REGULATORY FRAMEWORK GOVERNING CROSS-BORDER MERGERS IN INDIA UNDER COMPANIES ACT, 2013

Kamakshi Venkatraman & Sonakshi Varshney, Amity University, Noida

ABSTRACT

Cross-border mergers have emerged as significant instruments for corporate restructuring, international expansion, and value maximization in an increasingly globalized economic environment. The enactment of the Companies Act, 2013 introduced a structured legal framework under Sections 234–240, thereby replacing the earlier fragmented and indirect mechanisms governing such transactions. This study critically examines the statutory and regulatory architecture applicable to inbound and outbound cross-border mergers in India.

Adopting a doctrinal research methodology, the paper analyzes relevant statutory provisions, judicial pronouncements, and regulatory guidelines to identify key implementation challenges. These include regulatory overlap among multiple authorities, complexities in valuation methodologies, inadequate protection for minority shareholders, and limitations in creditor safeguards. The study further evaluates the interaction between corporate law and allied regulatory regimes, including foreign exchange laws, competition regulations, securities law, and taxation frameworks.

The paper proposes reforms aimed at enhancing regulatory coherence, streamlining approval processes, strengthening valuation standards, and improving stakeholder protection mechanisms. It concludes that while the Companies Act, 2013 establishes a foundational framework, its effectiveness is contingent upon greater regulatory harmonization, procedural clarity, and coordinated enforcement across jurisdictions.

Keywords: Cross-border mergers; Companies Act 2013; FEMA; regulatory framework; NCLT; shareholder protection; corporate restructuring; foreign investment; valuation; creditor rights.

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 Economic Context and Strategic Significance

With globalization imperatives, technological convergence, market liberalization and competitive dynamics requiring scale, capabilities and geographic diversification, cross-border mergers and acquisitions has become defining feature of modern corporate restructuring. A growing number of Indian corporations are opting for international consolidation of companies. This is essential to access developed markets, technology assets, branding synergies, operational efficiencies, and competitive positioning in global value chains. Foreign firms also encourage joint venture entry strategies in the Indian market due to its large population, growth in domestic consumption, availability of skilled workforce and potential in sectors like drugs, IT, manufacturing, and services.

Statistical evidence shows considerable economic size. From 2018 to 2022, Indian companies made outbound acquisitions amounting to USD 65 billion in various sectors, including pharmaceuticals, IT, metals, and energy. During this time, inbound transactions crossed USD 95 billion with big investments in digital services, e-commerce, telecommunications and financial services. The transaction volume highlights the strategic role of cross-border mergers and the importance of regulatory frameworks in enabling capital allocation and protecting stakeholders' interests.[1]

1.2 Pre-2013 Regulatory Vacuum

Before the Companies Act, 2013, India did not have adequate statutory provisions for cross-border mergers. The Companies Act of 1956, which allowed only mergers between Indian companies. The absence of relevant legislation resulted in various challenges for a corporation undertaking international restructuring. Cross-border mergers and acquisitions took place by using indirect ways like multi-layered acquisition structures by using holding companies, slump sale of business undertaking, transfer of assets arrangement, share exchange agreement, etc. Each of these had different tax impacts, regulatory complexities, transaction costs, and implementation risks.[2]

[1] *DealStreetAsia Research*, *India M&A Report 2022* 14–17 (2022).
[2] *The Companies Act, 1956*, No. 1 of 1956, Acts of Parliament (India).

Corporate companies interested in merging across borders faced uncertainty about the applicable law, procedure, authority for approval and enforcement. The absence of regulation caused issues, namely, opportunities for jockeying to jurisdiction for regulatory arbitrage, lack of adequate protection for minority shareholders in cross-border cases without clear appraisal rights, lack of protection for creditors where liability was passed but without similar protection in the new jurisdiction, ambiguity in tax treatment causing disputes and litigation, limited regulatory oversight allowing for potential abuse like asset stripping, valuation manipulation, and escape from regulation.[3]

1.3 Legislative Response: Companies Act, 2013

Legislature took action The Companies Act of 2013 represented the beginning of one of the important provisions relating to cross border merger. Thanks to this legislative intervention, the statutory framework was provided in respect of inbound as well as outbound merger exercises. Specifically, inbound mergers where foreign company mergers into Indian company and outbound mergers where Indian company merge into foreign company. This statutory recognition was prompted by many factors. Among these were economic liberalization that required our country's business practices to be aligned with international ones, attracting investment and technology, corporate flexibility to allow for better structuring for efficient business operations, and protection of stakeholders through regulatory oversight that allows for transparency.[4]

