The Corporate Governance Review

Sixth Edition

Editor
Willem J L Calkoen

Law Business Research

Chapter 30

UNITED STATES: DELAWARE

Ellisa O Habbart and Michael S Swoyer[1]

I OVERVIEW OF GOVERNANCE REGIME

i Sources of Delaware law

The position of Delaware law is illustrated by the fact that more than half of the US public companies (including 64 per cent of the Fortune 500) are incorporated in the state. Delaware's corporate governance regime draws from two bodies of law. The first is the General Corporation Law of the State of Delaware (DGCL), a statutory framework adopted by the Delaware legislature in 1899, substantially revised in 1967, and regularly amended to date. Updates and revisions are made each year by the Delaware legislature based on the recommendations of the Council of the Corporation Law Section of the Delaware State Bar Association. As a result, the DGCL is constantly under review by the most knowledgeable members of the Delaware Bar.

Judicial decisions comprise the second source of corporate governance law in Delaware. The state's Court of Chancery (the Chancery Court) is largely regarded as the nation's premier business court. The Chancery Court is a court of equity, which consists of five expert judges chosen to adjudicate corporate and commercial disputes. Appeals from the Chancery Court are heard by the Delaware Supreme Court.

ii Enforcement of Delaware's corporate governance regime

Derivative, direct, and class actions each provide a method for stockholders to seek redress against corporations and their directors and officers for alleged wrongdoing. Class actions are essentially an aggregation of direct claims being prosecuted by one or more persons as representatives of a group of shareholders. Direct claims involve an injury to the suing stockholder individually, as opposed to the corporation. Where there is an

1 Ellisa O Habbart is a partner with The Delaware Counsel Group LLP; Michael S Swoyer is an associate with The Delaware Counsel Group LLP.

actual injury to the corporation to which any relief would flow, the cause of action must be brought by the corporation or by the shareholders derivatively if the corporation fails to act. In practice, the classification of a particular claim as derivative or direct may be challenging.

The classification of a claim is significant because a shareholder plaintiff may not proceed against the corporation with a derivative claim without first making a demand on the corporation to pursue the claim itself, unless the making of a demand would be futile. The Chancery Court will excuse the failure to make a demand based on futility if the complaint creates a reasonable doubt that the corporation's directors are disinterested and independent or the challenged action was otherwise the product of valid business judgement.[2] Under the first prong of the well-known *Aronson* test, a director is interested if he or she sits on both sides of a transaction or derives a benefit from a transaction that is not shared by the corporation or all stockholders generally. Independence is lacking if the director's decision is based on extraneous influences rather than the merits. When addressing *Aronson*'s second prong, the plaintiff must create a reasonable doubt that either: the action was taken honestly and in good faith; or the board was adequately informed in making the decision. Demand also may be excused under the second prong of *Aronson* if a plaintiff properly pleads a waste claim.[3]

iii Nature of the corporate governance regime and recent developments

Delaware's corporate governance regime is founded on the fundamental principle set forth in Section 141(a) of the DGCL that, unless otherwise provided in a corporation's certificate of incorporation, the business and affairs of a corporation must be managed by or under the direction of its board of directors. Delaware decisional law reflects a constant tension between directors and shareholders over the shareholders' desire to exert influence over corporate management and potentially usurp the board's decision-making authority. Aside from the corporate electoral process and the reservation of the shareholders' right to vote on various fundamental corporate actions,[4] the board's power is limited only by certain well-established fiduciary obligations.

There were several major developments in Delaware corporate governance in 2015. For example, '[i]n order to preserve the efficacy of the enforcement of fiduciary duties in stock corporations,' the DGCL was amended to prohibit the use of fee-shifting or 'loser pays' provisions in a stock corporation's certificate of incorporation or by-laws.[5] Fee-shifting provisions require unsuccessful plaintiffs who bring an 'internal corporate claim'[6] to pay the litigation fees of the defending corporation. The application and scope

2 *Aronson v. Lewis*, 473 A.2d 805, 814 (Del. 1984).

3 See *infra* note 9.

4 These matters include amendments to the certificate of incorporation, certain mergers, sales of substantially all or all of the corporation's assets and dissolution.

