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**ANSWER ALL THE QUESTIONS**

**QUESTION 1**

Questions 1.1 – 1.20 are multiple-choice questions designed to assess your ability to think critically about the subject. Please read each question carefully before reading the answer options. Be aware that some questions may seem to have more than one right answer, but you are to look for the one that makes the most sense and is the most correct. When you have a clear idea of the question, find your answer and mark your selection on the answer sheet by highlighting the relevant paragraph **in yellow**. Select only **ONE** answer. Candidates who select more than one answer will receive no mark for that specific question. Each of the 20 questions count 1 mark.

**Question 1.1**

Choose the **correct** statement:

Which of the following statements correctly describes the objective of business rescue?

1. The development, by a business rescue practitioner, and implementation, if approved, of a business rescue plan to rescue the company by restructuring the affairs of the company.
2. The development of a business rescue plan by the directors of the company which, once implemented, will return the company to profitability.
3. The development, by a business rescue practitioner, and implementation, if approved, of a business rescue plan that results in a better return for creditors than the immediate liquidation of the company.
4. Both (a) and (c) are correct.

**Question 1.2**

Choose the **correct** statement:

A company may be placed in voluntary business rescue by filing –

(a) A special resolution by the company’s shareholders.

(b) A resolution by the company’s board of directors.

(c) A resolution by a majority of the company’s independent creditors.

(d) An ordinary resolution by the company’s shareholders.

**Question 1.3**

Choose the **correct** statement:

The moratorium is a defence *in personam* because:

(a) It is a personal but temporary benefit that is only available to the company in business rescue, its business rescue practitioner and creditors.

(b) It is a personal but temporary benefit available to the company in business rescue and all affected persons as defined in the Companies Act of 2008.

(c) It is a personal but temporary benefit available to the company in business rescue with the result that a creditor of the company in business rescue has legal standing to rely on non-compliance with s 133 as a defence.

(d) It is a temporary personal defence and benefit available to the company in business rescue, with the result that the business rescue practitioner of the company in question may invoke the moratorium in the event of non-compliance with section 133 of the Companies Act of 2008.

(e) It is a personal defence and benefit available indefinitely to the company in business rescue, with the result that the business rescue practitioner of the company concerned may invoke the moratorium to permanently defeat the claims of creditors in order to improve the prospects of rescuing the company in financial distress.

**Question 1.4**

Choose the **correct** statement:

Section 134 of the Companies Act 2008 regulates situations where a company in business rescue may dispose of its property.

1. As the business rescue practitioner has full management control of the company during business rescue, he is entitled to make all decisions regarding the disposal of assets on his own.
2. A board of directors is not absolved of its duties, powers and obligations during business rescue and continues to represent the company. As such the board can dispose of property on behalf of the company in business rescue, as long as such disposal meets the requirements of section 134 of the Companies Act 2008.
3. The business rescue practitioner and the board of directors have to act jointly when disposing of assets in terms of section 134 of the Companies Act 2008.
4. Both statements (b) and (c) are correct.
5. None of the above statements are correct.

**Question 1.5**

Choose the **correct** statement:

A company is leasing property from which it is conducting its business. The company is placed in business rescue, which is an event of breach and the landlord threatens to terminate the lease. The company's business rescue practitioner, who is of the view that the property is of strategic importance, agrees with the landlord to terminate the lease and to conclude a new lease. The landlord has a claim for arrear rentals that were incurred while the Company was in business rescue.

The Landlord's claim under the new lease ought to be classified as:

1. Business rescue costs.
2. Post-commencement finance.
3. Preferent claim in business rescue.
4. Secured claim.
5. Unsecured claim.
6. Damages claim.

**Question 1.6**

Choose the **correct** statement:

During business rescue proceedings an employee of the company enjoys various contractual and statutory rights. Many large companies utilise the services of labour brokers in order to manage the varying employee needs of the company, which are often project specific. When considering the rights of employees during business rescue proceedings, do employees employed through a labour broker, or temporary employment service, enjoy the same rights and protections as employees employed directly by the company?

1. No, these employees are strictly those of the labour broker for the period of their employment and accordingly the labour broker has the relevant contractual and statutory obligations to such employees for the entire period of their employment.
2. No, these employees are strictly those of the labour broker and accordingly the labour broker has the relevant contractual, but not statutory obligations to employees, for the entire period of their employment.
3. Yes, the employees of the labour broker are also employees of the company that has engaged the services of the labour broker, from the date of employment to the termination thereof.
4. Yes, the employees of the labour broker are also employees of the company that has engaged the services of the labour broker, however the employees of the labour broker are only deemed to be an employee of the company, after a period of three months.

**Question 1.7**

Choose the **correct** statement:

Section 128 of the of the Companies Act 2008 defines an “affected person” as:

1. A shareholder or creditor of the company, registered trade union representing the employees of the company; and employees of the company that are not represented by trade unions.
2. Directors of the company, shareholder or creditor of the company and employees of the company.
3. Shareholders or creditors of the company, suppliers of the company; and employees of the company that are not represented by trade unions.
4. None of the above.

**Question 1.8**

Choose the **correct** statement:

You were certified by CIPC for the first-time last year to practice as a junior business rescue practitioner after you completed the INSOL SARIPA Programme in South African Business Rescue. Since then, you have accepted appointment as the business rescue practitioner of one company in business rescue and are busy implementing the business rescue plan that was adopted by creditors in that matter. You have been approached by your sister to accept appoint as the business rescue practitioner of a large company that she is a director of. You accept the appointment. Which of the grounds for removal of a business rescue practitioner would constitute a sound basis for your removal?