Nonetheless, implementation experience presented considerable difficulties. The framework necessitates coordination between the National Company Law Tribunal, Reserve Bank of India, Securities and Exchange Board of India, Competition Commission of India, sectoral regulators, and other parties. Multiple agencies involved means more procedures, more uncertainty on timelines, more likelihood of conflicting regulations, and more coordination issues, impacting feasibility and costs of the transaction.[5]

2. STATUTORY FRAMEWORK

2.1 Sections 234-240: Legislative Architecture

[3] *Law Commission of India*, Report No. 260, *The Companies Act, 2013* 43–47 (2015).
[4] *Ministry of Corporate Affairs*, *Companies Law Committee Report* 78–82 (2016).
[5] *The Companies Act, 2013*, No. 18 of 2013, §§ 234–240, Acts of Parliament (India).

Sections 234-240 of Companies Act, 2013 deals with cross border mergers in India. Section 234 is used to define basics, scope applicability and jurisdiction Section 234(1) states that a foreign company means any company or body incorporated outside India which has established a place of business in India whether by itself or through an agent or conduct business in India in any other manner.[6]

The section empowers the Central Government to notify countries whose companies may participate in cross-border mergers with Indian companies. The mechanism creates a gateway with respect to jurisdiction, restricting merger transactions only with counterparty incorporated in approved jurisdiction. The exclusion that prohibits the merger of a foreign company with an Indian company registered in a jurisdiction notified under section 12(10) concerning the standards of beneficial ownership disclosure is provided in section 234(2). An effort here is made to exclude shell companies incorporated in a tax haven and virtually opaque jurisdiction.[7]

Thus, while the special resolution of the company may approve the merger, the host nation must also approve the resolution. If the incorporation of the company requires compliance with 234(6)(b), that compliance must also be achieved before the merger can be finalized.

Requirements of the procedure:

The amendment in 2017 in Rule 25A related to the cross-border mergers under The Companies (Compromises, Arrangements and Amalgamations) Rules, 2016. This piece of secondary legislation dictates the processes required to implement the statutory provisions in a detailed manner.[8]

As per Rule 25A, the merger application must include sufficient information including the approved draft scheme of merger which gives the transaction structure, a board resolution of all the merging companies and their financial statements for the last three years, valuation reports of registered valuers, regulatory approvals of Reserve Bank with reference to permissible foreign exchange requirements, Competition Commission in reference to competition clearance, and Security and Exchange Board reference to compliance with the

[6] *The Companies Act, 2013*, § 234(1), No. 18 of 2013, Acts of Parliament (India).
[7] *The Companies Act, 2013*, § 234(2), No. 18 of 2013, Acts of Parliament (India).
[8] *Companies (Compromises, Arrangements and Amalgamations) Rules, 2016*, r. 25A, G.S.R. 368(E) (India).

requirement of the listed company.[9]

As per rule 25A(3), the NCLT has to direct notices to the Central Government through the Ministry of Corporate Affairs, The Reserve Bank of India, The income tax authorities, The Securities and Exchange Board for listed companies, The Registrar of Companies, The Official Liquidator, And various other regulatory authorities. Following the already established scheme procedure, NCLT orders meetings of creditors and of shareholders. To secure approval, the main credit or shareholders present and voting must be in majority in number who represent not less than three-fourths in value. Rules laid down by SEBI for listed companies further require approval by at least majority of minority shareholders excluding promoter group.

2.2 Procedural Requirements

Cross-border mergers must meet not only procedural requirements but also substantive requirements ensuring compliance and protection. Clause 25A(4) requires the valuation by registered valuers in accordance with Companies (Registered Valuers and Valuation) Rules, 2017. The valuer must have the qualifications, the registration and the independence and arm's length relationship with the merging companies as prescribed in the Rules. Recognized methodologies such as discounted cash flow analysis, comparable company multiples, net asset value approaches or combination methods that take into account industry and transaction characteristics must be used in valuation reports.

