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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)**

It is submitted that the board resolution to commence business rescue proceedings may be valid despite Urban Shopfitters CC’s preparation of a liquidation application. The reasons for same are set out below.

In terms of section 129(2)(a) of the Companies Act 2008, a voluntary resolution by the board of directors to commence business rescue proceedings cannot be adopted if liquidation proceedings have already been initiated by or against the company. The question then arises as to when a liquidation application is deemed to have been “initiated” as this is not defined in the Companies Act 2008. There have been several differing interpretations provided by the courts.

In *FirstRand Bank Ltd v Imperial Crown Trading 143 (Pty) Ltd*[[1]](#footnote-2) the court held that “initiated” is a synonym for “commence”. This would provide certainty as the commencement point of liquidations is defined in the Companies Act 1973.

In *Tjeka Training Matters (Pty) Ltd v KPPM Construction (Pty) Ltd and Others*[[2]](#footnote-3), the court held that a liquidation application (which has been issued and filed) is deemed to have been “initiated” once it has been served on the company that such application is against. This view was confirmed by the court in *Pan African Shopfitters (Pty) Limited v Edcon and Others*[[3]](#footnote-4).

In *Mouton v Park 2000 Development 11 (Pty) Ltd and Others*[[4]](#footnote-5), the court ascribed the ordinary grammatical meaning to the word “initiate” and held that liquidation proceedings are “initiated” by a preceding act which sets such proceedings in motion, with such an act likely being an adopted resolution by the creditor to launch liquidation proceedings against the company.

Although not dealt with specifically in the Supreme Court of Appeal, it seems likely that the SCA will agree with the findings in *Tjek Training Matters* and *Pan African Shopfitters* as, in the case *of Lutchman NO v African Global Holdings (Pty) Ltd*[[5]](#footnote-6), the SCA held that, on a reversed scenario (albeit under a different section), service of a business rescue application on the affected company is required to suspend liquidation proceedings.

I submit that the views held in *Tjek Training Matters* and *Pan African Shopfitters* are correct. In light of which, Urban Shopfitters CC’s mere preparation of a liquidation application (without effecting service thereof) does not invalidate the board resolution to commence business rescue proceedings.

**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)**

Upon commencement of business rescue proceedings and for the duration thereof, a general moratorium is put in place in terms of section 133(1) of the Companies Act 2008. One of the effects of the moratorium is a temporary stay on all current/pending legal proceedings. As such, the action instituted by Johannesburg Central Security Service (Pty) Ltd would be stayed for the duration of the business rescue proceedings.

However, the moratorium is not absolute and a few exceptions exist. *In casu*, Johannesburg Central Security Service (Pty) Ltd could either request written consent from the business rescue practitioner to proceed with the legal proceedings (in terms of section 133(1)(a) of the Companies Act 2008) or, failing which, apply to court for leave to continue with proceedings (in terms of section 133(1)(b) of the Companies Act 2008).

In *Merchant West Working Capital Solutions (Pty) Ltd v Advanced Technologies and Engineering Company (Pty) Ltd and Another*[[6]](#footnote-7), the court held that an application in terms of section 133(1)(b) of the Companies Act 2008 must be well-motivated and be able to place the court in a position to make an appropriate ruling in the circumstances. In *Arendse and Others v Van der Merwe and Another NNO*[[7]](#footnote-8), the court held that such an application must establish a *prima facie* case against the company in business rescue.

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 moratorium created under section 133(1) of the Companies Act 2008, which comes into effect upon commencement of business rescue proceedings, does not extend to letters of demand. As such, the commencement of business rescue proceedings has no effect on the letters of demand delivered by the South African Revenue Service.

**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)**

Section 133(2) of the Companies Act 2008 provides protection, under the moratorium, to the company in business rescue itself in circumstances where it is a surety or guarantor. However, this section does not refer to suretyships or guarantees entered into by a third party for the benefit of the company in business rescue.

