder is said to have no duty to pay a fair price, irrespective of its power over the subsidiary. Even more striking is the different manner in which the coercion concept is deployed. In the tender offer context addressed by *Solomon* and its progeny, coercion is defined in the more traditional sense as a wrongful threat that has the effect of forcing stockholders to tender at the wrong price to avoid an even worse fate later on, a type of coercion” which Vice Chancellor Strine called “*structural coercion.*” The “*inherent coercion*” that *Lynch* found to exist when controlling stockholders seek to

---

552. 638 A.2d 1110 (Del. 1994).

553. *In re Aquila, Inc.*, 805 A.2d 184 (Del. Ch. 2002); *In re Siliconix*, 2001 WL 716787 (Del. Ch. June 21, 2001).

acquire the minority's stake is not even a cognizable concern for the common law of corporations if the tender offer method is employed.

The Court agonized "that nothing about the tender offer method of corporate acquisition makes the 800-pound gorilla's retributive capabilities less daunting to minority stockholders . . . many commentators would argue that the tender offer form is more coercive than a merger vote [for in] a merger vote, stockholders can vote no and still receive the transactional consideration if the merger prevails. In a tender offer, however, a non-tendering shareholder individually faces an uncertain fate. That stockholder could be one of the few who holds out, leaving herself in an even more thinly traded stock with little hope of liquidity and subject to a DGCL § 253 merger at a lower price or at the same price but at a later (and, given the time value of money, a less valuable) time. The 14D-9 warned Pure's minority stockholders of just this possibility. For these reasons, some view tender offers as creating a prisoner's dilemma - distorting choice and creating incentives for stockholders to tender into offers that they believe are inadequate in order to avoid a worse fate."

The Court wrote that to avoid "the *prisoner's dilemma* problem, our law should consider an acquisition tender offer by a controlling stockholder non-coercive only when: 1) it is subject to a non-waivable majority of the minority tender condition; 2) the controlling stockholder promises to consummate a prompt § 253 merger at the same price if it obtains more than 90% of the shares; and 3) the controlling stockholder has made no retributive threats. \* \* \*

"The informational and timing advantages possessed by controlling stockholders also require some countervailing protection if the minority is to truly be afforded the opportunity to make an informed, voluntary tender decision. In this regard, the majority stockholder owes a duty to permit the independent directors on the target board both free rein and adequate time to react to the tender offer, by (at the very least) hiring their own advisors, providing the minority with a recommendation as to the advisability of the offer, and disclosing adequate information for the minority to make an informed judgment. For their part, the independent directors have a duty to undertake these tasks in good faith and diligently, and to pursue the best interests of the minority.

“When a tender offer is non-coercive in the sense . . . identified and the independent directors of the target are permitted to make an informed recommendation and provide fair disclosure, the law should be chary about super-imposing the full fiduciary requirement of entire fairness on top of the statutory tender offer process.” In response to plaintiffs’ argument that the Pure board breached its fiduciary duties by not giving the Special Committee the power to block the Offer by, among other means, deploying a poison pill, the Court wrote, “[w]hen a controlling stockholder makes a tender offer that is not coercive in the sense I have articulated, therefore, the better rule is that there is no duty on its part to permit the target board to block the bid through use of the pill. Nor is there any duty on the part of the independent directors to seek blocking power.”

The application of these principles to Unocal’s Offer yields the following result: “The Offer . . . is coercive because it includes within the definition of the ‘minority’ those stockholders who are affiliated with Unocal as directors and officers [and] includes the management of Pure, whose incentives are skewed by their employment, their severance agreements, and their Put Agreements.” The Court categorized this as “a problem that can be cured if Unocal amends the Offer to condition it on approval of a majority of Pure’s unaffiliated stockholders.”

The Court accepted the plaintiffs’ argument that the Pure stockholders are entitled to disclosure of all material facts pertinent to the decision they are being asked to make, and that the 14D-9 is deficient because it does not disclose any substantive portions of the work of the investment banker on behalf of the Special Committee, even though the bankers’ negative views of the Offer are cited as a basis for the board’s own recommendation not to tender. The Court, however, concluded that Unocal did not have to disclose its “*reserve price*” in case its offer was not initially successful.

### ***B. In re Emerging Communications, Inc. Shareholders Litigation***

In *In re Emerging Communications, Inc. Shareholders Litigation*,<sup>554</sup> the Delaware Court of Chancery entered a judgment after trial imposing personal liability on outside directors for

---

554. No. CIV.A.16415, 2004 WL 1305745 (Del. Ch. May 3, 2004) (V.C. Jacobs now on the Supreme Court sitting by designation on old case from his Chancery Court days).

voting to approve a going-private transaction at an unfair price, where the directors had no personal financial interest in the transaction itself. The transaction had been approved by a special committee of directors advised by independent legal counsel and an independent financial advisor that opined to the fairness of the merger's terms to the public minority, and had been conditioned on a majority-of-the-minority tendering into the first-step tender offer. The process, however was tainted: (i) the controlling stockholder had failed to provide an updated set of projections that forecast substantially higher growth for the controlled subsidiary than the projections on which the special committee and its advisers relied; (ii) the special committee chair communicated with his fellow special committee members by faxing confidential materials (including the financial analysis of the special committee's financial advisor) to the secretary of the controlling stockholder with a request that they be faxed on to the special committee members; (iii) the actual fair value of the shares was found to be over three times the transaction price (\$38.05 vs. \$10.25); (iv) investment banking firms that had previously been engaged by the directors were "co-opted" by the controlling stockholder to serve as his advisors; (v) the controlling stockholder had "misled" the special committee chair by "falsely representing" that the price of the deal strained the limits of his available financing; and (vi) a majority of the special committee lacked true independence based on lucrative consultancy and directorship fees paid by the controlling stockholder or their expectation of continuing to serve as directors of his controlled entities.

The *Emerging Communications* opinion focused on the culpability and abilities of each director, rather than focusing on the collective decision making process of the board, and found some (but not all) of the directors liable. One of the directors held individually liable was a professional investment advisor, with significant experience in the business sector involved who had previously been a financial analyst for a major investment banking firm and a fund focused in the same industry. The Chancery Court reasoned that this director's "specialized financial expertise" put him in a position where he "knew, or at the very least had strong reasons to believe" that the price was unfair, and he was "in a unique position to know that." The Chancery Court reasoned that, while the other directors could argue that they relied on the fairness opinion of the independent financial advisor to the special committee, the director whose ex-

expertise in the industry was “equivalent, if not superior” to that of the committee’s financial advisor could not credibly do so. Notwithstanding his lack of financial interest in the transaction, this director’s vote to approve the transaction was “explainable in terms of only one of two possible mindsets” – either as a deliberate effort to further his personal interests (he was a consultant to a firm controlled by the controlling stockholder, receiving an annual \$200,000 retainer for providing banking/financial advisory services, and could receive a potential \$2 million fee for other financial advisory work) or the director had “for whatever reason, consciously and intentionally disregarded his responsibility to safeguard the minority stockholders from the risk, of which he had unique knowledge, that the transaction was unfair.” Either motivation, the court held, would render the director personally liable, notwithstanding the DGCL § 102(b)(7) exculpation provision in the certificate of incorporation, for conduct that “amounted to a violation of the duty of loyalty and/or good faith.” The Chancery Court’s finding a category of non-management director with specialized knowledge liable, while exonerating others without such expertise who approved the same transaction and engaged in essentially the same conduct, seems inconsistent with the thought-to-be Delaware concept that all directors are equally responsible to stockholders and all have the same fiduciary duties, but may be explainable because the facts suggest loyalty and independence concerns.

A second non-management director was held personally liable for a breach of the duty of loyalty because he was found “clearly conflicted” as an attorney whose law firm received virtually all of its fees from the controlling stockholder and he was found to have “actively assisted” the controlling stockholder in carrying out the privatization transaction. Other non-management directors who voted to approve the same transaction were not held individually liable.

### ***C. In re PNB Holding Co. Shareholders Litigation***

*In re PNB Holding Co. Shareholders Litigation*<sup>555</sup> involved the use of vote of a majority of disinterested stockholders condition (a “*majority-of-the-minority*”) outside of the context in

---

555. 2006 WL 2403999 (Del. Ch. Aug. 18, 2006).



which a controlling stockholder is on both sides of a merger transaction.<sup>556</sup>

PNB was a bank holding company whose board decided to convert it to an S corporation under the Internal Revenue Code, but had too many stockholders to qualify as an S corporation under the Code. Thus, it proposed a merger transaction to cash out a sufficient number of stockholders to permit PNB to qualify as an S corporation. Any stockholder who owned at least 2,000 shares of stock and was one of the largest 68 stockholders would remain a stockholder, while all other stockholders would be cashed out. The directors controlled a sufficient number of shares such that they would remain stockholders of PNB following the merger.