Section 234(5) safeguards the statutory rights of dissenting shareholders embodied in Section 230(11) to exit at fair value if they dissent. Dissenting shareholders voting against schemes and giving written dissent notices are entitled to share purchase by the acquiring companies at a value determined by registered valuers. This mechanism protects minority shareholders from being forced to participate in restructurings that they view as disadvantageous or unfair.

3. REGULATORY INTERFACE

3.1 Foreign Exchange Management Act Compliance

Cross-border mergers of companies or corporate entities necessarily implicate the foreign exchange regulations similarly administered by Reserve Bank of India under the Foreign

[9] *Companies (Compromises, Arrangements and Amalgamations) Rules, 2016*, r. 25A(3), G.S.R. 368(E) (India).

Exchange Management Act, 1999 (FEMA) (the Regulations). The Foreign Exchange Management (Cross Border Merger) Regulations, 2018 (the Regulations) establish a specific framework which governs the foreign exchange aspects involved with a cross border merger. Mergers of foreign firms with Indian firms entail transactions that would be a foreign investment. Such investment is subject to various sectoral FDI caps as are prescribed in the Consolidated FDI Policy. Foreign Investment Limits Imposed by Sectors: The sectors covered under different routes impose foreign investment limits as follows: Under the automatic route, 100 per cent foreign investment is permitted in all sectors including most manufacturing and certain services. Under the approval route, it is permitted only after receiving government approval where foreign investment exceeds prescribed limits. For example, manufacturing defence products beyond 74 per cent requires government approval, as does broadcasting beyond 49 per cent. The prohibited sector is one where only Indian investment is permitted meaning there is a complete ban on foreign investment in these sectors.[10]

FEMA pricing guidelines prevent underpricing which leads to capital flight and overpricing that enables money laundering. In this context, it is required that foreign investment transactions take place at fair market values. According to Regulation 10 of the Foreign Exchange Management (Transfer or Issue of Security by a Person Resident Outside India) Regulations, 2017, the price of equity instruments must be determined at fair value according to internationally accepted pricing methodology certified by a chartered accountant or a merchant banker. Provisions relating to pricing appear in guidelines of various cross-border mergers.

When the mergers of Indian companies into foreign entities constitute an outward investment, they require Reserve Bank approval as per Foreign Exchange Management (Transfer or Issue of Any Foreign Security) Regulations, 2004. The Indian companies can invest up-to 400% of its net worth for bona fide business activities by way of issue of foreign security in not more than one venture and in not more than one country. Investments that surpass the limits require explicit permission from the Reserve Bank which has to be substantiated by adequate justification outlining the rationale behind the business. Approval for outbound mergers from the Reserve Bank requires tax clearances on compliance at the very outset only.[11]

[10] *The Companies Act, 2013*, § 230(11), No. 18 of 2013, Acts of Parliament (India).
[11] *Foreign Exchange Management (Cross Border Merger) Regulations, 2018*, Notification No. FEMA 389/2018-RB (India).

3.2 Competition Law Requirements

All cross-border mergers fulfil the threshold criteria laid down under Section 5 of the Competition Act, 2002 require the prior approval of the Competition Commission of India (CCI) before being implemented. Section 5 sets out the monetary limits above which the parties to a combination are obliged to notify. The parties to a combination have to notify, if either the assets in India of the parties to the combination exceed Rs. 1000 crore with total worldwide assets exceeding Rs. 3000 crore; or the turnover in India of the parties to the combination exceeds Rs. 2000 crore with total worldwide turnover exceeding Rs. 5000 crore.[12]

The Competition Commission of India assesses whether mergers and combinations take place to the adverse effect of competition in India. In determining this the CCI examines the factors specified in Section 20(4) such as the actual and potential competition between the merging parties, the structure of the market and the level of concentration, whether entry barriers that limit new competition are being created, whether countervailing buyer power is being created and any efficiencies that are being created that benefit consumers. Mergers that raise competition concerns but also offer beneficial efficiencies may be approved by the Commission subject to structural remedies requiring the divestitures of businesses or behavioral remedies imposing restrictions on conduct.

3.3 Securities Regulations for Listed Companies

According to the SEBI regulations, whenever a listed company undertakes a cross-border merger, it will have to comply with some extra obligations meant to protect public shareholders. As per SEBI (Listing Obligations and Disclosure Requirements) Regulations, 2015, the continuous disclosure obligations include the material event disclosure regarding mergers and the scheme documentation disclosure ensuring access of the shareholders to all the detailed information regarding the scheme along with the ongoing status update regarding the scheme as well as regulatory approvals.

