



Shareholder Protection from Unfair Prejudice: Case and Statute Citator 2020

compiled by Andrew Marsden, Barrister

"He has great charisma and sets clients at ease, even in very tense circumstances. He is calm, always well prepared, very persuasive and extremely intelligent. He has a very useful knack of coming up with innovative solutions to seemingly intractable problems."

Chambers and Partners

- Called to the Bar: 1994 (Lincolns Inn)
- Qualifications: LLB (Business Law (1st class)), Bachelor of Civil Law (Oxon)
- Experienced CEDR accredited mediator
- Professional Memberships: Commercial Bar Association, Chancery Bar Association

Andrew is included in the prestigious Chambers 100 marking him out as one of the top 100 barristers in the country and one of the very best in his field. He is also ranked in the first tier of Chambers and Partners and the Legal 500



Andrew has also been shortlisted several times as "Barrister of the Year" by the Bristol Law Society and is authorised to accept instructions on a direct public access basis

Expertise

- Commercial Dispute Resolution
- Company Law (particularly shareholder disputes)
- Partnership Law
- Agency (including Commercial Agents)
- Mediation

Introduction

Part 30 of the Companies Act 2006 enables a shareholder in a company who is being treated in an 'unfairly prejudicial' way to seek relief from the court. Typically, these cases involve companies with relatively small numbers of shareholders. Those shareholders are usually also directors and may be the only directors of the company.

The shareholders / directors will generally have fallen out with each other. The unfairly prejudicial conduct often takes the form of an exclusion of one shareholder / director by another from the affairs of the company. On other occasions, it arises because of the misappropriation by one shareholder / director of property or funds belonging to the company or of a business opportunity that might have been enjoyed by the company. In other cases it might take the form of wrongful dealings with shares, improper dividends, salary or other payments or other improper conduct of the company's affairs.

This legislation gives the court very wide powers to control the conduct of the affairs of the company and its shareholders / directors. Such proceedings regularly result in the court ordering that one shareholder / director should purchase the shares of another at a value determined by the court to be fair in the circumstances.

This citator reflects the law as at 1 August 2020.

Contents

Statutory Basis	4
Procedure	6
Interim injunctions and security for costs	10
Nature of unfair prejudice	12
Examples of unfairly prejudicial conduct	19
What relief will be ordered?	27
When the petition may be struck out	37

Statutory Basis	
Member's statutory right to petition for relief from unfair prejudice	<i>Section 994 Companies Act 2006</i>
Secretary of State's statutory right to petition for relief from unfair prejudice	<i>Section 995 Companies Act 2006</i>
Court has unlimited power to make such order as it sees fit for giving relief in respect of unfair prejudice	<i>Section 996 Companies Act 2006</i>
A petition presented under section 459 Companies Act 1985 will be treated as continued under section 994 Companies Act 2006 where it continues after 1 October 2007	<i>Hawkes v Cuddy & others [2007] EWHC 2999</i>
The right to petition under section 994 Companies Act 2006 is probably not an inalienable statutory right. Rather, it can probably be limited or removed by contractual agreement (e.g. by articles or LLP agreement) or otherwise	<i>Re Vocam Europe [1998] BCC 396</i> <i>Exeter City FC Ltd v The Football Conference Ltd [2005] 1 BCLC 238</i> <i>Fulham Football Club (1987) Ltd v Richards [2011] EWCA Civ 855</i> <i>Flanagan v Liontrust Investment Partners LLP [2015] EWHC 2171</i> <i>Heart of Midlothian Football Club Plc v Scottish Football League Ltd [2020] CSOH 68</i>
Applies to UK companies and limited liability partnerships (unless excluded from an LLP under terms of LLP agreement)	<i>Section 1 Companies Act 2006</i> <i>Limited Liability Partnerships (Application of Companies Act 2006) Regulation 2009 (SI 2009)</i> <i>Flanagan v Liontrust Investment Partners LLP [2015] EWHC 2171</i>

<p>Definition of 'member'</p>	<p><i>Section 112 Companies Act 2006</i></p> <p><i>Re Nuneaton Borough AFC Ltd [1989] 5 BCC 377</i></p> <p><i>Re a Company (No 007828 of 1985) [1986] 2 BCC 98,951</i></p> <p><i>Re a Company (No 003160 of 1986) [1986] BCC 99,276</i></p> <p><i>Re Quickdome Ltd [1988] BCLC 370</i></p> <p><i>Jaber v Science & Info Tech Ltd [1992] BCLC 764</i></p> <p><i>Re a Company (No: 00506 of 1995) (unreported) 29 June 1995</i></p> <p><i>Atlasview Ltd v Brightview Ltd [2004] EWHC 1056</i></p> <p><i>Baker v Potter [2005] BCC 855</i></p> <p><i>Re McCarthy Surfacing Ltd [2006] EWHC 832</i></p> <p><i>Kaneria v Kaneria LTL 10 August 2015</i></p> <p><i>Re FSC Andrews Ltd [2015] EWHC 4042</i></p>
<p>A person not yet registered as a member but to whom shares have been transferred or transmitted by operation of law may petition</p>	<p><i>Section 112 Companies Act 2006</i></p> <p><i>Section 994(2) Companies Act 2006</i></p> <p><i>Re Quickdrome Ltd [1988] BCLC 370</i></p> <p><i>Harris v Jones [2011] EWHC 1518</i></p> <p><i>(1) Hamilton and (2) Dowers v (1) Brown and (2) C & MB Holdings Ltd [2016] EWHC 191</i></p>
<p>Query whether a majority shareholder can complain of unfair prejudice</p>	<p><i>Re Baltic Real Estate Ltd [1992] BCC 629</i></p> <p><i>Re Baltic Real Estate Ltd (No.2) [1993] BCLC 503</i></p> <p><i>Re Legal Costs Negotiators Ltd [1999] BCC 547</i></p> <p><i>Parkinson v Eurofinance Group Ltd [2001] 1BCLC 720</i></p> <p><i>Re Ravenhart Service (Holdings) Ltd [2004] 2 BCLC 376</i></p>
<p>In case of limited liability partnerships, provision of section 994 Companies Act 2006 can be excluded by unanimous agreement of members</p>	<p><i>Limited Liability Partnerships (Application of Companies Act 2006) Regulation 2009 (SI 2009/1804) Reg 48</i></p>
<p>No power to order that a co-respondent (who is not also a petitioner) should have his shares purchased by fellow respondents guilty of unfairly prejudicial conduct</p>	<p><i>Gray v Braid Group (Holdings) Ltd [2015] CSOH 146</i></p>

<p>Procedure</p> <p>Separate petition for each company in respect of which unfair prejudice is alleged is usually (but not always) required</p>	<p><i>Re a Company</i> [1984] BCLC 307 <i>Davies v Pro-tect GRP Enclosures Limited</i> 17 December 2019 (unreported)</p>
<p>Statutory provision as to form of proceeding, procedure for presentation of petition, service and return of petition</p>	<p><i>The Companies (Unfair Prejudice Applications) Proceedings Rules 2009</i></p>
<p>The statutory procedure is important and the court has no power to dispense with the requirement to comply with The Companies (Unfair Prejudice Applications) Proceedings Rules 2009</p>	<p><i>Re Osea Camp Sites Limited</i> [2005] 1WLR 760 <i>Evans v Eurokey Properties Limited</i> [2020] EWHC 1047</p>
<p>Form of petition</p>	<p><i>Rule 3 and the Schedule to The Companies (Unfair Prejudice Applications) Proceedings Rules 2009</i> (SI 2009 No: 2469) <i>Civil Procedure Rules Practice Direction 49A</i></p>
<p>Failure to proceed by petition cannot be remedied under CPR and will be struck out</p>	<p><i>Cooke v Cooke</i> [1997] 2 BCLC 28</p>
<p>Who should be joined in the petition?</p>	<p><i>Re a Company (No: 007281 of 1986)</i> [1987] 3 BCC 375 <i>Re a Company (No: 005287 of 1985)</i> [1986] 1 WLR 281 <i>Re BSB Holdings Ltd</i> [1992] BCC 915 <i>Re Baltic Real Estate Ltd</i> [1992] BCC 629 <i>Re Saul D Harrison & Sons Plc</i> [1995] BCLC 14 <i>Supreme Travels Ltd v Little Olympian Each-Ways Ltd</i> [1994] BCC 947 <i>Lowe v Fahey</i> [1996] 1 BCLC 262 <i>Re Ravenhart Service (Holdings) Ltd</i> [2004] 2 BCLC 696 <i>Apex Global Management Ltd v FI Call Ltd</i> [2013] EWHC 1652</p>

Parties cases are defined by the petition and, in turn, any points of claim and points of defence ordered	<p><i>Re Luddite Brothers Ltd</i> [1965] 1 WLR 1051</p> <p><i>Re Fildes Brothers Ltd</i> [1970] 1 WLR 592</p> <p><i>Re Tecnion Investments Ltd</i> [1985] BCLC 434</p> <p><i>Re Coroin</i> [2012] EWHC 2343</p> <p><i>Re Pedersen (Thameside) Ltd</i> [2017] EWHC 3406</p>
Allegations of unfair prejudice need to be pleaded with precision	<p><i>Unisoft (3)</i> [1994] 1 BCLC 609</p> <p><i>McKillen</i> [2012] EWHC 521</p> <p><i>Tobian</i> [2013] BCC 98</p>
A respondent may have the petition struck out as against him if no relief will be granted against him and he will not be affected by an order	<p><i>Supreme Travels Ltd v Little Olympian Each-Ways Ltd</i> [1994] BCC 947</p> <p><i>Re a Company (No: 004415 of 1996)</i> [1997] 1 BCLC 479</p>
A prayer for a winding up should not be included where inappropriate	<p><i>Civil Procedure Rules Practice Direction 49A in respect of applications under the Companies Act 1985 and the Insurance Companies Act 1982 para 9(1)</i></p> <p><i>Re a Company (No: 004415 of 1996)</i> [1997] 1 BCLC 479</p>
Civil Procedure Rules 1998 (as amended) apply save to the extent that they may be inconsistent with the Companies Act 2006 or the Companies (Unfair Prejudice Applications) Proceedings Rules 2009 (SI 2009 No: 2469)	<p><i>Rule 2(2) of the Companies (Unfair Prejudice Applications) Proceedings Rules 2009 (SI 2009 No: 2469)</i></p> <p><i>Civil Procedure Rules Practice Direction 49A</i></p>
Leave required to serve petition outside of jurisdiction	<p><i>Spiliada Maritime Corp v Cansulex Ltd</i> [1987] AC 460</p> <p><i>Re Harrods (Buenos Aires) Ltd</i> [1991] BCC 249</p> <p><i>Re Baltic Real Estate Ltd</i> [1992] BCC 629</p> <p><i>Apex Global Management Ltd v FI Call Ltd</i> [2013] EWHC 1652</p>
On return day the court will give directions for progress of petition (statements of case, preliminary issues, mediation, disclosure, witness statements, expert evidence, restrictions on advertising the petition, etc)	<p><i>Re a Company (No: 002015 of 1996)</i> [1997] 2 BCLC 1</p> <p><i>Re Rotadata Ltd</i> [2000] BCLC 122</p>
The court may be persuaded to engage in early active case management (e.g. giving directions that deal early with principal issues which might serve to dispose of the case)	<p><i>Re Rotadata Ltd</i> [2000] BCLC 122</p>