Several stockholders dissented from the merger and perfected their appraisal rights, while several other stockholders accepted the merger consideration, but commenced an action in the Delaware Court of Chancery alleging that PNB's directors breached their fiduciary duties by approving a merger that was unfair to the minority stockholders.

Vice Chancellor Leo Strine, Jr. first considered the plaintiffs' contentions that the merger was subject to the entire fairness standard of review. The plaintiffs argued that PNB's board should be "considered as a monolith and that given the board's voting power and board control, the merger should be analyzed as if it were a squeeze-out merger proposed by a controlling stockholder." In *Lynch I*,<sup>557</sup> the Delaware Supreme Court held that the entire fairness standard of review applied *ab initio* in certain special circumstances, *e.g.*, a negotiated going private transaction with a controlling stockholder or a merger of two companies under the common control of one controlling stockholder. In those circumstances in which a controlling stockholder is on both sides of a negotiated transaction, the Delaware Supreme Court has found that the approval of the transaction by disinterested directors (*e.g.*, by a special committee) or by a majority of disinterested stockholders would only shift the burden of proving entire fairness, but would not render the business judgment rule applicable.

In considering the plaintiffs' argument that the merger should be subject to the rule of *Lynch I*, the Chancery Court

---

556. See Michael K. Reilly & Roxanne L. Houtman, PNB Holding: "Majority of Minority Clarified," Vol. XI Deal Points, Issue 3 (Fall 2006) at 2.

557. 638 A.2d 1110 (Del. 1994).

found that the officers and directors were not a “controlling stockholder group.” The Court noted that, under Delaware law, a controlling stockholder exists either where the stockholder (i) owns more than 50% of the voting power of the corporation, or (ii) exercises control over the business and affairs of the corporation. Taken as a whole, the officers and directors owned only 33.5% of the voting power of the corporation. Furthermore, the evidence failed to show that the officers, directors, and their respective families operated as a unified controlling bloc. Rather, the Court observed that there were no voting agreements in place between any of the members of the purportedly controlling block (consisting of directors, officers, spouses, children and parents), and that each individual “had the right to, and every incentive to, act in his or her own self-interest as a stockholder.” Importantly, of the approximately 20 people that comprised the “supposed controlling stockholder group,” the largest block held by any one holder was 10.6%. Thus, the Court reasoned as follows:

Glomming share-owning directors together into one undifferentiated mass with a single hypothetical brain would result in an unprincipled Frankensteinian version of the already debatable 800-pound gorilla theory of the controlling stockholder that animates the *Lynch* line of reasoning.

The Court, therefore, held that the *PNB* facts did not fit within the *Lynch I* line of jurisprudence.

Although concluding that the defendant directors were not controlling stockholders, the Court nevertheless found that the defendant directors were subject to a conflict of interest that was sufficient to invoke the application of the entire fairness standard of review. Each of the defendant directors personally benefited to the extent that departing stockholders were underpaid. Furthermore, each of the defendant directors had a material interest in the merger, which had the effect of yielding an economic benefit that was not shared equally by all of the stockholders of the corporation. In addition, and unlike in the context of determining whether a controlling stockholder group existed, the Court found that the family ties between the directors and the non-director stockholders were relevant. Importantly, several of the directors apparently transferred shares of *PNB*’s stock to family members in order to ensure that they remained stockholders of *PNB* after the merger. The Court found

that fact to be “indicative of the importance they ascribed to continued ownership in” PNB.

Having found that the merger was subject to the entire fairness standard of review, the Vice Chancellor addressed the potential “cleansing” effect of approval by (i) independent and disinterested directors (e.g., a fully-functioning special committee), or (ii) a fully-informed, non-coerced vote of a “majority-of-the-minority.” With respect to the former, Vice Chancellor Strine stated as follows:

In my view, the rule of *Lynch* would not preclude business judgment rule protection for a merger of this kind so long as the transaction was approved by a board majority consisting of directors who would be cashed-out or a special committee of such directors negotiated and approved the transaction.

Although the defendant directors created a committee to investigate the feasibility of the conversion of PNB to an S corporation, the committee was not comprised of disinterested directors. As a result, the Committee did not operate to invoke the substantive protections of the business judgment rule.

The Court also noted that the substantive protections of the business judgment rule could be invoked if the merger was approved by a “majority-of-the-minority.” The Court found, however, that PNB failed, as a mathematical matter, to obtain the approval of a vote of a “majority-of-the-minority.” In that regard, the Court rejected the defendant directors’ contention that only those stockholders who returned a proxy should be included in calculating whether a transaction had been approved by an informed, non-coerced “majority-of-the-minority.” Clarifying a previously unresolved aspect of Delaware law, the Court held that Delaware law requires a vote of a majority of *all* of the minority shares entitled to vote.

The Court indicated that, outside of the *Lynch I* context, the approval of a majority of the disinterested stockholders may be sufficient to invoke the protections of the business judgment rule, even if the challenged transaction is not subject to a non-waivable “majority-of-the-minority” condition. The Vice Chancellor explained as follows:

Under Delaware law, however, the mere fact that an interested transaction was not made expressly subject to a non-waivable majority-of-the-minority vote condi-

tion has not made the attainment of so-called ‘ratification effect’ impossible. Rather, outside the *Lynch* context, proof that an informed, non-coerced majority of the disinterested stockholders approved an interested transaction has the effect of invoking business judgment rule protection for the transaction and, as a practical matter, insulating the transaction from revocation and its proponents from liability.

The Court ultimately concluded that the defendant directors failed to prove the entire fairness of the merger. The Court awarded the appraisal claimants the fair value of their shares. Other claimants who did not vote in favor of the merger were awarded damages in an amount representing the difference between the merger consideration and the fair value. Claimants who voted in favor of the merger were barred from recovery under the doctrine of acquiescence. Claimants who accepted the merger consideration but did not approve the merger were not similarly barred.

#### ***D. In re SS&C Technologies, Inc. Shareholder Litigation***

*In re SS&C Technologies, Inc. Shareholder Litigation*<sup>558</sup> was a case in which Vice Chancellor Lamb disapproved the settlement of litigation challenging a management led cash-out merger for two independent reasons: (i) the parties had been dilatory in presenting the settlement to the Court for approval (they did not seek Court approval of the settlement for eleven months after signing the settlement agreement and nine months after the merger was consummated) and (ii) the fairness of the process for the management led buy-out was not shown. The Court was concerned that the buyer’s proposal was solicited by the CEO as part of informal “test the waters” process to find a buyer who would pay a meaningful premium while allowing the CEO to make significant investment in the acquisition vehicle and continue managing the target. After being satisfied with the buyer’s proposal but before all details had been negotiated, the CEO advised the Board about the deal. The Board then formed special committee that hired independent legal and financial advisers and embarked on a program to solicit other buyers, but perhaps too late to affect outcome. The Court

---

558. 911 A.2d 816 (Del. Ch. 2006).

was concerned whether the CEO had misused confidential information and resources of the corporation in talking to his selected buyer and engaging an investment banker before Board approval and whether the CEO's precommitment to a deal with the buyer and his conflicts (i.e., receiving cash plus an interest in the acquisition vehicle and continuing management role) prevented the Board from considering whether a sale should take place and, if so, from negotiating the best terms reasonably available.

### ***E. In re Netsmart Technologies***

The Delaware Court of Chancery in *In re Netsmart Technologies*,<sup>559</sup> a case which the Court found "literally involves a microcosm of a current dynamic in the mergers and acquisitions market," enjoined the sale by a \$115 million cash merger of a micro-cap public corporation (market capitalization approximately \$82 million) to a private equity firm until the target's Board supplemented its proxy statement for the merger to (i) explain why the Board focused solely on private equity buyers to the exclusion of strategic buyers and (ii) to disclose the projections on which its investment bankers had relied in rendering their opinion that the merger was fair to the target's stockholders from a financial point of view.

