Preface

| Ac                 | Acknowledgments  | xxvii    |
|--------------------|--|----------|
| 1                  | Economic and Legal Aspects of the Firm   | 1        |
| <del>—</del><br>А. | A. Some Basic Concepts and Terminology   | 1        |
|                    | 1. The Classical Firm  | 1        |
|                    | a. Introductory Note   | 1        |
|                    | b. The Entrepreneur  | 1        |
|                    | c. The Coasean Firm: Differentiating the Market and the Firm   | 2 3      |
|                    | 2. The Business Association  | 3        |
|                    | 3. The Modern Corporation and the Berle-Means Critique   | 4        |
|                    | 4. The Return of Free Market Ideology: The Firm as a Nexus of Contr  |          |
|                    | 5. Separation of Ownership and Control and Agency Costs  | 7        |
|                    | 6. The New Millennium: Corporate Scandal, Financial Crises,  |          |
|                    | Corporate Governance, and Government Regulation  | 8        |
| В.                 | <ol> <li>Organizing the Firm: Selecting a Value-Maximizing Governance Struc</li> <li>Business Planning: The Role of the Corporate Lawyer in Organizin</li> </ol> |          |
|                    | a Firm   | 9        |
|                    | 2. The Goal of Informed Rational Choice Between Competing Investi  |          |
|                    | Options  | 9        |
|                    | <ul><li>a. Comparative Search for Best Investment</li><li>b. Risk and Return</li></ul>   | 9        |
|                    |  | 11<br>13 |
|                    | 3. Transaction Costs and Choice of Organizational Form a. Introduction   | 13       |
|                    | b. Transaction Cost Factors  | 13       |
|                    | c. Discrete and Relational Contracting   | 13       |
|                    | d. Deciding to Organize as a Firm  | 15       |
|                    | 4. State-Provided Governance Structures  | 16       |
|                    | a Entity and Employment Law as Standard Form Contracts   | 16       |

xxiii

**X** Contents

|    |           | b. Default Versus Immutable Rules                                | 16 |
|----|-----------|--|----|
|    |           | c. Tailored, Majoritarian, and Penalty Default Rules             | 17 |
|    | 5.        | Nonjudicial Mechanisms That Supplement and Reinforce             |    |
|    |           | Private Ordering   | 18 |
|    |           | a. The Governance Role of Markets                                | 18 |
|    |           | b. The Role of Trust   | 19 |
|    |           | c. The Role of Norms   | 19 |
| C. | Tł        | ne Firm and the Law of Agency                                    | 20 |
|    | 1.        | Introduction   | 20 |
|    | 2.        | Creating the Relationship of Principal and Agent                 | 22 |
|    |           | A. Gay Jenson Farms Co. v. Cargill, Inc.                         | 22 |
|    |           | Problem 1-1  | 28 |
|    | 3.        | Employee or Independent Contractor                               | 28 |
|    |           | In the Matter of Vega  | 29 |
|    |           | Notes and Questions  | 40 |
|    | 4.        | Apparent Authority and Related Concepts                          | 42 |
|    |           | Ophthalmic Surgeons, Ltd. v. Paychex, Inc.                       | 43 |
|    |           | Problem 1-2  | 48 |
|    |           | Problem 1-3  | 48 |
|    | 5.        | Respondeat Superior; Vicarious Liability                         | 49 |
|    |           | Vargas v. Riverbend Management LLC                               | 50 |
|    |           | Notes and Questions  | 56 |
|    | 6.        | Fiduciary Duty as Constraint on Agent's Pursuit of Self-Interest | 57 |
|    |           | Taser International, Inc. v. Ward                                | 58 |
|    |           | Notes and Questions  | 65 |
|    |           |  |    |
| 2  |           | Partnerships   | 67 |
| _  | <u> </u>  |  |    |
| A. |           | troduction   | 67 |
|    | 1.        | Traditional Noncorporate Business Associations                   | 67 |
|    |           | a. The General Partnership and Its Standard Form Internal        | CH |
|    |           | Governance Rules   | 67 |
|    |           | b. The Joint Venture   | 69 |
|    |           | c. The Limited Partnership                                       | 70 |
|    | 0         | d. The UPA (1997) and Its Innovations                            | 71 |
|    | 2.        | Determining the Legal Nature of the Relationship                 | 73 |
|    |           | Ziemann v. Grosz   | 73 |
|    |           | Notes and Questions  | 79 |
|    |           | Problem 2-1  | 80 |
|    | 0         | Problem 2-2  | 81 |
|    | <b>3.</b> | Sharing Profits and Losses                                       | 82 |
|    |           | Kovacik v. Reed  | 82 |
|    |           | Shamloo $v$ . $Ladd$   | 84 |

|    | Notes and Questions  | 87    |
|----|--|-------|
|    | Problem 2-3  | 88    |
|    | Problem 2-4  | 88    |
| В. | The Partner as Fiduciary   | 88    |
|    | 1. The Common Law Duty of Loyalty  | 88    |
|    | Meinhard v. Salmon   | 89    |
|    | Notes and Questions  | 96    |
|    | Problem 2-5  | 98    |
|    | 2. Self-Dealing  | 98    |
|    | Vigneau v. Storch Engineers  | 98    |
|    | 3. Fiduciary Duty and Management of the Partnership's Business and Affairs | 102   |
|    | Covalt v. High   | 103   |
|    | 4. Contracting for Absolute Discretion                                     | 106   |
|    | Starr v. Fordham   | 106   |
|    | Notes and Questions  | 110   |
|    | 5. The Duty of Care  | 110   |
|    | Ferguson v. Williams   | 112   |
|    | Notes and Questions  | 113   |
|    | Problem 2-6  | 114   |
| C. | Dissolution and Dissociation   | 114   |
|    | 1. The Basic Framework   | 114   |
|    | McCormick v. Brevig  | 115   |
|    | Notes and Questions  | 121   |
|    | Problem 2-7  | 123   |
|    | Problem 2-8  | 124   |
|    | 2. Wrongful Dissociation   | 124   |
|    | Drashner v. Sorenson   | 125   |
|    | McCormick v. Brevig  | 127   |
|    | Notes and Questions  | 129   |
|    | Problem 2-9  | 129   |
|    | 3. Fiduciary Limits on Dissolution "At Will"                               | 130   |
|    | Page v. Page   | 130   |
|    | Notes and Questions  | 133   |
|    | Problem 2-10   | 134   |
|    | 4. Fiduciary Limits on Expulsion of Unwanted Partners                      | 134   |
|    | Bohatch v. Butler & Binion   | 135   |
|    | Problem 2-11   | 141   |
|    | 5. Contracting to Prevent Opportunistic Withdrawal: The Fiduciary          |       |
|    | Duties Owed by Withdrawing Partners  | 141   |
|    | Meehan v. Shaughnessy  | 142   |
|    | Notes and Questions  | 149   |
| Б  | Problem 2-12   | 150   |
| D. | Partners as Agents: Allocating the Risk of Loss in Transactions with       | 1 2 4 |
|    | Third Parties  | 150   |
|    | Veggie Creations, Inc. v. HBK–Willow, LLC                                  | 151   |

| ••  |          |
|-----|----------|
| X11 | Contents |
|     |          |

|                    | Note: Authority of Joint Venturers                 | 156                             |
|--------------------|--|---------------------------------|
|                    | Problem 2-13                                       | 157                             |
|                    | Problem 2-14                                       | 158                             |
| 3                  | 3 The Corporation and Its Governance               | 159                             |
| <del>—</del><br>А. | A. The Corporate Form                              | 159                             |
|                    | 1. Defining Characteristics of the Corporate Form  | (as Distinguished from          |
|                    | Traditional Partnerships)                          | 159                             |
|                    | 2. The Specialized Roles of Shareholders, Director | rs, and Officers 160            |
|                    | a. Directors                                       | 161                             |
|                    | b. Officers  | 162                             |
|                    | c. Shareholders                                    | 162                             |
|                    | Problem 3-1  | 163                             |
|                    | d. The Business Judgment Rule                      | 164                             |
|                    | 3. The Big Picture                                 | 164                             |
| В.                 | B. Formation and Capital Structure                 | 165                             |
|                    | 1. Where to Incorporate: State Corporation Laws a  |                                 |
|                    | Standard Form Rules                                | 165                             |
|                    | 2. Formation: The Articles of Incorporation        | 168                             |
|                    | Problem 3-2  | 168<br>169                      |
|                    | 3. The Bylaws Problem 3-3                          | 169                             |
|                    | 4. Using Stock to Allocate Equity Interests        | 169                             |
|                    | Problem 3-4  | 172                             |
|                    | 5. Determining Voting Rights: Using Articles and I |                                 |
|                    | Legal Norms  | 174                             |
|                    | a. Overview of Normal Rules of Shareholder Vo      |                                 |
|                    | of Directors                                       | 174                             |
|                    | b. Class Voting                                    | 175                             |
|                    | Problem 3-5  | 176                             |
|                    | c. Cumulative Voting                               | 176                             |
|                    | Problem 3-6  | 177                             |
|                    | d. A Classified Board with Staggered Terms: Ada    | aptability Versus Stability 178 |
|                    | Problem 3-7  | 178                             |
|                    | 6. Looking Ahead: How Shareholders Act             | 179                             |
|                    | a. The Annual Meeting and Other Forums for S       | Shareholder Action 179          |
|                    | Hoschett v. TSI International Software, Ltd        | <i>l</i> . 181                  |
|                    | Notes and Questions                                | 184                             |
|                    | b. Removal of Directors and Other Midstream I      | ĕ                               |
|                    | Adlerstein v. Wertheimer                           | 187                             |
|                    | Notes and Questions                                | 198                             |
|                    | Problem 3-8  | 198                             |
|                    | Problem 3-9  | 199                             |