Agreements with stock exchange listing require independent valuation reports along with fairness opinions for mergers. i.e. with the help of multiple valuation approaches, a

[12] *Foreign Exchange Management (Transfer or Issue of Security by a Person Resident Outside India) Regulations, 2017*, Notification No. FEMA 20(R)/2017-RB (India).

comprehensive assessment is provided.

Insiders that have unpublished price-sensitive information about merger negotiations cannot trade. The SEBI (Prohibition of Insider Trading) Regulations, 2015, impose restrictions on trading by insiders. Cross-border mergers that result in the delisting of an Indian listed company must follow SEBI (Delisting of Equity Shares) Regulations, 2021, including providing an exit opportunity to public shareholders through reverse book building mechanisms.

4. CRITICAL IMPLEMENTATION CHALLENGES

4.1 Valuation Disputes and Methodological Complexity

Valuation is at the heart of any cross-border merger issue, determining exchange ratios which establish relative entitlement of shareholders, the adequacy of protection for creditors and fairness of the transaction. There are various challenges in cross-border contexts. Companies in India adopt Indian Accounting Standards (Ind AS), which has been substantially converged with International Financial Reporting Standards (IFRS). However, these standards retain jurisdiction-specific modifications. Foreign businesses can comply with IFRS, US GAAP, or country-specific accounting standards. Valuation complexities arise due to differences in accounting standards. Asset recognition and measurement principles diverge, as do liability measurement and revenue recognition timing.

The translations of currencies you decide upon will affect the reported value of entities. The time distance between announcement and implementation creates valuation disputes caused by exchange rate volatility. Changes in currency values can affect relative values and exchange ratios, which may create windfall gains or losses for groups of shareholders. Transaction documentation should provide for allocation of exchange rate risk, via a fixed exchange ratio which accepts the currency risk, a floating exchange ratio which moves with the currency or a collar which fixes a band within which the exchange ratio will vary.[13]

Various methods including discounted cash flow projecting future free cash flows and discounting to present values using weighted average cost of capital, comparable company analysis comparing valuation multiples for publicly traded comparable companies are done by

[13] *Foreign Exchange Management (Transfer or Issue of Any Foreign Security) Regulations, 2004*, Notification No. FEMA 120/RB-2004 (India).

valuers. Further he does precedent transaction analysis examining acquisition prices paid in comparable transactions, and net asset value calculating fair market values of identifiable assets and liabilities. Contentious methodology selection occurs in practice arising from divergent indications of value from differing methods which favour different stakeholder groups.

4.2 Minority Shareholder Protection Gaps

The ability of minority shareholders to guard themselves against losses is weakened in cross-border mergers. Minority shareholders examining a cross-border merger must have access to a comprehensive range of information. This must include detailed financial forecasts and the assumptions behind them, strategic rationale and synergy quantification, methodology for deriving the exchange ratio and sensitivity analysis, tax effects for each category of shareholder, currency risks and exchange rate assumptions, regulatory risk and timing of approvals, and relevant foreign jurisdiction legal frameworks affecting shareholder rights.

The quality of real disclosure differs significantly throughout transactions. The schemes often give generic rationale without quantifying synergies. May fail to include sensitivity analyses that show ranges for outcomes. The disclosure requirements of SEBI for listed company only apply to public companies that are listed. Minority shareholders of private companies do not enjoy the same level of disclosure protection as publicly traded companies.

Section 230(11) provides for dissent rights but will have implementation difficulties. Exercising dissent rights entails voting against schemes at shareholder meetings, delivering a written notice of dissent within a specified time, as well as tendering shares for purchase. Strict timelines and complex procedural requirements can impose barriers on unsophisticated minority shareholders. Disputes regarding fair value assessments occur often, but contesting expert valuations requires financial expertise and resources that individual minority shareholders frequently do not have.

4.3 Creditor Safeguard Limitations

Creditors have valid interests in limiting the impact of liability transfers on recovery. Mechanisms that surround the scheme currently include a meeting of creditors and approval of creditors, scrutiny by NCLT as to the scheme being fair to creditors and provisions that preserve a security interest. Nevertheless, one is limited. Creditors who assess cross-border mergers

require information concerning the creditworthiness of the foreign transferee including its financial statements, credit rating capital structure, insolvency and bankruptcy regimes in the foreign jurisdiction including creditor priority scheme and average recovery rates, security enforcement mechanism in foreign jurisdictions, and a comparative analysis of creditor positions pre- and post-merger.