The context of the opinion was summarized by the Court as follows:

Netsmart is a leading supplier of enterprise software to behavioral health and human services organizations and has a particularly strong presence among mental health and substance abuse service providers. It has been consistently profitable for several years and has effectively consolidated its niche within the healthcare information technology market. In October 2005, Netsmart completed a multi-year course of acquisitions by purchasing its largest direct competitor, CMHC Systems, Inc. ("CMHC"). After that acquisition was announced, private equity buyers made overtures to Netsmart management. These overtures were favorably received and management soon recommended, in May 2006, that the Netsmart board consider a sale to a private equity firm. Relying on the failure of sporadic,

---

559. C.A. No. 2563-VCS; 2007 Del. Ch. LEXIS 35 (March 14, 2007).

isolated contacts with strategic buyers stretched out over the course of more than a half-decade to yield interest from a strategic buyer, management, with help from its long-standing financial advisor, William Blair & Co., L.L.C., steered the board away from any active search for a strategic buyer. Instead, they encouraged the board to focus on a rapid auction process involving a discrete set of possible private equity buyers. Only after this basic strategy was already adopted was a “Special Committee” of independent directors formed in July 2006 to protect the interests of the company’s non-management stockholders. After the Committee’s formation, it continued to collaborate closely with Netsmart’s management, allowing the company’s Chief Executive Officer to participate in its meetings and retaining William Blair as its own financial advisor.

After a process during which the Special Committee and William Blair sought to stimulate interest on the part of seven private equity buyers, and generated competitive bids from only four, the Special Committee ultimately recommended, and the entire Netsmart board approved, the Merger Agreement with Insight. As in most private equity deals, Netsmart’s current executive team will continue to manage the company and will share in an option pool designed to encourage them to increase the value placed on the company in the Merger.

The Merger Agreement prohibits the Netsmart board from shopping the company but does permit the board to consider a superior proposal. A topping bidder would only have to suffer the consequence of paying Insight a 3% termination fee. No topping bidder has emerged to date and a stockholder vote is scheduled to be held next month, on April 5, 2007.

A group of shareholder plaintiffs now seeks a preliminary injunction against the consummation of this Merger. As a matter of substance, the plaintiffs argue that the Merger Agreement flowed from a poorly-motivated and tactically-flawed sale process during which the Netsmart board made no attempt to generate interest from strategic buyers. The motive for this narrow search, the plaintiffs say, is that Netsmart’s management only wanted to do a deal involving their continuation as corporate officers and their retention of an

equity stake in the company going forward, not one in which a strategic buyer would acquire Netsmart and possibly oust the incumbent management team. \* \* \* At the end of a narrowly-channeled search, the Netsmart directors, the plaintiffs say, landed a deal that was unimpressive, ranking at the low end of William Blair's valuation estimates.

The plaintiffs couple their substantive claims with allegations of misleading and incomplete disclosures. In particular, the plaintiffs argue that the Proxy Statement (the "Proxy"), which the defendants have distributed to shareholders in advance of their vote next month, omits important information regarding Netsmart's prospects if it were to remain independent. In the context of a cash-out transaction, the plaintiffs argue that the stockholders are entitled to the best estimates of the company's future stand-alone performance and that the Proxy omits them.

The defendant directors respond by arguing that they acted well within the bounds of the discretion afforded them by Delaware case law to decide on the means by which to pursue the highest value for the company's stockholders. They claim to have reasonably sifted through the available options and pursued a course that balanced the benefits of a discrete market canvass involving only a select group of private equity buyers (e.g., greater confidentiality and the ability to move quickly in a frothy market) against the risks (e.g., missing out on bids from other buyers). In order to stimulate price competition, the Special Committee encouraged submissions of interest from the solicited bidders with the promise that only bidders who made attractive bids would get to move on in the process. At each turning point during the negotiations with potential suitors, the Special Committee pursued the bidder or bidders willing to pay the highest price for the Netsmart equity. In the end, the directors argue, the board secured a deal with Insight that yielded a full \$1.50 more per share than the next highest bidder was willing to pay.

Moreover, in order to facilitate an implicit, post-signing market check, the defendants say that they negotiated for relatively lax deal protections. Those measures included a break-up fee of only 3%, a "window shop" pro-

vision that allowed the board to entertain unsolicited bids by other firms, and a “fiduciary out” clause that allowed the board to ultimately recommend against pursuing the Insight Merger if a materially better offer surfaced. The directors argue that the failure of a more lucrative bid to emerge since the Merger’s announcement over three months ago confirms that they obtained the best value available.

In this context the Court delayed the stockholder vote on the merger until additional disclosures were made, but left the ultimate decision on the merger to the stockholders. The Court summarized its holding as follows:

In this opinion, I conclude that the plaintiffs have established a reasonable probability of success on two issues. First, the plaintiffs have established that the Netsmart board likely did not have a reasonable basis for failing to undertake *any* exploration of interest by strategic buyers. \* \* \* Likewise, the board’s rote assumption (encouraged by its advisors) that an implicit, post-signing market check would stimulate a hostile bid by a strategic buyer for Netsmart — a micro-cap company — in the same manner it has worked to attract topping bids in large-cap strategic deals appears, for reasons I detail, to have little basis in an actual consideration of the M&A market dynamics relevant to the situation Netsmart faced. Relatedly, the Proxy’s description of the board’s deliberations regarding whether to seek out strategic buyers that emerges from this record is itself flawed.

Second, the plaintiffs have also established a probability that the Proxy is materially incomplete because it fails to disclose the projections William Blair used to perform the discounted cash flow valuation supporting its fairness opinion. This omission is important because Netsmart’s stockholders are being asked to accept a one-time payment of cash and forsake any future interest in the firm. If the Merger is approved, dissenters will also face the related option of seeking appraisal. A reasonable stockholder deciding how to make these important choices would find it material to know what the best estimate was of the company’s expected future cash flows.



The plaintiffs' merits showing, however, does not justify the entry of broad injunctive relief. Because there is no other higher bid pending, the entry of an injunction against the Insight Merger until the Netsmart board shops the company more fully would hazard Insight walking away or lowering its price. The modest termination fee in the Merger Agreement is not triggered simply on a naked no vote, and, in any event, has not been shown to be in any way coercive or preclusive. Thus, Netsmart's stockholders can decide for themselves whether to accept or reject the Insight Merger, and, as to dissenters, whether to take the next step of seeking appraisal. In so deciding, however, they should have more complete and accurate information about the board's decision to rule out exploring the market for strategic buyers and about the company's future expected cash flows. Thus, I will enjoin the procession of the Merger vote until Netsmart discloses information on those subjects.

This holding reflected the intense scrutiny that Delaware courts give to directors' conduct under the *Revlon* standard<sup>560</sup> when a Board has decided to sell the company for cash and has a fiduciary duty to secure the highest price for the company reasonably achievable. This *Revlon* scrutiny was explained by the Court as follows:

Having decided to sell the company for cash, the Netsmart board assumed the fiduciary duty to undertake reasonable efforts to secure the highest price realistically achievable given the market for the company. This duty — often called a *Revlon* duty for the case with which it is most commonly associated — does not, of course, require every board to follow a judicially prescribed checklist of sales activities. Rather, the duty requires the board to act reasonably, by undertaking a logically sound process to get the best deal that is realistically attainable. The mere fact that a board did not, for example, do a canvass of all possible acquirers before signing up an acquisition agreement does not mean that it necessarily acted unreasonably. Our case law recognizes that [there] are a variety of sales ap-

---

560. See notes 259-269 and related text, *supra*.

proaches that might be reasonable, given the circumstances facing particular corporations.

What is important and different about the *Revlon* standard is the intensity of judicial review that is applied to the directors' conduct. Unlike the bare rationality standard applicable to garden-variety decisions subject to the business judgment rule, the *Revlon* standard contemplates a judicial examination of the reasonableness of the board's decision-making process. Although linguistically not obvious, this reasonableness review is more searching than rationality review, and there is less tolerance for slack by the directors. Although the directors have a choice of means, they do not comply with their *Revlon* duties unless they undertake reasonable steps to get the best deal.

In so holding, the Court found that the Board and its Special Committee did not act reasonably in failing to contact strategic buyers. The Court rejected defendants' attempt to justify this refusal based on unauthorized sporadic contacts with strategic buyers over the half-decade preceding the proposed merger, and held that "[t]he record, as it currently stands, manifests no reasonable, factual basis for the board's conclusion that strategic buyers in 2006 would not have been interested in Netsmart as it existed at that time." In a later discussion, the Court distinguished such informal contacts from a targeted, private sales effort in which authorized representatives seek out a buyer. The Court viewed the record evidence regarding prior contacts as "more indicative of an after-the-fact justification for a decision already made, than of a genuine and reasonably-informed evaluation of whether a targeted search might bear fruit."