May be directions for split trial to determine whether there had been any unfair prejudice before costs of valuation are incurred	<i>In the matter of Annacott Holdings Ltd [2012] EWCA Civ 998</i> <i>In the matter of LCM Wealth Management Ltd LTL 22/1/2013</i>
If company is in insolvent liquidation the petitioner must first show that, but for the alleged wrongdoing, his shares would have had value	<i>Maidment v Attwood [2012] EWCA Civ 998</i>
Generally proceedings are in public	<i>Re FI Call Ltd [2013] EWHC 223</i>
Advice provided to the company itself will not be subject to privilege and will therefore be disclosable to all shareholders	<i>Re Hydosan Ltd [1991] BCC 19</i>
The courts encourage early expert valuation on a joint basis to promote the chances of settlement and the avoidance of costs and in practice may order early disclosure on the issue of valuation to promote the prospects of early settlement	<i>North Holdings Ltd v Southern Tropics Ltd [1999] 2 BC LC 625</i>
Where parties agree to sale at a price to be determined by an expert the court will not generally interfere with that valuation if it is reached in accordance with his instructions	<i>Premier Telecom Communication Group Ltd v Webb [2014] EWCA Civ 994</i>
The court will not compel a victim of unfair prejudice to bring a claim for relief pursuant to section 994-996 Companies Act 2006 where the victim does not wish his shares to be acquired and wishes to pursue a derivative action	<i>Hook v Sumner LTL 27/11/2015</i>
Judgment in default under CPR Part 12 is not available as petitioner is not "entitled" to any particular relief	<i>Re Bankside Hotels Ltd [2018] EWHC 1035</i>
Summary judgment procedure of CPR Part 24 is available	<i>Re Bankside Hotels Ltd [2018] EWHC 1035</i>
Even if a respondent is debarred from defending the petitioner nevertheless still has to prove his case through evidence adduced to the court upon which the respondent may cross examine	<i>Re Full Cup International Trading Ltd [1995] BCC 682</i> <i>Re B & G Care Homes Ltd [2016] BCC 615</i> <i>Re Bankside Hotels Ltd [2018] EWHC 1035</i>

<p>The courts have shown a degree of enthusiasm for the arbitration of claims under section 994 Companies Act 2006 and a willingness to uphold the enforceability of arbitration clauses (even though the full range of reliefs might not be available in an arbitration (e.g. ordering a winding up))</p>	<p><i>Fulham v Richards [2012] Ch 333</i></p>
<p>The Disclosure Pilot provided for under PD51U CPR 1998 applies to claims for relief under section 994 Companies Act 2006 even if the petition was presented before the commencement of the Disclosure Pilot</p>	<p><i>See Note from Chief Insolvency and Companies Court Judge February 2020</i> <i>UTB LLC v Sheffield United Limited [2019] EWHC (Ch) 914</i></p>
<p>In practice it is often the case that Extended Disclosure under the Disclosure Pilot is ordered in accordance with Extended Disclosure Model D (often with “narrative documents”) and sometimes even Model E)</p>	
<p>Revised automatic directions tailored to deal with the requirements of the Disclosure Pilot Scheme have been issued in respect of petitions presented in the Business and Property Courts in London</p>	
<p>Where the relief sought by the petitioner might affect other shareholders in the company it is a matter of case management as to whether those others should actually be joined to the proceedings or simply given notice of the proceedings</p>	<p><i>Re Hut Group Limited [2020] EWHC 5</i></p>
<p>A claim alleging unfairly prejudicial conduct of a company’s affairs based on alleged breaches by a director of duties owed to the company which are alleged to have affected the petitioner’s interests as a shareholder will not necessarily be characterised as, in substance, a derivative action requiring the court’s permission to continue the claim. That is particularly likely where the claim is in substance a complaint about conduct affecting the petitioner shareholder’s interest in the company rather than the company itself. It is also particularly likely where the relief sought would not be available in a derivative claim</p>	<p><i>Re Hut Group Limited [2020] EWHC 5</i></p>
<p>In many cases a determination as to whether there has been unfairly prejudicial conduct will involve an evaluative decision by the judge at first instance and any appeal of that decision may be difficult as the appeal court will not seek to carry out the balancing task afresh but merely ask whether the trial judge’s decision was wrong by reason of some identifiable flaw in his treatment of the issues to be decided</p>	<p><i>Re Sprintroom Ltd [2019] EWCA Civ 932</i></p>

Interim injunctions and applications and security for costs

Interim relief not available under section 996 Companies Act 2006 before unfair prejudice is established but interim injunctions may be available under Supreme Court Act 1981 on American Cyanamid principles. The court may order interim injunctive relief both against those alleged as responsible for the unfairly prejudicial conduct, against the company concerned itself and against alleged recipients of that company's assets. The court may also appoint interim receivers in appropriate circumstances and give directions as to the holding of meetings of the company pending determination of the petition

Re a Company (No: 00596 of 1986) [1986] 2 BCC 99,063
Re Posgate & Denby (Agencies) Ltd [1986] 2 BCC 99,352
Re a Company (No: 004175 of 1986) [1987] 3 BCC 41
Re a Company (No: 004502 of 1988) [1991] BCC 234
Re Sticky Fingers Restaurant Ltd [1991] BCC 754
Re a Company (No 00330 of 1991) [1991] BCLC 597
Re Mountforest Ltd [1993] BCC 565
Re Tottenham Hotspur Plc [1994] 1 BCLC 655
Re a Company (No: 003061 of 1993) [1994] BCC 883
Re Whitchurch Insurance Consultants Ltd [1994] BCC 51
Re BML Group Ltd [1994] BCC 502
Lunn v All Starr Video Ltd [1993] 137 SJ 108
Wright, Petitioners [1997] BCC 198
Wilson-Davies v Kirk [1997] BCC 770
Corbett v Corbett [1998] BCC 93
Trident European Fund v Coats Holdings Ltd [2003] EWHC 2471
Re Premier Electronics (GB) Ltd [2002] 2 BCLC 634
Re Ravenhart Service (Holdings) Ltd [2004] 2 BCLC 376
Williams v Brinkmann [2004] EWHC 601
Re Canterbury Travel (London) Ltd [2010] All ER (D) 133
Wendy Palmer v Mr Loveland Starlight Diamond Setters Hatton Garden Jewellers 2017 WL 04552554
Homes of England Ltd v Horsham Holdings Ltd [2019] EWHC 2429

Courts are reluctant to impose a director on a company by interim injunction

Pringle v Collard [2007] EWCA 1075
Mission Capital plc v Sinclair [2010] 1 BCLC 304

Interim orders may be refused if sufficient undertakings are given as to the future conduct of the company

Pringle v Callard [2007] EWCA Civ 1075

<p>Security for costs may be ordered</p>	<p><i>CPR 25.12 and 25.13</i></p> <p><i>Re Unisoft Group Ltd [1992] BCC 494 and [1994] BCC 11</i></p> <p><i>Re Tottenham Hotspur Plc (unreported) July 1993</i></p> <p><i>In the matter of Auger Investments Ltd [2012] EWHC 94</i></p> <p><i>Re Tonstate Group Limited [2020] EWHC 328</i></p>
<p>Not usually proper for respondents to use company funds to defend a petition</p>	<p><i>Re Sherborne Park [1986] 2 BCC 99,528</i></p> <p><i>Re Kenyon Swansea [1987] 3 BCC 259</i></p> <p><i>Re Crossmore Electrical and Civil Engineering Ltd [1989] 5 BCC 37</i></p> <p><i>Re a Company (No 005685 of 1988) [1989] 5 BCC 79</i></p> <p><i>Re Hydrosan Ltd [1991] BCC 19</i></p> <p><i>Re Milgate Developments Ltd [1991] BCC 24</i></p> <p><i>Re a Company (No: 004502 of 1988) [1991] BCC 234</i></p> <p><i>Re a Company (No: 001126 of 1992) [1993] BCC 325</i></p> <p><i>Corbett v Corbett [1998] BCC 93</i></p> <p><i>Cas (Nominees) Ltd v Nottingham Forest Plc [2002] BCC 145</i></p> <p><i>Arrow Trading & Investments v Edwardian Group Ltd [2003] EWHC 2863</i></p> <p><i>Pollard v Pollard and others LTL 26/09/2007</i></p> <p><i>Apex Global Management Ltd v F1 Call Ltd [2013] EWHC 1652</i></p>
<p>No advertising of petition without court's direction</p>	<p><i>Companies (Unfair Prejudice Applications) Proceedings Rules 2009 (SI 2009/2469 Rule 6)</i></p> <p><i>Re a Company [1997] 2 BCLC 1</i></p>
<p>Interim disclosure orders available against parties and non-parties</p>	<p><i>Re TPD Investments Ltd LTL 22 January 2016</i></p>

Nature of Unfair Prejudice

Unfair prejudice may consist of acts or omissions committed in the past, being currently committed or which are anticipated

Re Gorwyn Holdings Ltd [1985] 1 BCC 99,479
Re a Company [1987] BCLC 141
Re Kenyon Swansea Ltd [1987] 3 BCC 259
Re a Company (No: 00314 of 1989) [1990] BCC 221
Lloyd v Casey [2002] 1 BCLC 454

Unfair prejudice must comprise conduct of the company's affairs and be an act or omission of the company or an act or omission on its behalf

Re a Company (No: 001761 of 1986) [1987] BCLC 141
Re Kenyon Swansea Ltd [1987] 3 BCC 259
Re Piccadilly Radio Plc [1989] 5 BCC 692
Re a Company (No: 00314 of 1989) [1990] BCC 221
Re a Company (No: 002470 of 1988) [1992] BCC 895
Re Unisoft Group Ltd (No 3) [1994] 1 BCLC 609
Re Leeds United Holdings Plc [1997] BCC 131
Re a Company (No: 00709 of 1992) [1997] 2 BCLC 739
Sikorski v Sikorski [2012] EWHC 1613
Re Coroin [2012] EWHC 2343

The affairs of a company may include the affairs of its subsidiaries

Nicholas v Soundcraft Electronics Ltd [1993] BCLC 360
Gross v Rackind [2005] 1 WLR 3505
Hawkes v Cuddy & others [2007] EWHC 2999 and [2009] EWCA Civ 291
Oak Investment Partners xii Ltd Partnership v Martin Boughtwood and others [2009] EWHC 176 and [2010] EWCA Civ 23