5 See 8 Del. C. §§ 102(f) and 109(b).

6 Internal corporate claims are claims, including claims in the right of the corporation, that are based upon a violation of a duty by a current or former director or officer or stockholder in such capacity or as to which the DGCL confers jurisdiction upon the Chancery Court.

of these provisions had been the subject of intense debate as a result of the Delaware Supreme Court's decision in *ATP Tour, Inc. v. Deutchser Tennis Bund.*[7] In *ATP Tour*, the Court upheld the facial validity of a by-law that made the members of a non-stock corporation liable for the corporation's legal expenses if members brought suit against the corporation and lost. The 2015 amendments to the DGCL expressly limit the *ATP Tour* holding to non-stock corporations, and invalidate any previously enacted fee-shifting provisions in stock corporations.

The amendments also added Section 115 to the DGCL, which permits a corporation to include an exclusive forum selection provision in its certificate of incorporation or by-laws. The use of such a provision ensures that all internal corporate claims will be brought solely and exclusively in the Delaware courts. Section 115 also invalidates any such provision selecting courts outside of Delaware, or any arbitral forum, to the extent such provision prohibits litigation of internal corporate claims in the Delaware courts.[8]

II CORPORATE LEADERSHIP

i Board structure and practices

The board of directors must consist of at least one member, and all members must be natural persons.

Term of office

Under Section 141(b) of the DGCL, each director holds office until the director's successor is elected and qualified, or until the director's earlier resignation or removal. Typically, the term of each director is one year unless the board has been structured as classified. Pursuant to Section 141(d) of the DGCL, the certificate of incorporation, the initial by-laws of the company or a by-law adopted by the shareholders may divide the board into a maximum of three classes of directors who serve staggered terms. If three classes of directors are created, then only one class of directors stands for election each year.

Qualifications

The DGCL does not specify any qualifications for directors other than that they be natural persons. However, pursuant to Section 141(b) of the DGCL and the common law, the certificate of incorporation and by-laws may prescribe reasonable director qualifications. The Delaware courts are likely to enforce qualifications that are reasonably related to the corporation's business. Valid qualifications might include a maximum age limit or a minimum ownership requirement.

---

8 Del. C. § 115.

7 91 A.3d 554 (Del. 2014).

8 The amendments do not address provisions in the certificate of incorporation or by-laws that select a forum other than the Delaware courts as an additional forum in which an internal corporate claim may be brought.

Board action

Directors act collectively, and all directors possess equivalent voting rights unless the certificate of incorporation otherwise provides. Any action may be taken at a meeting by vote of a majority of the directors present at a meeting at which a quorum is present unless the certificate of incorporation or by-laws provide for a supermajority vote. Unless directors are restricted by the certificate of incorporation or by-laws, directors may act without a meeting by unanimous written or electronic consent, including email transmissions.

Committees

Certain managerial duties may be delegated by the board of directors to committees of the board consisting of one or more directors. Generally, a properly constituted board committee may exercise the full powers of the board of directors in the management of the business and affairs of the corporation with two significant exceptions: (1) a board committee cannot approve, adopt or recommend to shareholders any action or matter expressly required by the DGCL to be submitted to shareholders for a vote (other than the election or removal of directors); and (2) a board committee cannot adopt, amend or repeal any by-law. Advisory committees of the corporation may include members who are not directors, but any such committee's function must be purely advisory in nature.

Officers

Corporations must have such officers as established by the by-laws or by resolution of the board of directors. A court will generally uphold a delegation of authority to officers by a corporation's board of directors unless the delegation is of a task specifically assigned by the DGCL to the board. However, if such delegation conflicts with some overriding public policy or provision of a corporation's certificate of incorporation, it will not be upheld. Unauthorised acts of officers may be validated by ratification by the board of directors unless the acts are beyond the authority of the corporation.

