# CORPORATE & COMMERCIAL ALERT

# IN THIS ISSUE >

# Impact of business rescue and creditors compromise on contractual arrangements

Business rescue proceedings and arrangements or compromises with creditors under the Companies Act 71 of 2008 (Companies Act) are, by their very nature, contentious proceedings which may result in the dissatisfaction of some participating parties.

For more insight into our expertise and services

CLICK HERE



Pursuant to the conclusion of the Buy-Back Agreement, Highveld Syndication began experiencing financial difficulties and in 2010, the group of companies which Highveld Syndication formed part of were placed under business rescue. Impact of business rescue and creditors compromise on contractual arrangements

Business rescue proceedings and arrangements or compromises with creditors under the Companies Act 71 of 2008 (Companies Act) are, by their very nature, contentious proceedings which may result in the dissatisfaction of some participating parties.

The case of Zephan (Pty) Ltd & others v Noormahomed (1303/18) [2019] ZASCA 162 (29 November 2019) (Zephan v Noormahed) explores the effect of business rescue proceedings in terms of section 128 of the Companies Act and arrangements or compromises with creditors in terms of section 155 of the Companies Act on share buy-back agreements similar to the share buy-back agreement concerned in the case. We have used this case to study the impact of business rescue proceedings or arrangements with creditors on contractual arrangements to which the company undergoing either one of these processes is not party to, but which affect securities held in it.

Zephan v Noormahomed revolved around a share buy-back agreement entered into between Zephan Proprietary Limited (Zephan) and Suraiya Begun Noormahomed (Suraiya) in terms of which Zephan sold 3,000 shares in Highveld Syndication Proprietary Limited (Highveld Syndication), which shares Zephan had acquired for a purchase price of R3 million, to Suraiya and agreed to purchase the same shares from Suraiya after a period of 5 years for a pre-agreed purchase price of R6 million (Buy-Back Agreement).

Pursuant to the conclusion of the Buy-Back Agreement, Highveld Syndication began experiencing financial difficulties and in 2010, the group of companies which Highveld Syndication formed part of were placed under business rescue. After it became clear that it was necessary to restructure the debts of Highveld Syndication so as to yield a better return for its creditors than any return that would have resulted from liquidation, the company proceeded to enter into a court sanctioned arrangement with its creditors in terms of section 155 of the Companies Act, which included the adoption of a plan to restructure the debts of Highveld Syndication and entailed receipt by Suraiya of interest payments from a related company, Orthotouch Limited (Orthotouch) (section 155 Arrangement).

Upon expiry of a period of five years from conclusion of the Buy-Back Agreement, Suraiya demanded that Zephan comply with its undertaking to purchase the shares in Highveld Syndication in accordance with the terms of the Buy-Back Agreement.

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.



The question before the SCA was whether the section 155 Arrangement and Suraiya's receipt of interest payments from Orthotouch had novated Suraiya's rights under the Buy-Back Agreement.

# Impact of business rescue and creditors compromise on contractual arrangements...continued

After the Defendant had accordingly failed to fulfil its obligations under the Buy-Back Agreement, Suraiya elected to approach the High Court of South Africa, Pretoria (High Court) to enforce the terms of the Buy-Back Agreement and accordingly obtained judgment by default, which was followed by an application for rescission of the default judgment by Zephan.

In the High Court, and subsequently the Supreme Court of Appeal (SCA), Zephan argued that Suraiya's rights under the Buy-Back Agreement had been novated through Suraiya voting in favour of the section 155 Arrangement and by receiving interest payments from Orthotouch. In turn, Suraiya argued that the section 155 Arrangement and her receipt of interest payments from Orthotouch did not affect her rights in terms of the Buy-Back Agreement.

The question before the SCA was whether the section 155 Arrangement and Suraiya's receipt of interest payments from Orthotouch had novated Suraiya's rights under the Buy-Back Agreement.