| C.             | Shareholder Investment and Governance in Publicly Held  |            |
|----------------|---|------------|
|                | Corporations  | 199        |
|                | 1. How Publicly Held Corporations Are Different   | 199        |
|                | a. The Market for Shares and the Efficient Market Hypothesis  | 199        |
|                | Problem 3-10  | 204        |
|                | b. Federal Regulation of Publicly Held Companies  | 205        |
|                | Problem 3-11  | 206        |
|                | Problem 3-12  | 208        |
|                | 2. The Modern Era of Shareholder Governance in the Public Corporation                               | 209        |
|                | a. Introduction   | 209        |
|                | Edward Rock, Institutional Investors in Corporate Governance, in                                    |            |
|                | Oxford Handbook of Corporate Law and Governance (2015)  | 209        |
|                | Notes and Questions   | 213        |
|                | Problem 3-13  | 214        |
|                | Problem 3-14  | 214        |
|                | Problem 3-15  | 214        |
|                | Problem 3-16  | 215        |
|                | b. The Push and Pull of Shareholder Governance in the Public  |            |
|                | Corporation   | 215        |
|                | CA, Inc. v. AFSCME Employees Pension Plan   | 216        |
|                | Notes and Questions   | 224        |
|                | Problem 3-17  | 226        |
|                | Lovenheim v. Iroquois Brands, Ltd.  | 229        |
|                | Notes and Questions   | 232        |
|                | Problem 3-18  | 234        |
|                | Problem 3-19  | 234        |
|                | Problem 3-20  | 234        |
|                | Problem 3-21  | 235        |
|                | Majority Voting in Director Elections: A Look Back and A Look Ahead,                                |            |
|                | in Simpson Thacher Client Alert (Aug. 4, 2006)  | 236        |
|                | Notes and Questions   | 239        |
|                | Note on the Decline of Staggered Boards   | 240        |
|                | Business Roundtable v. SEC  | 242        |
|                | Notes and Questions   | 248        |
|                | Note on the Expanding Federally Defined Governance  |            |
|                | Space and Say-on-Pay  | 249        |
|                | West Palm Beach Firefighters' Pension Fund v. Moelis & Co.  | 250        |
|                | Notes and Questions   | 262        |
|                |   |            |
| 4              | Fiduciary Duty and the Business Judgment Rule   | 265        |
| <u>—</u><br>А. | Introduction to Director Discretion, Corporate Purpose, and the Role of Fiduciary Duty  1. Overview | 265<br>265 |
|                | 1. O (C) (1C)   | 400        |

xiv Contents

|    | 2. | Corporate Purpose   | 267 |
|----|----|---|-----|
|    |    | a. Shareholder Primacy  | 267 |
|    |    | Milton Friedman, The Social Responsibility of Business Is to        |     |
|    |    | Increase Its Profits  | 267 |
|    |    | Notes and Questions   | 271 |
|    |    | b. Stakeholder Primacy  | 271 |
|    |    | Leo E. Strine Jr. & Joey Zwillinger, What Milton Friedman           |     |
|    |    | Missed About Social Inequality                                      | 272 |
|    |    | Notes and Questions   | 273 |
|    |    | Problem 4-1   | 274 |
|    | 3. | The Legal Standard  | 274 |
|    |    | a. Discretion to Determine Business Goals, Strategies, and Policies | 275 |
|    |    | Shlensky v. Wrigley   | 275 |
|    |    | b. Discretion to Consider Interests of Non-Shareholder              |     |
|    |    | Constituencies  | 278 |
|    |    | Dodge v. Ford Motor Co.   | 279 |
|    |    | Notes and Questions   | 282 |
|    |    | Problem 4-2   | 285 |
|    |    | McRitchie v. Zuckerberg   | 285 |
|    |    | Notes and Questions   | 297 |
|    | 4. | Benefit Corporations  | 298 |
|    |    | Notes and Questions   | 300 |
|    |    | Problem 4-3   | 302 |
| В. |    | ne Fiduciary Duty of Care   | 302 |
|    | 1. | The Interaction of Statutory and Common Law                         | 302 |
|    |    | Smith v. Van Gorkom   | 304 |
|    |    | Notes and Questions   | 325 |
|    | 2. | Policy Arguments for Limiting the Role of the Duty of Care          | 326 |
|    |    | Joy v. North  | 326 |
|    |    | Notes and Questions   | 328 |
|    | 3. | Statutorily Authorized Exculpation Provisions: Contracting to Limit |     |
|    |    | Shareholder Litigation as a Mechanism to Enforce the Duty of Care   | 329 |
|    |    | Malpiede v. Townson   | 330 |
| ~  |    | Notes and Questions   | 331 |
| C. |    | ne Fiduciary Duty of Loyalty  | 333 |
|    |    | Introduction  | 333 |
|    | 2. | The Corporate Opportunity Doctrine                                  | 333 |
|    |    | a. The American Law Institute and MBCA Approaches                   | 333 |
|    |    | Northeast Harbor Golf Club, Inc. v. Harris                          | 333 |
|    |    | Note: Fairness and the Doctrine of Waste                            | 340 |
|    |    | Notes and Questions   | 342 |
|    |    | Problem 4-4   | 342 |
|    |    | Problem 4-5   | 343 |

|    |    | b. The Delaware Approach  | 343        |
|----|----|---|------------|
|    |    | Broz v. Cellular Information Systems, Inc.                            | 343        |
|    |    | Notes and Questions   | 354        |
|    |    | Problem 4-6   | 356        |
|    | 3. | Conflicting-Interest Transactions                                     | 356        |
|    |    | a. At Common Law  | 356        |
|    |    | Globe Woolen Co. v. Utica Gas & Electric Co.                          | 357        |
|    |    | b. The Intersection of the Common Law and Typical                     |            |
|    |    | Conflicting-Interest Statutes   | 361        |
|    |    | Problem 4-7   | 362        |
|    |    | Problem 4-8   | 363        |
|    |    | Problem 4-9   | 363        |
|    |    | Problem 4-10  | 364        |
|    | 4. | Self-Dealing  | 364        |
|    |    | Sinclair Oil Corp. v. Levien  | 365        |
|    |    | Notes and Questions   | 369        |
|    | 5. | Controlling Shareholder Self-Dealing                                  | 370        |
|    |    | Tornetta v. Musk  | 370        |
|    |    | Notes and Questions   | 390        |
|    | 6. | The Statutory Treatment of Controlling Shareholders: The New          |            |
|    |    | Section 144   | 392        |
|    |    | Notes and Questions   | 394        |
|    | 7. | Reincorporation as Self-Dealing                                       | 395        |
|    |    | Maffei v. Palkon  | 395        |
|    |    | Notes and Questions   | 406        |
| D. |    | irectors' Oversight and Monitoring Responsibilities                   | 407        |
|    | 1. | Role of the Board in Selection, Oversight, and Compensation of        | –          |
|    |    | CEO and Other Senior Executive Officers                               | 407        |
|    |    | In re Walt Disney Company Derivative Litigation                       | 409        |
|    | 0  | Notes and Questions   | 429        |
|    | 2. | The Board of Directors' Responsibility to Ensure That the Corporation | 490        |
|    |    | Conducts Its Business Lawfully  | 430        |
|    |    | a. Introduction   | 430        |
|    |    | Stone v. Ritter   | 432        |
|    |    | b. The Essence of a Successful Caremark Claim  Marchand v. Barnhill   | 438<br>439 |
|    |    | Notes and Questions   | 439        |
|    |    | Problem 4-11  | 450        |
|    |    | Problem 4-12  | 451        |
|    | 2  | Officer Liability   | 451        |
|    | J, | In re McDonald's Corporation Stockholder Derivative Litigation        | 452        |
|    |    | Notes and Questions   | 467        |
|    |    | Problem 4-13  | 468        |
|    |    | 110010111 1 10  | 100        |