Compensation

The board of directors may fix director compensation in the absence of restrictions in the certificate of incorporation or by-laws. The directors' self-interested decision will be entitled to the protection afforded by the business judgement rule if the compensation plan has been approved by the corporation's stockholders and contains well-defined, specific limits on potential self-dealing. Otherwise, if challenged, the board will have to show that the compensation arrangements are fair to the corporation by demonstrating that services of value are actually being rendered, and that the level of compensation for such services is similar to either industry standards or compensation at corporations of similar size and profitability. The board should also approve the compensation of executive officers of the corporation. As a matter of customary practice, most corporations delegate the responsibility for fixing executive compensation to outside directors. At a minimum,

directors do not participate in the discussion of, or vote upon, their own compensation as officers or employees to minimise the appearance of self-dealing. Executive compensation decisions made by disinterested directors are generally upheld in the absence of waste.[9]

Takeover practice

The responsibility for responding to takeovers is generally held to reside with the board of directors pursuant to the managerial authority provided in Section 141(a) of the DGCL. The board of directors has a fiduciary responsibility to advance the best interests of the corporation's shareholders in responding to takeovers.

ii Directors

Fiduciary duties

All directors of a Delaware corporation owe fiduciary duties of care and loyalty to the corporation and its shareholders. The courts have also recognised that directors have fiduciary duties of disclosure and good faith, which are not separate duties, but rather specific applications of the fiduciary duties of care and loyalty. These duties are owed by all directors to the corporation and shareholder body as a whole without regard to whether any director is an inside or outside director or was elected by a particular class of shareholders.

Duty of care

The duty of care requires that directors inform themselves using all material information reasonably available to them before making a business decision. This duty extends to the board's delegation functions. However, directors are not expected to oversee every detail of day-to-day corporate activities and may rely in good faith upon the records of the corporation and upon information, reports, opinions, and statements of corporate officers and employees.

Duty of loyalty

Directors also owe a duty of loyalty to the corporation. The duty of loyalty mandates that a director cannot consider or represent interests other than the best interests of the corporation and its shareholders in making a business decision. Where a director has an interest in a decision that is different from or in addition to the interests of the corporation and shareholders generally, such a director is said to be an 'interested director'. Interested directors should disclose the interest to the other members of the board and, if the interest is material, consider abstaining from any board vote on the matter.

9 See *Calma on Behalf of Citrix Systems, Inc. v. Templeton*, 114 A.3d 563, 590 (Del. Ch. 2015) ('To state a claim for waste, it must be reasonably conceivable that the directors authorize[d] an exchange that [was] so one sided that no business person of ordinary, sound judgement could conclude that the corporation has received adequate consideration.') (internal quotations and citations omitted).

The duty of loyalty also encompasses cases where the director fails to act in good faith.[10] Bad faith may be shown where the director's conduct is motivated by an actual intent to do harm or where the director intentionally acts with a purpose other than that of advancing the best interests of the corporation or with the intent to violate applicable positive law. Bad faith is also demonstrated where the director intentionally fails to act in the face of a known duty to act, thereby demonstrating a conscious disregard for his or her duties.

Liability of directors

Directors may be found to be personally liable for monetary damages if they breach their fiduciary duties of loyalty and care. Directors may be exculpated from paying monetary damages for liability arising from breach of the fiduciary duty of care if the corporation's certificate of incorporation contains an exculpatory provision authorised by Section 102(b)(7) of the DGCL. Whether a director will be found liable for breach of fiduciary duty depends largely on the standard of review applicable to the challenged action or decision of the director. However, the Delaware Supreme Court recently clarified that regardless of what standard of review applies, a plaintiff seeking only monetary damages against a director protected by an exculpatory provision must plead claims for breach of the duty of loyalty to survive a motion to dismiss.[11]

Standards of review

Delaware has three standards of review for evaluating director decision-making: the business judgement rule, intermediate scrutiny and entire fairness.

The business judgement rule

The business judgement rule is the default standard of review. In general, the business judgement rule is a presumption that, in making a business decision on behalf of the corporation, the directors acted on an informed basis, in good faith, and in the honest belief that the action taken was in the best interests of the company.[12] When a court finds that the business judgement rule applies, the business decisions of disinterested directors will not be disturbed if they can be attributed to any rational business purpose.

