 DOI: *https://doij.org/10.10000/IJLMH.113750*

INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF LAW MANAGEMENT & HUMANITIES

[ISSN 2581-5369]

Volume 5 | Issue 6

2022

Corporate Mobility in Private International Law

MS. ANUPREET KAUR[1]

ABSTRACT

Corporate mobility is a prominent concept in this era of globalization. At this moment, companies that restrict their operations to a specific jurisdiction are exceedingly rare. Distinct kinds of corporate mobility are possible. It could seem as if a company is operating in another nation but doesn't have a substantial form there. However, the company could use a section or franchise to do more international business. In actuality, a business may maintain its incorporation in the state where it is based while moving a considerable portion of its management elsewhere.

I. INTRODUCTION

Corporate mobility is a prominent concept in this era of globalization. At this moment, companies that restrict their operations to a specific jurisdiction are exceedingly rare. Distinct kinds of corporate mobility are possible. It could seem as if a company is operating in another nation but doesn't have a substantial form there. However, the company could use a section or franchise to do more international business. In actuality, a business may maintain its incorporation in the state where it is based while moving a considerable portion of its management elsewhere.[2]

Ultimately, a corporation has the option to open a subsidiary internationally. As a consequence, it won't be the corporation's continuation but rather a separate legal organization. In theory, each of these instances appears simple and achievable. However, when applied to the complex multi-jurisdictional world we live in today, several legal issues might arise.[3] Corporations may be barred from moving their state bureaucracy outside of the country or from performing a substantial percentage of their operations outside of the country without first dissolving in their homeland. The entity may also establish cumbersome administrative procedures or other constraints on businesses that seek to operate abroad via a department. Additionally, depending on the real degree of economic operations the company engages in its state of residence, the

[1] Author is a Student at Narsee Monjee Institute of Management Studies, Navi Mumbai, India.
[2] Robert R. Drury, 'The regulation and recognition of foreign corporations: The "Delaware syndrome.
[3] Cambridge Law Journal 165-194; Robert R. Drury, 'Migrating companies', 24(4) [1999] European Law Review 354-372.

 [ISSN 2581-5369]

parent state may completely fail to recognize the branch.

II. CORPORATE MOBILITY AND PRIVATE INTERNATIONAL LAW

There are two significant conflicts of laws theories under the private international law of corporate entities: the incorporation theory and the real seat theory. These theories relate a corporation to a body of law and address problems including the law that applies to the corporation (lex societatis), the admittance of multinational businesses, and the passing movement of seats.[4]

In the parts that precede, they are looked at:

(A) Conflict of laws theories:

(i) Incorporation theory: According to the incorporation theory, a business is bound to the country in which it was established. This theory is accepted by the United States, Ireland, Denmark, the United Kingdom, Switzerland, and Dutch countries. In France and Germany, it is often alluded to as "siège statuaire" or "Gründungstheorie." This theory also includes a few minor alterations, such as the residency in the UK theory. This theory was created by countries who were eager to embrace a free trade policy.[5] According to this view, the State of incorporation decides whether a firm will continue to exist or dissolve. Additionally, the law of the State of incorporation governs the corporate affairs of the company (such as issues of legal standing, existence, corporate standards that govern, the connection between the company, directors, and stakeholders, liquidation, insolvency, etc).[6]

As a result, a corporation is globally recognized when it has met the registration criteria in its State of incorporation. In all the other terms, the incorporation theory often governs the question of recognition when it is used to determine prevailing law. A firm may, in general, move its real seat of administration to another State under this structure without retaining its legal identity. The migratory firm continues to be governed by the laws of the State in which it was incorporated as long as its registered office is still there.[7] One of the key benefits of the incorporation idea is that the immigration firm may conduct its business while still adhering to its more established and recognizable company law regime.

Consequently, incorporation states allowed businesses that were created in another state but have their actual administration elsewhere. Without the need to re-incorporate, such firms' legal

[4] Dan Prentice, 'The Incorporation Theory – The United Kingdom, [2003] 14 European Business Law Review 631.
[5] Dicey and Morris, The Conflict of Laws, Collins, 2002, Vol. 2, 13th ed., Rule 152(1) and Comment 30-002.
[6] Scoles/Hay/Borchers/Symeonides, supra note 8, § 23.2, p. 1222.
[7] Farnsworth, supra note 9, p. 74 et seq.; Dicey and Morris, supra note 11, Rule 152 (2).