Further, the Court rejected a post-agreement market check involving a window-shop and 3% termination fee as a viable method for maximizing value for a micro-cap company:

Of course, one must confront the defendants' argument that they used a technique accepted in prior cases. The Special Committee used a limited, active auction among a discrete set of private equity buyers to get an attractive "bird in hand." But they gave Netsmart stockholders the chance for fatter fowl by including a fiduciary out and a modest break-up fee in the Merger Agreement. By that means, the board enabled a post-

signing, implicit market check. Having announced the Insight Merger in November 2006 without any bigger birds emerging thereafter, the board argues that the results buttress their initial conclusion, which is that strategic buyers simply are not interested in Netsmart. The problem with this argument is that it depends on the rote application of an approach typical of large-cap deals in a micro-cap environment. The “no single blueprint” mantra is not a one way principle. The mere fact that a technique was used in different market circumstances by another board and approved by the court does not mean that it is reasonable in other circumstances that involve very different market dynamics.

Precisely because of the various problems Netsmart’s management identified as making it difficult for it to attract market attention as a micro-cap public company, an inert, implicit post-signing market check does not, on this record, suffice as a reliable way to survey interest by strategic players. Rather, to test the market for strategic buyers in a reliable fashion, one would expect a material effort at salesmanship to occur. To conclude that sales efforts are always unnecessary or meaningless would be almost un-American, given the sales-oriented nature of our culture. In the case of a niche company like Netsmart, the potential utility of a sophisticated and targeted sales effort seems especially high.

\* \* \*

In the absence of such an outreach, Netsmart stockholders are only left with the possibility that a strategic buyer will: (i) notice that Netsmart is being sold, and, assuming that happens, (ii) invest the resources to make a hostile (because Netsmart can’t solicit) topping bid to acquire a company worth less than a quarter of a billion dollars. In going down that road, the strategic buyer could not avoid the high potential costs, both monetary (e.g., for expedited work by legal and financial advisors) and strategic (e.g., having its interest become a public story and dealing with the consequences of not prevailing) of that route, simply because the sought-after-prey was more a side dish than a main course. It seems doubtful that a strategic buyer would

put much energy behind trying a deal jump in circumstances where the cost-benefit calculus going in seems so unfavorable. Analogizing this situation to the active deal jumping market at the turn of the century, involving deal jumps by large strategic players of deals involving their direct competitors in consolidating industries is a long stretch.

Similarly, the current market trend in which private equity buyers seem to be outbidding strategic buyers is equally unsatisfying as an excuse for the lack of *any* attempt at canvassing the strategic market. Given Netsmart's size, the synergies available to strategic players might well have given them flexibility to outbid even cash-flush private equity investors. Simply because many deals in the large-cap arena seem to be going the private equity buyers' way these days does not mean that a board can lightly forsake any exploration of interest by strategic bidders.

In this regard, a final note is in order. Rightly or wrongly, strategic buyers might sense that CEOs are more interested in doing private equity deals that leave them as CEOs than strategic deals that may, and in this case, certainly, would not. That is especially so when the private equity deals give management . . . a "second bite at the apple" through option pools. With this impression, a strategic buyer seeking to top Insight might consider this factor in deciding whether to bother with an overture.

The Court was critical of the lack of minutes for key Board and Special Committee meetings (some of which were labeled "informal" because no minutes were taken) relied upon by the Board to justify its process.<sup>561</sup> The Court also was displeased that most of the minutes were prepared in omnibus fashion after the litigation was filed.

---

561. The Court focused on what the Board described as an "informal meeting" that resulted in a "tactical choice . . . to focus solely on a sale to a private equity buyer" rather than to also concurrently seek strategic buyers. The Court criticized the Board for failing to keep minutes of this important meeting, and subsequently discounted the description of the decision to go private and not focus on strategic buyers set forth in the proxy statement because of the lack of minutes from this meeting, finding "no credible evidence in the record" to support the description. *In re Netsmart* at \*26-30.

The Court criticized the Special Committee for permitting management to conduct the due diligence process without supervision:

“In easily imagined circumstances, this approach to due diligence could be highly problematic. If management had an incentive to favor a particular bidder (or type of bidder), it could use the due diligence process to its advantage, by using different body language and different verbal emphasis with different bidders. ‘She’s fine’ can mean different things depending on how it is said.”

The Court ultimately found no harm, no foul on this issue because management did not have a favored private equity backer and there was no evidence that they tilted the process in favor of any participant.

The Court found that the proxy’s disclosures regarding the target’s process and its reasons for not pursuing strategic buyers had no basis in fact. The Court also found that the projections relied on by the Special Committee and its financial advisor in its fairness opinion needed to be disclosed in the proxy materials:

In the Proxy, William Blair’s various valuation analyses are disclosed. One of those analyses was a DCF valuation founded on a set of projections running until 2011. Those projections were generated by William Blair based on input from Netsmart management, and evolved out of the earlier, less optimistic, Scalia projections. Versions of those figures were distributed to interested parties throughout the bidding process, and one such chart is reproduced in part in the Proxy. The final projections utilized by William Blair in connection with the fairness opinion, however, have not been disclosed to shareholders. Those final projections, which were presented to the Netsmart board on November 18, 2006 in support of William Blair’s final fairness opinion, take into account Netsmart’s acquisition of CMHC and management’s best estimate of the company’s future cash flows.

\* \* \*

But, that was thin gruel to sustain the omission. Even if it is true that bidders never received 2010 and 2011

projections, that explanation does not undercut the materiality of those forecasts to Netsmart's stockholders. They, unlike the bidders, have been presented with William Blair's fairness opinion and are being asked to make an important voting decision to which Netsmart's future prospects are directly relevant.

\* \* \*

[T]he Proxy now fails to give the stockholders the best estimate of the company's future cash flows as of the time the board approved the Merger. Because of this, it is crucial that the entire William Blair model from November 18, 2006 — not just a two year addendum — be disclosed in order for shareholders to be fully informed.

Faced with the question of whether to accept cash now in exchange for forsaking an interest in Netsmart's future cash flows, Netsmart stockholders would obviously find it important to know what management and the company's financial advisor's best estimate of those future cash flows would be. In other of our state's jurisprudence, we have given credence to the notion that managers had meaningful insight into their firms' futures that the market did not. Likewise, weight has been given to the fairness-enforcing utility of investment banker opinions. It would therefore seem to be a genuinely foolish (and arguably unprincipled and unfair) inconsistency to hold that the best estimate of the company's future returns, as generated by management and the Special Committee's investment bank, need not be disclosed when stockholders are being advised to cash out. That is especially the case when most of the key managers seek to remain as executives and will receive options in the company once it goes private. Indeed, projections of this sort are probably among the most highly-prized disclosures by investors. Investors can come up with their own estimates of discount rates or (as already discussed) market multiples. What they cannot hope to do is replicate management's inside view of the company's prospects.

The Court did not require that either the fairness opinion or the proxy statement “engage in self-flagellation” over the fact

that the merger price was at the low end of the investment banker's analytical ranges of fairness and explained:

Here, there is no evidence in the record indicating that William Blair ever explained its decision to issue a fairness opinion when the Merger price was at a level that was in the lower part of its analytical ranges of fairness. \* \* \* From this "range of fairness" justification, one can guess that William Blair believed that, given the limited auction it had conducted and the price competition it generated, a price in the lower range was "fair," especially given William Blair's apparent assumption that an implicit, post-signing market check would be meaningful. \* \* \* The one reason in the record is simply that the price fell within, even if at the lower end, of William Blair's fairness ranges. William Blair's bare bones fairness opinion is typical of such opinions, in that it simply states a conclusion that the offered Merger consideration was "fair, from a financial point of view, to the shareholders" but plainly does not opine whether the proposed deal is either advisable or the best deal reasonably available. Also in keeping with the industry norm, William Blair's fairness opinion devotes most of its text to emphasizing the limitations on the bank's liability and the extent to which the bank was relying on representations of management. Logically, the cursory nature of such an "opinion" is a reason why the disclosure of the bank's actual analyses is important to stockholders; otherwise, they can make no sense of what the bank's opinion conveys, other than as a stamp of approval that the transaction meets the minimal test of falling within some broad range of fairness.