Entire fairness

If the business judgement rule's presumption is rebutted, the burden generally shifts to the defendant directors to show the 'entire fairness' of the transaction. The entire fairness standard is the most exacting standard of review applied by Delaware courts when reviewing a challenged transaction and has two elements: fair price and fair dealing.[13] Fair price relates to the economic and financial considerations of a transaction. Fair dealing

10 *Stone v. Ritter*, 911 A.2d 362, 370 (Del. 2006).

11 See *In re Cornerstone Therapeutics Inc. Stockholder Litig.*, 115 A.3d 1173 (Del. 2015).

12 *In re MFW S'holders Litig.*, 67 A.3d 496 (Del. Ch. 2013), aff'd sub nom., *Kahn v. M & F Worldwide Corp.*, 88 A.3d 635 (Del. 2014).

13 *Ams. Mining Corp. v. Theriault*, 51 A.3d 1213, 1239 (Del. 2012).

requires a review of when the transaction was timed, how it was initiated, structured, negotiated, and disclosed to the directors, and how the approvals of the directors and the shareholders were obtained.

Intermediate scrutiny

Unocal

A Delaware court will apply an intermediate level of scrutiny in reviewing a board's responses to takeovers that are defensive in nature under the *Unocal* enhanced scrutiny test.[14] If this test applies, directors must show that they had 'reasonable grounds for believing that a danger to corporate policy and effectiveness existed'[15] and that their action was 'reasonable in relation to the threat posed'.[16] If the defensive action was neither preclusive nor coercive, the court will determine whether the directors have met their burden of showing that the response was within a range of reasonableness considering the threat posed.

Revlon

Intermediate scrutiny will also be applied to review a board's actions in the context of transactions involving a change in control or a break-up of the corporation under *Revlon*.[17] In order to meet this standard, the directors must focus on one primary objective – to secure the best value reasonably available for the shareholders. The Delaware courts have recognised that there is no single blueprint to follow in reaching the ultimate goal of maximising shareholder value. Thus, under *Revlon*, directors are generally free to select the path to value maximisation so long as they choose a reasonable route. For example, in *C & J Energy Services, Inc. v. City of Miami General Employees*, the Delaware Supreme Court reversed a Chancery Court decision which held that a board must conduct a pre-signing active solicitation process in order to satisfy its duties under *Revlon*.[18] The Court found that so long as any bidder interested in paying more for the target company had a reasonable opportunity to do so, the company was not required to actively shop itself.[19]

Indemnification

Under Section 145 of the DGCL, a director may be indemnified for expenses incurred in defending derivative claims and for expenses, judgements, fines, and amounts paid in settlement incurred in connection with defending direct actions. However, if the director has been successful on the merits or otherwise in the defence of the proceeding, the director is entitled to mandatory indemnification for expenses actually and reasonably incurred. In order to be indemnified in criminal actions or proceedings, the director

14 *Unocal Corp v. Mesa Petroleum Co.*, 493 A.2d 946 (Del. 1985).

15 Id. at 954.

16 Id. at 955.

17 *Revlon v. MacAndrews & Forbes Holdings, Inc.*, 506 A.2d 173, 182 (Del. 1986).

18 107 A.3d 1049, 1067-69 (Del. 2014).

19 Id. at 1069.

must also have had no reason to believe that the challenged conduct was unlawful. Advancement of expenses to a director prior to the final disposition is also permitted if the director executes an undertaking to repay the monies advanced if it is ultimately determined that he or she is not entitled to indemnification. These rights apply only where the director has been sued 'by reason of the fact' that the director is or was a director of the corporation.[20] This standard cannot be modified by contract.[21]

Election of directors

An annual meeting of shareholders of a Delaware corporation is mandated to elect directors. To permit an orderly period of solicitation of shareholder nominations prior to a meeting, many corporations have adopted provisions in their certificates of incorporation or by-laws to provide for advance notice of the nomination of directors by shareholders. Such provisions typically require that the shareholder making the nomination be a shareholder of record. The nominating shareholder must also submit specific information within a specified window to the corporation about himself or herself, the beneficial owner, if any, on whose behalf the nomination is being made, and about each of his or her director nominees. The information required typically includes all information about the nominee that would be required to be disclosed under federal securities laws and whether the nominating shareholder or the beneficial owner, if any, intends to solicit proxies from other shareholders. By-law provisions requiring advance notice of nominations have been found inequitable in specific factual circumstances.[22]