1. You did not and do not meet the requirements of section 138 of the Companies Act 2008 when appointed.
2. You are not independent.
3. You are incompetent.
4. You have failed to perform the duties of a practitioner.
5. You have engaged in illegal conduct.
6. You have a conflict of interest.
7. You are incapacitated.
8. (i)
9. (ii)
10. (i) and (ii)
11. (vi)
12. (i), (ii) and (vi)

**Question 1.9**

Choose the **correct** statement:

All creditors must be joined in all legal proceedings involving a company in business rescue where:

1. The creditors have a direct and substantial interest in the subject matter of the litigation.
2. A business rescue plan has been adopted by the creditors.
3. An application is brought to set aside a published business rescue plan that has not yet been adopted by creditors.
4. All of the above.

**Question 1.10**

Choose the **correct** statement:

A legitimate creditor becomes known for the first time after the adoption of the business rescue plan. They claim they have not received notice and, of course, they did not vote in a section 151 meeting. How do you propose dealing with this situation?

1. They fall outside the ambit of the adopted business rescue plan and are thus not bound by it. Their claim needs to be verified and they need to be paid based on a separate arrangement with the creditor exclusively. The claim of not having received notice places a risk on the validity of the business rescue proceedings.
2. They fall outside the ambit of the adopted business rescue plan, have foregone their opportunity to be recognised as a creditor and therefore have no claim nor any standing. The fact that they claim that they have not received notice is irrelevant.
3. The business rescue practitioner asks them to cast a vote late and re-calculates the outcome of the section 151 meeting. Then notifies the affected persons of the revised outcome.
4. The creditor is recognised and bound by the adopted plan regardless of whether they were present and voting at the section 151 meeting. Substantial notices were issued across the various methods as prescribed by the regulations.
5. The business rescue practitioner rejects the claim on the basis that it is late and excludes the creditor from the distribution list.

**Question 1.11**

Choose the **correct** statement:

A distressed company is placed into business rescue by its board of directors. The company has two shareholders, being Shareholder A and Shareholder B, who hold 60% and 40% of the issued shares respectively. Included in the shareholders’ agreement are minority shareholder rights, most notably, anti-dilution rights. The appointed business rescue practitioner intends to publish a business rescue plan that includes running a rights issue to raise new funding. Shareholder A is prepared to take up R100m in new shares as part of the proposed rights issue, which should resolve the company’s financial issues, but Shareholder B does not have the funding to be able to follow their rights in terms of the rights issue (it would not be able to subscribe for any new shares). In short, if the rights issue is run and Shareholder A subscribes for new shares, but Shareholder B does not, then Shareholder B will be diluted to a near 0% shareholding. Shareholder A will vote in favour of the intended plan, but Shareholder B will not. How should the business rescue practitioner go about getting the intended business rescue plan approved, given the minority shareholder rights in the shareholders’ agreement?

1. The business rescue practitioner only requires 50% of the shareholders to vote in favour of the plan to amend shareholder rights and given that Shareholder A already has 60% of the shares, it could pass the vote on its own.
2. In terms of section 136 (2), the business rescue practitioner has the right to “…entirely, partially or conditionally suspend, for the duration of the business rescue proceedings, any obligation of the company that arises under an agreement to which the company was a party at the commencement of the business rescue proceedings…”, and hence, the business rescue practitioner can suspend the minority shareholder rights in the shareholders’ agreement.
3. The business rescue practitioner can only proceed with the proposed rights issue if the company already has sufficient authorised but un-issued shares.
4. All of the above.
5. The business rescue practitioner does not have the right to proceed due to the minority shareholder rights contained in the shareholders’ agreement.

**Question 1.12**

Choose the **correct** statement:

Financial projections are, per section 150(2) of the Act, required to be incorporated into the published business rescue plan. The projections presented in the business rescue plan must include:

1. Material assumptions on which the projections have been based as contained within the published business rescue plan and as if it has been adopted.
2. The expected forecast trading and financial position of the company were the plan not to succeed and the business were to continue trading “as is”.
3. An alternative plan to that presented in the rescue plan.
4. All of the above.
5. None of the above.

**Question 1.13**

Choose the **correct** statement:

# How important is it for business rescue practitioners to keep Boards and Directors onside and included?

* 1. Critical to keep them at all costs.
  2. Really valuable to keep them.
  3. Important if possible to maintain, assist with knowledge, bandwidth and continuity.
  4. Best to divide into those who agree with business rescue practitioner *versus* not (and side-line / remove) those who don’t agree.
  5. Doesn’t matter at all as the business rescue practitioner has all the power.

**Question 1.14**

Choose the **correct** statement:

A business rescue plan will be approved on a preliminary basis if:

There are no creditors and the shareholders vote in favour of its adoption.

It is supported by more than 51% of all the creditors and approved by the shareholders of the company.

It is supported by more than 75% of all the creditors who voted, and at least 50% of the independent creditors’ voting interests.

The plan alters the rights of shareholders of any class, but the majority of the affected shareholders nevertheless support the adoption of the plan.

Only (c) and (d) are correct.

**Question 1.15**

Choose the **correct** statement:

Which of the following statements is true about the “fresh start” principle in South African Insolvency law?

* + 1. It applies only to individual consumer debtors and not to companies.

It applies only to companies and not to individual consumer debtors.

It applies to both individual consumer debtors and companies, under the Insolvency Act of 1936, and the Companies Act of 2008, respectively.

It does not apply to either individual consumer debtors or companies.

**Question 1.16**

Choose the **correct** statement:

Which of the following might be a reason to choose liquidation over business rescue where there is reason to suspect financial mismanagement by the pre-existing board?

* + 1. In business rescue, creditors will be notified of the company’s financial distress, whereas a liquidation application does not require notice to creditors.

(b) A liquidator has certain investigative powers that a business rescue practitioner does not have.

(c) Liquidations are quicker and more cost effective than business rescue.

(d) In a liquidation context, it is possible to prevent dispositions made by the company outside of the ordinary course of business.

1. The threshold / degree of financial distress is lower in the case of liquidation, and therefore the board would be able to be displaced more easily if it were placed into liquidation than if it were placed under business rescue.