Real disclosures to creditors often don't contain such detailed information. Schemes contain basic reports of the financial status of the government security without analysing the creditworthiness in detail. Descriptions of the legal framework in a foreign jurisdiction are superficial without a substantial comparison of the rights and remedies for creditors. The merger of secured assets in Indian Companies to a Foreign Company raises questions about the continuation of security interest, registration in a foreign jurisdiction, maintenance of priority, and enforcement in case of default.[14]

4.4 Tax Implications and Structuring Considerations

Cross-border merger structuring, transaction economics, and stakeholder returns are influenced by taxation. Participants in schemes of demerger, the transfer of shares and smart investments are considered. Income Tax Saved under Section 47 at 1961 moratorium Business reorganization. NCLT approval plans by NCLT in 2016 business rezoning application. NCLT-approved scheme under the merger of multiple steps. Section 47(vii) application to cross-border mergers can be ambiguous. Section 47(vii) will potentially be excluded for transferee companies outside India. Outbound mergers where Indian companies merge in foreign companies will lead to that result. Capital gains taxation on transferee companies may take place thereafter.

Cross-border mergers are international transactions which thus require the transfer price analysis under Section 92 to take place at arm's length prices. Tax authorities review whether the exchange ratios are at fair market values or involve value transfer to a particular person. Taxpayers should maintain complete documentation along with an economic analysis, assessments of comparability and explanation of methodology to justify pricing determinations in accordance with transfer pricing regulations.

The provisions delineated under section 95-102 which create the general Anti-avoidance rule

[14] *The Competition Act, 2002*, § 5, No. 12 of 2003, Acts of Parliament (India).

give power to the authorities to question tax avoidance arrangements which are impermissible and lack commercial substance and also made with a primary objective of obtaining tax benefits. Cross-border mergers which are motivated primarily by tax benefits rather than a genuine business purpose could be subjected to GAAR application leading to disallowance of tax benefits and recharacterization of the arrangements for tax purposes.

5. COMPARATIVE PERSPECTIVES

5.1 United Kingdom Framework

The framework established by the United Kingdom Companies Act 2006 Part 26, which is widely applied for cross-border restructuring, is now increasingly utilized for international schemes of arrangement owing to its compliance with the requirements of procedural flexibility, judicial sophistication and international recognition. Jurisdiction rests with UK courts for schemes relating to companies registered in England, Wales. Through the "sufficient connection" doctrine that is evolved in the case laws, the courts have sanctioned the schemes of foreign incorporated companies which have show sufficient connection with England, such as, central management and control, location of shareholders or creditors, provision for governing law.[15]

The process followed in the UK for schemes emphasizes efficiency through judicial discretion, enabling courts to approve schemes that satisfy fairness standards. The process does not require multiple regulatory approvals. The single court process centralizes approval in the Companies Court which streamlines timelines. Other factors include judicial consistency providing precedential clarity that provides predictability, and expedited timelines. These typically span for 6-9 months that are substantially shorter than Indian cross-border merger timelines which often extend from 15-24 months.

The UK jurisprudence established the rules for classifying creditors to determine when different creditor groups will be a different class and having their own vote. Creditors who have barely the same rights to reflect together in the interest of a common cause are distinct classes. As a result of this classification rigor, no creditor group with conflicting interest can

[15] *The Competition Act, 2002*, § 20(4), No. 12 of 2003, Acts of Parliament (India).

outvote another.[16]

5.2 Singapore Approach

Singapore has strengthened itself as the premier Asian restructuring jurisdiction through wide-ranging legislative reforms. The companies of Singapore are governed by the provisions of the Companies Act. The Companies Act Part VIIIA was introduced in 2017 to modernize scheme provisions. The Insolvency, Restructuring and Dissolution Act 2018 also introduced additional restructuring tools including the automatic moratorium preventing creditor enforcement actions upon scheme application filing. The tool also includes pre-packaged schemes which allow for expedited approval for pre-negotiated schemes and cross-border protocols which facilitate judicial cooperation with foreign courts.[17]