III DISCLOSURE

Under Delaware law, obligations relating to corporate disclosure are derived from common law fiduciary duties, not the DGCL. The 'duty' of disclosure is a component of a director's fiduciary duties of care and loyalty, and its scope and requirements depend on context. Corporate fiduciaries can breach their duty of disclosure by making a materially false statement, by omitting a material fact or by making a partial disclosure that is materially misleading. The duty of disclosure applies in a number of situations, including when directors seek shareholder action such as the ratification of director compensation.[23]

20 See, e.g., *Charney v. American Apparel, Inc.*, 2015 WL 5313769, at *14 (Del. Ch. 11 September 2015).

21 Id.

22 See, e.g., *JANA Master Fund, Ltd. v. CNET Networks, Inc.*, 954 A.2d 335 (Del. Ch. 2008).

23 The failure to disclose material information in this context will negate any effect a stockholder vote otherwise might have on the validity of the transaction or the applicable standard of review.

IV CORPORATE RESPONSIBILITY

In contrast to United States federal law, Delaware does not have a statutory regime addressing risk management, compliance policies, whistle-blowing or other issues of corporate responsibility. Rather, Delaware relies on fiduciary duty law to encourage and enforce ethical behaviour by directors and officers of Delaware corporations.

A claim of breach of fiduciary duty that seeks to hold directors of a Delaware corporation liable for either knowingly causing the corporation to violate the law or for failing to establish an effective system for monitoring the corporation's compliance with the law is rarely successful.[24] Plaintiffs are faced with the difficult burden of establishing the necessary linkage between illegal conduct and a conscious board decision. If plaintiffs cannot point to a particular board decision demonstrating the board's conscious decision to violate the law, the plaintiff must plead that the board deliberately failed to act after learning about incidents or occasions of possible illegality. Alternatively, the plaintiffs could establish that the illegality occurred because the board abrogated its oversight function by failing to ensure that the corporation possessed an adequate compliance system. For example, a plaintiff might be successful if the board did not form an audit or other compliance committee.

Section 204 and Section 205 of the DGCL, which were adopted in 2014 and amended in 2015, act as powerful tools for current boards of Delaware corporations. These provisions grant boards the power to ratify, and the Chancery Court authority to validate, defective corporate acts that failed to comply with the DGCL or the corporation's organisational documents. The Section 204 ratification procedure involves adopting resolutions, obtaining stockholder approval if such approval is legally required, and filing a certificate of validation in accordance with Section 103 of the DGCL. Under Section 205, the Chancery Court can determine the validity of any defective corporate act that has not been ratified or has been ratified effectively under Section 204, regardless of whether such defective corporate act would have been capable of ratification pursuant to Section 204.

V SHAREHOLDERS

i Shareholder rights and powers

Equality of voting rights

Unless otherwise provided in the certificate of incorporation, shareholders are entitled to one vote for each share of capital stock held by such shareholders pursuant to Section 212 of the DGCL. A common type of variation from the one vote per share rule is the creation of preferred stock with contingent voting rights. Generally, all holders of the same class or series of stock must have equivalent voting, dividend and other rights under the common law doctrine of equal treatment. However, the Chancery Court has

24 This type of claim is known colloquially as a *Caremark* claim, after the seminal decision by the Chancery Court in *In re Caremark International Inc.* See *In re Caremark Int'l Inc. Derivative Litig.*, 698 A.2d 959 (Del. Ch. 1996).

upheld scaled and tenured voting patterns where specifically authorised by the certificate of incorporation, as well as other types of discrimination among holders of the same class or series of stock where the discrimination was not inequitable.[25]

Shareholders' ability to influence the board

Generally, the shareholders' ability to influence the board is limited to the power to elect and remove directors, with or without cause,[26] and to approve or disapprove certain actions as required by the DGCL or as may be provided in the corporation's certificate of incorporation.