**Question 1.17**

Choose the **correct** statement:

According to *Van Staden v Angel Ozone Products (in liquidation) CC* 2013 (4) SA 630 (GNP), when is it possible to convert liquidation proceedings to business rescue proceedings?

1. At any time.
2. At any time between the *concursus* of creditors and the interim liquidation order is granted.
3. At any time before the final order of liquidation has been granted.
4. At any time before the liquidator has prepared the final liquidation and distribution account.
5. Never – it is only possible to convert a business rescue into liquidation.

**Question 1.18**

Choose the **incorrect** statement:

Business rescue proceedings end -

1. when the business rescue plan has been rejected by creditors and nothing further is done.
2. when the business rescue practitioner files a notice of substantial implementation of the rescue plan.
3. when no business rescue plan is published within the prescribed period or extended period.
4. when the practitioner files a notice that a company in voluntary business rescue is no longer financially distressed.

**Question 1.19**

Which of the following rights **is not** afforded to creditors?:

1. the right to participate in court proceedings;
2. the right to be given notice of all court proceedings;
3. the right to be given notice of all creditors’ meetings;
4. the right to be represented on the creditors’ committee where creditors decide that such a committee is necessary.

**Question 1.20**

Choose the **correct** statement:

A company is placed in business rescue. Its employees have not been paid for several months before business rescue commenced. Those employees' claims ought to be classified as:

1. Business rescue cost.
2. Post-commencement finance.
3. Preferent claim in business rescue.
4. Secured claim.
5. Unsecured claim.
6. Damages claim.

**Where appropriate, refer to the case study below when answering the questions that follow.**

**CASE STUDY**

**MEROPA RETAIL GROUP LIMITED**

Meropa Retail Group Limited (**Meropa Retail**) is a public company duly incorporated and registered as such under the applicable company laws of the Republic of South Africa. Meropa Retail has been operating as a clothing, footwear and homeware retailing company in South Africa for more than 80 years and has – up until the year 2022 – enjoyed significant market share as one of the country’s largest and most profitable non-food retailers. Meropa Retail serves customers across South Africa through over 700 department stores located in leading shopping malls throughout the country. All Meropa Retail’s stores are situated on premises that are leased (on a long-term basis) by Meropa Retail in terms of various commercial lease agreements entered into with landlords. It is well known that Meropa Retail is the “anchor tenant” of a number of shopping malls and has what may be referred to as an “over-supply” of leased floorspace, given the advent of online shopping and consumers’ increasing preference to purchase products online.

Over the past years, Meropa Retail has firmly established itself as the “go-to” retail group, comprising several well-known divisions that house local and international brands, and which cater for the clothing, footwear and homeware needs of both upper and lower-income consumers. In addition, Meropa Retail has steadily become a leading “homegrown” employer, with a large staff complement of approximately 18,000 employees across its various divisions and stores countrywide. The majority of Meropa Retail’s employees are represented by United Retail Workers Union (**URWU**), a South African registered trade union that aims to advance the interests of employees engaged in the retail sector.

From about 1 March 2021 (being the start of the 2021 financial year), it became apparent that Meropa Retail had experienced a sharp decline in its operating revenue during the 2020 financial year, which was due to the following factors: (i) increased competition from up-and-coming South African clothing and homeware retailers, (ii) an increased supply of cheaper imported clothing sold on digital platforms accessible to South African consumers, (iii) the advent of online shopping, which Meropa Retail battled to keep up with, (iv) a weakening Rand that led to increases in Meropa Retail’s operating costs and overheads, and (iv) a stalling South African economy which resulted in South African consumers tightening their belts.

As a result of the lacklustre financial performance of Meropa Retail in the 2020 financial year, Meropa Retail embarked on a group-wide debt restructure and refinancing in order to (i) preserve its current business operations, (ii) retain its employees, and (iii) return to profitability. This group-wide restructure entailed (i) the refinance of approximately R7,000,000,000 of existing debt acquired from The Extraordinary Bank of South Africa (for which Meropa Retail ceded its book debts and bank accounts as security - over and above the existing security package), (ii) the acquisition of an additional R5,000,000,000 in debt financing from Real Dollar Bank, secured by, amongst others, a special notarial bond and a general notarial bond registered in favour of Real Dollar Bank, (iii) the issuance of preference shares and other equity instruments by Meropa Retail to Orlando Investments Proprietary Limited (**Orlando Investments**), pursuant to which an additional R2,500,000,000 was raised, and (iv) a capital injection of R500,000,000 by way of unsecured shareholder loans advanced by Meropa Retail’s three shareholders namely, (i) Meropa Holdings Limited, which holds 60% of the issued ordinary shares in the share capital of Meropa Retail, (ii) Orlando Investments, which holds 35% of the issued ordinary shares in the share capital of Meropa Retail, and (iii) Management HoldCo Proprietary Limited, which holds 5% of the issued ordinary shares in the share capital of Meropa Retail.

By virtue of the recapitalisation of Meropa Retail and the significant increase in liquidity resulting from the restructure, the board of directors of Meropa Retail, which comprises three executive directors, namely (i) Mr Tim Savannah (the Chief Executive Officer), (ii) Ms Kwena Seroka (the Chief Financial Officer), and (iii) Mrs Georgia Smith (the Chief Operations Officer), and two non-executive directors, namely (i) Mr Bryan Khumalo, and (ii) Ms Caroline Abrahams, resolved to aggressively expand Meropa Retail’s business operations by venturing into neighbouring markets, namely Botswana, Namibia, Lesotho and Eswatini. Pursuant to this expansion, Meropa Retail (i) increased its workforce by hiring an additional 800 employees to cater for the anticipated increase in demand, (ii) acquired a brand-new fleet of delivery vehicles under instalment sale agreements (with appropriate reservation of ownership clauses) concluded on market standard terms with Wonderworld Autos Proprietary Limited (**Wonderworld Autos**), and (iii) entered into new commercial lease agreements with Real Landlords Limited (**Real Landlords**) for additional warehouses and storage facilities to accommodate the additional inventory destined for Meropa Retail’s new Southern African locations.