A failure to transfer shares in accordance with an alleged agreement may not involve the conduct of the affairs of the company

Kaneria v Kaneria LTL 10 August 2015

<p>Conduct complained of is ordinarily that of controllers of the company</p>	<p><i>SCWS v Meyer</i> [1959] AC 324 <i>Re Bovey Hotel Ventures Ltd</i> (unreported), 31 July 1981 <i>Re R A Noble (Clothing) Ltd</i> [1983] BCLC 273 <i>Re a Company</i> (No: 05287 of 1985) [1986] 1 WLR 281 <i>Re Blue Arrow Plc</i> [1987] BCLC 585 <i>Re a Company</i> (No: 002470 of 1988) [1992] BCC 895 <i>Re Saul D Harrison & Sons Plc</i> [1995] BCLC 14</p>
<p>The affairs of the company may in practice be conducted by not only its directors or some of its directors but also by its senior management</p>	<p><i>Oak Investment Partners xii Ltd Partnership v Martin Boughtwood and others</i> [2009] EWHC 176 and [2010] EWCA Civ 23</p>
<p>The 'unfairly prejudicial' conduct of the affairs of the company need not necessarily be carried on by persons acting as agents of those against whom relief is sought. Rather, it is sufficient if the unfairly prejudicial conduct is sufficiently attributable to those against whom relief is sought that it is 'fair' that relief should be given against them</p>	<p><i>F&C Alternative Investments (Holdings) Ltd v Barthelemy & others</i> [2011] EWHC 1731</p>
<p>'Unfairness' to be judged by ordinary meaning of the word and does not require infringement of legal rights. Keeping promises and honouring agreements are the 'watchwords'</p>	<p><i>Re Saul D Harrison & Sons Plc</i> [1995] 1 BCLC 14 <i>Re BSB Holdings Ltd (No 2)</i> [1996] 1 BCLC 155 <i>Re Marchday Group</i> [1998] BCC 800 <i>O'Neill v Phillips</i> [1999] 1 WLR 1092</p>

<p>Both 'unfairness' and 'prejudice' need to be individually and objectively established</p>	<p><i>Re R A Noble (Clothing) Ltd</i> [1983] BCLC 273 <i>Re a Company (No: 008699 of 1985)</i> [1986] 2 BCC 99,024 <i>Re Ringtower Holdings Plc</i> [1989] 5 BCC 82 <i>Re a Company (No: 002470 of 1988)</i> [1992] BCC 895 <i>Re Saul D Harrison & Sons Plc</i> [1995] 1 BCLC 14 <i>Re Blackwood Lodge</i> [1997] BCC 434 <i>Re Guidezone Ltd</i> [2001] BCC 692 <i>Rock (Nominees) Ltd v RCO Holdings Plc (in liquidation)</i> [2004] BCC 466 <i>Re Baumler (UK) Ltd</i> [2005] 1 BCLC 92 <i>Hawks v Cuddy</i> [2007] EWHC 2999 and [2009] EWCA Civ 291 <i>Gray v Braid Group (Holdings) Ltd</i> [2015] CSOH 146 <i>Cusack v Holdsworth</i> [2016] EWHC 3084 <i>Re TPD Investments Limited</i> [2017] EWHC 657</p>
<p>Unfair Prejudice involves a visible departure from the standards of fair dealing and a violation of the conditions of fair play on which every shareholder who entrusts his money to a company is entitled to rely</p>	<p><i>Jenkins Committee's Report</i> <i>Saul D Harrison</i> [1995] 1 BCLC 14</p>
<p>Whether conduct is to be considered fair or unfair is to be determined judicially upon the application of rational principles</p>	<p><i>O'Neill v Phillips</i> [1999] 1 WLR 1092</p>
<p>The prejudice suffered must be substantial</p>	<p><i>Re Metropolis Motorcycles</i> [2005] 1 BCLC 520</p>
<p>"Prejudice" is not to be too narrowly or technically construed but is to be considered in context and to be regarded as a flexible and open-textured concept</p>	<p><i>O'Neill v Phillips</i> [1999] 1 BCLC 1 <i>Re Tobian Properties Limited</i> [2012] 2 BCLC 567</p>
<p>The prejudice suffered can be either financial prejudice (e.g. prejudicial to the value of the petitioners shares or otherwise financially prejudicial to the petitioner) or otherwise prejudicial in character (e.g. disregarding of the rights of the shareholder)</p>	<p><i>Re Cronin Ltd</i> [2012] EWHC 2343 <i>Gandesha v Gandesha</i> [2019] EWHC 1717</p>

<p>Petitioner's interests in his capacity as a member must be affected by the conduct complained of though a court may take a relatively wide view as to whether a person interests in his capacity as a member are affected (e.g. affecting interests as creditor in respect of a loan made at same time as investment in shares may suffice)</p>	<p><i>Re Saul D Harrison & Sons Plc</i> [1995] 1 BCLC 14 <i>Re Alchemea Ltd</i> [1998] BCC 964 <i>Re a Company (No: 00709 of 1992)</i> [1997] 2 BCLC 739 <i>Gamlestaden Fastigheter AB v Baltic Partners Ltd</i> [2007] 4 All ER 164, PC <i>Hawks v Cuddy</i> [2007] EWHC 2999 and [2009] EWCA Civ 291 <i>Gandesha v Gandesha</i> [2019] EWHC 1717</p>
<p>If the company is insolvent the petitioner will generally have to establish that his shares would have had value but for the wrongdoing of the respondents (though if the petitioner was also a lender to the company at the time he acquired his shares prejudice to his ability to recover that debt might also suffice)</p>	<p><i>Maidment v Attwood</i> [2012] EWCA Civ 998 <i>Gamlestaden Fastigheter AB v Baltic Partners Ltd</i> [2007] 4 All ER 164, PC</p>
<p>Generally the petitioner will need to establish (a) breach of the terms on which he agreed that the affairs of the company should be conducted; (b) that equitable considerations (i.e. those referred to in <i>Ebrahimi v Westbourne Galleries Ltd</i> [1973] AC 360), arising either at the commencement of the relationship or subsequently, make it unfair for those conducting the affairs of the company to rely upon their strict legal rights; or (c) that the board of directors has exceeded the powers vested in them or have exercised their powers for an illegitimate or ulterior purpose</p>	<p><i>Cobden Investments Ltd v RWM Langport Ltd</i> [2008] EWHC 2810 <i>Gandesha v Gandesha</i> [2019] EWHC 1717 <i>Re Audas Group Ltd</i> [2019] EWHC 2304</p>
<p>Of primary importance in identifying rights and interests of members are the memorandum and articles of association, any shareholders' agreements and the duties imposed upon directors by law and pursuant to statute. Conduct in breach of those agreements or duties may well involve unfairly prejudicial conduct and vice versa</p>	<p><i>Re Saul D Harrison & Sons Plc</i> [1995] 1 BCLC 14 <i>O'Neill v Phillips</i> [1999] 1 WLR 1092 <i>In the matter of Coroin Ltd</i> [2013] EWCA Civ 781 <i>In the matter of LCM Wealth Management Ltd</i> [2013] 3957 <i>Arbuthnott v Bonnyman</i> [2015] EWCA Civ 536 <i>Gandesha v Gandesha</i> [2019] EWHC 1717 <i>Re Audas Group Ltd</i> [2019] EWHC 2304</p>

In certain cases unfair prejudice may arise despite the absence of any breach of a legal right or duty. Where a company is in the nature of a 'quasi partnership', unfair prejudice may be found where a shareholder, though not acting in breach of any legally enforceable agreement or duty, uses the rules in a manner which equity regards as contrary to good faith. In such 'quasi partnership' cases equitable considerations make it unfair for the majority to rely on their strict legal rights. In such 'quasi partnership' cases unfair prejudice may exist where there is a failure to fulfil a 'legitimate expectation' of a member arising from an understanding or non-legally binding agreement between members which would make it unjust, unfair or inequitable were the majority permitted to enforce their strict legal rights. Such a 'legitimate expectation' might be, for example, that the member should continue to be employed as a director or otherwise be allowed to participate in management of the company whilst he holds shares in the company

Ebrahimi v Westbourne Galleries Ltd [1973] AC 360
Re a Company (No: 00477 of 1986) [1989] 5 BCC 82
Re J.E. Cade & Son Ltd [1992] BCLC 213
Re Saul D Harrison & Sons Plc [1995] 1 BCLC 14
Re R&H Electric Ltd v Haden Bill Electrical Ltd [1995] 2 BCLC 280
Re Leeds United Holdings Plc [1997] BCC 131
Quinland v Essex Hinge Co Ltd [1997] BCC 53
Re a Company (No: 00709 of 1992) [1997] 2 BCLC 739
Re Astec (BSR) Plc [1998] BCLC 556
O'Neill v Phillips [1999] 1 WLR 1092
Mears v R Mears & Co (Holdings) Ltd [2002] 2 BCLC 1
Grace v Biagioli [2006] 2 BCLC 70
In the matter of Gate of India (Tynemouth) Ltd [2008] EWHC 959
Oak Investment Partners xii Ltd Partnership v Martin Boughtwood and others [2009] EWHC 176 and [2010] EWCA Civ 23
Croly v Good [2010] EWHC 1
Apex Global Management Ltd v F1 Call Ltd [2015] EWHC 3269
Gray v Braid Group (Holdings) Ltd [2015] CSOH 146
Re TPD Investments Limited [2017] EWHC 657
Re Audas Group Ltd [2019] EWHC 2304
Starling v The Climbing Gym Limited [2020] EWHC 1833

It is unlikely that any such informal agreements or 'legitimate expectations' will exist in relation to listed public companies

Re Blue Arrow [1987] BCLC 585
Re Astec (BSR) Plc [1998] BCLC 556

A company may start out as a quasi partnership but later cease to operate as such (e.g. following the admission of new participants) and vice versa

Re a Company (No: 005134 of 1986) [1989] BCLC 383
Re McCarthy Surfacing Ltd [2008] EWHC 2279
Fowler v Gruber [2010] IBCLC 563
Croly v Good [2010] EWHC 1
Estera Trust (Jersey) Limited v Singh [2018] EWHC 1715

