# COMPANY DIRECTORS' OBLIGATIONS AND LIABILITIES IN RELATION TO INSOLVENT TRADING IN THAILAND: A COMPARATIVE PERSPECTIVE

by

PONGSIT AROONRATANAKUL

Bachelor of Laws (LL.B), Chulalongkorn University, Thailand

Master of Laws (by Research) (LL.M), Chulalongkorn

University, Thailand

Master of Laws in Global Business Law (LL.M.), Latrobe

University, Australia

A thesis submitted for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy at the University of New England

March 2016

# CANDIDATES DECLARATION

I certify that the substance of this thesis has not already been submitted for any degree and is not currently being submitted for any other degree or qualification.

I declare that to the best of my knowledge and belief the law as stated in this thesis is current until 23 March 2016.

PONGSIT AROONRATANAKUL

# **ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS**

I would like to take this opportunity to express my gratitude to the people and institutions who offered their support and aid throughout this research project.

Firstly, I would like to sincerely thank my supervisor, Dr Same Varayudej, from the bottom of my heart, for a great opportunity in my life. I would like to recognise Dr Same for expanding my knowledge and understanding for this research. He has always supported and encouraged me during the challenging times. I am also truly indebted to Associate Professor Lillian Corbin and Dr Ottavio Quirico for their wonderful support and invaluable suggestions. Without this supervising team, I could not have succeeded in completing this research.

Also, I would like to thank the School of law of the University of New England, and the Australia Government for the scholarship provided to undertake this study; also, a massive thanks to all the staff in the School of Law for providing me with a brilliant working atmosphere.

I would like to express my gratitude to all colleagues from the Sukhothai Thammathirat Open University: Assistant Professor Dr Panumas Kudngaongarm, Associate Professor Paninee Kitpoka, Associate Professor Dr Thawatchai Suvanpanich, Assistant Professor Siriphan Polrob, Dr Wanwipa Muangtham and all the staff who encouraged, assisted and supported me during this research.

Thank you for their friendship and help to Mr Christopher Clancy, Dr Wanida Phromlah, Mr Watis Sotthibandhu and Assistant Professor Terrarat Cherawattana. I truly appreciate their support.

Finally, I would like to thank my parents, my family and Ms Chittasuphung Tontipiyomya for their endless love and support.

### **ABSTRACT**

Inadequate provisions for dealing with corporate insolvency are a significant obstacle in the economic development of Thailand. Companies which continue to trade even after they are unable to pay their debts (insolvent trading), often experience meltdowns that result in deep insolvencies that severely impact their creditors. In the Asian Financial Crisis in 1997, the Thai economy was significantly impacted by the insolvent trading practices of Thai companies. The Pin Chakkaphak case, in which the Thai government unsuccessfully sought a UK court to extradite Pin Chakkaphak, the then CEO of Fin One, for providing uncommercial loans to insolvent subsidiary companies, is a leading example of how Thai laws are neither effective nor adequate to deal with the problem of insolvent trading. Nevertheless, in spite of the known problems, current Thai corporate and insolvency laws still do not provide specific provisions or measures to regulate insolvent trading.

Developed countries, such as the United Kingdom, Australia, the United States and Germany, have specific statutory or common law provisions to control insolvent trading. In addition, the United Nations Commission on International Trade Law (UNCITRAL), provides the *Legislative Guide on Insolvency Law* by recommending the imposition of specific obligations on company directors to take appropriate action in order to minimise potential losses in the period approaching insolvency. An essential component of good corporate governance frameworks, whether at the domestic or international level, is the specification of the director's obligations and liabilities with respect to insolvent trading.

Under current Thai laws, company directors are required to exercise their broad powers for the best interests of the company as a whole. Directors have a duty to protect the interests of the company and shareholders. By implication, company directors are not required to protect the interests of creditors because directors do not have a duty to third parties. Moreover, under Thai laws, company directors do not have a specific duty to protect creditors' legitimate interests when a company is insolvent. This means that when a company approaches insolvency, directors can continue as normal even if they are aware or have a reasonable suspicion that the company may be insolvent or is

on the brink of insolvency. In other words, directors, under Thai laws, have no duty to prevent insolvent trading and are not personally liable for their company's debts. Without appropriate rules and the imposition of directors' liabilities, the likelihood is that there will be no change in the behaviour of companies with regard to insolvent trading and the interests of creditors will continue to be ignored.

This thesis argues that current Thai laws do not adequately protect creditors' interests by creating a duty for company directors when a company is nearing insolvency or becomes insolvent. In order to maintain Thailand's financial stability and promote economic growth, it is necessary for Thailand to reform corporate and insolvency laws and establish an effective regulatory framework that imposes duties and liabilities on company directors to protect the interests of creditors and other stakeholders by requiring their company to cease trading when it is insolvent.