In *Investec v Bruyns*[[8]](#footnote-9), the court held that the protection of the moratorium, as a defence *in personam*, covers the company as the principal debtor and not third party sureties. This decision was echoed by the court in the case of *New Port Finance Company (Pty) Ltd and Another v Nedbank Limited;Mostert and Another v nedbank Limited*[[9]](#footnote-10).

Therefore, according to the relevant legislation and case law set out above, the moratorium created under business rescue would not be available to the directors of Meropa Retail.

**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 with Wonderworld Autos constitute a property interest (title interest) in terms of section 134 of the Companies Act 2008.

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

Both property interests and security interests are not defined in the Companies Act 2008. However, the key diference between the two interests is whether or not the company is the owner of the property in question over which a third-party holds certain rights.

A security interest may exist in circumstances where the company in business rescue owns the movable property in question and said property is held by a third-party creditor in terms of a lien or special notarial bond. The third-party creditor would therefore have a security interest over the movable property.

A property interest, also known as a title interest, arises where a company possesses property which has been sold to the company on credit with a reservation of ownership in place or acording to an instalment sale agreement. The seller of said property would therefore have a property interest over said property.

**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)**

In terms of section 136(2)(b) of the Companies Act 2008, a business rescue practitioner may apply to court for an order cancelling a contract either entirely, partially or conditionally. The court will consider whether the cancellation sought is just and reasonable.

Upon valid cancellation of an agreement, any property in relation thereto if still in the possession of the company in business rescue, will be deemed to be unlawful possession thereof. This view was confirmed by the court in *LA Sport 4X4 Outdoor CC and Another v Broadsword Trading 20 (Pty) Ltd and Others*[[10]](#footnote-11).

Furthermore, the moratorium created under section 133 of the Companies Act 2008 does not apply to property in the unlawful possession of the company in business rescue and thus said moratorium does not impede the owner of such property from recovery thereof. This view was held by the court in *Madodza (Pty) Limited v Absa Bank limited and Others*[[11]](#footnote-12).

Therefore the business rescue practitioner of Meropa Retail Group was entitled to unilaterally cancel the installment sale agreements, however the business is not entitled to retain the assets in relation to said agreements as they are no longer in lawful possession thereof due to the aforementioned cancellation.

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 of Meropa Retail Group is not entitled to unilaterally vary the terms and conditions of the employees’ employment contracts.

In terms of section 136(1)(a) of the Companies Act 2008, during business rescue the employees continue to be so employed on the same terms and conditions of employment immediately prior to business rescue and such terms and conditions may only be altered due to changes that occur in the ordinary course of attrition or via agreement between the employees and the company (subject to applicable labour laws).

In *Solidarity obo BD Fourie and Others v Vandium Products Proprietary Ltd and Others*[[12]](#footnote-13), the court held that the purpose of section 136 of the Companies Act 2008 is to impede the business rescue practitioner from making unilateral variations of the company’s obligations to employees.

*In casu*, the business rescue practitioner has not entered into an agreement with the employees to reduce their salaries and benefits, but rather has unilateraly varied the company’s obligations to the employees in contravention of section 136 of the Companies Act 2008.

However, it must be noted that, as held in *National Union of Metal Workers of South Africa and Others v Aveng Trident Steel (a division of Aveng Africa (Pty) Ltd) and Another[[13]](#footnote-14)*, employees may in certain circumstances vary an employee’s terms and conditions of employment if there is a genuine operational requirement necessitating such an action.

**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)**

Meropa Holdings Limited, Orlando Investments and Management Holdco Proprietary Limited hold several rights during the business rescue in their capacity as shareholders of the company in business rescue and therefore falling under the defintion of affected persons for the purposes of business rescue proceedings. Their rights as shareholders are set out below.

In terms of section 129(3)(a) of the Companies Act 2008, shareholders, as affected persons, are entitled to receive notice of court proceedings and business rescue meetings. Shareholders are also entitled to participate in such proceedings and meetings.