<p>Such informal agreements or ‘legitimate expectation’ might seemingly possibly exist between some but not necessarily all shareholders</p>	<p><i>Waldron v Waldron [2019] EWHC 115</i></p>
<p>Relations between the participants in a company that is to be considered in the nature of a quasi partnership must be sufficiently personal rather than purely professional</p>	<p><i>Woolliff v Ruston-Turner [2017] EWHC 3129</i></p>
<p>Of itself, an irretrievable breakdown in relations may not constitute unfairly prejudicial conduct</p>	<p><i>Re a Company (No: 007623 of 1984) [1986] 2 BCC 99,191</i> <i>Re a Company (No: 004377 of 1986) [1986] 1 WLR 102</i> <i>O'Neill v Phillips [1999] 1 WLR 1092</i> <i>Re Phoenix Office Supplies Ltd [2003] 1 BCLC 76</i> <i>McKee v O'Reilly [2003] EWHC 2008</i> <i>Re Jayflex Construction Ltd [2004] 2 BCLC 145</i> <i>Re Baumler (UK) Ltd [2005] 1 BCLC 92</i> <i>Grace v Biagiolli [2005] EWCA Civ 1222</i> <i>Racking v Gross [2004] EWCA Civ 815</i> <i>Hawks v Cuddy [2007] EWHC 2999 and [2009] EWCA Civ 291</i> <i>Oak Investment Partners xii Ltd Partnership v Martin Boughtwood and others [2009] EWHC 176 and [2010] EWCA Civ 23</i> <i>In the matter of Hart Investment Holdings Ltd [2013] EWHC 2067</i> <i>Apex Global Management v FI Call Ltd [2013] EWHC 1652 and [2015] EWHC 3269</i> <i>Badyal v Badyal [2018] EWHC 68</i></p>
<p>The jurisdiction does not afford the court the power to make a purchase order in the absence of unfairly prejudicial conduct. It does not afford a “no fault divorce” jurisdiction. In other jurisdictions there is a move towards extending the court’s jurisdiction to permit a court to make a purchase order as an alternative to an order for the winding up of the company where it is “just and equitable” to do so</p>	<p><i>O'Neill v Phillips [1999] 1 WLR 1092</i> <i>Evenstar [2006] 3 S.L.R.(R.) 827</i> <i>Ting Shwu Ping v Scanone Pte Ltd [2016] SGCA 65 (CA (Sing))</i> <i>Badyal v Badyal [2018] EWHC 68</i></p>
<p>In determining whether there has been any unfairly prejudicial conduct the cultural background to the company and its participants may be relevant</p>	<p><i>Rahman v Malik [2008] 2 BCLC 403</i></p>

<p>Generally mere mismanagement will not constitute unfair prejudice though it might in extreme cases</p>	<p><i>Re Elgindata Ltd</i> [1991] BCLC 959 <i>Re a Company (No: 002470 of 1988)</i> [1992] BCC 895 <i>Re Macro (Ipswich) Ltd</i> [1994] BCC 781 <i>Fisher v Cadman</i> [2006] 1 BCLC 499 <i>Oak Investment Partners xii Ltd Partnership v Martin Boughtwood and others</i> [2009] EWHC 176 and [2010] EWCA Civ 23 <i>F&C Alternative Investments (Holdings) Ltd v Barthelemy & others</i> [2011] EWHC 1731</p>
<p>The existence of a 'deadlock' situation within the company is, on its own, unlikely to amount to unfair prejudice</p>	<p><i>Hawks v Cuddy</i> [2009] 2 BCLC 427</p>
<p>The petitioner's own conduct may result in 'prejudicial' conduct not being 'unfair'</p>	<p><i>Re London School of Electronics Ltd</i> [1986] Ch 211 <i>Re Ringtower Holdings plc</i> [1989] 5 BCC 82 <i>Mears v R Mears & Co (Holdings) Ltd</i> [2002] 2 BCLC 1 <i>Woolwich v Milne</i> [2003] EWHC 414 <i>Baker v Potter</i> [2005] BCC 855 <i>Blackmore v Richardson</i> [2005] EWCA Civ 1356 <i>Grace v Biagioli</i> [2006] BCC 85 <i>Kelly v Hussain</i> [2008] EWHC 1117 <i>Re Flex Associates Ltd</i> [2009] EWHC 3690 (c.f. <i>Shah v Shah</i> [2010] EWHC 313) <i>Interactive Technology Corp Ltd v Ferster</i> [2016] EWHC 2896 <i>Corran v Butters</i> [2017] EWHC 2294 <i>Dinglis v Dinglis</i> [2019] EWHC 1664 <i>Starling v The Climbing Gym Limited</i> [2020] EWHC 1833</p>
<p>The conduct need not result in a reduction in the value of the petitioner's shares</p>	<p><i>McGuinness, Petitioners</i> [1988] 4 BCC 161 <i>R A Noble & Sons (Clothing) Ltd</i> [1993] BCLC 273</p>
<p>Directors must act fairly as between different classes of shareholders</p>	<p><i>Re BSB Holdings Ltd (No 2)</i> [1996] 1 BCLC 155</p>

<p>Proceedings under s994 Companies Act 2006 are not subject to any particular limitation period but delay in bringing proceedings may be a bar to relief</p>	<p><i>Re D.R. Chemicals Ltd [1989] 5 BCC 39</i> <i>cf Price v Rawlings (unreported)</i> <i>Re Grandactual Ltd [2006] BCC 73</i> <i>Re FSC Andrews Ltd [2015] EWHC 4042</i> <i>Evans v Eurokey Properties Limited [2020] EWHC 1047</i></p>
<p>If member acquiesces in conduct that may deprive the conduct of 'unfairness'</p>	<p><i>Fisher v Cadman [2005] EWHC 377</i> <i>Re Sunrise Radio [2010] 1 BCLC 367</i> <i>Re K R Hardy Estates Limited [2016] BCC 367</i> <i>Re AMT Coffee Ltd [2019] EWHC 46</i></p>
<p>On the other hand, if a petitioner fails to object to matters disclosed in published accounts (e.g. excessive remuneration) that failure,, on its own, is unlikely to prevent him asserting that that matter involves unfairly prejudicial conduct</p>	<p><i>Maidment v Attwood [2012] EWCA Civ 998</i></p>
<p>Although a petitioner must be a member when petition is presented, he may rely on events prior to his becoming a member</p>	<p><i>Lloyd v Casey [2002] 1 BCLC 454</i></p>
<p>Examples of unfairly prejudicial conduct</p> <p>A director acting in breach of the duties that he owes to the company and thereby acting contrary to an express or implied agreement to conduct the affairs of the company in accordance with the duties owed as directors (e.g by exceeding the powers vested in him or by exercising those powers for an ulterior purpose or by exercising those powers otherwise than in the best interests of the company as a whole)</p>	<p><i>Re D. R. Chemicals Ltd [1989] 5 BCC 39</i> <i>Re Saul D Harrison & Sons plc [1995] 1 BCLC 14</i> <i>Re BSB Holdings (No. 2) [1996] 1 BCLC 155</i> <i>CAS (Nominees) Ltd v Nottingham Forest plc [2002] BCC 145</i> <i>Re McCarthy Surfacing Ltd [2008] EWHC 2279</i> <i>In the matter of Southern Counties Fresh Food Ltd [2008] EWHC 2810</i> <i>Oak Investment Partners XII Ltd Partnership v Martin Broughtwood and others [2009] EWHC 176 & [2010] EWCA Civ 23</i> <i>Re Tobian Properties [2012] EWCA Civ 998</i> <i>Re Addbins Ltd [2015] EWHC 3161</i> <i>Gray v Braid Group (Holdings) Ltd [2015] CSOH 146</i> <i>Ferster v Ferster [2016] EWCA Civ 717</i> <i>Wootliff v Ruston-Turner [2017] EWHC 3129</i> <i>Re Last Lion Holdings Ltd [2018] EWHC 2347</i></p>

<p>Failure to act in accordance with express agreement (whether contained in the memorandum or articles of association, a shareholders' agreement or otherwise) or with an implied agreement or informal understanding</p>	<p><i>O'Neill v Phillips</i> [1999] 1 WLR 1092</p>
<p>Exclusion from participation in management of a company that is in the nature of a 'quasi partnership' or where there is an agreement, understanding or legitimate expectation that the petitioner should be entitled to participate in the company is likely to amount to unfairly prejudicial conduct in absence of sufficient reasons justifying exclusion</p>	<p><i>Ebrahimi v Westbourne Galleries Ltd</i> [1973] AC 360 <i>Re Flex Associates Ltd</i> [2009] EWHC 3690 <i>Croly v Good</i> [2010] EWHC 1 <i>Shah v Shah</i> [2010] EWHC 313 <i>Lantsbury v Hauser</i> [2010] EWHC 390 <i>Amin v Amin</i> [2010] EWHC 827 <i>Fowler v Grubar</i> [2010] 1 BCLC 563 <i>Shepherd v Williamson</i> [2010] EWHC 2375 <i>Williams v Williams & others</i> LTL 12/10/11 <i>Harris v Jones</i> [2011] EWHC 1518 <i>Re Abbingdon Hotel Ltd</i> [2011] EWHC 635 <i>Williams v Williams</i> LTL 12/10/11 <i>In the matter of I Fit Global Ltd</i> [2013] EWHC 2090 <i>In the matter of Insurance & Finance Consultants Ltd</i> [2014] EWHC 2206 <i>Flanagan v Liontrust Investment Partners LLP</i> [2015] EWHC 2171 <i>Re TPD Investments Limited</i> [2017] EWHC 657 <i>Corran v Butters</i> [2017] EWHC 2294 <i>VB Football Assets v. Blackpool Football Club (Properties) Ltd</i> [2017] EWHC 2767 <i>Badyal v Badyal</i> [2018] EWHC 68 <i>Sudicka v Morgan</i> [2019] EWHC 311 <i>Re Sprintroom Ltd</i> [2019] EWCA Civ 932 <i>Re Audas Group Ltd</i> [2019] EWHC 2304 <i>Starling v The Climbing Gym Limited</i> [2020] EWHC 1833</p>

<p>In the absence of specific agreement between the shareholders that they should be entitled to continued employment with the company for so long as they hold shares in the company, dismissal of petitioner from a position as an employee of a company generally does not amount to unfairly prejudicial conduct of the affairs of a company unless the dismissal of the petitioner from their position as an employee is made in breach of a contractual duty of good faith, done for ulterior purposes or is done to promote the person dismissing's own sectional interests</p>	<p><i>Re Audas Group Ltd [2019] EWHC 2304</i></p>
<p>But if the company is not a "quasi partnership" and there is no such agreement or understanding exists then removal of a minority shareholder from his position as a director may not amount to unfairly prejudicial conduct</p>	<p><i>Michel v Michel [2019] EWHC 1378</i> <i>Dinglis v Dinglis [2019] EWHC 1664</i></p>
<p>But if the petitioner resigns his directorship voluntarily there may be no obligation to reappoint</p>	<p><i>Re Flex Associates Ltd [2009] EWHC 3690</i> <i>Kaneria v Kaneria LTL 10 August 2015</i></p>
<p>Removal of a company's auditor from office on grounds of divergence of opinion on matters of accounting treatment or audit procedures or for any other improper grounds is deemed to involve unfair prejudice</p>	<p><i>Section 994(1A) Companies Act 2006</i> <i>Gray v Braid Group (Holdings) Ltd [2015] CSOH 146</i></p>
<p>Refusal to permit audit</p>	<p><i>Interactive Technology Corp Ltd v Ferster [2016] EWHC 2896</i></p>