 [ISSN 2581-5369]

capacity and identity are recognized. However, there are limitations to the incorporation idea in a variety of countries to safeguard individuals doing business with foreign corporations operating in those nations. Such businesses are known as pseudo-foreign corporations, quasi-foreign businesses, or officially foreign businesses.

Thus, the incorporation theory encourages the principles of consistency, regularity, and access to justice. The crucial element in determining whether to recognize a company—its incorporation—is rigorously confirmed. In business affairs, partisan autonomy is also maintained. This approach effectively enables the business's founders to determine the best (and often least stringent) company law framework. No of where the company's real operations are located, this decision is kept throughout its existence. Therefore, a company's real centre of management moving across borders does not result in the loss of legal capacity or character. Additionally, international businesses are acknowledged, and their internal structure is recognized.

(ii) **Real seat theory:** Several European nations with legal systems have embraced the actual seat doctrine, which stems from the middle of the 19th century. According to this idea, the only State with the authority to control an organization's internal operations is the one in which the organization has its legitimate base or administrative hub.[8] A business must incorporate or establish in the nation where its administrative centre is located. The notion is predicated on the idea that the State with the actual seat is typically the State that is most significantly impacted by the company's operations and should, therefore, have the authority to control those affairs. In other words, the real seat theory seeks to create a meaningful link between a corporation and the legal framework upon which it is formed and upon which it derives its legal identity.[9]

It's possible that a business that is established in one State but has its organizational headquarters in another State that adheres to the actual seat theory won't be recognized as a corporation in that State. Because of this, limited liability could not be an option, and the company's members might be held personally responsible for their obligations. Additionally, its actions could be restricted. Such foreign corporations, for instance, are considered partnerships in Germany, and their participants (shareholders) are individually responsible for the obligations of the firm. Additionally, these foreign corporations exhibit legal competence and may not be allowed to file a lawsuit.

[8] Werner F. Ebke, 'The 'Real Seat' Doctrine in the Conflict of Corporate Laws', 36 [2002] International Lawyer 1015- 1037, 1016.

[9] Ebke (2002) op.cit., 1022, 1029 and Werner F. Ebke, 'The European Conflict-of-Corporate-Laws Revolution: Überseering, Inspire Art and Beyond', (2005) 16 (1) European Business Law Review 9, 15; E.R. Latty, 'Pseudoforeign corporations', 65 [1995] Yale Law Journal 137.

 [ISSN 2581-5369]

One severe sentence for the actual seat idea is the non-recognition of international corporations with their administrative centre in another country. Today's globalized corporate nature enables the decentralization and multijurisdictional operation of firms. Therefore, locating a company's true administrative centre may be difficult. Additionally, the penalties associated with a real seat being discovered in a state other than the State of creation may be too harsh.

Therefore, nations that "recognize a political, or even a constitutional, obligation to safeguard particular interests" are more likely to favour this approach. It is maintained that the notion levels the field of play by requiring all businesses to abide by the same company law regulations, particularly those that are intended to safeguard shareholders, creditors, workers, and other stakeholders. It is driven by the desire to defend regional interests and the commercial setting in which the corporation carries out its core operations. Stands for equal treatment and the safeguarding of equal opportunity," according to the real seat theory. Additionally, it stops businesses from escaping a nation's legal system by incorporating it into a region with weak company law regulations.[10]

Corporate mobility:

After the various conflicts of laws, and ideas have been briefly explained, corporate mobility is looked at in a variety of contexts. First, the viewpoint of the home State is prioritized (i.e., outward migration), and then the standpoint of the host State is highlighted (i.e. inbound migration). The capacity of the business to move its registered office and/or administrative seat without sacrificing its legal identity, the modification of the relevant legislation as a consequence of the change in the linking element, and the recognition of foreign corporations are among the issues brought up.[11]

Both the host state's substantive law and the home state's substantive law apply to the first problem. Again, both States' principles on conflicts of law apply to the last two.

(i) **Outbound Migration**: A corporation may decide to move its registered office and/or administrative seat to some other State. From the standpoint of the home State, whether or not the transaction is allowed relies on both its substantive law and conflict of laws regulations.

(a) **Transfer of Registered Office:** What happens if a business wishes to move its registered office to a different State?

The change in the corporate headquarters would indicate a change in the linking component if

[10] See Rammeloo, op.cit., chapter 4(III)(1); Ebke (2002) op.cit., 1034-1035; Wymeersch (March 2003) op.cit., 12-13; Siems (2002) op.cit.
[11] Rammeloo, op.cit., 14.