This study discusses the current status of company directors' duties and personal liabilities with regard to insolvent trading in Thailand. The thesis also compares and critiques the *UNCITRAL Legislative Guides* and the laws of selected developed countries to determine the key elements necessary for establishing an appropriate model law for the Thai jurisdiction. Finally, the thesis makes recommendations on a model law for reforming the Thai bankruptcy law.

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

CANDIDATES DECLARATION	II
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	III
ABSTRACT	IV
LIST OF TABLES	IX
LIST OF FIGURES	IX
LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS	XII
CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION	1
I Introduction	1
II Thesis Statement	5
III Significance of the Research	7
IV Purpose of the Research	7
V Core Research Questions	8
VI Research Methodology	11
VII Limitations of the Study	13
VIII Definitions of Term in the Thesis	14
IX Structure of the Thesis	15
CHAPTER 2: THAI CORPORATE REGULATORY SYSTEM	18
I Introduction	18
II Historical Background of Corporate Laws	
A The Civil and Commercial Code	
B The Public Limited Companies Act	
C The Securities and Exchange Act	23
D The Bankruptcy Act	25
III State Agencies Regulating Companies	27
A Department of Business Development	27
B The Securities and Exchange Commission	29
C The Stock Exchange of Thailand	30
IV Conclusion	34
CHAPTER 3: ISSUES FOR CREDITORS WHEN A COMPANY TRA	DES
WHILE IT IS INSOLVENT	35
I Introduction	35
II Problems with Thai Corporate Laws	36
A Strict Adherence to the Juristic Person Principle	37
1 Agency Duties	37
(a) General duties	39
(b) Specific Duties	44
2 Corporate Veil	51
B Lack of a Definition of Director	53
C Uncertainty Concerning the Standard of Care under Thai Laws	56

D Inadequate Directors' Liabilities	62
1 Liabilities of Directors	62
(a) Liability to Company	62
(b) Liabilities to Shareholders	70
(c) Liability to Creditors	75
(d) Liability to Third Parties	77
2 Absence of Remedies when Company Directors' Fail to Prevent Insc	olvent
Trading E Absence of Directors' Duty when a Company is in an Insolvent State	
F Obstacles to Reorganisation	
III Conclusion	
CHAPTER 4: LESSONS FROM ABROAD CONCERNING CORPORAT INSOLVENT TRADING	
I Introduction	
II Background and Rationale to Prevent Insolvent Trading	
A The United Kingdom	
B Australia	
D Germany	
•	
E. The UNCITRAL Legislative Guide	
III Insolvent Trading Resolutions	
A Definition of Director	
B Duties to Prevent Insolvent Trading	
1 The Need for Specific Provisions	
2 Test to Verify a Company's Insolvency	
C Liabilities, Remedies and Defences	
1 Lifting the Corporate Veil and Directors' Liabilities	
2 Remedies	
3 Defences	171
D Reorganisation	176
IV Conclusion	181
CHAPTER 5: WHEN DOES A DIRECTORS' DUTY ARISE?	182
I Introduction	182
II Commencement of Directors' Duty to Prevent Insolvent Trading as Define	-
Other Countries and the UNCITRAL Legislative Guide	
A The United Kingdom	
B Australia	
C The United States	
D Germany	
E The UNCITRAL Legislative Guidelines	
III The State of Insolvency under the Thai Jurisdiction	205

A Presumptions of Insolvency in Thailand	206
B Commencement of Directors' Duty to Prevent Insolvent Trading	212
1 Comparing Starting Times	
2 Resolution of the Starting Point of Directors' Duty for Insolvent Tra	
Under Thai Jurisdiction	
III Conclusion	217
CHAPTER 6: REFORMING THAI REGULATION	219
I Introduction	219
II Why is a Reform Necessary?	220
III Barriers to a Reform	221
IV A Model Law	223
A Specific Statutory Provisions on Insolvent Trading	224
1 Director's Duty not to Engage in Insolvent Trading.	224
2 A Director should have High Level of Care to Manage a Company V is Insolvent	
3 Subjective and Objective Tests to Verify Directors' Execution of Th	neir
Duty	
4 Commencement of Directors' Duty to Prevent Insolvent Trading 5 Liabilities and Remedies	
(a) Civil Liability	
(b) Criminal Liability	
(c) Disqualification	235
6 Recommended Insolvent Trading Provisions	238
7 Defence	
B Definition of a Director	242
C Amendment of the Provision for Reorganisation	246
V Conclusion	252
CHAPTER 7: CONCLUSION	253
I Introduction	253
II Responses and Recommendations Relating to the Research Questions	254
III Research Outcomes	259
IV Suggestions for Future Research	260
BIBLIOGRAPHY	262
A Articles/Books/Reports	262
B Cases	
D. Other	282