<p>Excessive remuneration or drawings from the company</p>	<p><i>Re Cumana</i> [1986] 2 BCC 99,453 and [1986] BCLC 430</p> <p><i>Grace v Biagioli</i> [2005] EWCA Civ 1222</p> <p><i>Re Campbell Irvine (Holdings) Ltd</i> [2006] EWHC 406</p> <p><i>Re McCarthy Surfacing Ltd</i> [2008] EWHC 2279</p> <p><i>In the matter of Sunrise Radio Ltd</i> [2009] EWHC 2893</p> <p><i>Croly v Good</i> [2010] EWHC 1</p> <p><i>Maidment v Attwood</i> [2012] EWCA Civ 998</p> <p><i>Re Blue Index Ltd</i> [2014] EWHC 2680</p> <p><i>Re CF Booth Ltd</i> [2017] EWHC 457</p> <p><i>VB Football Assets v Blackpool Football Club (Properties) Ltd</i> [2017] EWHC 2767</p> <p><i>Rembert v Daniel</i> [2018] EWHC 388</p> <p><i>Re The Edwardian Group Ltd</i> [2018] EWHC 1715</p> <p><i>Re AMT Coffee Limited</i> [2019] EWHC 46</p>
<p>The issue as to what comprises reasonable remuneration in any particular circumstance is an issue suitable for expert evidence but expert evidence in this regard will only be admitted if it is robust, necessary, it is sufficiently relevant and its admission would be proportionate</p>	<p><i>British Airways plc v Spencer</i> [2015] EWHC 2477</p> <p><i>Re AMT Coffee Limited</i> [2019] EWHC 46</p>
<p>The court may be able to assess what is reasonable remuneration in any particular case as a matter of fact on the evidence before it and on the basis of material of which the court is able to take judicial notice and without any admissible expert evidence</p>	<p><i>Re AMT Coffee Limited</i> [2019] EWHC 46</p>
<p>Failure to hold meetings or holding "sham" meetings</p>	<p><i>McGuinness, Petitioners</i> [1988] 4 BCC 161</p> <p><i>Nuneaton Borough AFC Ltd</i> [1989] 5 BCC 792</p> <p><i>Re Ghyll Beck Driving Range Ltd</i> [1993] BCLC 1126</p> <p><i>Fowler v Gruyere</i> [2010] BCLC 563</p> <p><i>LCM Weath Management Ltd</i> [2013] EWHC 3957</p>

<p>Refusal to conduct business of company in accordance with agreement or agreed policy</p>	<p><i>Re Abbington Hotel Ltd [2011] EWHC 635</i> <i>Khoshkhou v Cooper [2014] EWHC 1087</i> <i>Birdi v (1) Specsavers Optical Group Ltd; (2) Singh; (3) Dartford Visionplus Ltd and (4) Dartford Specsavers Ltd [2015] EWHC 2870</i></p>
<p>Failure to permit a shareholder involvement in decisions relating to matters reserved by terms of a shareholders' agreement to shareholders is likely to involve unfairly prejudicial conduct of the affairs of the company</p>	<p><i>Re Audas Group Ltd [2019] EWHC 2304</i></p>
<p>Interference with agreed management structure and operational procedures</p>	<p><i>Oak Investment Partners xii Ltd Partnership v Martin Boughtwood and others [2009] EWHC 176 and [2010] EWCA Civ 23</i></p>
<p>Failure properly to pay dividends</p>	<p><i>Re Sam Weller & Sons Ltd [1989] 5 BCC 810</i> <i>Re Saul D Harrison & Sons Plc [1995] 1 BCLC 14</i> <i>Re a Company (No: 004415 of 1996) [1997] 1 BCLC 479</i> <i>Re Metropolis Motorcycles Ltd [2006] EWHC 364</i> <i>In the matter of Gate of India (Tynemouth) Ltd [2008] EWHC 959</i> <i>Re McCarthy Surfacing Ltd [2008] EWHC 2279</i> <i>Croly v Good [2010] EWHC 1</i> <i>J & S Insurance and Financial Consultants Ltd [2014] EWHC 2206</i> <i>Re CF Booth Ltd [2017] EWHC 457</i> <i>Corran v Butters [2017] EWHC 2294</i> <i>VB Football Assets v Blackpool Football Club (Properties) Ltd [2017] EWHC 2767</i> <i>Re AMT Coffee Limited [2019] EWHC 46</i> <i>Rutledge v Skerritt [2019] EWHC 573</i></p>

<p>Misapplication of or misappropriation of company funds, property or opportunities or 'expropriation of the minority'</p>	<p><i>Re Stewarts (Brixton) Ltd</i> [1985] BCLC 4 <i>Re London School of Electronics Ltd</i> [1986] Ch 211 <i>Re Cumana Ltd</i> [1986] BCLC 430 <i>Re Elgindata Ltd</i> [1991] BCLC 959 <i>Re Little Olympian Each-Ways Ltd (No 3)</i> [1995] 1 BCLC 636 <i>Re McCarthy Surfacing Ltd</i> [2008] EWHC 2279 <i>In the matter of Allied Business and Financial Consultants Ltd</i> [2009] EWCA Civ 751 <i>In the matter of Sunrise Radio Ltd</i> [2009] EWHC 2893 <i>Re Flex Associates Ltd</i> [2009] EWHC 3690 <i>Croly v Good</i> [2010] EWHC 1 <i>Sethi v Patel</i> [2010] EWHC 1830 <i>Lantsbury v Hauser</i> [2010] EWHC 390 <i>In the matter of Annacott Holdings Ltd</i> [2013] EWCA Civ 119 <i>In the matter of Hart Investment Holdings Ltd</i> [2013] EWHC 2067 <i>Thomas v Dawson</i> [2015] EWCA Civ 706 <i>In the matter of Husbands Bosworth Properties Ltd</i> [2015] EWHC 1928 <i>Hook v Sumner</i> LTL 27/11/2015 <i>Patel v Ferdinand</i> (unreported) 14 July 2016 <i>Interactive Technology Corp Ltd v Ferster</i> [2016] EWHC 2896 <i>Cusack v Holdsworth</i> [2016] EWHC 3084 <i>VB Football Assets v Blackpool Football Club (Properties) Ltd</i> [2017] EWHC 2767 <i>Rembert v Daniel</i> [2018] EWHC 388 <i>Badyal v Badyal</i> [2018] EWHC 68 <i>Estera Trust (Jersey) Limited v Singh</i> [2018] EWHC 1715 <i>Re The Edwardian Group Ltd</i> [2018] EWHC 1715 <i>Sudicka v Morgan</i> [2019] EWHC 311</p>
<p>May be difficult to establish a misappropriation of business opportunities if there is a finding of agreement to discontinue trading</p>	<p><i>Ahmadifard v McCullough</i> (Unreported July 2014)</p>
<p>Provision of loans on preferential terms (e.g interest free or unsecured)</p>	<p><i>Re AMT Coffee Limited</i> [2019] EWHC 46 <i>Dinglis v Dinglis</i> [2019] EWHC 1664</p>

Wrongful use of company's trading name	<i>Maidment v Attwood</i> [2012] EWCA Civ 998
Unfair calls on shares	<i>Re a Company</i> (No: 008126 of 1989) [1992] BCC 542 <i>Re D.R. Chemicals Ltd</i> [1989] 5 BCC 39 <i>Randall v S & F (Quarries) Ltd</i> (unreported) 12 October 1994 <i>Re Regional Airports Ltd</i> [1999] 2 BCLC 30 <i>Dalby v Bodilly</i> [2004] EWCA 307
Selective or otherwise improper share issues	<i>Re a Company</i> (No: 007623 of 1984) [1986] 2 BCC 99,191 <i>Re a Company</i> (No: 0026712 of 1984) [1985] BCLC 80 <i>Re D.R. Chemicals Ltd</i> [1989] 5 BCC 39 <i>Randall v S & F (Quarries) Ltd</i> (unreported) 12 October 1994 <i>Re Regional Airports Ltd</i> [1999] 2 BCLC 30 <i>Dalby v Bodilly</i> [2004] EWCA 307 <i>In the matter of Gate of India (Tynemouth) Ltd</i> [2008] EWHC 959 <i>In the matter of Sunrise Radio Ltd</i> [2009] EWHC 2893 <i>Lantsbury v Hauser</i> [2010] EWHC 390 <i>In the matter of Zetnet Ltd</i> [2011] EWHC 1518 <i>In the matter of I Fit Global Ltd</i> [2013] EWHC 2090 <i>Re TPD Investments Limited</i> [2017] EWHC 657
Preventing a sale of shares at highest value	<i>Re a Company</i> (No: 8699 of 1985) [1986] BCLC 382
Seriously diminishing or jeopardising the value of the petitioner's shares	(1) <i>Hamilton and</i> (2) <i>Dower v</i> (1) <i>Brown and</i> (2) <i>C & MB Holdings Ltd</i> [2016] EWHC 191 <i>Re Last Lion Holdings Ltd</i> [2018] EWHC 2347
Wrongful refusal to register a transfer of shares	<i>Holman v Adams Securities Ltd</i> [2010] EWHC 2421 <i>Graham v Every</i> [2014] EWCA Civ 191 <i>Re Last Lion Holdings Ltd</i> [2018] EWHC 2347
Transfers of shares or transfers of control of shares may not amount to unfairly prejudicial conduct unless specifically prohibited by agreement between the shareholders	<i>In the matter of Coroin Ltd</i> [2013] EWCA Civ 781

Failure to provide proper information as to company's affairs	<p><i>Re a Company (No 008699 of 1985) [1986] 2 BCC 99,024</i></p> <p><i>Re R A Noble (Clothing) Ltd [1983] BCLC 273</i></p> <p><i>Randall v S & F (Quarries) Ltd (unreported) 12 October 1994</i></p> <p><i>In the matter of Sunrise Radio Ltd [2009] EWHC 2893</i></p> <p><i>Gray v Braid Group (Holdings) Ltd [2015] CSOH 146</i></p> <p><i>VB Football Assets v Blackpool Football Club (Properties) Ltd [2017] EWHC 2767</i></p> <p><i>Rembert v Daniel [2018] EWHC 388</i></p> <p><i>Re Audas Group Ltd [2019] EWHC 2304</i></p>
Improper accounting and record keeping or accounting deficiencies	<p><i>Fowler v Gruyere [2010] BCLC 563</i></p> <p><i>Apex Global Management Ltd v F1 Call Ltd [2015] EWHC 3269</i></p> <p><i>Gray v Braid Group (Holdings) Ltd [2015] CSOH 146</i></p>
Ignoring board decisions or allowing persons not appointed or disqualified from acting as directors to manage the affairs of the company	<p><i>Re H.R. Harmer Ltd [1959] 1 WLR 62</i></p> <p><i>(1) Hamilton and (2) Dower v (1) Brown and (2) C & MB Holdings Ltd [2016] EWHC 191</i></p>
Denigrating conduct particularly in the context of a "quasi partnership" such as to render it unrealistic to expect the participants to continue in business together	<p><i>Apex Global Management Ltd v F1 Call Ltd [2015] EWHC 3269</i></p>
Wrongful registration of new members	<p><i>Re Piccadilly Radio Plc [1989] 5 BCC 692</i></p>
Failure to permit proper financial management	<p><i>Thomas v Dawson [2015] EWCA Civ 706</i></p>
Failure to permit proper remuneration of management	<p><i>Thomas v Dawson [2015] EWCA Civ 706</i></p>
Permitting a bankrupt former director to continue in the management of the affairs of a company contrary to Company Directors Disqualification Act 1986 s11	<p><i>(1) Hamilton and (2) Dowers v (1) Brown and (2) C & MB Holdings Ltd [2016] EWHC 191</i></p>
Committing criminal offences	<p><i>Bermuda Cablevision Ltd v Colica Trust Co Ltd [1997] BCC 982</i></p>