xvi

| 5       | Shareholder Litigation                                 | 469 |
|---------|--|-----|
| —<br>A. | Introduction   | 469 |
|         | United Food & Commercial Workers Union v. Zuckerberg   | 472 |
|         | Notes and Questions                                    | 481 |
|         | Problem 5-1  | 485 |
|         | Problem 5-2  | 486 |
| В.      | Demand Futility in Action                              | 486 |
|         | In re The Limited, Inc. Shareholders Litigation        | 486 |
|         | Notes and Questions                                    | 497 |
|         | Problem 5-3  | 498 |
| C.      | Books and Records Request as a Litigation Tool         | 498 |
|         | Simeone v. Walt Disney Co.                             | 499 |
|         | Notes and Questions                                    | 507 |
| D.      | Attorney's Fees  | 509 |
|         | Tornetta v. Musk                                       | 510 |
|         | Notes and Questions                                    | 517 |
| E.      | Settlement   | 518 |
|         | In re Trulia, Inc. Stockholder Litigation              | 518 |
|         | Notes and Questions                                    | 523 |
| 6       | Mergers and Other Transactions in, or Uses of, Control | 525 |
|         | Introduction   | 525 |
|         | The Statutory Template                                 | 526 |
| Β.      | 1. Mergers   | 526 |
|         | Hewlett v. Hewlett-Packard Co.                         | 528 |
|         | 2. Dissenter's Rights                                  | 540 |
|         | Notes and Questions                                    | 542 |
|         | Problem 6-1  | 543 |
| C.      | Contracting Around Appraisal and Voting Rights         | 544 |
|         | 1. Introductory Note                                   | 544 |
|         | 2. Sale of Assets                                      | 544 |
|         | 3. Triangular Mergers                                  | 545 |
|         | 4. Compulsory Share Exchanges                          | 546 |
|         | 5. Negotiated Stock Purchase                           | 546 |
|         | 6. De Facto Mergers                                    | 547 |
| D.      | Cash-Out Mergers and the Weinberger Approach           | 548 |
|         | Weinberger v. UOP, Inc.                                | 550 |
|         | Notes and Questions                                    | 561 |
|         | Problem 6-2  | 564 |
|         | Problem 6-3  | 564 |

| Contents | xvii |
|----------|------|
|          |      |

| E.                 | Cleansing After Weinberger  | 565 |
|--------------------|---|-----|
|                    | 1. Obtaining Business Judgment Rule Protection for "Controller Mergers" | 565 |
|                    | Kahn v. M & F Worldwide Corp.   | 566 |
|                    | Notes and Questions: MFW Creep and Amended Section 144                  | 582 |
|                    | Problem 6-4   | 583 |
| F.                 | Appraisal After Weinberger  | 584 |
|                    | 1. Valuation Under Statutory Appraisal                                  | 584 |
|                    | DFC Global Corp. v. Muirfield Value Partners, L.P.                      | 584 |
|                    | Notes and Questions   | 601 |
|                    | Problem 6-5   | 603 |
| 7                  | Hostile Challenges to Incumbent Board Control                           | 605 |
| <del>—</del><br>А. | Introduction  | 605 |
|                    | 1. Hostile Tender Offers as Distinguished from Friendly Mergers         | 605 |
|                    | 2. Hostile Takeovers: The Debate  | 605 |
|                    | 3. Federal Law Designed to Protect Shareholders in Making Decisions in  |     |
|                    | Response to Tender Offers   | 606 |
|                    | 4. Defensive Tactics by Boards and Managers                             | 607 |
|                    | 5. State Antitakeover Laws  | 608 |
|                    | 6. New Frontiers: Shareholder Activism                                  | 610 |
| В.                 | Judicial Review of Defensive Tactics                                    | 610 |
|                    | 1. The Enhanced Scrutiny Framework—The <i>Unocal</i> Doctrine           | 610 |
|                    | Unocal Corp. v. Mesa Petroleum Co.                                      | 611 |
|                    | Notes and Questions   | 619 |
|                    | Problem 7-1   | 620 |
|                    | 2. The Poison Pill  | 621 |
|                    | Moran v. Household International, Inc.                                  | 621 |
|                    | Notes and Questions   | 633 |
|                    | Problem 7-2   | 634 |
|                    | 3. Judicial Review of Voting Contest Defenses                           | 634 |
|                    | Schnell v. Chris-Craft Industries, Inc.                                 | 635 |
|                    | Problem 7-3   | 638 |
|                    | Blasius Industries, Inc. v. Atlas Corp.                                 | 639 |
|                    | Notes and Questions   | 650 |
|                    | Problem 7-4   | 652 |
|                    | Problem 7-5   | 652 |
|                    | 4. Beyond Tender Offers: Enhanced Scrutiny in the Director              |     |
|                    | Election Context  | 652 |
|                    | Unitrin, Inc. v. American General Corp.                                 | 653 |
|                    | Notes and Questions   | 663 |
|                    | 5. Enhanced Scrutiny in the Shareholder Activism Setting                | 664 |
|                    | a. Advance Notice Bylaws  | 664 |
|                    | Kellner v. AIM ImmunoTech Inc.  | 664 |