In terms of section 130 of the Companies Act 2008, shareholders, as affected persons, are entitled to object to business rescue proceedings.

In terms of section 131(1) of the Companies Act 2008, shareholders, as affected persons, are entitled to apply to court for an order commencing business rescue proceedings.

Shareholders are also entitled to vote on the approval or rejection of the proposed business rescue plan if such plan will have the effect of altering their rights as holders of any class of the company’s securities.

Furthermore, in circumstances where a shareholder is also a creditor of a company in business rescue, they may have the right to vote on a proposed business rescue plan. *In casu*, this right would be extended to Orlando investments as an unsecured creditor due to its shareholder loan made to the company pre-commencement of business rescue proceedings. It must be noted however that Orlando Investments could be regarded as a non-independent creditor which affects the rights attached to its voting interests.

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

A business rescue practitioner may remove a director, by applying for a court order, if said director has failed to comply with requirements set out in Chapter 6 of the Companies Act 2008.

In addition, in terms of section 137(5) of the Companies Act 2008, a business rescue practitioner may remove a director, by applying for a court order, if said director has imepeded the practitioner’s performance of his powers/functions, management of the company or development/implementation of a business rescue plan.

In terms of section 142 of the Companies Act 2008, a director has several duties to co-operate with the business rescue practitioner including providing information on the company’s affairs and delivering all of the company books and records to the business rescue practitioner as soon as possible. Furthermore, a director’s actions/decisions are void when made without the practitioner’s approval in circumstances where such approval is needed. Any acts or ommissions in contradiction to the aforementioned duties would amount to a contravention of section 137(5) of the Companies Act 2008.

*In casu*, Mr Khumalo has derelicted several of the abovementioned duties, such as refusing to co-operate with the business rescue practitioner, making decisions without the requisite approval, and not providing records relating to the affairs of the company to the practitioner. Therefore, Mr Nkosi could have removed Mr Khumalo 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 applicant creditor would have relied on sections 130 and 139 of the Companies Act 2008 to remove Mr Dunce as business rescue practitioner of Meropa Retail.

Sections 130(1)(b)(i) and 139(2)(d) of the Companies Act 2008 provide grounds for removal where a business rescue practitioner does not currently or at the time of appointment did not meet the requirements set out in section 138 of the Companies Act 2008. Mr Dunce’s appointment did not meet such requirements as he was disqualified from acting as a director of the company and he is related to a person with a relationship to the company (which would lead a third party to the reasonable conclusion that his integrity and objectivity has been compromised).

Sections 130(1)(b)(ii) and 139(2)(e) of the Companies Act 2008 provide grounds for removal where a business rescue practitioner is not independent of the company or its management. Mr Dunce is a close relation of one of the company’s directors, and as such cannot be deemed independent of the company or its management.

Section 139(2)(e) of the Companies Act 2008 provides grounds for removal where a business rescue practitioner has a conflict of interest. Mr Dunce’s sibling relationship with one of the directors of the company creates a clear conflict of interest.

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 of Meropa Retail were not correct. They did not have a right to appoint a replacement business rescue practitioner.

In circumstances where the company appointed the business rescue practitioner via board resolution in terms Section 129(1) of the Companies Act 2008, it follows that upon resignation or removal of said practitioner, it is the company itself that has the right to appoint a replacement business rescue practitioner.

Alternatively, when compulsory commencement of business rescue proceedings has occurred, the affected person who applied for such commencement and who thus also nominated the initial business rescue practitioner in terms of section 131(5) of the Companies Act 2008, has the right to appoint a replacement practitioner following the resignation or removal of the initial business rescue practitioner.

The above was held by the court in *Tayob and Another v Shiva Uranium (Pty) Ltd and Others*[[14]](#footnote-15), and confirmed by the Constitutional Court in *Shiva Uranium (Pty) Limited (in business rescue) and Another v Tayob and Others*[[15]](#footnote-16).