Physical violence	<i>In the matter of Home & Office Fire Extinguishers Ltd [2012] EWHC 917</i>
Threats to wind up	<i>In the matter of TPL Holdings Ltd 25.3.14</i>
Unsubstantiated threats of applications for committal for contempt of court or for perjury	<i>Interactive Technology Corp Ltd v Ferster [2016] EWHC 2896</i>
<p>What relief will be ordered?</p> <p>No limit on types of order court may make to give relief in respect of matters complained of</p>	<p><i>Section 996 Companies Act 2006</i></p> <p><i>Re Bird Precision Bellows [1986] Ch 658</i></p> <p><i>Re Nuneaton Borough AFC Ltd (No.2) [1991] BCC 44</i></p> <p><i>Re J.E.Cade & Son Ltd [1992] BCLC 213</i></p> <p><i>Supreme Travels Ltd v Little Olympian Each-Ways Ltd [1994] BCC 947</i></p> <p><i>cf Re Full Cup Int Trading Ltd [1998] BCC 58</i></p> <p><i>Grace v Biagioli [2005] EWCA Civ 1222</i></p> <p><i>Hawks v Cuddy [2009] EWCA Civ 291</i></p> <p><i>Sikorski v Sikorski [2012] EWHC 1613</i></p> <p><i>In the matter of Hart Investment Holdings Ltd [2013] EWHC 2067</i></p> <p><i>Thomas v Dawson [2015] EWCA Civ 706</i></p>
The court only has jurisdiction to grant any relief if unfairly prejudicial conduct of the company's affairs is admitted or proved	<p><i>Re Bird Precision Bellows [1986] Ch 658</i></p> <p><i>Re a Company (No: 004175 of 1986) [1987] BCLC 574</i></p> <p><i>Caldero Trading Ltd v Beppler & Jacobson Ltd [2013] EWHC 2191</i></p>
The court may make an order for relief in a form not sought by the petitioner	<i>Hawkers v Cuddy [2008] BCC 390 and [2010] BCC 597</i>
Even if unfairly prejudicial conduct is established there is no entitlement to relief. Rather, relief will only be granted if it is considered fair and appropriate that relief should be granted	<p><i>Re Bird Precision Bellows Ltd [1986] Ch 658</i></p> <p><i>Pro finance Trust SA v Gladstone [2002] 1 WLR 1024</i></p> <p><i>Grace v Biagioli [2005] EWCA Civ 1222</i></p> <p><i>Re Bankside Hotels Ltd [2018] EWHC 1035</i></p>

<p>The court assesses the appropriateness of any particular remedy as at the date of the hearing rather than at the date of the presentation of the petition and so can take account of conduct after the presentation of the petition but before the hearing</p>	<p><i>Re Hailley Group Ltd [1992] BCC 542</i> <i>Grace v Biagioli [2005] EWCA Civ 1222</i></p>
<p>The court will not grant relief where it will serve no substantially useful purpose</p>	<p><i>Re a Company (No: 008126 of 1989) [1992] BCC 542</i> <i>Re Full Cup Int. Trading Ltd [1998] BCC 58</i> <i>Re Hailey Group Ltd [1993] BCLC 459</i></p>
<p>The remedy is not limited merely to one reversing or putting right the immediate conduct which has justified the making of the order. Rather, the court is entitled to look at the realities and practicalities of the overall situation, past, present and future.</p>	<p><i>Grace v Biagioli [2006] BCC 85</i></p>
<p>Court will grant the minimum remedy to repair the misconduct and unfair prejudice suffered and prevent it happening in the future. So, in an appropriate case, the court might refuse a purchase order where sufficient relief can be provided through an alternative order</p>	<p><i>Re Bird Precision Bellows [1986] Ch 658</i> <i>Fexuto Pty Ltd v Bosnjak Holdings Ltd (1998) 28 ACSR 688</i> <i>Re Legal Costs Negotiators Ltd [1999] BCC 547</i> <i>Rural v Lopmand (2003) 47 ACSR 514</i> <i>Grace v Biagioli [2006] BCC 85</i> <i>Re Metropolis Motorcycles Ltd [2006] 364</i> <i>Hawks v Cuddy [2007] EWHC 2999 and [2009] EWCA Civ 291</i> <i>Re TPD Investments Limited [2017] EWHC 657</i></p>
<p>The question of what relief is appropriate should be addressed in light of all the facts as they exist as at the date of the order rather than those that pertained at the date of the presentation of the petition</p>	<p><i>Grace v Biagioli [2006] BCC 85</i></p>
<p>The remedy ordered will be one that is "fair" and "appropriate" in the circumstances and will seek to avoid unjust enrichment to any of the parties</p>	<p><i>Re Regional Airports Ltd [1999] 2 BCLC 30</i> <i>Grace v Biagioli [2005] EWCA 1222</i> <i>Re Sunrise Radio Ltd [2009] EWHC 2893</i> <i>F & C Alternative Investments (Holdings) Ltd v Barthelemy [2012] Ch 613</i> <i>Re TPD Investments Limited [2017] EWHC 657</i> <i>VB Football Assets v Blackpool Football Club (Properties) Ltd [2017] EWHC 2767</i></p>

<p>The court may refuse to grant any relief where relief has already been obtained in respect of the consequences of the unfairly prejudicial conduct suffered</p>	<p><i>Re Kenyan Swansea Ltd (1987) 3 BCC 259</i> <i>Re Estate Acquisition & Development Ltd [1995] BCC 338</i> <i>Weatherley v Weatherley [2018] EWHC 3201</i></p>
<p>Court will only grant relief that is proportionate to the unfairly prejudicial conduct of which the petitioner complains and will not use the order to inflict punishment for bad behaviour</p>	<p><i>Re Phoenix Office Supplies Ltd [2003] BCC 11</i> <i>Hawkers v Cuddy [2008] BCC 390</i> <i>VB Football Assets v Blackpool Football Club (Properties) Ltd [2017] EWHC 2767</i></p>
<p>Relief may be granted against any current members of the company or persons involved in the conduct of the affairs of the company but particularly against those who bear responsibility for the unfair prejudice suffered</p>	<p><i>Re Baltic Estate (No. 1) [1993] BCLC 498</i> <i>Re Little Olympian Each-Ways Ltd (No.3) [1995] 1BCLC 636</i> <i>Croly v Good [2011] BCC 105</i> <i>Shah v Shah [2011] WTLR 519</i></p>
<p>The court may order relief against persons who are not members of the company</p>	<p><i>Re BSB Holdings Ltd [1992] BCC 915</i> <i>Apex Global Management Ltd v Fi Call Ltd [2014] BCC 286</i></p>
<p>In certain circumstances the court might even order relief against past members</p>	<p><i>Re Company (No. 005287 of 1985) [1986] BCLC 68</i></p>
<p>Conduct of the petitioner may affect the relief which the court thinks fit to grant</p>	<p><i>Re London School of Electronics Ltd [1986] Ch 211</i> <i>Richardson v Blackmore [2006] BCC 276</i> <i>Interactive Technology Corp Ltd v Ferster [2016] EWHC 2896</i></p>
<p>Relief will only be granted in respect of matters complained of</p>	<p><i>Re Legal Costs Negotiators Ltd [1999] BCLC 171</i></p>
<p>Court may order relief in a form that the petitioner does not seek or desire</p>	<p><i>Hawks v Cuddy [2009] EWCA Civ 291</i></p>
<p>In considering the appropriate remedy the court will take account of the interests of all shareholders, creditors and even third parties (e.g. joint venturers with the company), customers and the public generally</p>	<p><i>Hawkers v Cuddy [2008] BCC 390</i> <i>Re Asia Television [2015] 1 HKLRD 607</i></p>

<p>The court may take into account the hardship that a particular type of order would represent to the respondents but whether it will be prepared to do so is likely to depend on the degree of misconduct on the part of the respondent</p>	<p><i>Re a Company (No: 002612) [1986] 2 BCC</i> <i>Re Scitec Group Ltd [2011] 1 BCLC 277</i></p>
<p>The courts have emphasised that in many cases there is much to be said for a “clean break” between the parties</p>	<p><i>Re Elgindata Ltd (No 1) [1991] BCLC 959</i> <i>Re Clearspring Management Ltd [2003] EWHC 2516</i></p>
<p>In appropriate cases relief may be provided by an order granting a remedy against non-members</p>	<p><i>Re a Company (No: 005287 of 1985) [1986] BCLC 68</i> <i>Re Little Olympian Each-Ways Ltd [1994] 2 BCLC 420, 429</i> <i>F&C Alternative Investments (Holdings) Ltd v Barthelemy & others [2011] EWHC 1731</i> <i>Apex Global Management Ltd v FI Call Ltd [2013] EWHC 1652</i> <i>Re TPD Investments Limited [2017] EWHC 657</i></p>
<p>Relief may take the form of an order requiring the rectification of registers (e.g. as to shareholdings)</p>	<p><i>Lantsbury v Hauser [2010] EWHC 390</i></p>
<p>Relief may be ordered in the form of suitable injunctive orders being made</p>	<p><i>Re Last Lion Holdings Ltd [2018] EWHC 2347</i></p>

