

18 SEPTEMBER 2019

CORPORATE & COMMERCIAL ALERT

IN THIS ISSUE >

How not to resolve a conflict of interests where the entire board of directors is conflicted

A persistent problem with the practical application of s75 of the Companies Act, No 71 of 2008 (Companies Act) relates to the conflicts of interest of common directors in the context of intra-group transactions. The objective of this article is not to cover any new ground with respect to s75, but rather to critique the argument that s75(2)(a)(i)(ii) excludes the application of s75 in such cases.

For more insight into our
expertise and services

[CLICK HERE](#) 

How not to resolve a conflict of interests where the entire board of directors is conflicted

Unlike the company statutes of a number of other jurisdictions, s75 does not contain a carve out in this regard for the group company context.

A persistent problem with the practical application of s75 of the Companies Act, No 71 of 2008 (Companies Act) relates to the conflicts of interest of common directors in the context of intra-group transactions. The objective of this article is not to cover any new ground with respect to s75, but rather to critique the argument that s75(2)(a)(i)(ii) excludes the application of s75 in such cases.

The problem

For the purposes of our argument below, it may be useful to summarise the problem referred to above as follows –

1. Section 75, among other things, requires a director to recuse herself from a board meeting (it is general practice to apply this also to “round robin” written resolutions under s74 of the Companies Act) whenever a person “related” to her has a material personal financial interest in the matter to be considered at the meeting. In other words, the foregoing director is not permitted to vote on the applicable resolutions.
2. A “related person” for the purposes of the section, includes a second company of which that director is also a director. Therefore, if (A) a holding company (Guarantor) provides a guarantee in respect of a loan to be advanced to its subsidiary (Borrower) (i.e. financial assistance is to be provided by one group company to another group company), and (B) the same person is a director of both the Borrower and the Guarantor, that common director of both group companies is not permitted to vote in respect of any resolution to authorise the foregoing financial assistance.

3. It happens every so often that both group companies have “mirror boards”. In other words, the board of directors of both group companies are identical. The practical effect of this is that the entire board of directors of the Guarantor is ruled out of being able to participate in the board resolution (in that one can accept that the Borrower has a direct and material financial interest in the Guarantor’s board approving the guarantee), which would render the passing of any resolutions impossible, if not for the ability of shareholders to ratify the board resolution by way of ordinary resolution. Unlike the company statutes of a number of other jurisdictions, s75 does not contain a carve out in this regard for the group company context.

The solution

The only method to resolve this “stalemate” is therefore to (A) have all the directors of the Guarantor disclose the personal financial interest (being the Borrower’s interest in the matter to be decided by the board of directors of the Guarantor), to nevertheless vote on the matter, and to then have the shareholders of the Guarantor ratify the board resolution by way of ordinary resolution. It is uncontroversial that under common law, shareholders enjoy the authority to ratify board resolutions despite a breach by the directors of, among others, this no conflict rule. Furthermore, it is arguably a logical extension of the principle in s75(3) which provides that where a company has a sole director, and that director is conflicted under s75, the director may still proceed to vote but must additionally obtain shareholder approval.

How not to resolve a conflict of interests where the entire board of directors is conflicted...*continued*

In numerous transactions in which we have acted for both lenders and borrowers, the argument has been raised that s75(2)(a)(i)(ii) excludes the application of s75 and that shareholder ratification is therefore not required.

What not to do

In numerous transactions in which we have acted for both lenders and borrowers, the argument has been raised that s75(2)(a)(i)(ii) excludes the application of s75 and that shareholder ratification is therefore not required.

Section 75(2)(a)(i)(ii) provides, among other things, that *"this section [75] does not apply to a director of a company in respect of a decision that may generally affect all of the directors of the company in their capacity as directors"*. The argument in support of this interpretation appears to be that: the conflict of interests (broadly) affects all of the directors in their capacity as directors and therefore the section does not apply.

We are the view that this interpretation is incorrect for the following reasons –

1. Section 75(2)(a)(i)(ii) clearly refers to a *"decision that may generally affect all of the directors of the company in their capacity as directors"*. A decision that would generally affect all of the directors in their capacity as such relates, for example, to their remuneration for their services as directors or the purchase of insurance to protect the directors.
2. For s75(2)(a)(i)(ii) to apply, it is clear that the decision must affect the director in her capacity as director (of the first company i.e. the Guarantor), and not in any other capacity (i.e. as director of the second company i.e. the Borrower). In other words, if a company is to contract with all five of its directors individually, then all the directors are conflicted and the section applies, as the conflict relates to their capacity as a party to a contract and not to their functions as directors.
3. Section 75(3) provides that where a company has a sole director and that director is conflicted, any decision by that sole director must be approved by an ordinary resolution of the shareholders. It follows then that where all the directors are conflicted, whether it is a sole director or a board of twelve directors, shareholder approval is required. There is no rational reason why the legislature would have intended to distinguish between these two situations.