Shareholders may also exercise influence by dissolving the corporation without board approval if the written consent of all shareholders is obtained. A shareholder who owns 90 per cent or more of the outstanding shares of each class of capital stock of a Delaware corporation may force a 'short-form' merger of the corporation without board or other shareholder approval under Section 253 of the DGCL. The only other significant power that shareholders may exercise without prior board action is the amendment of the corporation's by-laws pursuant to Section 109 of the DGCL. The board may be given concurrent power to amend the by-laws in the corporation's certificate of incorporation, and the certificate of incorporation or by-laws may impose supermajority voting requirements for shareholder amendments to the by-laws. However, in no case may the ability of the shareholders to amend the by-laws be completely eliminated.

Rights of dissenting shareholders

Aside from the right to an appraisal of the 'fair value' of their shares by the Chancery Court in connection with certain types of mergers, shareholders do not enjoy dissenters' rights under the DGCL. Generally, appraisal rights are triggered in connection with the merger of a listed company incorporated in Delaware if the shareholders of such corporation are required to accept in the merger consideration other than stock in the surviving corporation or publicly traded stock in another corporation. If the Chancery Court finds that the 'fair value' of the shares is higher than the merger consideration and the petitioning shareholders have properly asserted their appraisal rights, then such shareholders are entitled to receive the difference between the merger price and the price determined by the Chancery Court to constitute 'fair value', plus interest.

ii Shareholders' duties and responsibilities

A controlling shareholder owes fiduciary duties to the shareholders of the corporation he or she controls. A controlling stockholder may not exercise control over the management and affairs of the corporation to his or her benefit and to the detriment of the corporation and the minority shareholders.[27] Indeed, whenever a corporation enters into a transaction

25 See, e.g., *Lacos Land Co. v. Arden Group, Inc.*, 517 A.2d 271, 275 (Del. Ch. 1986).

26 In the case of a corporation whose board is classified, shareholders may effect such removal only for cause.

27 Delaware does not impose fiduciary duties or other obligations upon shareholders who are not controlling shareholders. A controlling shareholder may possess less than a majority of

with, or at the behest of, its controlling shareholder, the applicable standard of review is normally entire fairness, placing the burden of proof on the defendant to demonstrate the fair value and process of the transaction.[28] This burden of proof is shifted to the plaintiffs if the controlling stockholder transaction is approved either by an independent and well-functioning special committee or by a majority of the minority stockholders.[29]

In the context of a going-private merger featuring a controlling shareholder, the business judgment standard of review will apply if, and only if, the transaction is conditioned on the approval of both an independent special committee of the board and a minority stockholder vote, and (1) the special committee is empowered to freely select its own advisors and to say no definitively; (2) the special committee meets its duty of care in negotiating a fair price; (3) the vote of the minority is informed; and (4) there is no coercion of the minority.[30]

iii Shareholder activism and takeover defences

Shareholder activism has increased significantly over the past decade, and Delaware has not been immune to its expanding influence.[31] Delaware corporations often regulate shareholder activism by including defensive provisions in their certificate of incorporation and by-laws. These include: advance notice by-laws, staggered board provisions, supermajority requirements for by-law amendments and prohibitions on the shareholders' ability to act by written consent and to fill vacancies on the board. These defences, often used in combination, allow corporations to effectively prevent or defeat hostile tender offers.[32]

iv Contact with shareholders

Communications between the board and the shareholders mainly occur in connection with the solicitation of the shareholders' vote on matters in which the shareholders are required to act.

Under Delaware law, when directors communicate with shareholders outside the context of seeking stockholder action, the directors' fiduciary duty of disclosure still applies but on a more limited basis. In such circumstances, the directors must communicate with honesty. For example, if a director speaks 'through public statements made to the

---

the corporation's outstanding voting power and still be considered a controlling shareholder if such a shareholder exercises actual domination and control of the corporation.

28 *Kahn v. Lynch Communication Systems, Inc.*, 638 A.2d 1110, 1117 (Del. 1994).

29 Id.

30 *Kahn v. M&F Worldwide Corp.*, 88 A.3d 635, 645 (Del. 2014).