<p>The court may make an order regulating the future conduct of the company's affairs (e.g. as to the calling of meetings)</p>	<p><i>Re Harmer [1959] 1 WLR 62</i> <i>McGuinness v Bremner Plc (1988) 4 BCC 161</i></p>
<p>In a suitable case relief may take the form of an order requiring the perpetrators to pay the company damages in respect of losses suffered but it is unclear whether the court can order the perpetrator to pay the victim damages directly</p>	<p><i>The Brightview 2004] BCC 542</i> <i>Re Chime Corp Ltd [2004] HKFCA 8</i> <i>Re Lehman Brown Ltd [2013] HKEC 357</i> <i>Re Last Lion Holdings Ltd [2018] EWHC 2347</i></p>
<p>It is doubtful whether the court has power to order a winding up of the company under section 994 Companies Act 2006</p>	<p><i>Re Full Cup International Trading Ltd [1995] BCC 682</i> <i>Hawkers v Cuddy [2008] BCC 390 & [2010] BCC 597</i></p>
<p>Court even has power to order a division of the company's assets though such an order may involve significant issues in practice (e.g. as regards creditors and third parties)</p>	<p><i>Bhullar v Bhullar (unreported 10 May 2002)</i></p>
<p>Court may order an account of profits including and account as against a third party joined to the proceedings for this purpose</p>	<p><i>Clark v Cutland [2004] 1 WLR 783</i> <i>Anderson v Hogg [2002] S.C. 190</i> <i>Bhullar v Bhullar (unreported) 10 May 2002</i> <i>Gamlestaden v Baltic Partners [2007] Bus LR 1521</i></p>

<p>Often relief given by ordering the respondent to buy out the petitioner at a 'fair value' with the price fixed by court in light of expert valuation evidence</p>	<p><i>Re Bird Precision Bellows Ltd [1986] Ch 658</i> <i>Re D.R. Chemicals Ltd [1989] 5 BCC 39</i> <i>Re Nuneaton Borough AFC Ltd [1989] 5 BCC 792</i> <i>Re Nuneaton Borough AFC Ltd (No.2) [1991] BCC 44</i> <i>Re Regional Airpots Ltd [1999] 2 BCLC 30</i> <i>Grace v Biagioli [2005] EWCA Civ 1222</i> <i>Sethi v Patel [2010] EWHC 1830</i> <i>Shah v Shah [2011] EWHC 1902</i> <i>Kohli v Lit [2013] EWCA Civ 667</i> <i>CF Booth Ltd [2017] EWHC 457</i> <i>Re TPD Investments Limited [2017] EWHC 657</i> <i>Ashdown v Griffin [2017] EWHC 2601</i> <i>VB Football Assets v Blackpool Football Club (Properties) Limited [2017] EWHC 2767</i></p>
<p>In cases of relatively modest unfair prejudice a buyout order may be considered disproportionate</p>	<p><i>VB Football Assets v Blackpool Football Club (Properties) Ltd [2017] EWHC 2767</i></p>
<p>Where a purchase order is made and the petitioner is also owed money by the company then usually the company is also ordered to repay the debt owed</p>	<p><i>Re a Company (No: 00789) [1991] BCLC 267</i> <i>Re Ghyll Beck Driving Range [1993] BCLC 1126</i> <i>R & H Electric Ltd v Hayden Bill Electrical Ltd [1995] BCC 958</i> <i>Gamlestaden v Baltic Partners [2007] BCC 272</i></p>
<p>Reliable expert evidence as to value provided by a jointly instructed expert or unchallenged reliable expert evidence provided by an expert instructed by only one party is likely to be accepted by the court</p>	<p><i>Coopers Payen Limited v Southampton Container Terminal Ltd [2004] 1 Lloyds Rep 331</i> <i>Ashdown v Griffin [2017] EWHC 2601</i></p>
<p>In an appropriate case the court may make an order permitting the petitioner to purchase the respondent's shareholding</p>	<p><i>Oak Investment Partners xii Ltd Partnership v Martin Boughtwood and others [2009] EWHC 176 and [2010] EWCA Civ 23</i> <i>Lantsbury v Hauser [2010] EWHC 390</i> <i>Thomas v Dawson [2015] EWCA Civ 706</i></p>

<p>Rarely will a court order a majority shareholder to cede control to a minority shareholder</p>	<p><i>Re a Company (No: 003843 of 1986) [1987] 3 BCC 624</i></p> <p><i>Re a Company (No: 006834 of 1988) [1989] 5 BCC 218</i></p> <p><i>Re Ringtower Holdings (1989) 5 BCC 82</i></p> <p><i>Re Company (No. 00789 of 1987) [1990] BCLC 384</i></p> <p><i>Re Baltic Real Estate (No.1) [1993] BCLC 498</i></p> <p><i>Re A Company (No. 00836 of 1995) [1996] BCC 432</i></p> <p><i>Re Brenfield Squash Rackets Club Ltd [1996] 2 BCLC 184</i></p> <p><i>Nuneaton Borough AFC Ltd [1989] 5 BCC 792</i></p> <p><i>Oak Investment Partners xii Ltd Partnership v Martin Boughtwood and others [2009] EWHC 176 and [2010] EWCA Civ 23</i></p>
<p>In an appropriate case the court may also order a non-party's shares to be purchased</p>	<p><i>Re Abbington Hotel Ltd [2011] EWHC 635</i></p>
<p>In considering whether to make a purchase order and the terms of the order itself the court might be prepared to consider the hardship that such an order might cause to a respondent</p>	<p><i>Re Company (No. 002612 of 1984) [1986] 2 BCC</i></p>
<p>But impecuniosity of the proposed purchaser may be considered irrelevant</p>	<p><i>Re Company (No. 002612 of 1984) [1986] 2 BCC</i></p> <p><i>Re Cumana Ltd [1986] BCLC 430</i></p> <p><i>Sethi v Patel [2010] EWHC 1830</i></p> <p><i>Re TPD Investments Limited [2017] EWHC 657</i></p>
<p>An interim payment or payment on account can be ordered</p>	<p><i>Ferguson v Maclellan Salmon Co Ltd [1990] BCC 702</i></p> <p><i>Re Clearspring Management [2003] EWHC 2516</i></p> <p><i>Dalby v Bodilly [2004] EWCA 3078</i></p> <p><i>In the matter of Annacott Holdings Ltd [2011] EWHC 3180</i></p>

<p>Buyout price to be 'fair'</p>	<p><i>Re Bird Precision Bellows Ltd [1984] 1 Ch 419, [1986] Ch 658</i></p> <p><i>Eurofinance v Parkinson [2001] BCC 551</i></p> <p><i>Re Sunrise Radio Ltd [2009] EWHC 2893</i></p> <p><i>Sethi v Patel [2010] EWHC 1830</i></p> <p><i>In the matter of Annacott Holdings Ltd LTL 23/5/12</i></p> <p><i>Chilukuri v RP Explorer Master Fund [2013] EWCA Civ 1307</i></p> <p><i>Re Blue Index Ltd [2014] EWHC 2680</i></p> <p><i>Re Addbins Ltd [2015] EWHC 3161</i></p> <p><i>Birdi v (1) Specsavers Optical Group Ltd; (2) Singh; (3) Dartford Visionplus and (4) Dartford Specsavers Ltd [2015] EWHC 2870</i></p> <p><i>Re C F Booth [2017] EWCA 457</i></p> <p><i>Wann v Birkinshaw [2017] EWCA Civ 84</i></p> <p><i>Re TPD Investments Limited [2017] EWHC 657</i></p> <p><i>Edgar v Munro [2017] EWHC 1814</i></p> <p><i>Estera Trust (Jersey) Limited v Singh [2018] EWHC 1715</i></p> <p><i>Re AMT Coffee Ltd [2019] EWHC 46</i></p>
<p>"Fair value" is often measured by reference to "market value" subject to necessary adjustments to take account of unfairly prejudicial conduct</p>	<p><i>Wann v Birkinshaw [2017] EWCA Civ 84</i></p> <p><i>Re TPD Investments Limited [2017] EWHC 657</i></p>
<p>Valuation is very often the subject of expert evidence but experts will carry greater conviction if the expert has personal practical experience in buying and selling companies and is not just simply a professional expert witness</p>	<p><i>Re Sunrise Radio Ltd [2011] EWHC 3821</i></p>
<p>Court retains a wide power to disregard the views of expert valuers and to apply its own view of what is fair and sensible in all the circumstances</p>	<p><i>Re Planet Organic Ltd [2000] BCC 610</i></p>
<p>In the case of a going concern the "fair value" of the shares to be purchased should usually be valued on the date on which they are ordered to be purchased although the court has a discretion to order another date for valuation if "fairness" requires</p>	<p><i>Profinance Trust SA v Gladstone [2001] EWCA Civ 1031</i></p> <p><i>Re C F Booth Ltd [2017] EWHC 457</i></p> <p><i>Estera Trust (Jersey) Limited v Singh [2018] EWHC 1715</i></p> <p><i>Re AMT Coffee Ltd [2019] EWHC 46</i></p> <p><i>Re Dinglis Properties Ltd [2019] EWHC 3327</i></p>

<p>If the court determines that in a particular case the appropriate date for valuation of the petitioner’s shareholding should be a date earlier than the date of judgment it might possibly but not inevitably also order interest to be payable on that price from that earlier date depending on the cause of the delay in obtaining relief</p>	<p><i>Section 25 Senior Courts Act 1981</i> <i>Pro finance Trust SA v Gladstone [2002] 1 WLR 1024</i> <i>Re Clearsprings (Mangement) [2003] EWHC 2516</i> <i>Re Southern Counties Fresh Foods Ltd [2010] EWHC 3334</i> <i>Re Annacott Holdings Ltd [2012] EWHC 1662</i> <i>Re Goldshine Development Ltd [2013] 5 HKLRD 318</i> <i>Estera Trust (Jersey) Limited v Singh [2018] EWHC 1715 and [2019] EWHC 873</i></p>
<p>Once a valuation date has been determined the court is unlikely to order any adjustment to be made to the value as at that date or the valuation date itself in light of supervening events (eg. Covid-19 pandemic)</p>	<p><i>Dinglis v Dinglis [2020] EWHC 1363</i></p>
<p>In absence of a market for the company's shares the buyout price is to reflect ‘fair value’ in the context of a sale between the actual participants</p>	<p><i>Eurofinance v Parkinson [2001] BCC 551</i></p>
<p>If there is a “marriage value” in the combining of the shares of the vendor and the purchaser then the court may order that that “marriage Value” should be shared between the vendor and the purchaser</p>	<p><i>Estera Trust (Jersey) Limited v Singh [2018] EWHC 1715 and [2019] EWHC 873</i></p>
<p>Basis of valuation should be ‘fair’ to all parties</p>	<p><i>CVC/Opportunity Equity Partners Ltd v Demario Almeida [2011] 2 BCLC 108</i> <i>Re TPD Investments Limited [2017] EWHC 657</i></p>
<p>Share valuation is an art not a science</p>	<p><i>Joiner v George [2003] BCC 298</i></p>
<p>Buyout price to take account of reduction in share value as a consequence of unfairly prejudicial conduct</p>	<p><i>Re D.R. Chemicals Ltd [1989] 5 BCC 39</i> <i>Sethi v Patel [2010] EWHC 1830</i> <i>Kohl v Lit [2013] EWCA Civ 667</i> <i>Re Blue Index Ltd [2014] EWHC 2480</i> <i>Re C F Booth Ltd [2017] EWHC 457</i></p>