xviii Contents

| b. Anti-Activist Poison Pills The Williams Companies Stockholder Litigation Notes and Questions 6. The Revlon Rule: Directors' Duty to Get the Best Price in the Sale or Breakup of the Company Revlon, Inc. v. MacAndrews & Forbes Holdings, Inc. 966 Notes and Questions Problem 7-7 Problem 7-8 7. Cleansing Post-Closing Revlon and Unocal Claims Corwin v. KKR Financial Holdings ILC Notes and Questions 713  8 Illiquidity and Oppression in Non-Publicly Traded Corporations 715  A. Introduction 716 B. Contracting as a Device to Limit the Majority's Discretion 717 1. Agreements as to Director Decisions 718 Zion v. Kurtz Notes and Questions 726 Problem 8-1 2. Agreements as to Shareholder Decisions Ramos v. Estrada Notes and Questions 734 C. Fiduciary Duty and Threat of Dissolution as a Check on Opportunistic Majority Action 1. Traditional Judicial Deference to Majority's Discretion 735 Tidell v. Zidell, Inc. Notes and Questions 736 The Partnership Analogy as a Basis for Enhancing Minority Shareholders' Rights Donahue v. Rodd Electrotype Co. Wilkes v. Springside Nursing Home, Inc. J.A.C. Hetherington & Michael P. Dooley, Illiquidity and Exploitation: A  |    | Notes and Questions  | 676  |
|--|----|--|------|
| The Williams Companies Stockholder Litigation Notes and Questions 6. The Revlon Rule: Directors' Duty to Get the Best Price in the Sale or Breakup of the Company Revlon, Inc. v. MacAndrews & Forbes Holdings, Inc. 896 Notes and Questions Problem 7-7 Problem 7-8 7. Cleansing Post-Closing Revlon and Unocal Claims Corwin v. KRR Financial Holdings LLC 710 Notes and Questions 713  8 Illiquidity and Oppression in Non-Publicly Traded Corporations 715  A. Introduction 716 Contracting as a Device to Limit the Majority's Discretion 717 1. Agreements as to Director Decisions 718 2. Agreements as to Shareholder Decisions Problem 8-1 2. Agreements as to Shareholder Decisions Ramos v. Estrada Notes and Questions 728 C. Fiduciary Duty and Threat of Dissolution as a Check on Opportunistic Majority Action 1. Traditional Judicial Deference to Majority's Discretion 735 735 736 737 739 739 739 740 741 741 740 741 744 744 745 745 745 746 747 747 747 747 747 748 748 749 740 740 741 741 744 744 745 745 746 747 747 747 747 747 748 748 749 749 740 740 741 741 744 744 745 745 746 747 747 747 748 748 749 749 740 740 741 741 744 744 745 745 746 747 747 747 748 748 749 749 740 740 741 741 742 744 744 745 745 746 747 747 748 748 749 749 740 740 741 741 742 744 744 745 745 746 747 747 747 748 749 749 740 740 740 741 741 742 744 744 745 745 746 747 747 747 747 748 749 749 740 740 740 740 740 740 740 740 740 740  |    | Problem 7-6  | 677  |
| Notes and Questions 6. The Revlon Rule: Directors' Duty to Get the Best Price in the Sale or Breakup of the Company Revlon, Inc. v. MacAndrews & Forbes Holdings, Inc.  Revlon and Questions  700 Problem 7-7 Problem 7-8 709 709 710 710 711 711 712 712 713  8 Illiquidity and Oppression in Non-Publicly Traded Corporations  715 716 717 717  A. Introduction 718 719 719 710 710 710 711 711 711 712 712 713  713  714 715 715 715 715 715 716 717 717 717 717 717 717 717 717 717  |    | b. Anti-Activist Poison Pills  | 677  |
| 6. The Revlon Rule: Directors' Duty to Get the Best Price in the Sale or Breakup of the Company  Revlon, Inc. v. MacAndrews & Forbes Holdings, Inc.  Notes and Questions Problem 7-7 Problem 7-8 7. Cleansing Post-Closing Revlon and Unocal Claims Corwin v. KKR Financial Holdings LLC Notes and Questions  7. Iliquidity and Oppression in Non-Publicly Traded Corporations  7. Introduction 7. Introduction 7. A. Introduction 7. Agreements as to Director Decisions 7. Alignments as to Director Decisions 7. Agreements as to Shareholder Decisions 7. Agreements as to Director Pectual Decisions 7. Agreements as to Director Decisions 7. Agreements as to Decisions 7. Agreement |    | The Williams Companies Stockholder Litigation                                | 678  |
| or Breakup of the Company  *Revlon, Inc. v. MacAndrews & Forbes Holdings, Inc.  Notes and Questions Problem 7-7 Problem 7-8 7. Cleansing Post-Closing *Revlon* and Unocal* Claims Corvin v. KKR Financial Holdings LLC 710 Notes and Questions  **Illiquidity and Oppression in Non-Publicly Traded Corporations*  **Introduction* ** |    | Notes and Questions  | 693  |
| Revlon, Inc. v. MacAndrews & Forbes Holdings, Inc.  Notes and Questions Problem 7-7 Problem 7-8 709 Problem 7-8 709 7. Cleansing Post-Closing Revlon and Unocal Claims Corwin v. KKR Financial Holdings LLC Notes and Questions  713  8 Illiquidity and Oppression in Non-Publicly Traded Corporations  715  A. Introduction B. Contracting as a Device to Limit the Majority's Discretion 1. Agreements as to Director Decisions 718 Zion v. Kurtz 722 Notes and Questions Problem 8-1 2. Agreements as to Shareholder Decisions Ramos v. Estrada Notes and Questions Problem 8-1 2. Agreements as to Shareholder Decisions Ramos v. Estrada Notes and Questions C. Fiduciary Duty and Threat of Dissolution as a Check on Opportunistic Majority Action 1. Traditional Judicial Deference to Majority's Discretion 735 Zidell v. Zidell, Inc. Notes and Questions 2. The Partnership Analogy as a Basis for Enhancing Minority Shareholders' Rights Donahue v. Rodd Electrotype Co. Wilkes v. Springside Nursing Home, Inc. J.A. C. Hetherington & Michael P. Dooley, Illiquidity and Exploitation: A Proposed Statutory Solution to the Remaining Close Corporation Problem Frank H. Easterbrook & Daniel R. Fischel, Close Corporation and Agency Costs Notes and Questions Note: Direct Versus Derivative Suit  |    | 6. The <i>Revlon</i> Rule: Directors' Duty to Get the Best Price in the Sale |      |
| Notes and Questions Problem 7-7 Problem 7-8 7. Cleansing Post-Closing Revion and Unocal Claims Corwin v. KKR Financial Holdings LLC 710 Notes and Questions 715  8. Illiquidity and Oppression in Non-Publicly Traded Corporations 715  A. Introduction B. Contracting as a Device to Limit the Majority's Discretion 1. Agreements as to Director Decisions 718  Zion v. Kurtz 722 Notes and Questions Problem 8-1 2. Agreements as to Shareholder Decisions 734 2. Agreements as to Shareholder Decisions 735 Ramos v. Estrada 730 Notes and Questions 734 C. Fiduciary Duty and Threat of Dissolution as a Check on Opportunistic Majority Action 1. Traditional Judicial Deference to Majority's Discretion 735 Zidell v. Zidell, Inc. 735 Notes and Questions 2. The Partnership Analogy as a Basis for Enhancing Minority Shareholders' Rights 740 Donahue v. Rodd Electrotype Co. Wilkes v. Springside Nursing Home, Inc. J.A.C. Hetherington & Michael P. Dooley, Illiquidity and Exploitation: A Proposed Statutory Solution to the Remaining Close Corporation Problem Frank H. Easterbrook & Daniel R. Fischel, Close Corporation Problem Frank H. Easterbrook & Daniel R. Fischel, Close Corporation Solutions and Agency Costs Notes and Questions 753 Note: Direct Versus Derivative Suit  |    | or Breakup of the Company  | 696  |
| Problem 7-7 Problem 7-8 Problem 7-8 7. Cleansing Post-Closing Revlon and Unocal Claims Corwin v. KKR Financial Holdings LLC Notes and Questions 713  8 Illiquidity and Oppression in Non–Publicly Traded Corporations 715  A. Introduction 716 Contracting as a Device to Limit the Majority's Discretion 717 1. Agreements as to Director Decisions 718 Zion v. Kurtz 722 Notes and Questions 726 Problem 8-1 728 2. Agreements as to Shareholder Decisions 729 Ramos v. Estrada 730 Notes and Questions 734 C. Fiduciary Duty and Threat of Dissolution as a Check on Opportunistic Majority Action 735 736 1. Traditional Judicial Deference to Majority's Discretion 735 Zidell v. Zidell, Inc. Notes and Questions 736 2. The Partnership Analogy as a Basis for Enhancing Minority Shareholders' Rights 740 Donahue v. Rodd Electrotype Co. Wilkes v. Springside Nursing Home, Inc. J.A.C. Hetherington & Michael P. Dooley, Illiquidity and Exploitation: A Proposed Statutory Solution to the Remaining Close Corporation Problem Frank H. Easterbrook & Daniel R. Fischel, Close Corporation Problem Frank H. Easterbrook & Daniel R. Fischel, Close Corporations and Agency Costs Note: Direct Versus Derivative Suit  |    | Revlon, Inc. v. MacAndrews & Forbes Holdings, Inc.                           | 696  |