*In casu*, Mr Dunce was appointed by the company via board resolution when they voluntarily commenced business rescue proceedings. As such, it is the company itself that has the right to appoint a replacement business rescue practitioner and not the employees.

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)**

A business rescue practitioner’s success fee is based on a contigency agreement. In terms of section 143(3) of the Companies Act 2008, this contingency agreement is only binding when voted on and approved by a majority of the creditors’ voting interests present at the relevant meeting and a majority of shareholders’ voting rights present at the relevant meeting (said rights borne out of their attachment to shares in the company which would entitle a shareholder to a portion of the company’s residual value upon its winding-up).

Mr Nkosi, in non-compliance with section 143(3) of the Companies Act 2008 outlined above, unilaterally decided to grant himself a success fee as opposed to calling a meeting to consider a contigency agreement peratining to such fee and have the requisite creditor and shareholders vote on such an agreement.

Therefore, Meropa Retail is able to recover the success fee paid to Mr Nkosi.

**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) | None of the Above | None of the Above | 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) | Preferent 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) | Unsecured Creditor | Non-Independent | Yes |

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

Orlando Investments (Preference Shares) does not have a voting right. A shareholder, who is not also a creditor, only obtains a voting right if the proposed business rescue plan has the effect of altering the rights attached to their shares. Orlando’s rights in respect of its shares were not altered.

(Please note: Orlando Investments would have voting rights as a non-independent unsecured creditor resulting from its shareholder loan).

**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 as follows.

In addition to the balance sheet for the financial year ending 31 March 2024, Mr Nkosi should also include projected balance sheets for the financial years ending 31 March 2025 and 2026.

Mr Nkosi should also include projected cash flow statements for the financial years ending 31 March 2024, 2025 and 2026 in order to enable, *inter alia*, an understanding of the company’s liquidity position.

Furthermore, in addition to providing the required notice of material assumptions as per section 150(3)(a) of the Companies Act 2008, Mr Nkosi should also include alternative projections which account for varying assumptions and contingencies as per section 150(3)(b) of the Companies Act 2008.

Further, if Mr Nkosi’s business rescue plan envisages a period longer than three years to exit out of business rescue, the financial statements and forecasts provided should extend to cover the envisioned longer period to exit business rescue.

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 three main assumptions that should be specified by Mr Nkosi are as follows:

1. Key sensitivities that may affect exchange rates, inflation rates, pricing and revenue growth – which sensitivities include global recession, a struggling South African economy and the business interuption effects of loadshedding.
2. The effect of future financing to be provided by The Extraordinary Bank of South Africa.
3. Working capital assumptions to allow for a consideration on current and future debtors, creditors, inventory and cash flow.

**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)(b) of the Companies Act 2008, an adopted business rescue plan is binding on all creditors of the company regardless of whether or not they voted in favour of the business rescue plan. As a result thereof, the creditors who did not vote in favour of the adopted business rescue plan are still bound thereto. This concept is known as “cram-down”. The “cram-down” concept also applies to the dissenting creditors in terms of section 154(2) of the Companies Act 2008 which precludes creditors from enforcing debts against the company, save to the extent provided for in the business rescue plan.

In addition, in casu, the dissenting votes only amount to 20% of the creditors’ voting interest. Therefore, and in accordance with the case of *DH Brothers Industies (Pty) Ltd v Gribnitz NO and Others*[[16]](#footnote-17), the cram-down provision is still applicable as the dissenting votes do not amount to more than 25% of the creditors’ voting interests.

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)**

The main difference in respect of enforcement of a business rescue plan on assenting versus dissenting creditors is found under section 154(1) of the Companies Act 2008. Section 154(1) of the Companies Act 2008 states that creditors who aceded to the discharge of their debts under an adopted business rescue plan lose their rights to enforce such debts. This provision only applies to creditors who voted in favour of the business rescue plan and not to dissenting creditors.
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