<p>Evidence of what transpired after the relevant date of valuation may be considered</p>	<p><i>Edgar v Munro</i> [2017] EWHC 1814</p>
<p>Historically, in “quasi partnership” cases there was generally no discount applied to reflect the minority status of the petitioner’s shareholding whereas in non ‘quasi partnership’ cases there was conflicting authorities as to whether a discount should be applied. The more modern approach seems to be that in all cases the price ordered to be paid should be “fair”. In practice this seems generally to mean that no discount is applied whether the company is in the nature of a “quasi partnership” or not unless some specific feature of the case justifies application of a discount to determine the ‘fair value’ of the shareholding (e.g. where the minority shareholding was gifted/acquired at a discount)</p>	<p><i>Ebrahimi v Westbourne Galleries Ltd</i> [1973] AC 360 <i>Re Bird Precision Bellows Ltd</i> [1984] Ch 658 <i>Re D.R. Chemicals Ltd</i> [1989] 5 BCC 39 <i>Re a Company (No: 005134 of 1986)</i> [1989] BCLC 383 <i>Howie v Crawford</i> [1990] BCC 330 <i>Re Elgindata Ltd</i> [1991] BCLC 959 <i>Re Planet Organic Ltd</i> [2000] 1 BCLC 366 <i>CVC Opportunity Equity Partners Ltd v Demarco Almeida</i> [2002] 2 BCLC 108 <i>Phoenix Office Supplies Ltd v Larvin</i> [2002] EWCA Civ 1740 <i>Re Jayflex Construction Ltd</i> [2003] EWHC 2008 <i>Strahan v Wilcock</i> [2006] EWCA Civ 13 <i>Re Campbell Irvine (Holdings) Ltd (No.2)</i> [2006] EWHC 583 <i>Irvine v Irvine (No.2)</i> [2007] 1 BCLC 445 <i>Re McCarthy Surfacing Ltd</i> [2008] EWHC 2279 <i>Re Sunrise Radio Ltd</i> [2010] 1 BCLC 367 <i>Croly v Good</i> [2010] EWHC 1 <i>In the matter of Home & Office Fire Extinguishers Ltd</i> [2012] EWHC 9 <i>Re Blue Index Ltd</i> [2014] EWHC 2680 <i>Re Addbins Ltd</i> [2015] EWHC 3161 <i>Estera Trust (Jersey) Limited v Singh</i> [2018] EWHC 1715 <i>Re AMT Coffee Ltd</i> [2019] EWHC 46 <i>Re Sprintroom Ltd</i> [2019] EWCA Civ 932 <i>Re Dinglis Properties Ltd</i> [2019] 3327</p>
<p>Both in quasi-partnership and non-quasi-partnership cases, identification of the “fair” value may involve applying a premium to the proportionate value (e.g. where the purchaser acquires a 25%, 50% or 75% interest in the company)</p>	<p><i>Re Sunrise Radio</i> [2009] EWHC 2893 <i>Estera Trust (Jersey) Limited v Singh</i> [2018] EWHC 1715 and [2019] EWHC 873</p>

<p>The shares should be valued on the basis of the value of them to the person ordered to purchase them rather than their value to an independent third party</p>	<p><i>Re Edwardian Group Ltd [2018] EWHC 1715</i> <i>Re Dinglis Properties Ltd [2019] 3327</i></p>
<p>The order may allow the purchaser a period of time (and even an opportunity to apply for an extension of that period if required) within which to purchase the petitioner’s shareholding (e.g. to raise required funding for the purchase)</p>	<p><i>Re TPD Investments Limited [2017] EWHC 657</i> <i>Estera Trust (Jersey) Limited v Singh [2019] EWHC 873</i></p>
<p>If payment for the shares is to be delayed then interest may be awarded on the price that is to be paid</p>	<p><i>Estera Trust (Jersey) Limited v Singh [2019] EWHC 873</i></p>
<p>If the evidence available to the court indicates that the petitioner’s shares are worthless the court may direct that the only relief available to the petitioner is an order that he should be permitted but not obliged to transfer his shares to the respondent for a nil consideration</p>	<p><i>Ashdown v Griffin [2017] EWHC 2601</i></p>
<p>Generally, notional sale costs should be taken into account in determining the “fair value” of the shareholding</p>	<p><i>Atwood v Maidment [2013] EWCA Civ 119</i> <i>Wann v Birkinshaw [2017] EWCA Civ 84</i> <i>Re TPD Investments Limited [2017] EWHC 657</i></p>
<p>Ordinarily the court will not grant the petitioner an option to purchase the respondent’s shareholding in the event that the respondent fails to purchase the petitioner’s shareholding in accordance with the court’s order</p>	<p><i>Re TPD Investments Limited [2017] EWHC 657</i></p>
<p>When the petition may be struck out</p> <p>Petition may be struck out (ie under CPR Pt 3.4) or dismissed summarily (ie under CPR Pt 24) if no real prospect of success or it is plain and obvious that the relief claimed will not be granted</p>	<p><i>Civil Procedure Rules Part 3 and Part 24 apply</i> <i>Re Legal Costs Negotiators Ltd [1999] BCLC 171</i> <i>Evans v Eurokey Properties Ltd [2020] EWHC 1047</i></p>

<p>It may amount to an abuse of process for a person to issue a petition in circumstance where there has been unfair prejudice if the articles of association or shareholders' agreement contains a mechanism for offering his shares to the other shareholders at a fair price and for calculating the fair price unless that person has first utilised that procedure</p>	<p><i>Re a Company (No: 07623 of 1984) [1986] 2 BCC 99,191</i></p> <p><i>Re a Company (No: 004377 of 1986) [1987] 1 WLR 102</i></p> <p><i>Re Castleburn Ltd [1989] 5 BCC 652</i></p> <p><i>Re Benfield Greig Group Plc [2002] BCC 256</i></p> <p><i>Re Belfields Furnishings Ltd [2006] EWHC 183</i></p>
<p>No abuse if impropriety affects value or valuation</p>	<p><i>Re a Company (No: 006834 of 1988) [1989] 5 BCC 218</i></p> <p><i>North Holdings Ltd v Southern Tropics Ltd [1999] BCC 746</i></p> <p><i>cf Fuller v Syracuse Ltd [2001] BCC 806</i></p> <p><i>Re C F Booth [2017] EWHC 457</i></p>
<p>No abuse if mechanism for fixing price is not fair</p>	<p><i>Re a Company (No: 004377 of 1986) [1986] 1 WLR 102</i></p> <p><i>Re Abbey Leisure Ltd [1990] BCC 60</i></p> <p><i>Re a Company (No: 00330 of 1991) [1991] BCC 241</i></p> <p><i>Re Copeland & Craddock Ltd [1997] BCC 294</i></p> <p><i>O'Neill v Phillips [1999] 1 WLR 1092</i></p> <p><i>North Holdings Ltd v Southern Tropics Ltd [1999] BCC 746</i></p> <p><i>Re C F Booth Ltd [2017] EWHC 457</i></p>
<p>Issue of petition may amount to an abuse of process even though there has been unfair prejudice if it is clear that the petitioner will have to sell his shares to the respondent and the petitioner has unreasonably rejected a reasonable offer to purchase his shares at a fair price</p>	<p><i>Re a Company (No: 003843 of 1986) [1987] 3 BCC 624</i></p> <p><i>Re a Company (No: 003096 of 1987) [1988] 4 BCC 80</i></p> <p><i>O'Neill v Phillips [1999] 1 WLR 1092</i></p> <p><i>North Holdings Ltd v Southern Tropics Ltd [1999] BCC 746</i></p> <p><i>West v Blanchet [2000] 1 BCLC 795</i></p> <p><i>Wyatt v Frank Wyatt & Son Ltd [2003] EWHC 520</i></p> <p><i>Isaacs v Belfield Furnishings Ltd [2006] All ER (D) 216</i></p> <p><i>Hawks v Cuddy [2007] EWHC 2999 and [2009] EWHC Civ 291</i></p>
<p>Strike out may be available where it is "clear and obvious" that relief will not be granted against the offering party beyond that which he has offered</p>	<p><i>Bankside Hotels [2018] BCC 617</i></p>

But that may not be the case where there is uncertainty as to who should buy out whom, or the offer to purchase does not comprise one that provides all the advantages that the petitioner might reasonably expect to achieve from issuing a petition	<i>Harbourne Nominees Ltd v Karvaski</i> [2011] EWHC 2214
There is conflicting authority as to whether to be a 'fair offer' it must be unconditional and capable of a binding acceptance	<i>O'Neill v Phillips</i> [1999] 1 WLR 1092 <i>Re Flex Associates Ltd</i> [2009] EWHC 3690 <i>Shepherd v Williamson</i> [2010] EWHC 2375 (c.f. <i>Re Sprintroom Ltd</i> [2019] EWCA Civ 932)
What constitutes a "fair offer"	<i>O'Neill v Phillips</i> [1999] 1 WLR 1092 <i>Harbourne Road Nominees Ltd v Karvaski</i> [2011] EWHC 2214
Issues as to alleged wrongful conduct may be reserved to the court and dealt with as preliminary issues or exceptionally left to the independent valuer's determination	<i>Re Clearsprings (Mangement) Ltd</i> [2003] EWHC 25
It may amount to an abuse of process if the actions complained of amount only to breaches of duties owed by directors such that the appropriate method of complaint would be by means of a derivative action rather than by an unfair prejudice petition	<i>Re Chime Corp Ltd</i> [2004] 3 HKLR 922 cf <i>Re Brightview Ltd</i> [2004] BCC 542
Petition may be struck out where it relates to matters taking place after the petitioner has sold his beneficial interest in the company's shares	<i>Re FSC Andrews Ltd</i> [2015] EWHC 4042
No abuse if valuer is not independent	<i>Re Boswell & Co (Steels) Ltd</i> [1989] 5 BCC 145 <i>Re Benfield Greg Group Plc</i> [2002] BCC 256
Solicitors who fail to advise of the need to make a fair offer to avoid a finding of unfairly prejudicial conduct may be held negligent	<i>Magical Marketing Ltd v Ware & Kay</i> [2013] EWHC 59
Petition may also be struck out if it comprises an attempt to raise issues the same as or similar to those raised in an earlier petition which the petitioner has failed to prosecute	<i>Treetop Investment LLC v Falmouth House Freehold Co Ltd</i> [2017] EWHC 674

Uncertain whether petition will be stayed in face of an agreement to arbitrate

Re Vocam Europe Plc [1998] BCC 396

Eurotunnel v Balfour Beatty [1992] 2 Lloyd's Rep 7

Sheldon v D F Keane (unreported) 21 March 2003

Exeter City AFC Ltd v Football Conference Ltd [2005] 1 BCLC 238