| Problem 7-8 7. Cleansing Post-Closing Revlon and Unocal Claims Corvin v. KKR Financial Holdings LLC 710 Notes and Questions 713  8 Illiquidity and Oppression in Non–Publicly Traded Corporations 715  A. Introduction 715  B. Contracting as a Device to Limit the Majority's Discretion 718 1. Agreements as to Director Decisions 718 2ion v. Kurtz 722 Notes and Questions 726 Problem 8-1 2. Agreements as to Shareholder Decisions 729 Ramos v. Estrada 730 Notes and Questions 734 C. Fiduciary Duty and Threat of Dissolution as a Check on Opportunistic Majority Action 735 735 1. Traditional Judicial Deference to Majority's Discretion 736 Zidell v. Zidell, Inc. 737 Notes and Questions 739 2. The Partnership Analogy as a Basis for Enhancing Minority Shareholders' Rights 740 Donahue v. Rodd Electrotype Co. 741 Wilkes v. Springside Nursing Home, Inc. J.A. C. Hetherington & Michael P. Dooley, Illiquidity and Exploitation: A Proposed Statutory Solution to the Remaining Close Corporation Problem Frank H. Easterbrook & Daniel R. Fischel, Close Corporations and Agency Costs Notes and Questions 752 Notes and Questions 753 Note: Direct Versus Derivative Suit   |    |  | 706  |
| 7. Cleansing Post-Closing Revlon and Unocal Claims Corwin v. KKR Financial Holdings LLC Notes and Questions  7. Illiquidity and Oppression in Non–Publicly Traded Corporations  7. Introduction 7. Introduction 7. Contracting as a Device to Limit the Majority's Discretion 7. A. Introduction 7. A. Introduction 7. A. Introduction 7. Contracting as a Device to Limit the Majority's Discretion 7. A. Introduction 7. Contracting as a Device to Limit the Majority's Discretion 7. Contracting as a Device to Limit the Majority State of Texture of Texture of Texture  |    |  | 709  |
| 8 Illiquidity and Oppression in Non–Publicly Traded Corporations 715  A. Introduction 716  B. Contracting as a Device to Limit the Majority's Discretion 717  1. Agreements as to Director Decisions 718  Zion v. Kurtz 722  Notes and Questions 726  Problem 8-1 728  2. Agreements as to Shareholder Decisions 729  Ramos v. Estrada 730  Notes and Questions 734  C. Fiduciary Duty and Threat of Dissolution as a Check on Opportunistic Majority Action 735  1. Traditional Judicial Deference to Majority's Discretion 735  Zidell v. Zidell, Inc. 735  Notes and Questions 730  2. The Partnership Analogy as a Basis for Enhancing Minority Shareholders' Rights 740  Donahue v. Rodd Electrotype Co. 741  Wilkes v. Springside Nursing Home, Inc. 746  J.A.C. Hetherington & Michael P. Dooley, Illiquidity and Exploitation: A Proposed Statutory Solution to the Remaining Close Corporation Problem Frank H. Easterbrook & Daniel R. Fischel, Close Corporations and Agency Costs Notes and Questions 752  Notes and Questions 753  Note: Direct Versus Derivative Suit  |    |  |      |
| Notes and Questions  **Reliquidity and Oppression in Non-Publicly Traded Corporations**  **A. Introduction**  **B. Contracting as a Device to Limit the Majority's Discretion 718  1. Agreements as to Director Decisions 718  **Zion v. Kurtz 722  **Notes and Questions 726  **Problem 8-1 728  **Problem 8-1 728  2. Agreements as to Shareholder Decisions 729  **Ramos v. Estrada 730  **Notes and Questions 734  **C. Fiduciary Duty and Threat of Dissolution as a Check on Opportunistic Majority Action 735  1. Traditional Judicial Deference to Majority's Discretion 735  **Zidell v. Zidell, Inc. 735  **Notes and Questions 739  2. The Partnership Analogy as a Basis for Enhancing Minority Shareholders' Rights 740  **Donahue v. Rodd Electrotype Co. 741  **Wilkes v. Springside Nursing Home, Inc. 746  **J.A.C. Hetherington & Michael P. Dooley, Illiquidity and Exploitation: A Proposed Statutory Solution to the Remaining Close Corporation Problem Frank H. Easterbrook & Daniel R. Fischel, Close Corporations and Agency Costs 752  **Notes and Questions 753  **Note: Direct Versus Derivative Suit 754  |    |  |      |
| A. Introduction  A. Introduction  B. Contracting as a Device to Limit the Majority's Discretion 1. Agreements as to Director Decisions 2   |    | · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·  |      |
| A. Introduction B. Contracting as a Device to Limit the Majority's Discretion 718 1. Agreements as to Director Decisions 718  Zion v. Kurtz 722 Notes and Questions 726 Problem 8-1 728 2. Agreements as to Shareholder Decisions 729 Ramos v. Estrada 730 Notes and Questions 734 C. Fiduciary Duty and Threat of Dissolution as a Check on Opportunistic Majority Action 735 1. Traditional Judicial Deference to Majority's Discretion 735 Zidell v. Zidell, Inc. 735 Notes and Questions 739 2. The Partnership Analogy as a Basis for Enhancing Minority Shareholders' Rights 740 Donahue v. Rodd Electrotype Co. 741 Wilkes v. Springside Nursing Home, Inc. 746 J.A.C. Hetherington & Michael P. Dooley, Illiquidity and Exploitation: A Proposed Statutory Solution to the Remaining Close Corporation Problem Frank H. Easterbrook & Daniel R. Fischel, Close Corporations and Agency Costs Notes and Questions 753 Note: Direct Versus Derivative Suit   |    | Notes and Questions  | 713  |
| B. Contracting as a Device to Limit the Majority's Discretion 1. Agreements as to Director Decisions 718  Zion v. Kurtz 722  Notes and Questions 726  Problem 8-1 2. Agreements as to Shareholder Decisions 730  Ramos v. Estrada 730  Notes and Questions 734  C. Fiduciary Duty and Threat of Dissolution as a Check on Opportunistic Majority Action 735  1. Traditional Judicial Deference to Majority's Discretion 735  Zidell v. Zidell, Inc. 735  Notes and Questions 739  2. The Partnership Analogy as a Basis for Enhancing Minority Shareholders' Rights 740  Donahue v. Rodd Electrotype Co. 741  Wilkes v. Springside Nursing Home, Inc. 746  J.A.C. Hetherington & Michael P. Dooley, Illiquidity and Exploitation: A Proposed Statutory Solution to the Remaining Close Corporation Problem Frank H. Easterbrook & Daniel R. Fischel, Close Corporations and Agency Costs Notes and Questions 753  Note: Direct Versus Derivative Suit  | 8  | Illiquidity and Oppression in Non–Publicly Traded Corporations               | 715  |
| B. Contracting as a Device to Limit the Majority's Discretion 1. Agreements as to Director Decisions 718  Zion v. Kurtz 722  Notes and Questions 726  Problem 8-1 2. Agreements as to Shareholder Decisions 730  Ramos v. Estrada 730  Notes and Questions 734  C. Fiduciary Duty and Threat of Dissolution as a Check on Opportunistic Majority Action 735  1. Traditional Judicial Deference to Majority's Discretion 735  Zidell v. Zidell, Inc. 735  Notes and Questions 739  2. The Partnership Analogy as a Basis for Enhancing Minority Shareholders' Rights 740  Donahue v. Rodd Electrotype Co. 741  Wilkes v. Springside Nursing Home, Inc. 746  J.A.C. Hetherington & Michael P. Dooley, Illiquidity and Exploitation: A Proposed Statutory Solution to the Remaining Close Corporation Problem Frank H. Easterbrook & Daniel R. Fischel, Close Corporations and Agency Costs Notes and Questions 753  Note: Direct Versus Derivative Suit  | _  | <u> </u>   |      |
| 1. Agreements as to Director Decisions  Zion v. Kurtz  Notes and Questions Problem 8-1  2. Agreements as to Shareholder Decisions Ramos v. Estrada Notes and Questions  734  C. Fiduciary Duty and Threat of Dissolution as a Check on Opportunistic Majority Action  735  1. Traditional Judicial Deference to Majority's Discretion Zidell v. Zidell, Inc. Notes and Questions  739  2. The Partnership Analogy as a Basis for Enhancing Minority Shareholders' Rights  Donahue v. Rodd Electrotype Co. Wilkes v. Springside Nursing Home, Inc. J.A.C. Hetherington & Michael P. Dooley, Illiquidity and Exploitation: A Proposed Statutory Solution to the Remaining Close Corporation Problem Frank H. Easterbrook & Daniel R. Fischel, Close Corporations and Agency Costs Notes and Questions 753 Note: Direct Versus Derivative Suit  |    |  |      |
| Zion v. Kurtz722Notes and Questions726Problem 8-17282. Agreements as to Shareholder Decisions729Ramos v. Estrada730Notes and Questions734C. Fiduciary Duty and Threat of Dissolution as a Check on Opportunistic735Majority Action7351. Traditional Judicial Deference to Majority's Discretion735Zidell v. Zidell, Inc.735Notes and Questions7392. The Partnership Analogy as a Basis for Enhancing Minority740Shareholders' Rights740Donahue v. Rodd Electrotype Co.741Wilkes v. Springside Nursing Home, Inc.746J.A.C. Hetherington & Michael P. Dooley, Illiquidity and Exploitation: A750Proposed Statutory Solution to the Remaining Close Corporation Problem750Frank H. Easterbrook & Daniel R. Fischel, Close Corporations and<br>Agency Costs752Notes and Questions753Note: Direct Versus Derivative Suit754   | В. |  |      |
| Notes and Questions Problem 8-1  2. Agreements as to Shareholder Decisions Ramos v. Estrada Notes and Questions  734  C. Fiduciary Duty and Threat of Dissolution as a Check on Opportunistic Majority Action  735  1. Traditional Judicial Deference to Majority's Discretion 735  Zidell v. Zidell, Inc. 735  Notes and Questions  739  2. The Partnership Analogy as a Basis for Enhancing Minority Shareholders' Rights 740  Donahue v. Rodd Electrotype Co. 741  Wilkes v. Springside Nursing Home, Inc. 746  J.A.C. Hetherington & Michael P. Dooley, Illiquidity and Exploitation: A Proposed Statutory Solution to the Remaining Close Corporation Problem Frank H. Easterbrook & Daniel R. Fischel, Close Corporations and Agency Costs Notes and Questions 753  Note: Direct Versus Derivative Suit  |    | S .  |      |