31 See *Third Point LLC v. Ruprecht*, 2014 WL 1922029 (Del. Ch. 2 May 2014).

32 In some cases, a board will employ a 'white knight' defence, which entails management of the target company recruiting a rival bidder that will save them from an initial, unfriendly offer or by offering a more attractive deal.

market, statements informing shareholders about the affairs of the corporation, or public filings required by the federal securities laws, he or she must not knowingly disseminate false information that results in injury to a shareholder'.[33]

VI OUTLOOK

The ongoing and active involvement of the members of the Delaware Bar in maintaining and recommending amendments to the DGCL, as well as the quality of Delaware's courts and Office of the Secretary of State are likely to ensure that Delaware remains the jurisdiction of choice for incorporation and adjudication of business disputes in the United States.

33 *In re Wayport, Inc. Litig.*, 76 A.3d 296, 315 (Del. Ch. 2013) (quotations and citations omitted).

employment and general corporate matters. She has advised many multinational companies in cross-border transactions, especially in telecommunications, media, technology, education, life science and energy industries. She represented more than 30 international educational institutes for their operation and activities in China.

TIM GORDON

Gilbert + Tobin

Tim Gordon is a partner in Gilbert + Tobin's corporate advisory group with expertise in corporate governance, mergers and acquisitions, capital markets, private equity and distressed restructuring transactions. Mr Gordon holds a master of laws degree in corporate and commercial law from the University of New South Wales. *Best Lawyers* recognises Tim as a leading lawyer in equity capital markets.

DANIL GURYANOV

Herbert Smith Freehills CIS LLP

Danil is a Russian-qualified lawyer who advises on a variety of disciplines including corporate and disputes work. His experience covers M&A transactions, general corporate matters and a variety of disputes, including regulatory, corporate and shareholder disputes.

Danil graduated from the international law department of the Moscow State Institute of International Relations (MGIMO) and joined the firm in 2007.

ELLISA O HABBART

The Delaware Counsel Group LLP

Ms Habbart leads The Delaware Counsel Group and assists lawyers globally on transactions and governance issues with a Delaware connection. Outside counsel and in-house counsel of Fortune 100 companies, major financial institutions and private equity firms worldwide rely on Ms Habbart as their guide on Delaware law. A significant portion of Ms Habbart's representations involve cross-border transactions. Typical representations include fund formations, mergers and acquisitions, joint ventures, recapitalisations, financings and new equity issuances. In addition to helping to implement such transactions and rendering legal opinions, Ms Habbart regularly advises management on governance issues relating to significant transactions and issues that arise during the life of a business entity.

Ms Habbart is top ranked in *Chambers USA* as one of America's leading business lawyers in the Delaware corporate and mergers and acquisitions law section, and by *Who's Who Legal: Corporate Governance*. According to *Chambers*, clients report that she 'has expert knowledge in the field but is still commercially sensitive to what the client aims to achieve,' and is 'very plugged into Delaware legal developments'. She is also rated 'AV' by Martindale-Hubbell.

Ms Habbart is one of only 22 lawyers appointed to the Council of the Section of Corporation Law of the Delaware State Bar Association, the group responsible for monitoring and recommending amendments to the Delaware General Corporation Law. She is also the vice chair of the International Bar Association Corporate Governance Subcommittee of the Corporate and M&L Law Committee and holds significant leadership positions in the American Bar Association.

Ms Habbart's publications include: a chapter on Delaware law in *Partnerships, Joint Ventures and Strategic Alliances*; *Delaware Limited Liability Company Forms and Practice Manual*, which is updated annually; the US chapter of the *Treasury Shares Guide*; the Delaware chapter in *Private Fund Dispute Resolution*; the IBA's *Directors and Officers Checklist*; and the first in-depth analysis of the Uniform Law Commission Uniform Statutory Trust Act in the American Bar Association publication *The Business Lawyer*.

Prior to founding The Delaware Counsel Group LLP, Ms Habbart was an associate and partner with Prickett Jones & Elliott and was the partner in charge of the Delaware office of Stradley Ronon Stevens & Young. In addition to her *juris doctor*, Ms Habbart has a master's degree in taxation.