### ***F. In re Topps Company Shareholders Litigation***

The Delaware Court of Chancery decision in *In re Topps Company Shareholder Litigation*<sup>562</sup> pitted a late responding competitor whose bid raised financing and antitrust issues against a private equity buyer that would keep management but offered a lower price. In *Topps*, Vice Chancellor Strine

---

562. CA No. 2998-VCS June 19, 2007.

granted a preliminary injunction against a stockholder vote on a cash merger at \$9.75 per share with a private equity purchaser (“*Eisner*”) until such time as: (1) the Topps Board discloses several material facts not contained in the corporation’s proxy statement, including facts regarding Eisner’s assurances that he would retain existing management after the merger and background information regarding approaches by a strategic competitor (“*Upper Deck*”) which ultimately proposed a cash merger at \$10.75 per share (\$1.00 more than the Eisner merger price) although it presented antitrust and financing risks not present in the Eisner proposal; and (2) Upper Deck is released from a standstill that it had agreed to in return for non-public information for purposes of (a) publicly commenting on its negotiations with Topps in order to counter negative characterizations of Upper Deck’s proposal in the Board’s proxy statement, and (b) making a non-coercive tender offer on conditions as favorable or more favorable than those it has offered to the Topps Board. The Court concluded that Upper Deck and a group of stockholder plaintiffs had established a reasonable probability of success in being able to show at trial that the Topps Board breached its fiduciary duties by misusing a standstill to prevent Upper Deck from communicating with the Topps stockholders and presenting a bid that the Topps stockholders could find materially more favorable than the Eisner merger proposal, but found that the Board had not breached its *Revlon* duties.<sup>563</sup>

Topps had two lines of business, both of which had been declining: (i) baseball and other cards and (ii) bubblegum and other old style confections. It had a ten member classified board, seven of whom had served Topps for many years (five of them were independent directors and one was outside counsel to Topps) (the “*Incumbent Directors*”) and three of whom were representatives of a small hedge fund who were put on the Board to settle a proxy contest (the “*Dissident Directors*”). The proxy contest led Topp’s management to first (and unsuccessfully) endeavor to sell its confections division through a public auction. Sensing that these circumstances might make Topp’s Board receptive to a going private transaction, even though it had announced that Topps was not for sale, Eisner and two other financial buyers (both of whom soon dropped out after submitting low value indication of interest) approached the

---

563. See Notes 386-392, *supra*.



Board. Although the Dissident Directors wanted an open auction of Topps, the Board decided to negotiate exclusively with Eisner (perhaps because of the failed auction of the confections division). Ultimately a merger agreement was signed by Eisner that provided a \$9.75 per share, a 40-day “go-shop”<sup>564</sup> period with Eisner having the right to match any superior proposal and a fiduciary out with a 3% of transaction value termination fee for a superior bid accepted during the 40-day go-shop period and a 4.6% termination fee for superior proposals accepted after the go-shop period.<sup>565</sup>

---

564. Stephen I. Glover and Jonathan P. Goodman, *Go Shops: Are They Here to Stay*, 11 M&A Lawyer No. 6 (June 2007).

565. The Court described the Eisner merger agreement more fully as follows:

Eisner and Topps executed the Merger Agreement on March 5, 2006, under which Eisner will acquire Topps for \$9.75 per share or a total purchase price of about \$385 million. The Merger Agreement is not conditioned on Eisner’s ability to finance the transaction, and contains a representation that Eisner has the ability to obtain such financing. But the only remedy against Eisner if he breaches his duties and fails to consummate the Merger is his responsibility to pay a \$12 million reverse break-up fee.

The “Go Shop” provision in the Merger Agreement works like this. For a period of forty days after the execution of the Merger Agreement, Topps was authorized to solicit alternative bids and to freely discuss a potential transaction with any buyer that might come along. Upon the expiration of the “Go Shop Period,” Topps was required to cease all talks with any potential bidders unless the bidder had already submitted a “Superior Proposal,” or the Topps board determined that the bidder was an “Excluded Party,” which was defined as a potential bidder that the board considered reasonably likely to make a Superior Proposal. If the bidder had submitted a Superior Proposal or was an Excluded Party, Topps was permitted to continue talks with them after the expiration of the Go Shop Period.

The Merger Agreement defined a Superior Proposal as a proposal to acquire at least 60% of Topps that would provide more value to Topps stockholders than the Eisner Merger. The method in which the 60% measure was to be calculated, however, is not precisely defined in the Merger Agreement, but was sought by Eisner in order to require any topping bidder to make an offer for all of Topps, not just one of its Businesses.

Topps was also permitted to consider unsolicited bids after the expiration of the 40-day Go Shop period if the unsolicited bid constituted a Superior Proposal or was reasonably likely to lead to one. Topps could terminate the Merger Agreement in order

*Revlon* Analysis. In finding that the Topps Board had not violated its *Revlon* duties in deciding not to undertake a pre-signing auction, Vice Chancellor Strine commented:

The so-called *Revlon* standard is equally familiar. When directors propose to sell a company for cash or engage in a change of control transaction, they must take reasonable measures to ensure that the stockholders receive the highest value reasonably attainable. Of particular pertinence to this case, when directors have made the decision to sell the company, any favoritism they display toward particular bidders must be justified solely by reference to the objective of maximizing the price the stockholders receive for their shares. When directors bias the process against one bidder and toward another not in a reasoned effort to maximize advantage for the stockholders, but to tilt the process toward the bidder more likely to continue current management, they commit a breach of fiduciary duty.

\* \* \*

---

to accept a Superior Proposal, subject only to Eisner's right to match any other offer to acquire Topps.

The Eisner Merger Agreement contains a two-tier termination fee provision. If Topps terminated the Eisner Merger Agreement in order to accept a Superior Proposal during the Go Shop Period, Eisner was entitled to an \$8 million termination fee (plus a \$3.5 million expense reimbursement), in total, or approximately 3.0% of the transaction value. If Topps terminates the Merger Agreement after the expiration of the Go Shop Period, Eisner is entitled to a \$12 million termination fee (plus a \$4.5 million expense reimbursement), or approximately 4.6% of the total deal value.

The Eisner Merger Agreement is subject to a number of closing conditions, such as consent to the transaction by regulatory authorities and the parties to certain of Topps's material contracts, such as its licenses with Major League Baseball and other sports leagues.

In connection with the Eisner Merger Agreement, Shorin and Eisner entered into a letter agreement pursuant to which Shorin agreed to retire within sixty days after the consummation of the Merger and to surrender \$2.8 million to which he would otherwise be entitled under his existing employment agreement in the event of a change of control of Topps. Shorin would remain a consultant to Topps for several years with sizable benefits, consistent with his existing employment agreement.

The Stockholder Plaintiffs . . . argue that the Incumbent Directors unreasonably resisted the desire of the Dissident Directors to conduct a full auction before signing the Merger Agreement, that Greenberg [an Incumbent Director involved in the negotiations with Eisner] capped the price Eisner could be asked to pay by mentioning that a \$10 per share price would likely command support from the Incumbent Directors, that the Incumbent Directors unfairly restricted the Dissident Director's ability to participate in the Merger negotiation and consideration process, and that the Incumbent Directors foreclosed a reasonable possibility of obtaining a better bid during the Go Shop Period by restricting that time period and granting Eisner excessive deal protections. For its part, Upper Deck echoes these arguments, and supplements them with a contention that Upper Deck had made its desire to make a bid known in 2005, before Eisner ever made a formal bid, and was turned away.

Although these arguments are not without color, they are not vibrant enough to convince me that they would sustain a finding of breach of fiduciary duty after trial. A close reading of the record reveals that a spirited debate occurred between the two members of the Ad Hoc Committee who were Incumbent Directors . . . and the two who were Dissident Directors . . . . After examining the record, I am not at all convinced that [the Incumbent Directors] were wrong to resist the Dissidents' demand for a full auction. Topps had run an auction for its Confectionary Business in 2005, without success.