| Problem 8-1  2. Agreements as to Shareholder Decisions  Ramos v. Estrada Notes and Questions  734  C. Fiduciary Duty and Threat of Dissolution as a Check on Opportunistic  Majority Action 735  1. Traditional Judicial Deference to Majority's Discretion 735  Zidell v. Zidell, Inc. 735  Notes and Questions 739  2. The Partnership Analogy as a Basis for Enhancing Minority Shareholders' Rights 740  Donahue v. Rodd Electrotype Co. 741  Wilkes v. Springside Nursing Home, Inc. 746  J.A.C. Hetherington & Michael P. Dooley, Illiquidity and Exploitation: A Proposed Statutory Solution to the Remaining Close Corporation Problem Frank H. Easterbrook & Daniel R. Fischel, Close Corporations and Agency Costs Notes and Questions 753  Note: Direct Versus Derivative Suit  |    |  |      |
| 2. Agreements as to Shareholder Decisions  Ramos v. Estrada Notes and Questions 734  C. Fiduciary Duty and Threat of Dissolution as a Check on Opportunistic Majority Action 735 1. Traditional Judicial Deference to Majority's Discretion 735  Zidell v. Zidell, Inc. 735  Notes and Questions 739  2. The Partnership Analogy as a Basis for Enhancing Minority Shareholders' Rights 740  Donahue v. Rodd Electrotype Co. 741  Wilkes v. Springside Nursing Home, Inc. 746  J.A.C. Hetherington & Michael P. Dooley, Illiquidity and Exploitation: A Proposed Statutory Solution to the Remaining Close Corporation Problem Frank H. Easterbrook & Daniel R. Fischel, Close Corporations and Agency Costs Notes and Questions Note: Direct Versus Derivative Suit 754   |    | · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·  |      |
| Ramos v. Estrada Notes and Questions 734  C. Fiduciary Duty and Threat of Dissolution as a Check on Opportunistic Majority Action 735 1. Traditional Judicial Deference to Majority's Discretion 735 2idell v. Zidell, Inc. 735 Notes and Questions 739 2. The Partnership Analogy as a Basis for Enhancing Minority Shareholders' Rights 740 Donahue v. Rodd Electrotype Co. 741 Wilkes v. Springside Nursing Home, Inc. 746 J.A.C. Hetherington & Michael P. Dooley, Illiquidity and Exploitation: A Proposed Statutory Solution to the Remaining Close Corporation Problem Frank H. Easterbrook & Daniel R. Fischel, Close Corporations and Agency Costs Notes and Questions 753 Note: Direct Versus Derivative Suit  |    |  |      |
| Notes and Questions  C. Fiduciary Duty and Threat of Dissolution as a Check on Opportunistic Majority Action 735 1. Traditional Judicial Deference to Majority's Discretion 735  Zidell v. Zidell, Inc. 735  Notes and Questions 739 2. The Partnership Analogy as a Basis for Enhancing Minority Shareholders' Rights 740  Donahue v. Rodd Electrotype Co. 741  Wilkes v. Springside Nursing Home, Inc. 746  J.A.C. Hetherington & Michael P. Dooley, Illiquidity and Exploitation: A Proposed Statutory Solution to the Remaining Close Corporation Problem Frank H. Easterbrook & Daniel R. Fischel, Close Corporations and Agency Costs Notes and Questions Note: Direct Versus Derivative Suit 754  |    | S .  |      |
| C. Fiduciary Duty and Threat of Dissolution as a Check on Opportunistic Majority Action 735 1. Traditional Judicial Deference to Majority's Discretion 735 2idell v. Zidell, Inc. 735 Notes and Questions 739 2. The Partnership Analogy as a Basis for Enhancing Minority Shareholders' Rights 740 Donahue v. Rodd Electrotype Co. 741 Wilkes v. Springside Nursing Home, Inc. 746 J.A.C. Hetherington & Michael P. Dooley, Illiquidity and Exploitation: A Proposed Statutory Solution to the Remaining Close Corporation Problem Frank H. Easterbrook & Daniel R. Fischel, Close Corporations and Agency Costs Notes and Questions 753 Note: Direct Versus Derivative Suit  |    |  |      |
| Majority Action 735  1. Traditional Judicial Deference to Majority's Discretion 735  **Zidell v. Zidell, Inc.**  Notes and Questions 739  2. The Partnership Analogy as a Basis for Enhancing Minority  Shareholders' Rights 740  **Donahue v. Rodd Electrotype Co.**  Wilkes v. Springside Nursing Home, Inc.**  J.A.C. Hetherington & Michael P. Dooley, Illiquidity and Exploitation: A  **Proposed Statutory Solution to the Remaining Close Corporation Problem  Frank H. Easterbrook & Daniel R. Fischel, Close Corporations and  **Agency Costs**  Notes and Questions  Note: Direct Versus Derivative Suit 754   | C  | *  | 734  |
| 1. Traditional Judicial Deference to Majority's Discretion  Zidell v. Zidell, Inc.  Notes and Questions  735  Notes and Questions  739  2. The Partnership Analogy as a Basis for Enhancing Minority  Shareholders' Rights  Donahue v. Rodd Electrotype Co.  Wilkes v. Springside Nursing Home, Inc.  J.A.C. Hetherington & Michael P. Dooley, Illiquidity and Exploitation: A  Proposed Statutory Solution to the Remaining Close Corporation Problem  Frank H. Easterbrook & Daniel R. Fischel, Close Corporations and  Agency Costs  Notes and Questions  Note: Direct Versus Derivative Suit   | u. | , ,  | 735  |
| Zidell v. Zidell, Inc.  Notes and Questions  739  2. The Partnership Analogy as a Basis for Enhancing Minority Shareholders' Rights  Donahue v. Rodd Electrotype Co.  Wilkes v. Springside Nursing Home, Inc.  J.A.C. Hetherington & Michael P. Dooley, Illiquidity and Exploitation: A Proposed Statutory Solution to the Remaining Close Corporation Problem Frank H. Easterbrook & Daniel R. Fischel, Close Corporations and Agency Costs  Notes and Questions Note: Direct Versus Derivative Suit  |    | 0 ,  |      |
| Notes and Questions  2. The Partnership Analogy as a Basis for Enhancing Minority Shareholders' Rights  Donahue v. Rodd Electrotype Co.  Wilkes v. Springside Nursing Home, Inc. J.A.C. Hetherington & Michael P. Dooley, Illiquidity and Exploitation: A Proposed Statutory Solution to the Remaining Close Corporation Problem Frank H. Easterbrook & Daniel R. Fischel, Close Corporations and Agency Costs Notes and Questions Note: Direct Versus Derivative Suit  739  |    | · ,  |      |
| 2. The Partnership Analogy as a Basis for Enhancing Minority Shareholders' Rights  Donahue v. Rodd Electrotype Co.  Wilkes v. Springside Nursing Home, Inc. J.A.C. Hetherington & Michael P. Dooley, Illiquidity and Exploitation: A Proposed Statutory Solution to the Remaining Close Corporation Problem Frank H. Easterbrook & Daniel R. Fischel, Close Corporations and Agency Costs Notes and Questions Note: Direct Versus Derivative Suit  740 740 740 740 740 740 740 740 740 74  |    |  |      |
| Shareholders' Rights  Donahue v. Rodd Electrotype Co.  Wilkes v. Springside Nursing Home, Inc.  J.A.C. Hetherington & Michael P. Dooley, Illiquidity and Exploitation: A  Proposed Statutory Solution to the Remaining Close Corporation Problem Frank H. Easterbrook & Daniel R. Fischel, Close Corporations and Agency Costs  Notes and Questions  Note: Direct Versus Derivative Suit  740  740  741  742  743  744  745  746  747  747  748  759  750  750  751  752  753  753   |    | · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·  | 133  |
| Donahue v. Rodd Electrotype Co. 741  Wilkes v. Springside Nursing Home, Inc. 746  J.A.C. Hetherington & Michael P. Dooley, Illiquidity and Exploitation: A  Proposed Statutory Solution to the Remaining Close Corporation Problem  Frank H. Easterbrook & Daniel R. Fischel, Close Corporations and  Agency Costs 752  Notes and Questions 753  Note: Direct Versus Derivative Suit 754   |    |  | 740  |
| Wilkes v. Springside Nursing Home, Inc.  J.A.C. Hetherington & Michael P. Dooley, Illiquidity and Exploitation: A  Proposed Statutory Solution to the Remaining Close Corporation Problem Frank H. Easterbrook & Daniel R. Fischel, Close Corporations and Agency Costs  Notes and Questions 753 Note: Direct Versus Derivative Suit   |    |  |      |
| J.A.C. Hetherington & Michael P. Dooley, Illiquidity and Exploitation: A Proposed Statutory Solution to the Remaining Close Corporation Problem Frank H. Easterbrook & Daniel R. Fischel, Close Corporations and Agency Costs Notes and Questions Note: Direct Versus Derivative Suit  750 751 752 753 754   |    | 7.1  |      |
| Proposed Statutory Solution to the Remaining Close Corporation Problem Frank H. Easterbrook & Daniel R. Fischel, Close Corporations and Agency Costs Notes and Questions Note: Direct Versus Derivative Suit 750 751 752 753 754   |    |  | , 10 |
| Agency Costs 752 Notes and Questions 753 Note: Direct Versus Derivative Suit 754   |    | Proposed Statutory Solution to the Remaining Close Corporation Problem       | 750  |
| Notes and Questions 753<br>Note: Direct Versus Derivative Suit 754   |    | <u> </u>   | 750  |
| Note: Direct Versus Derivative Suit 754  |    | 6 ,  |      |
|  |    | · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·  |      |
|  |    |  |      |