The SCA held that there was an irrevocable undertaking by Zephan to purchase the shares of Suraiya as agreed in terms of the Buy-Back Agreement. It was noted by the SCA that the undertaking of Zephan in terms of the Buy-Back Agreement was independent and insulated from the affairs of Highveld Syndication. The SCA proceeded to refer to the judgment of Zephan (Pty) Ltd & others v De Lange (1068/2015) [2006] ZASCA 195 [2 December 2016] (Zephan v De Lange) which dealt with a similar issue where the question before the SCA was whether the adoption of a business rescue plan had rendered a share buy-back agreement unenforceable. The SCA in Zephan v De Lange held as follows:

"The business rescue plan relates only to the restructuring of the business of the HS companies and not the appellants. When the HS companies went into business rescue the appellants were the primary carriers of the obligation to buy back Mrs De Lange's shares. The fact that the HS companies might have been in business rescue was irrelevant to the appellants' discharge of their obligations under the buy-back agreement. Neither was the fact that she had accepted payments of the reduced annual interest. Such interest was never part of the buy-back agreement. There could be no basis for a finding that Mrs De Lange had compromised her rights under the buy-back agreement."



The lesson in this regard is a clear affirmation to the effect that no rights or obligations under an agreement similar to the Buy-Back Agreement may be relinquished by either business rescue proceedings nor an arrangement or compromise with creditors

# Impact of business rescue and creditors compromise on contractual arrangements...continued

The SCA in Zephan v Noormahomed found that Zephan's reasoning to the effect that the section 155 Arrangement and Suraiya's receipt of interest payments from Orthotouch had novated Suraiya's rights under the Buy-Back Agreement was misconceived. The SCA accordingly held that the rights and obligations in terms of the Buy-Back Agreement had been unaffected and, in the same manner as the High Court, ordered Zephan to purchase Suraiya's shares as agreed.

# Conclusion

Through Zephan v Noormahomed and Zephan v De Lange our courts have provided an unequivocal statement on the relevance of business rescue proceedings and arrangements or compromises with creditors in terms of section 155 of the Companies Act on contractual arrangements similar to the ones we have observed in Zephan v Noormahomed and Zephan v De Lange. The lesson in this regard is a clear affirmation to the effect that no rights or obligations under an agreement similar to the Buy-Back Agreement may be relinquished by either business rescue proceedings nor an arrangement or compromise with creditors in terms of section 155 of the Companies Act, unless such is expressly contained in the agreement. An agreement with similar arrangements as those of the Buy-Back Agreement concluded between parties and relating to a company which subsequently commences business rescue proceedings or enters into an arrangement or compromise with its creditors may not be affected by such proceedings or arrangements or by either party's participation in these proceedings unless clearly expressed and agreed to.

Mondli Sithole and Nonhla Mchunu



# **E-learning Offering**

Our Employment practice recently launched an e-learning module: A better place to work

The module will empower your organisation with a greater appreciation and understanding of what constitutes sexual harassment, how to identify it and what to do it if occurs.



# 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

# 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

# Jay Govender

Projects & Energy Sector Head Director Τ +27 (0)11 562 1387 Μ +27 (0)82 467 7981 Ε 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

### Nonhla Mchunu

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

### Ayanda Mhlongo

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

# William Midgley

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

# **Tessmerica Moodley**

Director T +27 (0)21 481 6397 M +27 (0)73 401 2488

E tessmerica.moodley@cdhlegal.com

# Anita Moolman

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

# Jo Neser

Director +27 (0)21 481 6329

# M +27 (0)82 577 3199 E jo.neser@cdhlegal.com

# Francis Newham

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

# Verushca Pillay

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

# David Pinnock

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

# Allan Reid

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

### Megan Rodgers

Oil & Gas Sector Head Director +27 (0)21 481 6429 M +27 (0)79 877 8870

E megan.rodgers@cdhlegal.com

# Ludwig Smith

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

# **Ben Strauss**

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

### **Tamarin Tosen** Director

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

# **Roxanna Valayathum**

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

### Roux van der Merwe

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

# **Charl Williams**

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

# STELL ENBOSCH

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

©2020 8689/MAR



CLIFFE DEKKER HOFME

CORPORATE & COMMERCIAL | cliffedekkerhofmeyr.com