The country of Singapore adopted the UNCITRAL Model Law on Cross-Border Insolvency which provides the basic framework for the recognition of foreign insolvency proceedings, coordination of concurrent proceedings and providing assistance to the foreign insolvency representatives which enhanced Singapore's attractiveness as a centre of restructuring. The Singapore International Commercial Court and High Court gain specialized expertise with experienced judges, efficient procedures through electronic filing systems and strict timelines, and international credibility attracting international parties.[18]

5.3 Delaware Corporate Law

CEO Activision Blizzard Bobby Kotick has prevailed in a lawsuit instituted by his ex-girlfriend. The board has been granted authority to approve the proposed merger by Delaware law subject to fulfilling its fiduciary duties. Judicial deference is afforded to the business decisions of directors, including merger approvals, under the business judgment rule when those decisions are made with due care, in good faith and without conflict. Merger transactions require approval by the board and majority of shareholder vote.

Dissenting shareholders have an appraisal right to obtain a judicial determination of fair value.

---

[16] *SEBI (Listing Obligations and Disclosure Requirements) Regulations, 2015*, Notification No. SEBI/LAD-NRO/GN/2015-16/013 (India); *SEBI (Prohibition of Insider Trading) Regulations, 2015*, Notification No. SEBI/LAD-NRO/GN/2014-15/021 (India).

[17] Shannon P. Pratt & Roger J. Grabowski, *Cost of Capital* 312 (5th ed. 2014).

[18] Jennifer Payne, Cross-Border Schemes of Arrangement and Forum Shopping, 14 *European Business Organization Law Review* 563, 571 (2013).

The assessment offers sole monetary remedy to dissenting shareholders in arm's-length mergers. The Delaware Chancery Court evaluates "fair value" in the absence of merger. The law provides guidance on valuation methodology.[19]

Fiduciary duties owed by directors include duty of care and duty to loyalty. The application of heightened scrutiny by the judiciary arises in relation to sale of control transactions which require value maximization; controlling shareholder squeeze-outs which call for entire fairness review; and defensive measures against hostile takeovers. Increased oversight safeguards against self-dealing while upholding board flexibility.

6. PROPOSED REFORMS

6.1 Integrated Regulatory Clearance

The main inefficiency of the present regime arises from separate approval processes requiring subsequent or simultaneous applications to agencies. Each authority is independent and has adopted its own procedures, timelines and documentation requirements creating timeline uncertainty, duplication and inconsistency risks, and transaction costs. Establish a combined cross-border merger clearance mechanism through a single application portal that receives a comprehensive application. It designates a lead regulator to coordinate with other authorities, a coordinated review timeline to establish a maximum period of 180 days from filing to final decision, and deemed approval if specialized authorities do not file objections within the stipulated timeline. Finally, there is consolidated objection resolution that allows for a comprehensive response from the parties.[20]

6.2 Expanded Jurisdictional Scope

Restricting legitimate opportunities of restructuring to central government notified jurisdictions. Broaden eligible jurisdictions through risk-based classification. Regulated jurisdictions with transparent corporate registries, accounting standards conforming to international standards, stringent anti-money laundering regulations, undertakings for bilateral information exchange and reciprocal recognition will be processed on a fast track basis under the automatic route – Tier 1. Jurisdictions that meet basic regulatory standards along the Tier

[19] *Re Drax Holdings Ltd.*, [2004] 1 W.L.R. 1049 (Ch).
[20] *Weinberger v. UOP, Inc.*, 457 A.2d 701, 711 (Del. 1983).

2 standard route follow standard approval processes. Enhanced documentation including beneficial ownership disclosure and independent fairness opinions is required for Tier 3 scrutinized jurisdictions with regulatory issues.

6.3 Enhanced Valuation Standards

Though the law provides for valuation standards, there is a lot of ambiguity which may allow disputes. The Ministry of Corporate Affairs must issue a complete set of valuation guidance. These have to cover criteria for selection of methodology based on type of industry and transaction, requirement of sensitivity analysis, fair value standards for dissenting rights clarifying treatment of minority discount and attribution of synergy benefits.

6.4 Strengthened Minority Protection

Require comprehensive disclosure in scheme documents, including financial projections, quantification of synergies, exchange ratio analysis, tax consequences, and analysis of alternative structures. Statutory guidance on principles of class determination and independent assessment requirements can enhance class voting protection. Implement streamlined procedures and prompt payment timelines, expedite dispute resolution, and adopt attorney fee provisions to incentivise exercise of dissent rights.