For most of the 2021 financial year, the expansion of Meropa Retail’s business began paying dividends, and the 2021 audited financial statements of Meropa Retail reflected slight increases in revenue. However, from the beginning of the 2022 financial year, factors such as (i) the global recession predicated by international conflicts, (ii) the struggling South African economy, and (iii) loadshedding, resulted in a negative outlook for Meropa Retail, as Meropa Retail’s management accounts reflected (i) an increase in overheads, and (ii) liquidity shortages due to Meropa Retail not reaching its projected sales targets, and being unable to collect sufficient amounts from its debtor’s book. The lack of liquidity resulted in Meropa Retail experiencing significant difficulties in servicing its debt obligations, and paying its employees’ salaries, on a month-to-month basis.

In light of the fact that it was becoming more and more likely that Meropa Retail would become unable to pay its debts as and when they became due and payable, the writing was on the wall, and Ms Kwena Seroka and Ms Caroline Abrahams became increasingly concerned about their duties and obligations as directors given that it appeared that Meropa Retail was “financially distressed”. Kwena and Caroline immediately began to explore the options available to Meropa Retail. Interestingly enough, the other directors of Meropa Retail were of the view that Meropa Retail was not “financially distressed” as its total assets exceeded its total liabilities.

Due to the reluctance of the remaining members of the board to take action, no further steps were taken by Kwena and Caroline, who both subsequently resigned from the board of directors of Meropa Retail. Accordingly, Meropa Retail continued to trade in the ordinary course for a few months, albeit in “financially distressed” circumstances. However, soon enough the company experienced a liquidity crisis where it was unable to pay its critical suppliers, its landlords and its employees’ salaries.

As a result of Meropa Retail’s failure to pay its debts, certain creditors began taking steps to recover the amounts owing to them, and in this regard: (i) Johannesburg Central Security Services Proprietary Limited issued summons against Meropa Retail, in terms of which it claimed the amounts outstanding under the service agreement it had concluded with Meropa Retail, (ii) Urban Shopfitters CC, had begun preparing a liquidation application, on the basis that Meropa Retail ought to be deemed to be unable to pay its debts, and (iii) the South African Revenue Services delivered letters of demand to Meropa Retail, demanding payment of unpaid income tax in terms of its 2019, 2020 and 2021 tax assessments.

Given that salaries remained unpaid, URWU in conjunction with the employees’ of Meropa Retail, immediately obtained legal advice from insolvency and restructuring law experts on the options available to them. In the advice, the employees of Meropa Retail were informed of the benefits of business rescue proceedings under the Companies Act 2008 (**Companies Act 2008**) and the advantageous position it puts them in (as employees), as compared to a liquidation scenario. On this basis, the employees and URWU agreed to commence business proceedings (at their instance) and launched a High Court application in their capacities as “affected persons“ for the business rescue of Meropa Retail.

In the interim, Mr Tim Savannah, on hearing that a business rescue application had been launched by URWU, obtained legal advice of his own and which advice subsequently prompted the board of directors of Meropa Retail to pass a board resolution to place Meropa Retail under business rescue proceedings on the basis that, amongst other things, there was a “reasonable prospect of rescuing the company”. Mr Tim Savannah was inclined to place the company in business rescue after being advised of the statutory moratorium on claims, and due to the strategic advantage that it would give the board in relation to the appointment of a business rescue practitioner.

The board resolution to commence voluntary business rescue was filed with the Companies and Intellectual Property Commission and Mr Ethan Dunce (being a senior business rescue practitioner) was appointed as the business rescue practitioner of Meropa Retail by the board. Mr Dunce was the clear “frontrunner” for the role of business rescue practitioner, despite being disqualified from acting as a director of a company in terms of the Companies Act 2008, given that he was Mrs Georgia Smith’s brother. It eventually came to light that Mr Dunce’s appointment as business rescue practitioner was inappropriate and he was subsequently removed as the business rescue practitioner of Meropa Retail, pursuant to a complex court application brought by one of Meropa Retail’s creditors.

Notwithstanding the assertion by the employees of Meropa Retail that they had the right to appoint Mr Dunce’s replacement, the board of Meropa Retail appointed Mr Themba Nkosi (an experienced business rescue practitioner) as the replacement business rescue practitioner. Mr Nkosi immediately assumed full management control of Meropa Retail. After the first meeting of creditors, Mr Nkosi thoroughly investigated the affairs of Meropa Retail and consulted with various affected persons in the development of a business rescue plan.

In relation to the various contracts concluded by Meropa Retail with its various suppliers, landlords, and employees, Mr Nkosi took a very robust approach and, in respect of:

1. the instalment sale agreements with Wonderworld Autos, opted to cancel the relevant instalment sale agreements whilst retaining possession of the delivery vehicles that formed the subject of those agreements, and was of the view that such vehicles could not be recovered by Wonderworld Autos as a result of the protections afforded by the moratorium against legal proceedings;

(ii) the commercial lease agreements with Real Landlords, refused to vacate the relevant warehouses and storage facilities due to their significance to the ongoing operation of Meropa Retails’ business, notwithstanding the fact that Real Landlords had validly cancelled the lease agreements, as Meropa Retail had fallen into arrears of its rental payment obligations;

(iii) the various prejudicial and onerous contracts that he had identified, proceeded to entirely or partially suspend the obligations of Meropa Retail thereunder; and

(iv) the additional 800 employees that were hired by Meropa Retail post the restructure, unilaterally amended and varied their employment terms and conditions, by reducing their salaries and benefits. In addition, Mr Nkosi began considering the retrenchment of Meropa Retail’s remaining workforce.