MITSUHIRO HARADA

Nishimura & Asahi

Mitsuhiro Harada has been a partner in the M&A/corporate group at Nishimura & Asahi since 2010 and was previously seconded to the US international law firm, Sullivan & Cromwell LLP, in New York for one year. Mr Harada has represented both Japanese and non-Japanese buyers or sellers in numerous cross-border commercial transactions in various industries, including stock and asset acquisitions, private equity and venture capital investments and strategic alliances. Mr Harada also has been involved in acquisitions and joint ventures in and outside Japan, especially in the Southeast Asian countries.

Mr Harada graduated from the University of Tokyo (LLB) in 1999 and gained his LLM from New York University School of Law in 2006. He was admitted to the Japanese Bar in 2000 and the New York Bar in 2007.

KLAUS ILMONEN

Hannes Snellman Attorneys Ltd

Klaus Ilmonen is a partner at Hannes Snellman working with transactions involving public corporations. He has considerable experience in public takeovers, as well as with equity capital markets transactions. Klaus also works with governance and regulatory matters related to public corporations.

Klaus serves as member of an expert working group for ESMA in relation to EU corporate finance regulation, and has participated in drafting Finnish takeover regulation. Klaus has been a visiting researcher at Harvard Law School and holds an LLM degree (Stone Scholar) from Columbia University.

JORGE INCHAUSTE

Guevara & Gutiérrez

Jorge Luis Inchauste has been a partner at Guevara & Gutiérrez SC for more than 12 years, and focuses his practice in the fields of project finance and corporate law. Mr Inchauste obtained an LLM degree from Georgetown University Law Centre and is admitted to practise law in Bolivia and in the State of New York, United States.

while teaching A-level law to young students at a local private institute and as an adjunct professor with the George Washington University in 2011. She has authored several publications, is fluent in Greek and English and has a good knowledge of German.

MICHAEL S SWOYER

The Delaware Counsel Group LLP

Michael S Swoyer represents domestic and international clients in complex business, commercial and structured finance transactions with a Delaware connection. Mr Swoyer's practice involves drafting and negotiating business entity agreements and organisational documents, as well as advising clients on the structure and use of Delaware corporations and alternative entities for various purposes. Mr Swoyer also provides third-party legal opinions concerning Delaware's General Corporation Law, Delaware's alternative entity statutes, and Articles 8 and 9 of the Delaware Uniform Commercial Code.

Prior to joining The Delaware Counsel Group LLP, Mr Swoyer served as judicial law clerk to Justice Henry duPont Ridgely and James T Vaughn Jr of the Delaware Supreme Court. He graduated *magna cum laude* from Widener University Delaware Law School, where he served as articles editor on the board of the *Delaware Journal of Corporate Law* and co-founded the Transactional Law Honor Society. Additionally, he served as a Josiah Oliver Wolcott Fellow.

Mr Swoyer is the author of several publications, including: '"Mandatory" But Not Guaranteed: Delaware Court of Chancery Narrows the Broad Scope of Corporations' Mandatory Advancement Provisions', *Bus. L. Today* (October 2015); and 'Home and Abroad: The First Sale Doctrine's Application to Foreign Made Goods Sold in the United States', Pennsylvania Bar Association Spring Newsletter (2014).

JOANA TORRES EREIO

Uría Menéndez – Proença de Carvalho

Joana Torres Ereio joined Uría Menéndez as a trainee lawyer in September 2007 and became a senior associate in September 2012.

She spent the period from October 2011 to February 2012 on secondment to the Uría Menéndez offices in Madrid.

Joana focuses her practice on corporate and commercial law, mergers and acquisitions, private equity and restructurings, and is regularly involved in cross-border transactions.

Joana has a postgraduate qualification in commercial law and a course on finance and accounting from the Universidade Católica and also completed an intensive course on corporate finance at the Universidade de Lisboa.

JOHN VALLEY

Osler, Hoskin & Harcourt LLP

John M Valley is an associate in Osler's Toronto office and practises corporate and securities law, with a particular focus on mergers and acquisitions and corporate governance. Mr Valley's corporate governance practice includes advising boards and management on a range of corporate governance matters, including in connection with directors' duties,