The market knew that Topps, which had no poison pill in place, had compromised a proxy fight in 2006, with the insurgents clearly prevailing. Thus, although [CEO] Shorin had put out a letter before the settlement of the proxy fight indicating that a "quick fix" sale was not in the interests of stockholders, the pot was stirred and ravenous capitalists should have been able to smell the possibility of a deal. Certainly that was true of Upper Deck, which is Topps's primary competitor. Now, of course, Upper Deck says that its overtures were rebuffed by Lehman, Topps's banker, a year earlier. But one must assume that Upper Deck is run by adults. As Topps's leading competitor, it knew the stress the Dissident Directors would be exerting on

[CEO] Shorin to increase shareholder value. If Upper Deck wanted to make a strong move at that time, it could have contacted [CEO] Shorin directly (e.g., the trite lunch at the Four Seasons), written a bear hug letter, or made some other serious expression of interest, as it had several years earlier. The fact that it did not, inclines me toward the view that the defendants are likely correct in arguing that Upper Deck was focused on acquiring and then digesting another company, Fleeer, during 2005 and 2006, and therefore did not make an aggressive run at (a clearly reluctant) Topps in those years.

Given these circumstances, the belief of the Incumbent Directors on the Ad Hoc Committee, and the full board, that another failed auction could damage Topps, strikes me, on this record, as a reasonable one.

*Duty of Candor.* The Vice Chancellor summarized the Delaware duty of candor as follows:

When directors of a Delaware corporation seek approval for a merger, they have a duty to provide the stockholders with the material facts relevant to making an informed decision. In that connection, the directors must also avoid making materially misleading disclosures, which tell a distorted rendition of events or obscure material facts. In determining whether the directors have complied with their disclosure obligations, the court applies well-settled standards of materiality, familiar to practitioners of our law and federal securities law.

The proxy statement disclosed that Topps' Board had instructed management not to have any discussions with Eisner regarding post merger employment with Eisner. The Court found that while that disclosure may have been true, the proxy statement should have also made disclosures to the effect that Eisner had explicitly stated that his proposal was "designed to" retain substantially all of Topps' management and key employees. The Court also cited concerns that Topps' financial adviser had manipulated its financial analyses to make Eisner's offer look more attractive after Eisner refused to increase his bid and, thus, that the proxy statement should have included projections of Topps' future cash flows from a presentation which

the financial adviser presented to the Topps Board at a meeting over a month before it made its fairness opinion presentation regarding the Eisner proposal that was approved by the Board.

*Financing.* Although the Upper Deck had not obtained a firm debt financing commitment, the Court found that the Proxy Statement should have disclosed that competing bidder Upper Deck (a private company) did not have a financing contingency.

*Antitrust.* Upper Deck and Topps were the only competitors in the baseball card business, but the Court felt that Board's proxy statement overstated the antitrust risk in an Upper Deck merger since the Board did not produce expert testimony that there was a significant antitrust risk and Upper Deck was willing to make such regulatory concessions (e.g. divestitures) necessary to get antitrust approval.

*Standstill.* In enjoining the enforcement of the standstill against Upper Deck, the Court found that standstills may be appropriate in some circumstances, but that the Topps Board had used the Upper Deck Standstill in a way that resulted in the Topps Board breaching its fiduciary duties:

Standstills serve legitimate purposes. When a corporation is running a sale process, it is responsible, if not mandated, for the board to ensure that confidential information is not misused by bidders and advisors whose interests are not aligned with the corporation, to establish rules of the game that promote an orderly auction, and to give the corporation leverage to extract concessions from the parties who seek to make a bid.

But standstills are also subject to abuse. Parties like Eisner often, as was done here, insist on a standstill as a deal protection. Furthermore, a standstill can be used by a target improperly to favor one bidder over another, not for reasons consistent with stockholder interest, but because managers prefer one bidder for their own motives.

In this case, the Topps board reserved the right to waive the Standstill if its fiduciary duties required. That was an important thing to do, given that there was no shopping process before signing with Eisner.

The fiduciary out here also highlights a reality. Although the Standstill is a contract, the Topps board is bound to use its contractual power under that contract

only for proper purposes. \* \* \* I cannot read the record as indicating that the Topps board is using the Standstill to extract reasonable concessions from Upper Deck in order to unlock higher value. The Topps board's negotiating posture and factual misrepresentations are more redolent of pretext, than of a sincere desire to comply with their *Revlon* duties.

Frustrated with its attempt to negotiate with Topps, Upper Deck asked for a release from the Standstill to make a tender offer on the terms it offered to Topps and to communicate with Topps's stockholders. The Topps board refused. That refusal not only keeps the stockholders from having the chance to accept a potentially more attractive higher priced deal, it keeps them in the dark about Upper Deck's version of important events, and it keeps Upper Deck from obtaining anti-trust clearance, because it cannot begin the process without either a signed merger agreement or a formal tender offer.

Because the Topps board is recommending that the stockholders cash out, its decision to foreclose its stockholders from receiving an offer from Upper Deck seems likely . . . to be found a breach of fiduciary duty. If Upper Deck makes a tender at \$10.75 per share on the conditions it has outlined, the Topps stockholders will still be free to reject that offer if the Topps board convinces them it is too conditional. \* \* \* Given that the Topps board has decided to sell the company, and is not using the Standstill Agreement for any apparent legitimate purpose, its refusal to release Upper Deck justifies an injunction. Otherwise, the Topps stockholders may be foreclosed from ever considering Upper Deck's offer, a result that, under our precedent, threatens irreparable injury.

Similarly, Topps went public with statements disparaging Upper Deck's bid and its seriousness but continues to use the Standstill to prevent Upper Deck from telling its own side of the story. The Topps board seeks to have the Topps stockholders accept Eisner's bid without hearing the full story. That is not a proper use of a standstill by a fiduciary given the circumstances presented here. Rather, it threatens the Topps stockholders with making an important decision on an uninformed basis, a threat that justifies injunctive relief.

***In re Lear Corporation Shareholder Litigation***

Again in *In re Lear Corporation Shareholder Litigation*,<sup>566</sup> the Delaware Court of Chancery enjoined a merger vote until additional proxy statement disclosures were made regarding proposed changes in the compensation arrangements for the CEO who served as a lead negotiator for the company, but found that the sales process was reasonable enough to withstand a *Revlon*<sup>567</sup> challenge.

Lear was a major supplier to the troubled American automobile manufacturers and faced the possibility of bankruptcy as the maturity of substantial indebtedness was imminent. A restructuring plan was undertaken to divest unprofitable units and restructure debts. During this process in 2006, Carl Icahn took a large, public position in Lear stock, first through open market purchases and then in a negotiated purchase from Lear, ultimately raising his holdings to 24%.

Icahn's purchase led the stock market to believe that a sale of the company had become likely and bolstered Lear's flagging stock price. Lear's Board had eliminated the corporation's poison pill in 2004.

In early 2007, Icahn suggested to Lear's CEO that a going private transaction might be in Lear's best interest. After a week of discussions, Lear's CEO told the rest of the Board of Icahn's approach, which formed a Special Committee that authorized the CEO to negotiate merger terms with Icahn.

During those negotiations, Icahn only moved modestly from his initial offering price of \$35 per share, going to \$36 per share. He indicated that if the Board desired to conduct a pre-signing auction, he would pull his offer, but that he would allow Lear to freely shop his bid after signing, during a so-called "go-shop" period,<sup>568</sup> but only so long as he received a termination fee of approximately 3%.

The Board approved a merger agreement on those terms. After signing, the Board's financial advisors aggressively shopped Lear to both financial and strategic buyers, none of which made a topping bid.

The plaintiffs moved to enjoin the merger vote, arguing that the Lear Board breached its *Revlon* duties and failed to

---

566. \_\_\_ A2d \_\_\_, 2007 WL 173258 (Del. Ch. June 15, 2007).

567. See Notes 386-392, *supra*.

568. Stephen I. Glover and Jonathan P. Goodman, *Go Shops: Are They Here to Stay*, 11 M&A Lawyer No. 6 (June 2007).

disclose material facts necessary for the stockholders to cast an informed vote.

*Revlon* Analysis. Plaintiffs argued that the Board breached its *Revlon* duties to obtain the best price reasonably available because (i) the Board allowed the CEO to lead the negotiations when he had a conflict of interest with respect to his compensation, (ii) the Board approved the merger agreement without a presigning auction and (iii) the merger agreement deal protections were unreasonable.