Mr Nkosi also conducted thorough investigations into the affairs of Meropa Retail, during which investigations it was discovered that:

1. the office furniture, manufacturing equipment and inventory (worth approximately R20,000,000) that Themba wished to dispose of as part of the business rescue process (and not in the ordinary course of the company’s business), was subject to security held by Real Dollar Bank, for loans advanced by Real Dollar Bank to Meropa Retail in an aggregate amount equal to R50,000,000; and
2. notwithstanding the clear instructions given by Mr Nkosi to Mr Bryan Khumalo in relation to the day-to-day management of the company and the exercise of his functions as a director, Mr Khumalo was on a “mission of his own” and consistently took decisions on behalf of Meropa Retail without the approval of Mr Nkosi. In addition, Mr Khumalo refused to co-operate with Mr Nkosi and was reluctant to provide any information and records relating to the affairs of the company to Mr Nkosi and his team. Eventually, Mr Khumalo began to conduct himself in manner which could be described as “obstructive” to the business rescue process and the performance of Mr Nkosi’s powers and functions.

Following his investigations into the business and affairs of Meropa Retail, Mr Nkosi was of the firm view that Meropa Retail was capable of being rescued, and he immediately set out to find ways to secure additional financing to keep the company afloat. Given that Meropa Retail had existing facilities with The Extraordinary Bank of South Africa, Themba approached its lead transactor Mr Maxwell Baggs, in an attempt to acquire post-commencement finance. Mr Baggs was unsure about the status of Meropa Retail’s existing facilities, and wondered whether the new facilities sought by Mr Nkosi would be treated differently in the business rescue context. In response to Mr Baggs' concerns, Mr Nkosi immediately responded by sharing a brief note with the Extraordinary Bank team setting out (i) the purpose and importance of post‑commencement finance, (ii) the different types of post-commencement finance, and (iii) the order in which the claims of creditors rank during business rescue. The note shared by Mr Nkosi gave the credit committee of The Extraordinary Bank the necessary comfort and consequently post-commencement finance facilities, in an aggregate amount equal to R4,000,000,000, were made available to Meropa Retail. Mr Nkosi was delighted by this incredible feat and unilaterally decided to pay himself a “success fee” of R2,000,000, on the basis that had he not secured the relevant post-commencement finance, Meropa Retail would have been placed into liquidation. The success fee was deposited via EFT directly into Themba’s bank account, and no mention of it was made in the business rescue plan of Meropa Retail.

The business rescue plan of Meropa Retail was eventually published 180 days after Themba was appointed as the business rescue practitioner. The business rescue plan was then put to a vote at a meeting of creditors held in terms of section 151 of the Companies Act 2008. The business rescue plan of Meropa Retail was supported by the holders of 80% of the creditors voting interests and, given that the business rescue plan altered the rights of Meropa Retail’s existing shareholders, an additional step was required in terms of the provisions of the Companies Act 2008. Following this additional step, the business rescue plan was finally adopted and Themba began implementing the plan.

Meropa Retail exited from business rescue six (6) months later, when Mr Nkosi filed a notice of substantial implementation of the business rescue plan.

**Question 2**

Was the board resolution to commence business rescue proceedings valid, even though Urban Shopfitters CC had already begun preparing a liquidation application? Substantiate your answer with reference to the provisions of the Companies Act 2008 and all relevant case law. **(10)**

* In terms of section 129(2)(a) of the Companies Act, a resolution to commence voluntary business rescue may not be adopted if liquidation proceedings have been initiated by or against the company.
* The meaning of “initiated” has been considered by the courts. In FirstRand Bank v Imperial Crown Trading 143 (Pty) Ltd, the court held that “initiated” has the same meaning as “commence” to ensure certainty. In Mouton v Park 2000 Development 11 (Pty) Ltd, the court stated that the ordinary grammatical meaning of “initiate” applies and requires a prior act to start the liquidation proceedings, for example, a resolution.
* The courts in Tjeka Training Matters (Pty) LTd v KPPM Construction (Pty) Ltd and Others, Pan African Shopfitters (Pty) Ltd v Edcon Limited and Others and Lutchman NO v African Global Holdings required more than the initial steps to a liquidation application. The courts stated that the company in question must be aware of the liquidation application, for example by the having been served on the company.
* In the matter of Meropa Retail, Urban Shopfitters CC was preparing the application. It does not seem that they had filed the application or served it on Meropa Retail.
* Accordingly, and based on case law’s interpretation of section 129(2)(a), liquidation proceedings had not been initiated against the company and the board resolution to commence business rescue proceedings was valid.

**Question 3**

With reference to the relevant legislative provisions and case law, advise Mr Nkosi on the effect, if any, of the commencement of business rescue proceedings in respect of Meropa Retail on the following steps taken by its creditors to recover monies owing to them:

3.1 The summons instituted by Johannesburg Central Security Service (Pty) Ltd against Meropa Retail for payment of amounts owing under the service agreement it had concluded with Meropa Retail. **(6)**

* Section 133 of the Companies Act provides for a general moratorium on legal proceedings, including enforcement action, against the company in business rescue, property belonging to the company or lawfully in its possession, subject to certain exceptions.
* Section 133 provides exceptions to the general moratorium, including with the written consent of the business rescue practitioner (section 133(1)(a)) and with the leave of the court (section 133(1)(b)). Neither of the exceptions applied when Johannesburg Central Security Service (Pty) Ltd issued summons.
* In Murray NO and Another v FirstRand Bank Ltd, the court emphasised the importance of the general moratorium to the success of a business rescue. Allowing summons or any other legal proceedings or enforcement to proceed against a company in business rescue would not give the company the breathing room required to restructure its affairs and jeopardise the company’s chances of returning to operation on a solvent basis, or securing a better return for creditors than a liquidation would.
* The claim under the summons would be stayed for the duration of the business rescue proceedings.