Contents xix

| 3. The Modern Approach to Involuntary Dissolution  | 756   |
|--|---|
| Robert B. Thompson, The Shareholder's Cause of Action  |   |
| for Oppression   | 757   |
| In re Kemp & Beatley, Inc.   | 759   |
| Gimpel v. Bolstein   | 763   |
| Notes and Questions  | 768   |
| Problem 8-3  | 770   |
| Problem 8-4  | 771   |
| D. Delaware's Approach to Oppression of Minority Shareholders  | 771   |
| Nixon v. Blackwell   | 771   |
| Notes and Questions  | 779   |
| E. Share Repurchase Agreements   | 780   |
| 1. In the Close Corporation Setting  | 780   |
| Concord Auto Auction, Inc. v. Rustin   | 781   |
| 2. Illiquidity in Non–Publicly Traded Corporations That Are Not  | 705   |
| Closely Held   | 785   |
| Nemec v. Shrader   | 785   |
| Notes and Questions<br>Problem 8-5   | 794<br>795  |
|  | ,,,,  |
| 9 The Limited Liability Company  | 797   |
| The Zimica Ziacitity dompany   | 131   |
| A. Introduction  |   |
|  |   |
| A. Introduction 1. The Emergence and Evolution of the Limited Liability Company  | 797   |
| A. Introduction 1. The Emergence and Evolution of the Limited Liability Company 2. Lack of Uniformity in Statutory Models and Delaware's Dominance   | 797<br>797  |
| A. Introduction 1. The Emergence and Evolution of the Limited Liability Company  | 797<br>797<br>798   |
| A. Introduction  1. The Emergence and Evolution of the Limited Liability Company  2. Lack of Uniformity in Statutory Models and Delaware's Dominance  *Elf Atochem North America, Inc. v. Jaffari  Notes and Questions   | 797<br>797<br>798<br>799  |
| A. Introduction 1. The Emergence and Evolution of the Limited Liability Company 2. Lack of Uniformity in Statutory Models and Delaware's Dominance  *Elf Atochem North America, Inc. v. Jaffari*   | 797<br>797<br>798<br>799<br>801   |
| A. Introduction  1. The Emergence and Evolution of the Limited Liability Company  2. Lack of Uniformity in Statutory Models and Delaware's Dominance  *Elf Atochem North America, Inc. v. Jaffari  Notes and Questions  3. The LLC's Key Actors—Members and Managers   | 797<br>797<br>798<br>799<br>801<br>801<br>802   |
| A. Introduction  1. The Emergence and Evolution of the Limited Liability Company  2. Lack of Uniformity in Statutory Models and Delaware's Dominance  Elf Atochem North America, Inc. v. Jaffari  Notes and Questions  3. The LLC's Key Actors—Members and Managers  B. Planning for the LLC   | 797<br>797<br>798<br>799<br>801<br>801  |
| A. Introduction  1. The Emergence and Evolution of the Limited Liability Company  2. Lack of Uniformity in Statutory Models and Delaware's Dominance  Elf Atochem North America, Inc. v. Jaffari  Notes and Questions  3. The LLC's Key Actors—Members and Managers  B. Planning for the LLC  1. Formation and Its Pitfalls  | 797<br>797<br>798<br>799<br>801<br>801<br>802<br>802  |
| <ul> <li>A. Introduction</li> <li>1. The Emergence and Evolution of the Limited Liability Company</li> <li>2. Lack of Uniformity in Statutory Models and Delaware's Dominance</li></ul>  | 797<br>797<br>798<br>799<br>801<br>801<br>802<br>802  |
| <ul> <li>A. Introduction</li> <li>1. The Emergence and Evolution of the Limited Liability Company</li> <li>2. Lack of Uniformity in Statutory Models and Delaware's Dominance  Elf Atochem North America, Inc. v. Jaffari  Notes and Questions</li> <li>3. The LLC's Key Actors—Members and Managers</li> <li>B. Planning for the LLC</li> <li>1. Formation and Its Pitfalls  Klein v. Sussman</li> <li>2. How Members and Managers Act: Allocating Management and</li> </ul>  | 797<br>797<br>798<br>799<br>801<br>801<br>802<br>802<br>803   |
| <ul> <li>A. Introduction <ol> <li>The Emergence and Evolution of the Limited Liability Company</li> <li>Lack of Uniformity in Statutory Models and Delaware's Dominance</li></ol></li></ul>  | 797<br>797<br>798<br>799<br>801<br>802<br>802<br>803<br>810<br>811                                    |
| <ul> <li>A. Introduction <ol> <li>The Emergence and Evolution of the Limited Liability Company</li> <li>Lack of Uniformity in Statutory Models and Delaware's Dominance</li></ol></li></ul>  | 797<br>797<br>798<br>799<br>801<br>802<br>802<br>803<br>810<br>811                                    |
| <ul> <li>A. Introduction <ol> <li>The Emergence and Evolution of the Limited Liability Company</li> <li>Lack of Uniformity in Statutory Models and Delaware's Dominance</li></ol></li></ul>  | 797<br>797<br>798<br>799<br>801<br>801<br>802<br>802<br>803<br>810<br>811                             |
| A. Introduction  1. The Emergence and Evolution of the Limited Liability Company  2. Lack of Uniformity in Statutory Models and Delaware's Dominance  Elf Atochem North America, Inc. v. Jaffari  Notes and Questions  3. The LLC's Key Actors—Members and Managers  B. Planning for the LLC  1. Formation and Its Pitfalls  Klein v. Sussman  2. How Members and Managers Act: Allocating Management and Control Rights  McMillan v. Nelson  C. Fiduciary and Contractual Duties  Cygnus Opportunity Fund, LLC v. Washington Prime Group, LLC   | 797<br>797<br>798<br>799<br>801<br>802<br>802<br>803<br>810<br>811<br>819<br>820                      |
| A. Introduction  1. The Emergence and Evolution of the Limited Liability Company  2. Lack of Uniformity in Statutory Models and Delaware's Dominance  Elf Atochem North America, Inc. v. Jaffari  Notes and Questions  3. The LLC's Key Actors—Members and Managers  B. Planning for the LLC  1. Formation and Its Pitfalls  Klein v. Sussman  2. How Members and Managers Act: Allocating Management and  Control Rights  McMillan v. Nelson  C. Fiduciary and Contractual Duties  Cygnus Opportunity Fund, LLC v. Washington Prime Group, LLC  Notes and Questions   | 797<br>797<br>798<br>799<br>801<br>802<br>802<br>803<br>810<br>811<br>819<br>820<br>834               |
| A. Introduction  1. The Emergence and Evolution of the Limited Liability Company  2. Lack of Uniformity in Statutory Models and Delaware's Dominance  Elf Atochem North America, Inc. v. Jaffari  Notes and Questions  3. The LLC's Key Actors—Members and Managers  B. Planning for the LLC  1. Formation and Its Pitfalls  Klein v. Sussman  2. How Members and Managers Act: Allocating Management and  Control Rights  McMillan v. Nelson  C. Fiduciary and Contractual Duties  Cygnus Opportunity Fund, LLC v. Washington Prime Group, LLC  Notes and Questions  Problem 9-1  | 797<br>797<br>798<br>799<br>801<br>802<br>802<br>803<br>811<br>819<br>820<br>834<br>835               |
| A. Introduction  1. The Emergence and Evolution of the Limited Liability Company  2. Lack of Uniformity in Statutory Models and Delaware's Dominance  Elf Atochem North America, Inc. v. Jaffari  Notes and Questions  3. The LLC's Key Actors—Members and Managers  B. Planning for the LLC  1. Formation and Its Pitfalls  Klein v. Sussman  2. How Members and Managers Act: Allocating Management and  Control Rights  McMillan v. Nelson  C. Fiduciary and Contractual Duties  Cygnus Opportunity Fund, LLC v. Washington Prime Group, LLC  Notes and Questions  Problem 9-1  D. The Special Litigation Committee: Zapata in the Contractual Entity Setting | 797<br>797<br>798<br>799<br>801<br>802<br>802<br>803<br>810<br>811<br>819<br>820<br>834<br>835<br>836 |