 [ISSN 2581-5369]

the home State adopts the incorporation hypothesis. In general, unless there is actual legislation in the home State that precludes it, this is preceded by a shift in the relevant law.[12] Certain States permit these transactions. The extra condition that the transfer is compliant with both the laws of the home and host states, as well as the need that the departing corporation clears its tax accounts first, may also be imposed. One would assume that as long as the administrative seat stays in the real seat State, there shouldn't be a problem if the home State upholds the real seat idea and a corporation attempts to move its registered office to another State. However, if the registered office is moved, the laws of that State are no longer applicable since registration links the business to the statutes of the state in which it has been incorporated.[13]

(b) **Transfer of Administrative Seat:**

What if a corporation wishes to shift its administrative seat? Once again, this would rely on the native State's legal system and norms governing conflicts of laws. For instance, if the home State adheres to the inclusion idea, it could merely pay attention to the corporate headquarters. The administrative seat's site is meaningless since it is not a connective component. As a result, it is plausible that the transition of an institutional seat from an incorporated State will be approved. There will be no modification to the relevant legislation, and the firm will continue to be established in its home State. The transfer of the organizational seat may not be conceivable if the individual State adheres to the real seat principle. The choice to relocate may be deemed unlawful in the native State, and the firm may not be permitted to shift its operational headquarters overseas without first winding up and dissolving. Even if the state permits the relocation, it may still place extra restrictions on it. For instance, there can be a need for the transference of the administrative seat to comply of the administrative seat is compliant with the laws of both the native State and the host State, or that the stakeholders simultaneously support the relocation.[14]

(ii) **Inbound Migration:** A business must indicate that the host State will approve the migration of its executive site and/or registered office. Again, this will rely on the host State's law governing and the principles governing conflicts of laws.

(iii) **Restraints on corporate mobility:** In general, considering the assessment above, several difficulties emerge that might impede or completely stop cross-border corporate mobility. The corporation may not be able to change its registered or administrative seat without first winding up and dissolving, from an outbound/emigration position. The corporation may not be

[12] Rammeloo, op.cit.,12; Mucciarelli, op.cit., 282.
[13] Roth (2003) op.cit., 177; Mucciarelli, op.cit., 284-285.
[14] inter alios, Rammeloo, op.cit.; Mucciarelli, op.cit; Wymeersch (March 2003) op.cit.

 [ISSN 2581-5369]

recognized as a foreign company in the contracting Country from an inbound/immigration viewpoint, in which case the limited liability status's safeguard would be lost. Additionally, the business might need to reorganize itself in the host State or amend some or all of its corporate legal framework. The significance of coordinating factors In theory, a nation-state's national laws apply to all legal interactions and organizations, including corporations. They are only sometimes subject to international or supranational legal norms. Every time a company conducts business internationally (i.e., whenever a "private international law," "conflict of laws," or "choice of law" issue could emerge; terms used interchangeably herewith), it becomes essential that the company is somehow localized in a particular State to verify the "proper" national company laws governing the company. Therefore, it is this State that may be considered to have dominion over the corporation, i.e., jurisdiction to impose legal requirements, jurisdiction to resolve legal disputes, and jurisdiction to carry out other prosecutorial duties.[15]

Restrictive jurisdiction is pertinent concerning cogent company laws (relating, in specific, the emergence, occurrence as well as legal attributes of a corporation, the indemnification policy, the organizational structure, the designation of associates, and the disintegration and liquidation), while jurisdiction to resolve disputes is appropriate concerning prosecutorial rules relating to corporates.[16] The qualities of the underlying legal relationship or organization and the legal environment in which they are employed influence connecting factors in various ways. To determine the appropriate company law, tax law, or insolvency law for a certain firm, several interconnecting aspects are utilized, such as those located in the laws of contracts, torts, corporations, or taxes.

III. CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTIONS

This research certainly looked at how national laws and norms of conflicts of laws interact to restrict corporate mobility. There were many instances when a company's cross-border shift of seating was impeded. The circumstances were taken into account in light of private international law. It was demonstrated that a corporation may not be able to change its registered office or administrative offices before really winding up. Additionally, the host State may reject the business's application for recognition or reject it as a foreign company, availing it of the security afforded by its limited liability position. Additionally, the business may need to reorganize in the legal regime or adhere to certain of the host state's company law regulations.