3.2 The letters of demand by the South African Revenue Service to Meropa Retail, demanding payment of unpaid tax in terms of the 2019, 2020 and 2021 tax assessments. **(1)**

* The issue of letters of demand is a juristic act and is not restricted or prohibited by the general moratorium under section 131 of the Companies Act.
* SARS can issue the letters of demand; however SARS would not be able to take any further legal or enforcement action against Meropa Retail if it fails to comply with the letters of demand, and the business rescue practitioner is not obliged to comply with the letters of demand.

**Question 4**

If the directors of Meropa Retail had bound themselves as sureties for Meropa Retail’s debts to Johannesburg Central Security Services arising from the services agreement concluded between Meropa and Johannesburg Central Security Services, would the moratorium created when Meropa was placed in business rescue be available to them as sureties? Substantiate your answer with the relevant authority. **(5)**

* The moratorium would not apply to the directors of Meropa Retail as sureties for Meropa Retail’s debt.
* In the cases of Investec v Bruyns, New Port Finance Company (Pty) Ltd and Another v Nedbank Limited, and Mostert and Another v Nedbank Limited, the court found that the moratorium in terms of section 133(1) of the Companies Act is a defence in personam and does not extend to sureties and guarantors, and that the Companies Act would have provided for that if that was the intention.

**Question 5**

5.1 Do the instalment sale agreements with Wonderworld Autos constitute a “property interest” or a “security interest” in terms of section 134 of the Companies Act 2008? **(1)**

* The instalment sale agreements constitutes a property interest held by Wonderworld Autos as it retains ownership of the vehicles until Meropa Retail settles the amounts due to Wonderworld Autos under the agreement.

5.2 Explain the difference between a “property interest” and a “security interest” and provide an example of each. **(4)**

* A property interest is also known as a title interest and relates to ownership of an asset. An example is the owner of machinery. Wonderworld is the owner of the vehicles under the instalment sale agreement and has a property interest in the vehicles until Meropa Retail settles the amounts owing under the instalment sale agreements, whereafter Meropa Retail would own the vehicles and have the property interest in the vehicles.
* A security interest is a right that does not include ownership of an asset and is held by a creditor of the owner of the asset or a company/individual on behalf of whom security it provided. It is a right to recover an unpaid debt against the asset. An example of this is a special notarial bond registered over an asset. Real Dollar Bank has a security interest in the assets over which it has registered a special notarial bond for its funding to Meropa Retail.

**Question 6**

6.1 During business rescue proceedings of Meropa Retail Group, the appointed business rescue practitioner elected to cancel the instalment sale agreements with Wonderworld Autos and to retain possession of the assets that are subject to the instalment sale agreements. Was the business rescue practitioner entitled to unilaterally cancel the instalment sale agreements and would the business be entitled to retain such assets in the circumstances? **(5)**

* The business rescue practitioner was not entitled to unilaterally cancel the instalment sale agreements. Cancellation of contracts must be by urgent application to court, whereas only suspension of obligations can be done by the business rescue practitioner.
* In terms of section 136(2)(b) of the Companies Act, a business rescue practitioner may apply urgently to court to entirely, partially or conditionally cancel any obligation of a company under a contract on the grounds that it is just and reasonable to do so. The court will exercise a discretion in deciding whether to grant the application based on whether it is just and reasonable in the circumstances.
* As the instalment sale agreements were not properly cancelled, the instalment sale agreements are still in place and the business can retain the assets.
* However, it the instalment sale agreements had been properly cancelled, the business would not be entitled to retain the assets as it would no longer be lawfully in possession of the assets by virtue of cancellation of the agreement. This was the court’s finding in LA Sport 4X4 Outdoor CC and Another and Broadswood Trading 20 (Pty) Ltd and Others.
* While this is the legal position, practically, this may affect the success of the business rescue as the company may require the assets to continue to trade but they are not lawfully entitled to retain them. The business rescue practitioner should in these circumstances, attempt to negotiate terms with the supplier which are favourable to both company Wonderworld Autos to allow the company to continue to trade and complete the rescue.

6.2 The business rescue practitioner of Meropa Retail Group made the unilateral election to vary the terms and conditions of the employment of nearly 800 employees of the company by seeking to reduce the salaries and benefits of such employees. Is the business rescue practitioner entitled to do so by virtue of his appointment as business rescue practitioner? Provide reasons for your answer. **(6)**

* The business rescue practitioner is not entitled to unilaterally vary the terms and conditions of employment of employees.
* In terms of section 136(1) of the Companies Act, during business rescue proceedings, employees of the company in business rescue who were employees immediately before the commencement of business rescue proceedings continue to be employed by the company on the same terms and conditions, except where changes occur in the ordinary course of attrition, or the employees and company agree different terms and conditions in accordance with the applicable labour laws, or by retrenchment in terms of the company’s business rescue plan, the Labour Relations Act and applicable employment legislation.
* Mr Themba Nkosi did not act in terms of any of the exceptions provided for in section 136(1) of the Companies Act and was therefore not entitled to vary the terms and conditions of the 800 employees’ salaries and benefits.

**Question 7**

7.1 Discuss the rights held, if any, by Meropa Holdings Limited, Orlando Investments and Management Holdco Proprietary Limited during the business rescue process of Meropa Retail. **(5)**

* In terms of section 146, the shareholders of Meropa Retail have a right to (i) receive notice of court proceedings, decisions, meetings and events related to business rescue; (ii) participate in court proceedings; (iii) participate in the business rescue proceedings; (iv) vote on a business rescue plan at a section 151 meeting if the plan would alter the rights attached to their class of shares; and (v) if the plan is rejected, propose the development of an alternative plan or offer to acquire the voting interests of any or all creditors or shareholders.
* Shareholders can also apply to court to place the in business rescue in terms of section 131(1) as they are affected persons in terms of section 129(1)(a)(i).
* Orlando Investments is also a creditor of the company by virtue of the preference share and equity funding. They would also have the rights of a creditor as set out in section 145. The shareholder loans would not qualify the shareholders as creditors of the company and so they would not have the same creditor rights by virtue of those loans.