CDH is a Level 1 BEE contributor – our clients will benefit by virtue of the recognition of 135% of their legal services spend with our firm for purposes of their own BEE scorecards.

How not to resolve a conflict of interests where the entire board of directors is conflicted...*continued*

It is submitted that where all the directors of a company are conflicted, on the basis that they are all directors of a second company which has a direct and material financial interest in the matter to be considered, s75(2)(a)(i)(ii) does not exclude the need for shareholder ratification.

4. If the argument is to be accepted that s75(2)(a)(i)(ii) does exclude the application of s75 as described above, the following absurd conclusion would follow –

4.1 **Scenario 1:** Company X has five directors, four of which are also directors of Company Y. If Company X provides financial assistance to Company Y, then the four conflicted directors are required to disclose the personal financial interest and recuse themselves, leaving the one non-conflicted director with a vote to pass the resolution.

4.2 **Scenario 2:** Company X has five directors, all of which are also directors of Company Y. If Company X provides financial assistance to Company Y, then the directors of Company X are free to vote as they please without the need for shareholder ratification, as they are all conflicted. The strange result is that a more lenient position applies (i.e. all directors may participate and vote) where every single director is conflicted and therefore where the risk of an unobjective vote is at its greatest. Why would they have a free pass to proceed without any shareholder involvement?

Thus it is submitted that where all the directors of a company are conflicted, on the basis that they are all directors of a second company which has a direct and material financial interest in the matter to be considered, s75(2)(a)(i)(ii) does not exclude the need for shareholder ratification.

*Emil Conradie, Jenni Darling
and Yaniv Kleitman*

OUR TEAM

For more information about our Corporate & Commercial practice and services, please contact:



Willem Jacobs
National Practice Head
Director
Corporate & Commercial
T +27 (0)11 562 1555
M +27 (0)83 326 8971
E willem.jacobs@cdhlegal.com



David Thompson
Regional Practice Head
Director
Corporate & Commercial
T +27 (0)21 481 6335
M +27 (0)82 882 5655
E david.thompson@cdhlegal.com

Mmatiki Aphiri
Director
T +27 (0)11 562 1087
M +27 (0)83 497 3718
E mmatiki.aphiri@cdhlegal.com

Roelof Bonnet
Director
T +27 (0)11 562 1226
M +27 (0)83 325 2185
E roelof.bonnet@cdhlegal.com

Tessa Brewis
Director
T +27 (0)21 481 6324
M +27 (0)83 717 9360
E tessa.brewis@cdhlegal.com

Etta Chang
Director
T +27 (0)11 562 1432
M +27 (0)72 879 1281
E etta.chang@cdhlegal.com

Clem Daniel
Director
T +27 (0)11 562 1073
M +27 (0)82 418 5924
E clem.daniel@cdhlegal.com

Jenni Darling
Director
T +27 (0)11 562 1878
M +27 (0)82 826 9055
E jenni.darling@cdhlegal.com

André de Lange
Director
T +27 (0)21 405 6165
M +27 (0)82 781 5858
E andre.delange@cdhlegal.com

Werner de Waal
Director
T +27 (0)21 481 6435
M +27 (0)82 466 4443
E werner.dewaal@cdhlegal.com

Emma Dempster
Projects & Energy
Director
T +27 (0)11 562 1194
M +27 (0)79 491 7683
E emma.dempster@cdhlegal.com

Lilia Franca
Director
T +27 (0)11 562 1148
M +27 (0)82 564 1407
E lilia.franca@cdhlegal.com

John Gillmer
Director
T +27 (0)21 405 6004
M +27 (0)82 330 4902
E john.gillmer@cdhlegal.com

Sandra Gore
Director
T +27 (0)11 562 1433
M +27 (0)71 678 9990
E sandra.gore@cdhlegal.com

Jay Govender
Projects & Energy Sector Head
Director
T +27 (0)11 562 1387
M +27 (0)82 467 7981
E jay.govender@cdhlegal.com

Johan Green
Director
T +27 (0)21 405 6200
M +27 (0)73 304 6663
E johan.green@cdhlegal.com

Allan Hannie
Director
T +27 (0)21 405 6010
M +27 (0)82 373 2895
E allan.hannie@cdhlegal.com

Peter Hesseling
Director
T +27 (0)21 405 6009
M +27 (0)82 883 3131
E peter.hesseling@cdhlegal.com

Quintin Honey
Director
T +27 (0)11 562 1166
M +27 (0)83 652 0151
E quintin.honey@cdhlegal.com

Roelf Horn
Director
T +27 (0)21 405 6036
M +27 (0)82 458 3293
E roelf.horn@cdhlegal.com

Kendall Keanly
Director
T +27 (0)21 481 6411
M +27 (0)83 645 5044
E kendall.keanly@cdhlegal.com