# LIST OF TABLES

Table 3.1: Company insolvency cases compared with reorganisation cases in Thailand
Table 4.1: Meaning of directors under UK and Australian laws
Table 4.2: Meaning of shadow directors under UK and Australian laws
Table 4.3: Provisions and theory to prevent insolvent trading
Table 4.4: Summary of tests to verify company's insolvency and directors' execution
for insolvent trading under various jurisdictions
Table 4.5: Directors' liabilities under various jurisdictions
Table 4.6: Defences for insolvent trading under various jurisdictions
Table 6.1: Comparing liabilities of directors under various jurisdictions
Table 6.2: Civil liabilities for insolvent trading
Table 6.3: Criminal liabilities for insolvent trading
Table 6.4: Disqualification liabilities for insolvent trading
Table 6.5: Defences for insolvent trading
Table 6.6: Options for directors when a company is approaching insolvency 247
Table 6.7: A recommendation for reform of the Thai <i>Bankruptcy Act</i> 1940249
LIST OF FIGURES
Figure 2.1: Regulatory framework of the capital market in Thailand
Figure 3.1: Nonexistence of a director's duty in the insolvent state
Figure 5.1: Directors' responsibilities during a company's insolvent state in Thailand
Figure 5.2: Commencement of directors' duty for wrongful trading
Figure 5.3: Zone of insolvency
Figure 5.4: Comparing the starting point of directors' duty for preventing insolvent
trading under various jurisdictions
Figure 6.1: Commencement of director's duty to prevent insolvent trading under the
Thai jurisdiction

# **Table of Statutes**

#### **Thailand**

The Act Determining Offences Relating to the Register Partnership, Limited Partnership, Limited Company, Association, and Foundation BE 2499 (1956)

The Act Amending Ministry, Sub-Ministry and Department BE 2545 (2002)

The Bankruptcy Act BE 2483 (1940)

The Business Registration Act BE 2499 (1956)

The Civil and Commercial Code BE 2468 (1925) ('CCC')

The Criminal Code BE 2499 (1956)

The Criminal Procedure Code BE 2477 (1934)

The Organization of State Administration Act (5<sup>th</sup> Amendment) BE 2545 (2002)

The Public Limited Companies Act BE 2521 (1978) ('PLC (1978)')

The Public Limited Companies Act BE 2535 (1992) ('PLC (1992)')

The Securities and Exchange Act BE 2535 (1992) ('SEA')

# The United Kingdom

The Companies Act 1963 (Ireland)

The Company Act 1948

The Company Act 2006

The Cork Committee Report 1982

The Insolvency Act 1986

#### Australia

The Companies Act 1961 (NSW)

The Companies (Amendment) Act 1964 (NSW)

*The Companies Act 1981* (Cth)

*The Corporation Act 2001*(Cth)

*The Corporate Law Reform Act 1992* (Cth)

The Companies (Amendment) Act 1971 (Cth)

The General Insolvency Inquiry Report 1988 No 45

The Uniform Companies Act 1961 (Cth)

# **The United States**

The Model Corporation Act 2005

Title 11 of the United States Code ('US Bankruptcy Code')

The Delaware Code

# Germany

The German Civil Code ('GBG')

The German Stock Corporation Act 2010 ('AktG')

The Insolvency Statute 1994 ('InsO')

The Law for the Modernisation of the German Limited Liability Company Law and the Prevention of Misuse 2008 ('MoMiG')

The Private Limited Companies Act 1892 ('GmbHG')

# Other

The Companies Act 1990 (Singapore)

# LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

ASIC The Australian Securities and Investment Committee

AktG The German Stock Corporation Act 2010

CCC The Civil and Commercial Code

GBG The German Civil Code

GmbHG The Private Limited Companies Act 1892

IA The Insolvency Act 1986

InsO The Insolvency Statute 1994

MoMiG The Law for the Modernisation of the German Limited Liability

Company Law and the Prevention of Misuse

PLC The Public Limited Companies Act B.E.2535

SEA The Securities and Exchange Act B.E.2535

SEC The Securities and Exchange Commission

SET The Stock Exchange of Thailand

UK United Kingdom

UN United Nations

UNCITRAL The United Nations Commission on International Trade Law

US United States