7.2 Could Mr Nkosi have had Mr Khumalo removed as a director of Meropa Retail? **(3)**

* Yes, Mr Nkosi could have had Mr Khumalo removed as a director in terms of section 137(5) of the Companies Act, which provides that a practitioner can apply to court for the removal of a director on the grounds that the director has failed to comply with the requirements of Chapter 6 of the Companies Act or, by act or omission, has impeded or is impeding the practitioner in the performance of its powers and functions, the management of the company by the practitioner or the development and implementation of the business rescue plan.
* Directors of a company in business rescue re required to fulfil certain duties in respect of a company in business rescue as set out in section 137(2) of the Companies Act. This includes a duty to the company to exercise any management function within the company in accordance with the express instructions or direction of the practitioner to the extent reasonable to do so, as provided in section 137(2)(b). Section 137(3) provides that a director must attend to the requests of the practitioner at all times and provide the practitioner with any information about the company’s affairs as may be reasonably required. Section 142 also requires directors to co-operate with and assist the practitioner by providing the practitioner with company’s books and records which the director has in its possession and informing the practitioner where to locate any other books and records of the company, and provide a statement of affairs of the company to the practitioner.
* Mr Khumalo’s actions were in contravention of sections 137(2) and (3), and section 142 by actively impeding the practitioner by acting on his own without the practitioner’s approval, being reluctant to provide information, refusing to co-operate and being obstructive. This was also in contravention of directors’ duties during business rescue.
* On this basis, Mr Nkosi could have applied to court to have Mr Khumalo removed as a director of Meropa Retail.

**Question 8**

8.1 Which sections of the Companies Act 2008 will the applicant creditor have relied upon in their court application to remove Mr Dunce as business rescue practitioner of Meropa Retail? Explain why each section applies. **(4)**

* The creditor would rely on section 139(1) in terms of the process to remove Mr Dunce and rely on section 139(2)(e) for the reason for Mr Dunce’s removal.
* Section 139(2)(e) provides that a court may remove a business rescue practitioner if there is a conflict of interest or lack of independence.
* Mr Dunce being Mrs Georgia Smith’s brother means there is a conflict of interest and he is not independent from the company. As per section 139(2)(e), Mr Dunce and Mrs Smith’s relation may lead a reasonable and informed third party to conclude that the integrity, impartiality or objectivity of that person is compromised by that relationship.
* Mrs Smith is the CFO of Meropa Retail, which is a significant role in the company and Mr Dunce’s integrity, impartiality and objectivity could be called into question in his investigation into the affairs of the company and his preparation of the business rescue plan.

8.2 Were the employees of Meropa Retail correct in their belief that they had a right to appoint a replacement business rescue practitioner following the removal of Mr Dunce by the court? Include reference to relevant case law in your answer. **(3)**

* The employees were not correct.
* In terms of section 139(3) of the Companies Act, the company or the creditor who nominated the practitioner must appoint a new practitioner if a practitioner dies, resigns or is removed from office. Further, an affected person may challenge that appointment in terms of section 130(1)(b) of the Companies Act.
* This was confirmed by both the Constitutional Court in Shiva Uranium (Pty) Ltd (in business rescue) and Another v Tayob and Others, where the court held that this principle allowed for an efficient and non-contentious process to replace a business rescue practitioner, while honouring the aim of business rescue and ensuring it is not delayed by the process. The Supreme Court of Appeal in Tayob and Another v Shiva Uranium (Pty) Ltd and Others, in the prior case, held the same.
* Mr Dunce was appointed by the board of directors; accordingly, only the board can appoint the replacement business rescue practitioner.

8.3 Meropa Retail approaches you for an opinion as to whether it is able to recover the success fee of R2,000,000 paid by the company to Mr Themba Nkosi during the business rescue process. Please provide reasoned argument to support your views. **(3)**

* Meropa Retail would be entitled to recover the success fee as it was not authorised.
* In terms of section 143(2) of the Companies Act, a practitioner can propose additional remuneration for itself, in addition to its tariffed fee under section 143(1), which is a contingency fee based on the practitioner achieving a certain milestone including adoption of the plan (within a time period or dealing with a specific matter) or the achievement of a certain result.
* In terms of section 143(3) of the Companies Act, such an agreement will be final and binding on the company only if the agreement is approved by (i) a simple majority of creditors, and (ii) a simple majority of the holders of voting interests attached to shares of the company which entitle the shareholder to residual value on winding- up of the company, in both instance who were present and voting at the meeting called for consideration of the agreement.
* Mr Themba Nkosi did not propose an agreement for the success fee and it was not approved by the creditors and shareholders as required by section 143, therefore Meropa Retail can recover the success fee.

**Question 9**

9.1 When preparing a Business Rescue Plan, the business rescue practitioner must understand the various creditor claims and, therefore, the associated voting rights attributable to each claim.

Assist the business rescue practitioner in understanding the voting universe by **populating the table below** as follows:

1. Classify each party as either: Secured Creditor, Unsecured Creditor, PCF Creditor, Preferent Creditor, or none of the above;
2. Indicate whether each party is independent or non-independent as per section 128(1)(g);
3. Indicate whether each party, considering your answers under (a) and (b), has a voting right or not.