The Court found that although the Lear Special Committee made an “infelicitous decision” to permit the CEO to negotiate the merger terms without the presence of Special Committee or financial adviser representatives, the Board’s efforts to secure the highest possible value appeared reasonable.<sup>569</sup> The Board retained for itself broad leeway to shop the company after signing, and negotiated deal protection measures that did not present an unreasonable barrier to any second-arriving bidder.<sup>570</sup> Moreover, the Board obtained Icahn’s agreement to vote his equity position for any bid superior to his own that was embraced by the Board, thus signaling Icahn’s own willingness to be a seller at the right price. Given the circumstances faced by Lear, the decision of the Board to lock in the potential for its stockholders to receive \$36 per share with the right for the Board to

---

569. The Court explained a Board’s *Revlon* duties as follows:

The other substantive claim made by the plaintiffs arises under the *Revlon* doctrine. *Revlon* and its progeny stand for the proposition that when a board has decided to sell the company for cash or engage in a change of control transaction, it must act reasonably in order to secure the highest price reasonably available. The duty to act reasonably is just that, a duty to take a reasonable course of action under the circumstances presented. Because there can be several reasoned ways to try to maximize value, the court cannot find fault so long as the directors chose a *reasoned* course of action.

570. The merger agreement provided the Lear Board 45 days after signing (the “go-shop period”) to actively solicit a superior proposal and a fiduciary out to accept an unsolicited superior third party bid after the go-shop period ended with a termination fee during the go-shop period of 2.79% of the equity, or 1.9% of the enterprise, value of Lear and thereafter of 3.52% of the equity, or 2.4% of the enterprise valuation. If the stockholders rejected the merger, a termination fee was payable only if a competing proposal was accepted substantially concurrently with the termination of the merger agreement. The merger agreement obligated Icahn to pay a 6.1% reverse breakup fee if he could not arrange financing or otherwise breached the merger agreement and to vote his stock for a superior proposal approved by the Board.



hunt for a higher price appeared as reasonable. The Board's post-signing market check, which was actively conducted by investment bankers, who offered stapled financing and would be compensated for bringing in a superior proposal, provided adequate assurance that there was no bidder willing to materially top Icahn.<sup>571</sup>

*Duty of Candor.* Since the Special Committee employed the CEO to negotiate deal terms with Icahn, the proxy statement should disclose that shortly before Icahn expressed an interest in making a going private offer, the CEO had asked the Lear Board to change his employment arrangements to allow him to cash in his retirement benefits while continuing to run the company, which the Board was willing to do, but not put into effect due to concerns at negative reactions from institutional investors and from employees who were being asked to make wage concessions. Because the CEO might rationally have expected a going private transaction to provide him with a unique means to achieve his personal objectives of cashing in on his retirement benefits and options while remaining employed by Lear and being able to sell his substantial holdings of Lear stock (which insider trading restrictions and market realities would inhibit him from doing), the court concluded that "the Lear stockholders are entitled to know that the CEO harbored material economic motivations that differed from their own that could have influenced his negotiating posture with Icahn." Thus, the Court issued an injunction preventing the merger vote until Lear shareholders were apprised of the CEO's overtures to the Board concerning his retirement benefits.

## **IX. DIRECTOR RESPONSIBILITIES AND LIABILITIES**

### **A. Enforceability of Contracts Violative of Fiduciary Duties**

Otherwise valid contracts may be rendered unenforceable if the directors of the party against which the contract is to be enforced breached their fiduciary duties in approving the con-

---

571. The *In re Netsmart Technologies, Inc. Shareholder Litigation* (see note 548, *supra*), in which a post-signing market check was found inadequate under *Revlon*, was distinguished on the basis that Lear was a large, well known NYSE company, whereas Netsmart was a microcap company unlikely to be noticed by potential bidders and the merger agreement permitted only a "window shop" (the right of the Board to consider unsolicited proposals) as contrasted with the active "go-shop" in *Lear*.

tract. In *Ace Ltd. v. Capital Re Corp.*,<sup>572</sup> a case in which the Chancery Court suggested that a “no-talk” provision (i.e., a provision without an effective carve-out permitting it to talk with unsolicited bidders) in a merger was not likely to be upheld and wrote:

[T]here are many circumstances in which the high priority our society places on the enforcement of contracts between private parties gives way to even more important concerns.

One such circumstance is when the trustee or agent of certain parties enters into a contract containing provisions that exceed the trustee’s or agent’s authority. In such a circumstance, the law looks to a number of factors to determine whether the other party to the contract can enforce its contractual rights. These factors include: whether the other party had reason to know that the trustee or agent was making promises beyond her legal authority; whether the contract is executory or consummated; whether the trustee’s or agent’s *ultra vires* promise implicates public policy concerns of great importance; and the extent to which the other party has properly relied upon the contract. Generally, where the other party had reason to know that the trustee or agent was on thin ice, where the trustee’s or agent’s breach has seriously negative consequences for her ward, and where the contract is as yet still unperformed, the law will not enforce the contract but may award reliance damages to the other party if that party is sufficiently non-culpable for the trustee’s or agent’s breach.

Indeed, Restatement (Second) of Contracts § 193 explicitly provides that a “promise by a fiduciary to violate his fiduciary duty or a promise that tends to induce such a violation is unenforceable on public policy grounds.” The comments to that section indicate that “[d]irectors and other officials of a corporation act in a fiduciary capacity and are subject to the rule in this Section.” It is therefore perhaps unsurprising that the Delaware law of mergers and acquisitions has given primacy to the interests of stockholders in being free to maximize value from their ownership of stock

---

572. 747 A.2d 95 (Del. Ch. 1999).

without improper compulsion from executory contracts entered into by boards—that is, from contracts that essentially disable the board and the stockholders from doing anything other than accepting the contract even if another much more valuable opportunity comes along.

But our case law does not do much to articulate an explicit rationale for this emphasis on the rights of the target stockholders over the contract rights of the suitor. The Delaware Supreme Court’s opinion in *Paramount v. QVC* comes closest in that respect. That case emphasizes that a suitor seeking to “lock up” a change-of-control transaction with another corporation is deemed to know the legal environment in which it is operating. Such a suitor cannot importune a target board into entering into a deal that effectively prevents the emergence of a more valuable transaction or that disables the target board from exercising its fiduciary responsibilities. If it does, it obtains nothing.

For example, in response to Viacom’s argument that it had vested contract rights in the no-shop provision in the Viacom-Paramount Merger Agreement, the Supreme Court stated:

The No-Shop Provision could not validly define or limit the fiduciary duties of the Paramount directors. To the extent that a contract, or a provision thereof, purports to require a board to act or not to act in such a fashion as to limit the exercise of fiduciary duties, it is invalid and unenforceable. Despite the arguments of Paramount and Viacom to the contrary, the Paramount directors could not contract away their fiduciary obligations. Since the No-Shop Provision was invalid, Viacom never had any vested contract rights in the provision.

As to another invalid feature of the contract, the Court explained why this result was, in its view, an equitable one:

Viacom, a sophisticated party with experienced legal and financial advisors, knew of (and in fact demanded) the unreasonable features of the Stock Option Agreement. It cannot be now heard to argue that it obtain vested contract rights by negotiating and obtaining contractual provisions from a board acting in violation of its fiduciary duties. . . . Likewise, we reject Viacom’s

arguments and hold that its fate must rise or fall, and in this instance fall, with the determination that the actions of the Paramount Board were invalid.

### ***B. Director Consideration of Long-Term Interests***

It has been implicit under Texas law that a director may consider the long-term interests of the corporation. However, because short-term market valuations of a corporation may not always reflect the benefits of long-term decisions and inherent long-term values, article 13.06 was added to the TBCA in 1997 (carried over in TBOC § 21.401) to expressly allow directors to consider the long-term interests of a corporation and its shareholders when considering actions that affect the interest of the corporations.<sup>573</sup> Although this provision was viewed as a mere codification of existing law, it was intended to eliminate any ambiguity that might exist as to the right of a board of directors to consider long-term interests when evaluating a takeover proposal. There is no similar provision in the DGCL.