6.5 Improved Creditor Safeguards

Require stronger disclosure to creditors including foreign company information packages, comparative insolvency analysis and plans for transfer of security. When the target company will have material liability, some security mechanism must be mandated like bank guarantees, escrow, retention of certain assets etc. Representation of creditor committees for significant mergers affecting different creditor groups.

7. CONCLUSION

Cross-border mergers refer to strategically important corporate restructuring mechanisms through which firms derive operational efficiencies, a foothold in foreign markets, and economies of scale. India's regulatory framework under Companies Act, 2013 is laid down in Sections 234-240, which provide statutory recognition. These sections also execute the approval process, protect stakeholder interest, and offer regulatory oversight and creates a

framework that now fills a regulatory vacuum.

Yet, the experience in implementation shows major difficulties calling for regulatory intervention and reform. The multi-agency approval method complicates coordination and makes timelines uncertain. Legitimate opportunities for restructuring limited through jurisdictional restrictions. Disputes over valuation are common among shareholders. Minority shareholders are not being adequately protected due to information asymmetries and complex deal structures. The mechanisms created to protect creditors do not adequately deal with the adequacy of the risk arising from the transfer of liabilities to foreign entities subject to different insolvency regimes. Taxation has a significant impact on transaction structuring given the uncertainty surrounding tax treatment of transactions.

A comparative analysis shows differing approaches to facilitate transactions and protecting stakeholders. A flexible jurisdictional approach and streamlined procedures allow efficient restructuring in the UK. Singapore has a top-notch restructuring centre due to its integrated regulatory framework and global cooperation. Delaware's board-centric corporate governance and fiduciary duty protections are evidence of an enabling regulatory approach with stakeholder safeguards.

To address the gaps identified, the suggested measures will go in the direction of integrated regulatory clearance for reduction of transaction time and cost, expansion of jurisdictional scope balancing flexibility with safeguards, improved valuation standards reducing the scope of disputes, tightening of minority protection to address information asymmetries, and improvement of creditor safeguards addressing vulnerability.

Regulation of cross-border mergers often requires a balancing act. Authorities need to balance the desire to permit legitimate restructuring against regulatory arbitrage; the need to provide regulatory certainty against flexibility; the need to protect minority shareholders and creditors against the will of the majority; the need to coordinate multiple authorities against paralysis; and lastly, there is a requisite balance between allowing foreign investment against protection of national interests.

Busier cross-border merger volumes expected before cross-border economic integration of India. The effectiveness of a regulatory framework largely determines whether a transaction will yield productive efficiency or regulatory arbitrage. Reformation to address identified gaps

in a proactive manner would place India in a role of facilitating restructuring for value creation while ensuring appropriate stakeholder protection. This will enhance corporate dynamism and market integrity, both essential for long-term sustainable economic development.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Statutes

Companies Act, 2013; Companies Act, 1956; Foreign Exchange Management Act, 1999; Competition Act, 2002; Income Tax Act, 1961; Insolvency and Bankruptcy Code, 2016 (India)

Companies (Compromises, Arrangements and Amalgamations) Rules, 2016; Foreign Exchange Management (Cross Border Merger) Regulations, 2018; SEBI (Listing Obligations and Disclosure Requirements) Regulations, 2015 (India)

Companies Act 2006 (UK); Singapore Companies Act; Delaware General Corporation Law (USA)

Cases

In re Hindustan Lever Employees' Union, (1995) 83 Comp. Cas. 30 (CLB) Vodafone India Limited v. Union of India, Comp. App. (AT) No. 34/2020 (NCLAT) Re Drax Holdings Ltd., [2004] 1 W.L.R. 1049 (Ch) Weinberger v. UOP, Inc., 457 A.2d 701 (Del. 1983)

Books & Articles

Pratt, Shannon P. & Grabowski, Roger J., Cost of Capital (5th ed., 2014) Payne, Jennifer, "Cross-Border Schemes," 14 EBOLR 563 (2013) Naniwadekar & Varottil, "Stakeholder Approach," 10 NLSIR 27 (2018)

Reports

Ministry of Corporate Affairs, "Companies Law Committee Report" (2016) Law Commission of India, "Report No. 260" (2015) DealStreetAsia Research, "India M&A Report 2022" (2022)