**(8)**

(1 mark per row only if **all three answers** in that row are correct)

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Party** | **Classification** | **Independent / Non-Independent** | **Voting Right (Yes / No)** |
| Orlando Investments (Preference Shares, which are assumed to be equity in nature) | Unsecured Creditor | Non-Independent | No |
| The Extraordinary Bank of South Africa (Pre – Commencement) | Secured Creditor | Independent | Yes |
| The Extraordinary Bank of South Africa (Post – Commencement) | PCF Creditor | Independent | Yes |
| Wonderworld Autos Proprietary Limited | Unsecured Creditor | Independent | Yes |
| Unpaid Employees’ Salaries  (Pre - Commencement) | Preferred Creditor | Independent | Yes |
| Johannesburg Central Security Services Proprietary Limited | Unsecured Creditor | Independent | Yes |
| South African Revenue Service (SARS) | Unsecured Creditor | Independent | Yes |
| Shareholder Loan  (Orlando Investments) | None of the above | Non-Independent | Yes |

9.2 If you have indicated above that a party **does not** have a voting right, explain why. (2)

* Orlando Investments holds preference shares and ordinary shares in Meropa Retail.
* In terms of section 146(d) of the Companies Act, a shareholder is entitled to vote on a business rescue plan if the plan would alter the rights attached to the class of shares held by that shareholder.
* The business rescue plan purports to alter the rights attached to the shares held by the existing shareholders (i.e. ordinary shares), and not the preference shares. Therefore, only ordinary shareholders’ rights would be altered by an approved business rescue plan and they would have a right to vote. Orlando Investments, in its capacity as a preference shareholder, would not be entitled to vote and the plan does not purport to alter the rights of preference shareholders.

**Question 10**

10.1 In preparing the financial forecasts for inclusion in the section 150 business rescue plan of Meropa Retail (Pty) Limited, Mr Nkosi includes the following:

* An annualised balance sheet for the financial year ending 31 March 2024; and
* Annualised income statements for the financial years ending 31 March 2024, 2025 and 2026.

What advice would you give Mr Nkosi to ensure that his business rescue plan, in terms of section 150(2)(c)(iv), is brought up to best-practice standards (and explain why)? **(4)**

* I would advise Mr Nkosi to prepare a projected balance sheet and statement of income and expenses for the ensuing three years, and do so with the assumption that the plan will be adopted, as required by section 150(2)(c)(iv). The latter requirement can be met by preparing an income statement and a cash flow statement for the ensuing three years. Although not required by section 150(2)(c)(iv), a cash flow statement can give the persons voting on the plan an idea of the expected movement of cash during implementation of the plan and after, the potential success of the plan and expected return to affected persons.
* The Companies Act doesn’t prescribe the three year period in relation to the projected balance sheet, but to the extent possible, the practitioner should also do a three year projected balance sheet to give the persons voting on the plan, a clear understanding on the expected future performance of the company based on the proposed plan.
* In terms of section 150(3) of the Companies Act, Mr Nkosi must also provide, with the projected balance sheet and statement of income and expenses, a notice of material assumptions which he based his projections on and alternate projections based on different assumptions and contingencies. This will enable the persons voting on the plan to consider the outcome of alternate options proposed in the plan.
* Lastly, Mr Nkosi should, as per section 150(4), include a certificate stating that the factual information in the plan appears to be accurate, complete and up to date, and that the projections are estimates in good faith based on factual information and assumptions. This is to give assurance to the persons voting on the plan, that the business rescue practitioner’s projections and assumptions were properly prepared with consideration of the information and facts the practitioner had and believed to be true and correct.

10.2 Section 150(3) of the Companies Act 2008 requires that a notice of material assumptions must accompany the financial projections in terms of section 150(2)(c)(iv). From the information available, please provide three main assumptions that you believe Mr Nkosi would need to specify in the notice of material assumptions and explain the importance of each. **(6)**

* The global recession, South African economy and loadshedding will not get worse – This is important as Mr Nkosi will have prepared his projections based on current information, perhaps with a slight allowance for further downturns. However, if there is a significant downturn beyond what Mr Nkosi assumed, his projections would be thrown off in a negative way. A positive turn in the three factors would improve his projections so that have a positive impact on his projections and not be a cause for concern. These outcome of these three factors will also have an impact on the projected revenue and expenses of Meropa Retail, which would be set out in the projected financials included in the business rescue plan.
* Related to the assumption above is that Meropa Retail can continue to operate in the way it did before, without significant challenges from online sales and cheaper imports, and that its operations in Botswana, Namibia, Lesotho and Eswatini will perform well.
* Reduced employee costs – Mr Nkosi had attempted to alter the terms and conditions of 800 employees. This was not done properly in terms of the Companies Act, the Labour Relations Act and applicable employment legislation. Mr Nkosi was concerned about employee costs. Assuming he can successfully address these concerns, with appropriate engagement with URWU and applicable legislation, he can provide for reduced costs in that regard.

**Question 11**

11.1 Given that only 80% of the creditors’ voting interest was in favour of the business rescue plan, briefly explain the position of the creditors who **did not** vote in favour of the business rescue plan, with reference to the relevant provision(s) of the Companies Act 2008. **(2)**

* In terms of section 152(4) of the Companies Act, a business rescue plan, once adopted, is binding on the company, its creditors, and shareholders whether or not they were present at the meeting at which the plan was voted on, whether or not they voted in favour of the plan and whether or not the creditor has proved their claims against the company.
* This is known as the “cram-down” principle, which requires that provided that a business rescue plan is passed with the requisite votes in section 152(2) and (3)(b) and (c) (as applicable), all other creditors are bound by the business rescue plan.
* In African Banking Corporation of Botswana Ltd v Kariba Furniture Manufacturers (Pty) and Others, the court found that the “cram-down” principle was necessary to ensure that the plan can be implemented, and to prevent and discourage a back and forth or selfish negotiating with and by affected person with no resolution which would hinder progress of the business rescue.

11.2 What is the difference between the effect of enforcement of a business rescue plan on creditors who voted in favour of adoption of the plan versus dissenting creditors? **(2)**

* There is no difference in enforcement.
* As per section 152(4) of the Companies Act, an approved business rescue plan is binding on all creditors, whether or not they voted on it or in approval of it and enforcement on all creditors will be in terms of the approved plan.
* All creditors’ claims after adoption of the plan will be dealt with as set out in clause 154(2) of the Companies Act. This provides that a creditor cannot seek to enforce a pre-business rescue debt against the company after adoption of the plan, where that debt is not provided for in the plan.
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