### ***C. Liability for Unlawful Distributions***

Both Texas and Delaware impose personal liability on directors who authorize the payment of distributions to shareholders (including share purchases) in violation of the statutory requirements.<sup>574</sup>

Under Delaware law, liability for an unlawful distribution extends for a period of six years to all directors other than those who expressly dissent, with the standard of liability being negligence.<sup>575</sup> DGCL § 172, however, provides that a director will be fully protected in relying in good faith on the records of the corporation and such other information, opinions, reports, and statements presented to the corporation by the corporation's officers, employees and other persons. This applies to matters that the director reasonably believes are within that person's professional or expert competence and have been selected with reasonable care as to the various components of surplus and other funds from which distributions may be paid or made.<sup>576</sup> Directors are also entitled to receive contribution from other di-

---

573. TBOC § 21.401; TBCA art. 13.06.

574. TBOC § 21.316; TBCA art. 2.41A(1); DGCL § 174(a).

575. DGCL § 174.

576. DGCL § 172.

rectors who may be liable for the distribution and are subrogated to the corporation against shareholders who received the distribution with knowledge that the distribution was unlawful.<sup>577</sup> Under the Texas Corporate Statutes, liability for an unlawful distribution extends for two years instead of six years and applies to all directors who voted for or assented to the distribution (assent being presumed if a director is present and does not dissent).<sup>578</sup> A director will not be liable for an unlawful distribution if at any time after the distribution, it would have been lawful.<sup>579</sup> A similar provision does not exist in Delaware. A director will also not be liable under the Texas Corporate Statutes for an unlawful distribution if the director:

- (i) relied in good faith and with ordinary care on information relating to the calculation of surplus available for the distribution under the Texas Corporate Statutes;
- (ii) relied in good faith and with ordinary care on financial and other information prepared by officers or employees of the corporation, a committee of the board of directors of which he is not a member or legal counsel, investment bankers, accountants and other persons as to matters the director reasonably believes are within that person's professional or expert competence;
- (iii) in good faith and with ordinary care, considered the assets of the corporation to have a value equal to at least their book value; or
- (iv) when considering whether liabilities have been adequately provided for, relied in good faith and with ordinary care upon financial statements of, or other information concerning, any other person that is contractually obligated to pay, satisfy, or discharge those liabilities.<sup>580</sup>

As in Delaware, a director held liable for an unlawful distribution under the Texas Corporate Statutes will be entitled to contribution from the other directors who may be similarly liable. The director can also receive contribution from shareholders

---

577. DGCL § 174(b), (c).

578. TBOC §§ 21.316, 21.317; TBCA art. 2.41A.

579. TBOC § 21.316(b); TBCA art. 2.41A.

580. TBOC § 21.316; TBCA arts. 2.41C and 2.41D.

who received and accepted the distribution knowing it was not permitted in proportion to the amounts received by them.<sup>581</sup> The Texas Corporate Statutes also expressly provide that the liability of a director for an unlawful distribution provided for under the Texas Corporate Statutes<sup>582</sup> is the only liability of the director for the distribution to the corporation or its creditors, thereby negating any other theory of liability of the director for the distribution such as a separate fiduciary duty to creditors or a tortious violation of the Uniform Fraudulent Transfer Act.<sup>583</sup> No similar provision is found in the DGCL.

#### ***D. Reliance on Reports and Opinions***

Both Texas and Delaware provide that a director in the discharge of his duties and powers may rely on information, opinions and reports prepared by officers and employees of the corporation and on other persons as to matters that the director reasonably believes are within that person's professional or expert competence.<sup>584</sup> In Delaware, this reliance must be made in good faith and the selection of outside advisors must have been made with reasonable care.<sup>585</sup> In Texas, reliance must be made both in good faith and with ordinary care.<sup>586</sup>

#### ***E. Inspection of Records***

Both Texas and Delaware have codified the common law right of directors to examine the books and records of a corporation for a purpose reasonably related to the director's service as a director.<sup>587</sup>

#### ***F. Right to Resign***

Directors of corporations in trouble may be tempted to resign, especially when they sense that legal action may be imminent which would be time consuming and possibly result in personal liability. The general rule is that a director may resign at any time, for any reason.<sup>588</sup> There is, however, an exception

---

581. TBOC § 21.318(a); TBCA arts. 2.41E and 2.41F.

582. TBOC § 21.316 or TBCA art. 2.41.

583. See TBOC § 21.316(d); TBCA art. 2.41G.

584. See TBOC §§ 21.316(c), 3.102; TBCA art. 2.41D; DGCL § 141(e).

585. DGCL § 141(e); see also *Brehm v. Eisner*, 746 A.2d 244 (Del. 2000).

586. TBOC § 21.316(c)(1); TBCA art. 2.41D.

587. TBOC § 3.152; TBCA art. 2.44B; DGCL § 220(d).

588. DGCL § 141(b) provides “[a]ny director may resign at any time upon notice given in writing or by electronic transmission to the corporation”;

in circumstances where that resignation would cause immediate harm to the corporation, allow such harm to occur, or leave the company's assets vulnerable to directors known to be untrustworthy.<sup>589</sup> While the judicial expressions of this exception appear broad, an analysis of the cases suggests that liability results only when the harm to the company is rather severe and

---

*see In re Telesport Inc.*, 22 B.R. 527, 532-3, fn. 8 (Bankr. E.D. Ark. 1982) ("Corporate officers [are] entitled to resign . . . for a good reason, a bad reason or no reason at all, and are entitled to pursue their chosen field of endeavor in direct competition with [the corporation] so long as there is no breach of a confidential relationship with [it]."); *Frantz Manufacturing Co. et al. v. EAC Industries*, 501 A.2d 401, 408 (Del. 1985); ("Directors are also free to resign."); *see also 2 Fletcher Cyclopedia on Corporations* § 345 (1998) ("A director or other officer of a corporation may resign at any time and thereby cease to be an officer, subject to any express charter or statutory provisions to which he or she has expressly or impliedly assented in accepting office, and subject to any express contract made with the corporation"); Medford, *Preparing for Bankruptcy; Director Liability in the Zone of Insolvency*, 20-APR AM. BANKR. INST. J. 30 (2001) ("A Delaware corporate director typically has the right to resign without incurring any liability or breaching any fiduciary duty").

589. *See Gerdes v. Reynolds*, 28 N.Y.S. 2d 622, 651 (N.Y. S.Ct. 1941) (In the context of a business combination, the court wrote that it "gravely doubt[s]" whether the directors could avoid liability if they sell their shares for a premium, resign and allow a transfer of control of a corporation to a purchaser before the full purchase price is paid and the transferee owns enough shares to elect its own slate of directors, suggesting that "officers and directors . . . cannot terminate their agency or accept the resignation of others if the immediate consequence would be to leave the interests of the company without proper care and protection"); *Xerox Corp. v. Genmoora Corp.*, 888 F.2d 345, 355 (5th Cir.1989), in a situation where a Texas corporation sold most of its assets and set up a liquidating trust to distribute the proceeds to shareholders and then four of the five directors resigned as liquidating trustees, leaving the liquidating trust in control of the fifth director known to be incompetent and dishonest, Judge Brown referred to the defense that the directors had resigned before the corporate abuse took place as the "Geronimo theory" and wrote "[u]nder this theory, by analogy, if a commercial airline pilot were to negligently aim his airplane full of passengers at a mountain, and then bail out before impact, he would not be liable because he was not at the controls when the crash occurred"; citing *Gerdes*, Judge Brown postulated that "[a] director can breach his duty of care – hence his fiduciary duty – by knowing a transaction that will be dangerous to the corporation is about to occur but taking no steps to prevent it or make his objection known;" *DePinto v. Landoe*, 411 F.2d 297 (9th Cir. 1969) (director found liable for resigning instead of opposing a raid on his corporation's assets); *Benson v. Braun*, 155 N.Y.S.2d 622, 624-6 ("officers and directors may not resign their offices and elect as their successors persons who they knew intended to loot the corporation's treasury.").

foreseeable. Further and regardless of the timing of the resignation, a director is still liable for breaches of the fiduciary duty made during his tenure.<sup>590</sup> Resignation does not free a director from the duty not to misuse information received while a director.<sup>591</sup> Finally, a director may have an interest in staying on the board of directors to help the corporation work through its difficulties in the hope that by helping the corporation survive he is reducing the chances that he will be sued in connection with the corporation's troubles.

## **X. CONCLUSION**

SEC disclosure requirements and SOX significantly influence the governance of the internal affairs of public companies, including executive compensation processes, and are increasingly influencing best practices for private companies and non-profit organizations. While SOX and related SEC and SRO requirements have changed many things, state corporation law remains the principal governor of the internal affairs of corporations. State statutes are still supplemented to a large degree by evolving adjudications of the fiduciary duties of directors and officers.

---

590. *FDIC v. Wheat*, 970 F. 2d 124, 128 (5th Cir. 1992); *District 65 UAW v. Harper & Roe Publishers*, 576 F. Supp. 1468, 1484 (S.D.N.Y. 1983).

591. *Quark Inc. v. Harley*, 1998 U.S. App. LEXIS 3864 at \*23 (10th Cir. March 4, 1998); *T.A. Pelsue Co. v. Grand Enterprises Inc.*, 782 F. Supp. 1476, 1485-86 (D. Colo. 1991).