[15] Ibid, Article 5(2).
[16] bid, Article 6(1).

 [ISSN 2581-5369]

Independence of incorporation might be violated by restrictions on the cross-border movement of corporations, whether they are based on substantive legislation or conflicts between the laws of different Member Countries. From a legislative standpoint, suggestions were made to make cross-border mobility easier. These suggestions' major objective was to make it possible for seat swaps to maintain their individuality. The majority of these ideas are concerned with challenges of the recognition and legislative alteration, as well as the combined relocation of the corporate headquarters and the head office. Additionally, measures were taken to protect the rights of stockholders, creditors, workers, and other existing shareholders. A limitation on the firm's freedom to establish itself would occur if the host State permitted such mobility by its rules but the home State required the corporation to be wound up or liquidated beforehand. Unless substantiated, then the home State would be infringing the corporation's freedom of incorporation. The Court of Justice's rulings has been clearer from the host State's viewpoint. A citizen of a Member State may establish a company in the Member State with the least onerous company law regulations and carry out the whole of the firm's operations in another Member State via a division. This is a lawful use of the right to start a business, not a case of misconduct by and large.

In relation, a host state must grant a stance and acknowledge a company that was lawfully incorporated in yet another individual country but moved its administrative headquarters there without reintegrating there. Nonetheless, due in large part to the legal system, development has been haphazard, fragmentary, and unstructured. It seems reasonable to believe that a piece of legislation will provide this aspect of the law with greater consistency and lawful security. However, it is improbable that any effective harmonizing measures would be introduced by a decree issued and passed at this juncture given the ongoing differences in methodology among the Member States in several important areas. As was previously stated, agreements allowing host States to enforce their regulations on, among many other things, creditor preservation, employee engagement, or the requirement of the resemblance of registered office and head office significantly undermined all proposed amendments for a corporate mobility mandate. While the fundamental objective of these suggestions was an identity-preserving transition of the seat, many of the concerns related to such a transition were left to be handled by Member State laws. Therefore, it is doubtful that a legislative framework can enhance cross-border business migration unless standard regulations are developed in these domains.

Nothing prevents the same from being said of corporate mobility. However, regulatory innovation has eased limits on company migration and contributed to some de facto consolidation of corporate regulations across the Member States, supported by the Court of

 [ISSN 2581-5369]

Justice's rulings. Additionally, advancement in the Commission's broader reformation of corporate law objectives will unavoidably contribute to addressing the methodological gaps on those critical supplementary concerns mentioned previously. In this domain, there are no genuinely held beliefs, no privileges, and no presumptions.

*****

 [ISSN 2581-5369]

IV. BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Professor Emeritus of Law (the University of Hamburg, Faculty of Law); Dr iur (University of Hamburg); MCJ (New York University); Managing Director of the Institute for European Integration at the Europa-Kolleg Hamburg.
2. 2. There are a limited number of companies that are legally based on an international treaty, such as e.g. the Scandinavian Airlines System (SAS).
3. 3. The most relevant supranational form of company is the European Company (Societas Europea – SE), which is based on an EC regulation. The legal nature of regulations enacted by the European Community is supranational because they are directly applicable in all Member States (Art. 249 EC Treaty).
4. Not surprisingly, the report on US law in this volume deals extensively with jurisdiction to adjudicate company law as well as non-company law issues.
5. Corporations Act 2001 (Cth), Sec. 57A.
6. Robert R. Drury, 'The regulation and recognition of foreign corporations: The "Delaware syndrome"', 57(1) [1998] Cambridge Law Journal 165-194; Robert R. Drury, 'Migrating companies', 24(4) [1999] European Law Review 354-372.
7. Werner F. Ebke, 'The 'Real Seat' Doctrine in the Conflict of Corporate Laws', 36 [2002] International Lawyer 1015- 1037, 1016.
8. Rammeloo, op.cit.,16; Drury (1998), op.cit.; Drury (1999) op.cit.; Garcia-Riestra, op.cit.
9. Part 34 Companies Act 2006 (Secs 1044-1059). These provisions are supplemented by the Overseas Companies Regulations. Similar provisions were contained in Part XXIII of the Companies Act 1985. See analysis in Prentice op.cit., 635-641.
10. Wymeersch (2003) CMLR op.cit., 662V.
11. Rammeloo, op.cit.,12; Mucciarelli, op.cit., 282.

*****