Yaniv Kleitman
Director
T +27 (0)11 562 1219
M +27 (0)72 279 1260
E yaniv.kleitman@cdhlegal.com

Justine Krige
Director
T +27 (0)21 481 6379
M +27 (0)82 479 8552
E justine.krige@cdhlegal.com

Johan Latsky
Executive Consultant
T +27 (0)11 562 1149
M +27 (0)82 554 1003
E johan.latsky@cdhlegal.com

Giada Masina
Director
T +27 (0)11 562 1221
M +27 (0)72 573 1909
E giada.masina@cdhlegal.com

OUR TEAM

For more information about our Corporate & Commercial practice and services, please contact:

Nkcubeko Mbambisa

Director
T +27 (0)21 481 6352
M +27 (0)82 058 4268
E nkcubeko.mbambisa@cdhlegal.com

Anita Moolman

Director
T +27 (0)11 562 1376
M +27 (0)72 252 1079
E anita.moolman@cdhlegal.com

David Pinnock

Director
T +27 (0)11 562 1400
M +27 (0)83 675 2110
E david.pinnock@cdhlegal.com

Tamarin Tosen

Director
T +27 (0)11 562 1310
M +27 (0)72 026 3806
E tamarin.tosen@cdhlegal.com

Nonhla Mchunu

Director
T +27 (0)11 562 1228
M +27 (0)82 314 4297
E nonhla.mchunu@cdhlegal.com

Jo Neser

Director
T +27 (0)21 481 6329
M +27 (0)82 577 3199
E jo.neser@cdhlegal.com

Allan Reid

Director
T +27 (0)11 562 1222
M +27 (0)82 854 9687
E allan.reid@cdhlegal.com

Roxanna Valayathum

Director
T +27 (0)11 562 1122
M +27 (0)72 464 0515
E roxanna.valayathum@cdhlegal.com

Ayanda Mhlongo

Director
T +27 (0)21 481 6436
M +27 (0)82 787 9543
E ayanda.mhlongo@cdhlegal.com

Francis Newham

Director
T +27 (0)21 481 6326
M +27 (0)82 458 7728
E francis.newham@cdhlegal.com

Megan Rodgers

Oil & Gas Sector Head
Director
T +27 (0)21 481 6429
M +27 (0)79 877 8870
E megan.rodgers@cdhlegal.com

Roux van der Merwe

Director
T +27 (0)11 562 1199
M +27 (0)82 559 6406
E roux.vandermerwe@cdhlegal.com

William Midgley

Director
T +27 (0)11 562 1390
M +27 (0)82 904 1772
E william.midgley@cdhlegal.com

Gasant Orrie

Cape Managing Partner
Director
T +27 (0)21 405 6044
M +27 (0)83 282 4550
E gasant.orrie@cdhlegal.com

Ludwig Smith

Director
T +27 (0)11 562 1500
M +27 (0)79 877 2891
E ludwig.smith@cdhlegal.com

Charl Williams

Director
T +27 (0)21 405 6037
M +27 (0)82 829 4175
E charl.williams@cdhlegal.com

Tessmerica Moodley

Director
T +27 (0)21 481 6397
M +27 (0)73 401 2488
E tessmerica.moodley@cdhlegal.com

Verushca Pillay

Director
T +27 (0)11 562 1800
M +27 (0)82 579 5678
E verushca.pillay@cdhlegal.com

Ben Strauss

Director
T +27 (0)21 405 6063
M +27 (0)72 190 9071
E ben.strauss@cdhlegal.com

BBBEE STATUS: LEVEL ONE CONTRIBUTOR

Cliffe Dekker Hofmeyr is very pleased to have achieved a Level 1 BBBEE verification under the new BBBEE Codes of Good Practice. Our BBBEE verification is one of several components of our transformation strategy and we continue to seek ways of improving it in a meaningful manner.

This information is published for general information purposes and is not intended to constitute legal advice. Specialist legal advice should always be sought in relation to any particular situation. Cliffe Dekker Hofmeyr will accept no responsibility for any actions taken or not taken on the basis of this publication.

JOHANNESBURG

1 Protea Place, Sandton, Johannesburg, 2196. Private Bag X40, Benmore, 2010, South Africa. Dx 154 Randburg and Dx 42 Johannesburg.
T +27 (0)11 562 1000 F +27 (0)11 562 1111 E jhb@cdhlegal.com

CAPE TOWN

11 Buitengracht Street, Cape Town, 8001. PO Box 695, Cape Town, 8000, South Africa. Dx 5 Cape Town.
T +27 (0)21 481 6300 F +27 (0)21 481 6388 E ctn@cdhlegal.com

STELLENBOSCH

14 Louw Street, Stellenbosch Central, Stellenbosch, 7600.
T +27 (0)21 481 6400 E cdhstellenbosch@cdhlegal.com

©2019 8304/SEP