| E. The Problem of Illiquidity and Oppression in Non–Publicly | 7            |
|--|--------------|
| Traded LLCs  | 848          |
| 1. Overview  | 848          |
| 2. Oppression as a Ground for Involuntary Judicial Dissolu   | tion 849     |
| Manere v. Collins  | 849          |
| Notes and Questions  | 857          |
| 3. Delaware and the "Impracticable" Ground for Judicial      |              |
| Dissolution  | 858          |
| In re Doehler Dry Ingredient Solutions, LLC                  | 859          |
| Notes and Questions  | 862          |
| F. A Final Reflection on Your LLC Journey                    | 864          |
| Problem 9-3  | 865          |
| 10 The Corporation as a Device to Allocate Risk              | 867          |
| A. Introduction  | 867          |
| Notes and Questions  | 869          |
| Problem 10-1   | 872          |
| Problem 10-2   | 873          |
| B. Piercing the Veil   | 873          |
| 1. Introduction  | 873          |
| 2. Piercing the Corporate Veil to Reach Individuals          | 879          |
| a. Contract Cases  | 879          |
| Consumer's Co-op v. Olsen                                    | 879          |
| K.C. Roofing Center v. On Top Roofing, Inc.                  | 885          |
| Notes and Questions  | 890          |
| Problem 10-3   | 892          |
| b. Tort Cases  | 893          |
| Western Rock Co. v. Davis                                    | 893          |
| Baatz v. Arrow Bar   | 896          |
| Notes and Questions  | 900          |
| Problem 10-4   | 902          |
| 3. Piercing the Corporate Veil to Reach Incorporated Share   | eholders 902 |
| Craig v. Lake Asbestos of Quebec, Ltd.                       | 902          |
| United States v. Bestfoods                                   | 908          |
| Notes and Questions  | 915          |
| Problem 10-5   | 919          |
| 4. Piercing in LLCs  | 919          |
| Kaycee Land & Livestock v. Flahive                           | 919          |
| Notes and Questions  | 924          |
| 5. The Overlap of Corporate Separateness and Fiduciary Pr    |              |
| in Newer Entity Structures                                   | 925          |
| Feeley v. NHAOCG, LLC  | 925          |

Contents xxi

| 11                 | Disclosure and Corporate Regulation   | 931  |
|--------------------|---|------|
| <del>—</del><br>А. | Introduction: Disclosure's Distinctive Role                                     | 931  |
| В.                 | Mandatory Disclosure  | 933  |
|                    | 1. The Issuance of Securities   | 933  |
|                    | a. Full and Fair Disclosure   | 934  |
|                    | b. What Transactions Are Covered?   | 935  |
|                    | Securities & Exchange Commission v. Edwards                                     | 936  |
|                    | 2. Required Disclosures in Proxy Solicitations                                  | 940  |
|                    | 3. Post-Issuance Disclosure Obligations of Public Companies                     | 941  |
| C.                 | Private Securities Fraud Enforcement via Implied Federal Causes of Action       | 941  |
|                    | 1. Introduction to Rules 10b-5 and 14a-9  | 941  |
|                    | 2. The Activist Supreme Court of the 1960s Provides Implied Private             |      |
|                    | Rights of Action for Rules 10b-5 and 14a-9                                      | 943  |
|                    | J.I. Case Co. v. Borak  | 943  |
|                    | Notes on Express Remedies and Implied Actions Under Rule 10b-5                  | 946  |
|                    | Mills v. Electric Auto-Lite Co.   | 947  |
|                    | 3. The Shift to Restricting the Private Right of Action                         | 951  |
|                    | a. Limiting the Private Right of Action to Purchasers and Sellers of Securities | 951  |
|                    | Blue Chip Stamps v. Manor Drug Stores   | 951  |
|                    | b. Federalism as a Limiting Principle for 10(b) Claims                          | 956  |
|                    | Santa Fe Industries, Inc. v. Green  | 956  |
|                    | c. Embracing a Narrow Space for <i>Borak</i>                                    | 962  |
|                    | Touche Ross & Co. v. Redington  | 962  |
|                    | 4. Clarifying the Elements of the Private Right of Action                       | 962  |
|                    | a. Materiality  | 963  |
|                    | TSC Industries, Inc. v. Northway, Inc.  | 963  |
|                    | Notes and Questions   | 964  |
|                    | b. Reliance   | 966  |
|                    | Basic Inc. v. Levinson  | 966  |
|                    | Notes and Questions on Materiality  | 977  |
|                    | Notes and Questions on Reliance   | 980  |
|                    | c. Scienter   | 981  |
|                    | Ernst & Ernst v. Hochfelder   | 982  |
|                    | Notes   | 984  |
|                    | d. The Private Securities Litigation Reform Act of 1995                         | 985  |
|                    | Tellabs, Inc. v. Makor Issues & Rights, Ltd.                                    | 987  |
|                    | Note  | 994  |
|                    | Problem 11-1  | 995  |
|                    | Problem 11-2  | 995  |
| D.                 | State Disclosure Law's Use of Federal Disclosure in Fiduciary Duties            | 995  |
|                    | In re The Topps Company Shareholders Litigation                                 | 995  |
|                    | Notes and Questions   | 1006 |

|         | Malone v. Brincat<br>Notes and Questions                                 | 1007<br>1012 |
|---------|--|--------------|
| 12      | Insider Trading  | 1013         |
| —<br>A. | The Common Law Foundation  | 1013         |
| В.      | Rule 10b-5 as a Regulator of Insider Trading                             | 1016         |
|         | 1. Classical Insider Trading as Fraud                                    | 1017         |
|         | Securities & Exchange Commission v. Texas Gulf Sulphur Co.               | 1017         |
|         | Notes and Questions  | 1027         |
|         | Chiarella v. United States   | 1029         |
|         | Notes and Questions  | 1036         |
|         | 2. Misappropriation as Fraud Under Rule 10b-5                            | 1037         |
|         | United States v. O'Hagan   | 1038         |
|         | Notes and Questions  | 1045         |
|         | Problem 12-1   | 1048         |
|         | Problem 12-2   | 1048         |
|         | Problem 12-3   | 1048         |
|         | Problem 12-4   | 1048         |
|         | Note: Enforcement  | 1049         |
| C.      | Extensions of the Classical and Misappropriation Liability and           |              |
|         | Insider Trading Regulation from Other Federal Law                        | 1050         |
|         | 1. Tippee Liability  | 1050         |
|         | Dirks v. Securities & Exchange Commission                                | 1050         |
|         | Notes and Questions  | 1058         |
|         | Problem 12-5   | 1059         |
|         | Problem 12-6   | 1059         |
|         | Problem 12-7   | 1059         |
|         | Problem 12-8   | 1060         |
|         | Problem 12-9   | 1060         |
|         | 2. Insider Trading in Tender Offers Under §14(e) and Rule 14e-3          | 1061         |
|         | United States v. O'Hagan   | 1061         |
|         | Notes and Questions  | 1064         |
|         | 3. Regulation FD   | 1065         |
|         | Securities & Exchange Commission v. Siebel Systems, Inc.                 | 1065         |
|         | Notes and Questions  | 1074         |
|         | Problem 12-10  | 1075         |
|         | 4. Regulation of Short-Swing Insider Trading Under §16 of the Securities |              |
|         | Exchange Act of 1934   | 1075         |
|         | Problem 12-11  | 1077         |
|         | ole of Cases   | 1079         |
| Inc     | lex  | 1089         |